

CABINET

29 OCTOBER 2013

GATEWAY 1 PROJECT COMMENCEMENT – EASTGATE HOUSE REFURBISHMENT WORKS

Portfolio Holders: Councillor Doe, Housing and Community Services
Councillor Alan Jarrett, Finance

Report from: Robin Cooper, Director of Regeneration, Community and Culture

Author: Bob Dimond, Project Manager Eastgate House, Greenspace and Heritage Services
Susan Goss, Category Specialist Place & Projects

Summary

This report seeks permission to commence the procurement of the refurbishment and conservation of the Grade I Listed Building, Eastgate House, High Street, Rochester, focal point of the Eastgate Conservation Area, in accordance with the Medway Council Plan.

This Gateway 1 report was approved for submission to Cabinet after review and discussion at Regeneration, Community and Culture Directorate Management Team meeting on 16 October 2013 and Procurement Board on 15 October 2013. Full Council approved the budget on 24 January 2013 (minute number: 777).

The Regeneration, Community and Culture Directorate Management Team have recommended that this project be approved as a Category B High Risk project at Gateway 1 by the Cabinet. This is because this project is a Works Category B High Risk procurement with a total contract value above £500,000.00 generating significant public interest.

1. Budget and Policy Framework

1.1 Service Background Information

1.1.1 The project will conserve this wonderful building and heritage for generations to come opening it up as a distinctive, valued and vibrant community resource for Medway and our visitors. When completed the project will have transformed

access to and experience of this much loved local landmark creating a sustainable future for Eastgate House.

- 1.1.2 An exciting and diverse range of activities and interpretation, inspired by the building and its residents over 400 years will enable anyone living in or visiting Medway to learn about, experience and enjoy this unique heritage.
- 1.1.3 Addressing the urgent conservation requirements of the house will transform this Tudor mansion and secure the future of the building. A new lift, sensitively designed to complement the site, and the reinstatement of a demolished staircase will allow access for all to floors closed for decades. A robust Conservation Management Plan will ensure that decisions throughout the project and beyond are taken with full consideration and understanding of the historical, social, aesthetic and communal significance of all areas of the house.
- 1.1.4 The project will introduce new galleries and education spaces to facilitate our learning and participation aims. Significant improvements to visitor facilities will generation new opportunities for income generation, creating new jobs and ensuring sustainability of the project.

1.2 Council's Strategic Priorities And Core Values

The project directly links into the following Council Strategic Priorities and Core Values:

Core Values

- Putting our customers at the centre of everything we do.

This project will deliver against the Core Value of 'Putting our customers at the centre of everything we do' through: preserving local heritage sites through making sites more accessible and giving them a sustainable future.

- Giving value for money

This project will deliver against the Core Value of 'Giving value for money' through: refurbishing the site, bringing it fully into use and enabling it to generate its own income making the site sustainable.

Strategic Priorities

- Children and young people having the best start in life in Medway.

This project will deliver against the Strategic Priority of 'Children and young people having the best start in life in Medway' through enabling them to experience local history first hand.

- Everyone benefiting from the area's regeneration.

This project will deliver against the Strategic Priority of 'Everyone benefiting from the area's regeneration' through the improvement of the site as a leisure facility and source of employment.

1.3 Strategic Council Obligations

The procurement of this requirement directly links into the following Strategic Council Obligations:

- Medway Council Plan

This project is named specifically on the Medway Council Plan:

Eastgate House improvements

The project focuses on conserving the important historic fabric of Eastgate House and adapting the building so that it can be used as a distinctive and vibrant community resource for Medway residents and our visitors.

1.4 Departmental and Directorate Service Plans

This project links into the following Departmental/Directorate Service Plans through the Medway Cultural Strategy 2009-2014.

1.5 Funding/Engagement From External Sources

As this project encompasses funding from external sources, authority to proceed with this procurement direction has been reviewed and approved by the Heritage Lottery Fund.

2. Background

2.1 Project Details

2.1.1 This is a Works/Construction project.

2.1.2 This report seeks permission to commence a new procurement project with a proposed contract duration of 50 weeks with provisions to extend.

The contract is proposed to commence on 03/02/2014 and conclude on 16/01/2015.

