

DEDC – Detailed Design Gateway Notes

One Cathedral Square – First Floor, Walker Room

Wednesday 17th May 2017

Attendees

Timo Murphy, Alan Niemeyer, Mike Cliffe, Rebekah Pittard, Andrew Brown, Walter Aspinall, Liam Hames, Saf Alam

1. Apologies

Simon Jones, Helen Holland, Trevor James

2. Project Overview Junctions Phasing

2.1 All Drawings have been revised as per the agreements made with Ian Richardson in the departures meeting.

2.2 Rumble strip specification for the link road is to be agreed within the next few weeks

2.3 Ellison fold to Ivinson Road GA - Material marking to be demarcated on the link road at the crossing.

AN to look into cost for bollards to make a crossing

2.4 Potential for Ground Investigation scope to be increased to de-risk mine shafts even further as none have been found except for one at the entrance.

2.5 Slow markings to be incorporated onto Roman Road to give prior notice of the junction.

2.6 Take out the existing footpath to Ivinson Road to tidy up the appearance.

2.7 Within the Landscaping proposals the following revisions are needed for the Planning submission:

- Trees to be removed to the Eastern side of the design. Leave the ones either side of each entrance.
- Ornamental planting to be changed for something less costly and low maintenance.
- Gabion wall and benches to stay.
- Some of the clusters of trees to be removed.
- Material to the woodland trail path to be revised to reduce cost.

3. Property Heads of Terms

3.1 Draft Heads of Terms has been issued to Lea Hough, no issues have been raised.

4. Procurement Strategy Cost Review

4.1 The work packages included within the procurement strategy are as follows:

1. Go out to procurement for medium size contractor (NEC B)
2. DLO
3. Potential for deferring to contractor for WP1

Work package 1 will be LEP funded, MC confirmed this would be his recommendation.

AB to provide procurement strategy document.

5. Confirmation of Meeting the Brief

5.1 MC confirmed the scheme meets the requirements of the brief.

5.2 MC confirmed he would approve the change controls that have been proposed by AB.

6. Funding

6.1 MC confirmed that funding for this financial year was £300,000 LTP funding and £500,000 LEP.

MC to send through profile for the whole project 12 month programme.

7. Programme

7.1 Planning Application and Draft Business Case to be submitted by 19th May. MC advised that the decision to continue could be an Exec Member decision and not an Exec Board which would streamline the process and programme.

8. Risk Mitigation

8.1 Risk and mitigation is all under control. Mine shafts, Ground conditions on the link road is still the biggest risk.

8.2 Percentages within the risk register need to match back to the Business Case.

TM to revise the risk register for the draft FBC.

9. Planning Update

9.1 AB confirmed that the planning documentation is almost complete and the final documentation is being collated for submission on Friday 19th May.

10. LEP Full Business Case Submission

10.1 WA confirmed most outstanding points have been resolved. Ecology and Tree Statement to be issued to WA.

10.2 Full GBA to be included.

10.3 BCR for Oakgrove, Holden Fold numbers to be run and agreed.

11. Consensus to Continue

11.1 It was agreed that the scheme should progress into the next stage and the planning application should be submitted.

Darwen East Development Corridor

Preliminary Gateway Review

Wednesday 8th February 2017

Castleway House

1. Introduction

The purpose of the Gateway Review was to highlight risk and issues, which if not addressed, would threaten the success of delivery. It was an internal peer review undertaken by the Programme Management Office to provide quality assurance and test whether project management principles are being applied. This report is based on evidence submitted prior and during the review and also through discussion. The review focused on the current status of the DEDC project and how well placed it is to move forward to the next stage.

Table 1 below identifies the RAG rating that has been applied to the items considered as part of the review and also the Programme Management Office view of the overall delivery confidence of the scheme.

<u>RAG</u>	<u>Criteria Description</u>
	Successful delivery of the project to time, cost and quality appears highly likely and there are no major outstanding issues that at this stage appear to threaten delivery significantly
	Successful delivery appears feasible but significant issues already exist requiring management attention. These appear resolvable at this stage and if addressed promptly, should not present a cost/schedule overrun
	Successful delivery of the project appears to be unachievable. There are major issues on project definition, schedule, budget required quality or benefits, which at this stage do not appear to be manageable or resolvable. The project may need re-baselining and/or overall viability re-assessed

Table 1

2. Overall Confidence Assessment

The outcome of the review finds that the overall rating of the project is **amber**.

“Successful delivery appears feasible but significant issues already exist requiring management attention. These appear resolvable at this stage and if addressed promptly, should not present a cost/schedule overrun”

Table 2 below identifies those elements of the project which were reviewed, the findings, RAG status, recommendations or agreed actions with assigned timescales from the date of the Gateway Review.

