

Option	Potential costs	Analysis against evaluation criteria	Overall comment on feasibility
<p>Find an alternative building / relocate the service</p>	<p>Cost of getting an alternative building up to the required standard.</p> <p>Service running costs: £1.5m</p>	<p>Capital An alternative building is likely to require additional investment to be fit for purpose.</p> <p>Revenue Ongoing maintenance and operational costs would need to be funded.</p> <p>Service model Relocating the service to an alternative building may allow us to fulfil our ambitions to move away from traditional day services to more modern community focused day opportunities provision. However, there would likely be a capital investment required to get an alternative building up to the required standard.</p>	<p>This option is not financially viable as relocating the service to an alternative building would likely require a capital investment to get the building up to standard.</p> <p>This option also represents a higher cost to the Council compared with accessing alternative provision in the wider day opportunities market to meet service user need.</p> <p>This option is not sustainable as we would need to fund ongoing maintenance, running costs etc.</p>
<p>Council to invest in the building to modernise the service</p>	<p>Service running costs: £1.5m</p> <p>Capital investment required: £1.2m</p>	<p>Capital This would require significant capital investment, likely higher than £1.2m, for repairs to bring the centre up to the standard of a modern-day service.</p> <p>Revenue As above.</p> <p>Dual operational costs would also apply if service users needed to access alternative provision whilst works were taking place.</p> <p>Service model This would require an initial capital investment of £1.2m as well as the costs associated with bringing the</p>	<p>This option is not financially viable as delivering the service, as well as funding the required capital investment to deliver on our ambitions for day opportunities provision, represents a higher cost to the Council compared with accessing alternative provision.</p> <p>This option is not sustainable as we would need to fund ongoing maintenance, running costs etc.</p>

		centre up to the standard of a modern-day service to fulfil our ambitions for day opportunities provision.	
Lease space in the building (e.g. the first floor) to another organisation / day opportunities provider	<p>Cost of repairing the lift and any required work to the first floor</p> <p>Capital investment required: £1.2m</p> <p>Service running costs: £1.5m</p>	<p>Capital As above. Repair work would also need to include the first floor and lift.</p> <p>Revenue As above.</p> <p>Service model As above.</p>	<p>This option is dependent on our ability to secure a tenant.</p> <p>The rental income generated is likely to be nominal and therefore not sufficient to sustain the service.</p> <p>This option raises safeguarding and access concerns as there is currently only one entry to the building and the lift needs repairing.</p>
Crowdfunding / Go Fundme / Community Donations Council led Community led Resident led	<p>Potential running costs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Service running costs: £1.5m - Employment of administrator to manage donations <p>Capital investment required: £1.2m</p>	<p>Capital The Council cannot guarantee the timeframes in which funds could be secured or the amount which could be secured. This may mean alternative funding is required to complete essential works to the building.</p> <p>Revenue As above.</p> <p>Service model As above.</p>	<p>It is not appropriate for the Council to Crowdfund.</p> <p>It is not clear if this option would cover the capital investment required or service running costs. Both would need to be funded.</p> <p>This option is not feasible as dependent on community donations which we can't quantify or attach a timescale to.</p> <p>This option is not sustainable as we would need to continually secure community donations for ongoing maintenance, running costs etc.</p> <p>This option is not financially viable as it represents a higher cost to the Council compared with accessing alternative provision in the wider day opportunities market to meet service user need.</p>
'DIY SOS' Identifying tradespeople	Service running costs: £1.5m	Capital As above.	This option is not feasible as we can't guarantee identifying the tradespeople/time commitment required as and when needed. This is also likely to

<p>who can volunteer their time to renovate the building</p>	<p>This option may also require administrative resource.</p>	<p>Revenue As above.</p> <p>Service model As above.</p>	<p>require long lead in times which would impact service delivery.</p> <p>This option is not sustainable as we would need to fund ongoing maintenance, running costs etc.</p> <p>This option is not financially viable as running the service represents a higher cost to the Council compared with accessing alternative provision.</p>
<p>Source external investment <i>e.g. Alan Sugar Chelsea Football Club</i></p>	<p>Resource to research, approach, and work with possible sources of external investment</p> <p>Service running costs: £1.5m</p>	<p>Capital As above.</p> <p>Revenue As above.</p> <p>Service model As above.</p>	<p>It is not clear if this option is to cover the capital investment required or service running costs. Both would need to be covered.</p> <p>This option is not sustainable as we would need to fund ongoing maintenance, running costs etc.</p>
<p>Parents create a consortium to run the building and service as a trust</p>	<p>Costs for establishing and managing a consortium</p> <p>Service running costs: £1.5m</p>	<p>Capital This would require an initial capital investment of £1.2m as well as additional investment to make the building fit for purpose.</p> <p>Revenue As above.</p> <p>Service model As above.</p>	<p>No viable proposal has been put forward in relation to this option that could be evaluated.</p>
<p>Alternative Day Opportunities provider proposal to take over the</p>	<p>Provider to take on costs</p>	<p>Capital To sit with provider – we would need reassurance that they could make the required capital investment.</p> <p>Revenue</p>	<p>All 3 providers who had expressed an interest in taking over the building and service have since confirmed that they will not be progressing this</p>

building and service <i>Trinity</i> <i>Acorn</i> <i>Eastway</i>		To sit with provider -we would need reassurance that they could fund revenue costs. Service model To sit with provider – we would need reassurance that they could fulfil our ambitions for day opportunities provision.	
---	--	---	--