2.1.3 This project is a standalone project with no linkage to any other procurement projects or procurement programmes.

2.2 Business Case

2.2.1 Procurement Project Outputs / Outcomes

As part of the successful delivery of this project, the following outputs / outcomes within the table below have been identified as key (by the Heritage Lottery Fund) and will be monitored as part of the procurement project delivery process.

Outputs / Outcomes	How will success be measured?	Who will measure success of outputs/ outcomes	When will success be measured?
1. Repair and restoration work to internal spaces and exterior fabric.	Monitoring and managing the project delivery plan.	Project Manager, Bob Dimond.	In line with the project delivery plan.
2. Installation of lift and shaft between the ground and second floors including alterations to existing lean-to structure.	Monitoring and managing the project delivery plan.	Project Manager, Bob Dimond.	In line with the project delivery plan.
3. Reinstatement of the 17 th century staircase between the ground and second floors.	Monitoring and managing the project delivery plan.	Project Manager, Bob Dimond.	In line with the project delivery plan.
4. Ground floor conversion including education room, entrance hall, interpretation area, kitchen and ablutions.	Monitoring and managing the project delivery plan.	Project Manager, Bob Dimond.	In line with the project delivery plan.
5. First floor conversion into five gallery spaces and three stores.	Monitoring and managing the project delivery plan.	Project Manager, Bob Dimond.	In line with the project delivery plan.
6 Second floor conversion into five gallery spaces and three stores.	Monitoring and managing the project delivery plan.	Project Manager, Bob Dimond.	In line with the project delivery plan.
7. Third floor conversion into	Monitoring and managing the	Project Manager, Bob Dimond.	In line with the project delivery

two offices and a storage space.	project delivery plan.		plan.
8. Programme of learning, engagement and volunteering as set out in the activity plan.	As outlined in the Heritage Lottery Grant application.	Project Manager, Bob Dimond	As outlined in the Heritage Lottery Grant application.

2.2.2 Procurement Project Management

This procurement project will be resourced through the following project resources and skills:

- Project Manager Eastgate House, Bob Dimond, on behalf of Greenspace and Heritage Services
- Design and Conservation Manager, Martin McKay
- Category Specialist Place and Projects, Susan Goss
- Architect, Clive England, Thomas Ford and Partners
- Structural Engineer, Robert Bowles, Alan Baxter and Associates
- M&E Engineer, Chris Darby, Crofton Design (Kent) Ltd
- CDM Coordinator, Paul Vind, Huntley Cartwright
- Cost Consultant, Alan Godden, Huntley Cartwright
- Conservator, Tom Organ, The Wall Paintings Workshop.

2.2.3 Post Procurement Contract Management

The contract management of this procurement project post award will be resourced through the following contract management strategy:

- Project Manager Eastgate House, Bob Dimond, on behalf of Greenspace and Heritage Services
- Design and Conservation Manager, Martin McKay
- Category Specialist Place and Projects, Susan Goss
- Architect, Clive England, Thomas Ford & Partners
- Structural Engineer, Robert Bowles, Alan Baxter and Associates
- M&E Engineer, Chris Darby, Crofton Design (Kent) Ltd
- CDM Coordinator, Paul Vind, Huntley Cartwright
- Cost Consultant, Alan Godden, Huntley Cartwright
- Conservator, Tom Organ, The Wall Paintings Workshop.

2.2.4 Other Issues

There are no other issues that could potentially impact both the procurement process and overall strategic aims as identified within Section 1 Budgetary and Policy Framework.

2.2.5 TUPE Issues

Further to guidance from the Category Management Team, it has been identified that TUPE does not apply to this procurement process. This is because it is a works project.

3. Options

In arriving at the preferred option as identified within Section 4.1 'Preferred Option', the following options have been considered with their respective advantages and disadvantages.

3.1 Do nothing

The option of doing nothing is not a viable option because: the authority is at risk of losing this valuable heritage site should it not be maintained.

3.2 In-house service provision

The option of providing this requirement through in-house service provision has been considered but is not a viable option because no such service exists.

3.3 Using another local authority to deliver projects

The option of using another local authority to deliver projects has been considered but is not a viable option.

3.4 Procurement via an EU compliant framework

The option of using an EU compliant framework to deliver projects has been considered and the following frameworks have been identified from which Medway Council's projects can be satisfied:

iESE Contractors Regional framework (Hampshire CC) Tier 1 Value Band £1 million – no upper limit

iESE Contractors Sub Regional framework (East Sussex CC) Tier 2 Value Band £1 million - £5 million.

Both of these frameworks are available to all members of SE7.

Below are the advantages and disadvantages of this option:

Advantages :-

- Early contractor involvement to provide programme and design advice
- Contractor Overhead and Profit fixed in framework
- Value based 2-stage procurement process
- Quality Assurance process and governance
- KPI performance measurement built into the process
- Local area spend, SME and sustainability targets

- Design risk passed to Main Contractor
- Stakeholder engagement via iESE Gateway process
- Process and efficiency saving on traditional tender process
- Target Cost approach gives budget certainty

Disadvantages:-

- Process requires full buy-in from all parties and a change in culture to embrace collaborative working
- Requires close working between Contractor and Medway Council's Cost Consultant to ensure rigour in pricing all sub-contract packages to achieve guaranteed maximum price
- Management cost of using the framework is 0.4% of 1% of the contract value or a maximum of £3,000 which is paid by the contractor.

3.5 Formal tender process in line with Contract Procedure Rules

The option of formally tendering this project solely in line with Medway Council's Contract Procedure Rules has been considered because this project is a Category B Procurement that has a total contract value above £100,000.00 but below the EU Procurement Threshold for Works of £4,348,350, thus only requiring a competitive process in line with Contract Procedure Rules. Analysis of the options for formal tender via the various select list options is given in paragraph 3.10 below.

3.6 Formal tender process in line with EU Procurement Regulations.

The option of formally tendering this project in line with EU Procurement Regulations has been considered but this is not required because the value of the requirement is below the EU Procurement Threshold for Works of £4,348,350.00.

3.7 Internal Medway Council Collaboration between departments

The option of procuring requirements through internal collaboration between Medway Council departments in order to exploit economies of scale and synergies has been considered but no such opportunities exist.

3.8 External public sector collaboration (e.g. other Councils, Fire Service, PCT, Police)

The option of procuring requirements through external collaboration between Medway Council and other external public sector organisations in order to exploit economies of scale and synergies has been considered but no such opportunities exist.

3.9 Private sector collaboration e.g. Private Public Partnering/Private Finance Initiatives

The option of procuring requirements through private sector collaboration between Medway Council and other external private sector organisations has been considered but no such opportunities exist.

3.10 Procurement via a below EU Threshold Select List

The option of using a below EU Threshold compliant Select List to deliver projects has been considered and the following Select Lists have been identified from which Medway Council's projects can be satisfied.

1) Constructionline – the UK register of pre-qualified construction services

Advantages

- Reduces the requirement on bidders to submit information
- Contractors are already checked for financial viability, quality and service
- Building and Design Services have already paid to utilise this service

Disadvantages

- External fees paid to utilise the framework
- Current pressure of Local Authority work is resulting in reluctance of best quality contractors to price traditional tendered contracts
- Discriminates against those suppliers who have not paid to be members of Constructionline
- Full tender process needs to be undertaken

2) Kent County Council Select List of contractors

Advantages

- Reduces procurement time
- Contractors are already checked for financial viability, quality and service
- Building and Design Services have already paid to utilise this service

Disadvantages

- External fees paid to utilise the framework
- Current pressure of Local Authority work is resulting in reluctance of best quality contractors to price traditional tendered contracts

3.11 Other alternative options

No alternative options have been identified.

4. Advice and analysis

4.1 Preferred option

Further to an extensive review of procurement options as highlighted within Section 3 'Options' above, the following preferred option is recommended to the Cabinet including justification for this recommendation.

The preferred option is 3.5 competitive tender in line with the Contract Procedure Rules, using specialist contractors who have been prequalified through their registration with Constructionline. A list of 6 prospective tenderers has been compiled through consultation with the main funder. Any change to the list will require further consultation and may delay the project.

4.2 Equality Act 2010

4.2.1 Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 requires the Council to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Act, to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it and to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. The relevant protected characteristics are age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.

4.2.2 A Diversity Impact Assessment was presented to Council on 24 January 2013 and is attached to this paper to assist the Cabinet in making its decision.

4.3 Corporate Sustainability Plan and Carbon Reduction Commitment Energy Efficiency Scheme (CRC)

4.3.1 This project will be environmentally sustainable and environmental issues will be considered at each state of the planning process. The project highlights the environmental advantages of reusing existing buildings.

4.3.2 The Design Team have ensured that sustainable practice is observed throughout in line with the listed status of the building and its location in a conservation area. The limited amount of new build will use materials such as timber from sustainable and local sources. The installation of new electrical and plumbing services with energy efficient environmental systems will reduce energy wastage and the building's carbon footprint. These efforts include minimising water usage and timed heading and lighting in some areas. Day to day management of environmental issues will be part of the management plan to reduce waste. New ICT technology will generate less paper and enable power save systems.

4.3.3 The Eastgate House Conservation Management Plan refer direct to climate change, sustainability and effects on the environment:

- Policy 16: Future proposals for Eastgate House must pay special regard to solutions which will reduce the carbon footprint of the building.

- Policy 17: future proposals should seek to minimise energy usage and water waste.
- Policy 18: regard must be made to the source of any materials used in refurbishment works at Eastgate House. Traditional materials should be used where possible, because of the lower embodied energy they contain.

4.3.4 Eastgate House is served well by public transport. The existing Medway Council benefits (reduced cost bus travel and car sharing schemes) will be promoted to staff and volunteers. The tourism and heritage departments already work closely with Southeastern Trains to encourage travel to the destination by train. Incentives such as 2 for 1 tickets for visitors will be extended to include exhibitions at Eastgate House (just 10 minutes walk from Rochester station). We will monitor how visitors reach the site with a visitor survey and aim to improve the percentage of people coming to Eastgate House without relying on a car.

5. Risk Management

5.1 Risk Categorisation

The following risk categories have been identified as having a linkage to this procurement project:

Procurement process	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Equalities	<input type="checkbox"/>
Contractual delivery	<input type="checkbox"/>	Sustainability / Environmental	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Service delivery	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Legal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Reputation / political	<input type="checkbox"/>	Financial	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Health & Safety	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other/ICT*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

For each of the risks identified above further information has been provided below.

Risk Categories	Outline Description	Risk Likelihood A=Very High B=High C=Significant D=Low E=Very Low F=Almost Impossible	Risk Impact I=Catastrophic II=Critical III=Marginal IV=negligible Impact	Plans To Mitigate Risk
a) Procurement process	Tenders received are above agreed budget.	C	I	Budget has been checked and approved independently by two cost consultants and is considered robust.
b) Sustainability / Environmental	Inclement weather due to undertaking conservation in winter months.	B	II	Contractor will be asked to produce appropriate schedule of works to complete on time, taking into account likely weather conditions, and consider use of fully enclosed scaffold with temporary roof.
c) Financial	Overall scheme exceeds budget.	D	I	Budget has been checked and approved independently by two cost consultants and is considered robust. Regular cost monitoring to be undertaken.

d) Service delivery	Scope creep through late client changes or requests for additional works.	D	II	Project manager to discuss any requests with project team to ascertain any time/costs impact arising from additional requests/client changes and report these to stakeholder and HLF groups.
e) Health & Safety	Injury to person on site.	C	II	Contractor to provide proposals for minimising potential risk.
f) Legal	(i) Failure of project to meet grant conditions.	D	II	Strict monitoring of delivery of project outcomes.
	(ii) Failure of project to meet Grade I listing requirements.	D	II	Strict monitoring of delivery of project outcomes.
	(iii) Failure of project to obtain necessary consents such as planning and listed building consent.	D	II	Close liaison with Planning and Conservation officers pre-submission.
g) Other/ICT*	Late discovery of hidden defects in the structure.	B	II	Project team to assess if such instance arises and implications to be reported back through stakeholder and HLF monitoring groups.

The risks listed above represent the higher level risks which Cabinet should be made aware of.

6. Consultation

6.1 Internal (Medway) Stakeholder Consultation

6.1.1 Before commencement of the procurement process in order to direct the specification the following internal stakeholders were consulted:

- Project Manager Eastgate House, Bob Dimond, on behalf of Greenspace and Heritage Services
- Design and Conservation Manager, Martin McKay
- Category Specialist Place and Projects, Susan Goss
- The Eastgate House Stakeholders Group
- The Eastgate House Steering Group

6.1.2 During the procurement process in order to aid the evaluation process the following internal stakeholders were consulted

- Project Manager Eastgate House, Bob Dimond, on behalf of Greenspace and Heritage Services
- Design and Conservation Manager, Martin McKay
- Category Specialist Place & Projects, Susan Goss
- The Eastgate House Stakeholders Group
- The Eastgate House Steering Group

6.1.3 Post procurement/tender award in order to aid the contract management process the following internal stakeholders were consulted

- Project Manager Eastgate House, Bob Dimond, on behalf of Greenspace and Heritage Services
- Design and Conservation Manager, Martin McKay
- Category Specialist Place and Projects, Susan Goss
- The Eastgate House Stakeholders Group
- The Eastgate House Steering Group

6.2 External Stakeholder Consultation

6.2.1 Before commencement of the procurement process in order to direct the specification the following external stakeholders will be consulted:

- The general public: during development thousands of people have been consulted through surveys, event evaluation, focus groups and open days.
- The Eastgate House Stakeholders Group
- Heritage Lottery Fund
- Friends of Eastgate House

6.2.2 During the procurement process in order to aid the evaluation process the following external stakeholders will be consulted:

- The Eastgate House Stakeholders Group
- Heritage Lottery Fund
- Friends of Eastgate House

6.2.3 Post procurement/tender award in order to aid the contract management process the following external stakeholders will be consulted:

- The Eastgate House Stakeholders Group
- Heritage Lottery Fund
- Friends of Eastgate House

7. Procurement Board

7.1 The Procurement Board considered this report on 15 October 2013 and supported the recommendations as set out in paragraph 9 below.

8. Financial and legal implications

8.1 Financial Implications

8.1.1 This project and its associated delivery as per the preferred option highlighted at Section 4.1 'Preferred Option' and the recommendations at Section 9, has the following financial implications which the Cabinet must consider:

The funding for this project was approved at Full Council on 24 January 2013. This report meets the funding requirements.

8.1.2 Detailed finance and whole-life costing information is contained within Section 2.1 Finance and Whole-Life Costing of the Exempt Appendix that accompanies this report.

8.2 Legal Implications

8.2.1 This project and its associated delivery as per the preferred option highlighted at Section 4.1 'Preferred Option' and the recommendations at Section 9, has the following legal implications which the Cabinet must consider:

8.2.2 Listed building consent will be needed to demolish, alter or extend the building, as it is a listed building. This is a separate consent from planning permission, and is required in addition to planning permission for alterations or extensions that would affect the listed building's character as a building of special architectural or historic interest.

8.2.3 The HLF grant offer letter dated 7 December 2012 states that the grant may be withdrawn if the delivery phase is commenced before permission to start has been given by HLF, and also if work has not started on the delivery phase

within 12 months of the date of the letter. The HLF monitor has approved permission to start and written confirmation of this will be forthcoming.

- 8.2.4 The terms and conditions in the HLF grant offer letter dated 7 December 2012, and the “Managing your grant” guidance accompanying it, must be adhered to. In particular, the Cabinet should note the grant expiry date of 30 December 2016, which could have a significant impact on procurement and contract management (eg if the start on site is delayed, or the project overruns beyond the grant expiry date for some other reason). The Cabinet should also note the HLF’s publicity requirements, including the need to include its logo on all designs and plans produced, and on all tender documents funded by the grant.
- 8.2.5 All terms and conditions of the grant should be reviewed in detail by Legal Services before the procurement is commenced.
- 8.2.6 Medway Council owns the freehold of Eastgate House and the surrounding land under Title K730590. The deeds have been reviewed and there are no third party rights that would be infringed by carrying out the works. However, there is a lease to Business Support Kent Community Interest Company of the property known as Eastgate Annexe, which grants the Company the right of access and egress over the linked passage with Eastgate House. The Council can vary the access at any time by giving prior reasonable notice to the Company, provided that an alternative access is provided. It is not known at this stage whether this access will be affected by the proposed works, so an inspection would be advisable. The appropriate notice can then be given to the Company in good time for the commencement of the works. The Council will also need to ascertain that there is adequate construction access to Eastgate House to permit the works.

8.3 Procurement Implications

- 8.3.1 This project and its associated delivery as per the preferred option highlighted at Section 4.1 ‘Preferred Option’ and the recommendations at Section 9, has the following procurement implications which the Cabinet must consider:
- 8.3.2 A shortlist of 6 specialist contractor has been drawn up via recommendation from the consultants involved in the project. All contractors will be registered with Constructionline to aid in assessing that they meet acceptable standards in terms of financial standing, and their health and safety, and equal opportunities policies. The shortlist of 6 will then be invited to tender for the project. The list and this method of procurement has been approved by the majority funder, the Heritage Lottery Fund, who monitors the delivery of the project within the grant constraints.
- 8.3.3 Extra care must be taken with this project to ensure Medway Council meets the terms of both its grant from the Heritage Lottery Fund and the specialist terms associated with working on Grade I listed properties.

8.4 ICT Implications

8.4.1 Looking at the proposal, offices are indicated but there is no suggestion as to whether these require network connectivity or telephones. Taking the assumption that connectivity is required to Medway Council services, appropriate circuit connectivity would need to be investigated and procured. For this reason, I would suggest ICT are involved at the earliest opportunity to ensure that any ICT requirements are included within the building plans, and not identified after the building works have finished. This is to avoid any damage and repetitive building works. It would be prudent to ensure that the budget includes funding for an ICT project manager to ensure that all ICT requirements are identified, specified, procured and installed as required.

9 Recommendations

9.1 The Cabinet is requested to approve this project to progress to the invitation to tender stage.

10 Suggested reasons for decision(s)

10.1 The recommendations contained within Section 9 'Recommendations' above are provided on the basis of the current momentum behind the project: we have a design team and funding in place, and the project meets the strategic needs of the Council.

Lead officer contact

Name	Bob Dimond	Title	Project Manager Eastgate House
Department	Greenspace & Heritage Services	Directorate	RCC
Extension	8238	Email	bob.dimond@medway.gov.uk
Name	Susan Goss	Title	Category Specialist Place & Projects
Department	Category Management	Directorate	BS
Extension	1046	Email	susan.goss@medway.gov.uk

Background papers

The following documents have been relied upon in the preparation of this report:

Description of document		Date
Report to Council: Eastgate House Heritage Lottery Fund Stage 2 Award	Eastgate House - Council Report 24 Jan 2013.pdf	24/01/2013
Full Council Minutes	Full Council Minutes 24 Jan 2013.pdf	24/01/2013
Heritage Lottery Fund Stage 2 Application	Exempt	31/08/2012
Heritage Lottery Fund Award Letter		07/12/2012
Project Programme (Created by Thomas Ford & Partners)		09/07/2013
The Medway Cultural Strategy		2009-2014

Diversity Impact Assessment: Screening Form

Directorate Regeneration, Community and Culture	Name of Function or Policy or Major Service Change Eastgate House Heritage Lottery Fund Project		
Officer responsible for assessment Tracy Stringfellow	Date of assessment December 2012	New or existing? New	
Defining what is being assessed			
1. Briefly describe the purpose and objectives	The HLF funded, Eastgate House Project from 2013-2015 (construction phase) 2015-2016 1 st year of operation		
2. Who is intended to benefit, and in what way?	All residents of, and visitors to Medway. Benefit from improved access to, and quality of visitor experience of Eastgate House		
3. What outcomes are wanted?	Service outcomes identified are: 1) Providing more high quality facilities, 2) Improved access both physical and intellectual, 3) Improved protection and conservation of a Grade I listed heritage asset, 4) More opportunities for Medway residents to participate in cultural activities 5) Greater engagement with Medway heritage		
4. What factors/forces could contribute/detract from the outcomes?	Contribute Partnership working Heritage Lottery Fund Friends of Eastgate House City of Rochester Society Eastgate House Stakeholder Group	Detract Lack of financial and staff resource to deliver strategy outcomes Lack of stakeholder support	
5. Who are the main stakeholders?	Heritage Lottery Fund, Medway Cultural Partnership, English Heritage, Friends of Eastgate House , Medway Council, City of Rochester Society, Rochester Cathedral, University of Kent, Bridge Wardens Trust		
6. Who implements this and who is responsible?	Greenspace, Heritage, Libraries Service in partnership with Heritage Lottery Fund, stakeholders and through various delivery models.		

Assessing impact		
7. Are there concerns that there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>racial groups</i>?		Brief statement of main issue
	NO	
What evidence exists for this?	Development of the Activity Plan for the Stage 2 application for funding undertook in depth consultation with user groups, through surveys, questionnaires and focus group work. No concerns were raised relating to access issues for people from different racial groups.	
8. Are there concerns that there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>disability</i>?		Brief statement of main issue
	NO	
What evidence exists for this?	The record of public consultation that has been produced following the development phase of the Heritage Lottery Fund grant raised no concerns in relation to differential impact access issues for people with disabilities. The construction phase of the project will address the access issues currently inherent in the building by adding a new lift and staircase.	
9. Are there concerns that there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>gender</i>?		Brief statement of main issue
	NO	
What evidence exists for this?	Development of the Activity Plan for the Stage 2 application for funding undertook in depth consultation with user groups, through surveys, questionnaires and focus group work. No concerns were raised relating to access issues for different gender groups	
10. Are there concerns there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>sexual orientation</i>?		Brief statement of main issue
	NO	
What evidence exists for this?	Development of the Activity Plan for the Stage 2 application for funding undertook in depth consultation with user groups, through surveys, questionnaires and focus group work. No concerns were raised relating to access on the basis of sexual orientation	
11. Are there concerns there <u>could</u> be a have a differential impact due to <i>religion or belief</i>?	YES	Brief statement of main issue
What evidence exists for this?	No specific consultation with different faith groups has yet been undertaken, but community discussions are planned as appropriate during the next stage of the project.	

12. Are there concerns there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to people's age?	NO	Brief statement of main issue
What evidence exists for this?	Eastgate House visitors and volunteers are currently predominantly older people. The Activity Plan for the project targets older users and young people of Medway to ensure any potential differential impact is addressed.	
13. Are there concerns that there <u>could</u> be a differential impact due to <i>being transgendered or transsexual</i>?	NO	Brief statement of main issue
What evidence exists for this?	Development of the Activity Plan for the Stage 2 application for funding undertook in depth consultation with user groups, through surveys, questionnaires and focus group work. No concerns were raised relating to access on the basis of being transgender or transsexual	
14. Are there any <i>other</i> groups that would find it difficult to access/make use of the function (e.g. people with caring responsibilities or dependants, those with an offending past, or people living in rural areas)?	NO	If yes, which group(s)?
What evidence exists for this?		
15. Are there concerns there <u>could</u> be a have a differential impact due to <i>multiple discriminations</i> (e.g. disability <u>and</u> age)?	NO	Brief statement of main issue None identified
What evidence exists for this?	The record of public consultation that has been produced during the development phase has identified no impact on the basis of multiple discriminations	

Conclusions & recommendation		
16. Could the differential impacts identified in questions 7-15 amount to there being the potential for adverse impact?	NO	Brief statement of main issue
17. Can the adverse impact be justified on the grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group? Or another reason?	NO	Please explain
Recommendation to proceed to a full impact assessment?		

NO	This function/ policy/ service change complies with the requirements of the legislation and there is evidence to show this is the case.	
NO, BUT ...	What is required to ensure this complies with the requirements of the legislation? (see DIA Guidance Notes)?	
YES	Give details of key person responsible and target date for carrying out full impact assessment (see DIA Guidance Notes)	

Planning ahead: Reminders for the next review		
Date of next review	December 2013	
Areas to check at next review (e.g. new census information, new legislation due)	Outcomes of individual activity/event evaluation	
Is there <i>another</i> group (e.g. new communities) that is relevant and ought to be considered next time?	Eastgate Advisory Group will be established by this date and consulted on activity/events programme development. The Advisory Group will be drawn from members of the community representing the project target audiences	
Signed (completing officer/service manager) 	Date 21 December 2012	
Signed (service manager/Assistant Director)	Date	