Ref	Item Under Review	RAG
01	<p>Project Overview Junctions and Phasing</p> <p>The scheme has progressed through preliminary design although there are still two junctions where options are still being considered and the design for the new road across Bailey’s Field has not commenced. The scope of the commission is fixed although there is still some uncertainty as to the extent of the bridge works and highways works at Grimshaw Street and Sough Road.</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A technical design meeting is held to confirm which option to progress with at the two junctions and confirm extent of works associated with bridge options Liam Hames immediate action 2. Highways team to develop the preliminary design based on their preferred route across Bailey’s Field. Alan Niemeyer / Liam Hames within 2 weeks 	
02	<p>Confirmation of Meeting the Brief</p> <p>The scheme meets the requirement of the client brief.</p>	
03	<p>Cost Review</p> <p>The scheme costs include a risk allowance of 10% and also the application of 22% optimism bias. A costing exercise has been undertaken for two options a “do minimum” and a “Capita Recommendation”. The costs do not reflect the whole scheme costs which need to include fees and surveys.</p> <p>Action:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Costs associated with fees and surveys to be included in the cost plan. Alan Niemeyer immediate action 	
04	<p>Funding</p> <p>There is a clear understanding of the funding available for the scheme and how this is made up from the LEP and LTP. Whilst the drawdown of the LEP funding is constrained the LTP funding allows for flexibility over years 2018 to 2021. The LEP funding is subject to approval of the Final Business Case.</p>	

05	<p>Programme</p> <p>A Microsoft Project Programme is in place with key milestones and critical path activities identified. The programme is a standing agenda item at all project team meetings and is reviewed regularly. The programme has no float and has made assumptions on the LEP funding approval timescales. The timeline for the LEP approvals and Council approvals needs to be confirmed as this will impact on the appointment of a contractor. The timeline for Miller Homes works on Bailey's Field has not been factored into the programme nor is it understood. The timing of the geotechnical site investigations is critical to inform the design on Bailey's Field. These are not scheduled on the programme.</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Confirm LEP and Council approval timescales. Mike Cliffe within 2 weeks 2. Confirm timeline for Miller Homes work on Bailey's Field. Simon Jones within 2 weeks 3. Confirm timeline for the procurement of Geotechnical Site Investigations. Andrew Brown within 2 weeks 4. Review output from actions 1 to 3 and update delivery programme. Timo Murphy within 2 weeks 	
06	<p>Risk Register and Risk Management</p> <p>It is evident the there are processes in place for the management of risk. The risk register is a standing item on all project team meetings and is reviewed regularly. There is a risk register in place and this uses a RAG status. The risk register assigns costs to risks where possible, identifies owners and rates risk post mitigation to determine whether the mitigation measures are adequate.</p>	
07	<p>Survey Strategy</p> <p>Whilst there is no survey strategy document in place, a number of surveys have been commissioned and these are scheduled to be completed at the end of February 2017. The Geotechnical Site Investigations for Bailey's Field have not been procured as there is little time for this to inform the preliminary or detailed design of the new road. There is no license agreement in place with the landowner to undertake intrusive site investigations. A planning validation tracker is in place which identifies all those surveys to support the planning application.</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Procure Geotechnical Site Investigations to be undertaken in March Andrew Brown within 2 weeks 2. Arrange to access agreement to undertake surveys on Bailey's Field Simon Jones within 2 weeks 	
08	<p>Procurement Strategy</p> <p>The procurement strategy is yet to be confirmed. Various options are being explored and a costed options table has been produced.</p>	

	<p>A procurement strategy paper is to follow to inform a decision on how the scheme is to be procured.</p> <p>Action:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Produce procurement strategy paper Andrew Brown within 2 weeks 	
09	<p>Planning Strategy</p> <p>A case officer has been assigned to the project and planning consultancy services are being provided. The planning strategy document is being produced by the planning consultant and a pre-application meeting is being scheduled for early March. The supporting survey information for the planning application is being procured although there is a concern that the Site Investigations will not be complete in time for the submission on the 4th April 2017.</p> <p>Action:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Procure Geotechnical Site Investigations to be undertaken in March Andrew Brown within 2 weeks 	
10	<p>Team Resources</p> <p>The necessary people are in place to deliver the scheme. There are no gaps in team resources and those which are needed for the detailed design are being appointed or procured. As the programme is on a critical path it is important that these resources do not become diluted or the programme will be in jeopardy. It is not clear how the Client Team is structured and roles are not assigned to individuals.</p> <p>Action:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Council Organogram to be produced Mike Cliffe within 2 weeks 2. Combine Capita and Client Organogram Rebekah Pittard within 3 weeks 	
11	<p>Stakeholder Communication and Engagement</p> <p>There is no stakeholder communication and engagement plan in place. Stakeholder analysis has not been undertaken and it is not clear what is being communicated, in what form, to whom, when. As this is a high profile, complex scheme this is in need of urgent attention.</p> <p>Action</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Confirm Council resource to support on communications and engagement to produce the strategy Mike Cliffe within 2 weeks 	
12	<p>Governance and Decision Making</p> <p>A Project Board was established and met of the 20th December 2016. This was the first formal recorded meeting of the Project Board. The Terms of Reference and representatives of this Board are being reviewed in light of the new management arrangements between Capita and Blackburn with Darwen Borough Council.</p>	

	<p>There are no formal governance arrangements in place.</p> <p>Action</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Formalise governance arrangements Simon Jones within 4 weeks 	
13	<p>LEP Full Business Case Submission</p> <p>The scheme has LEP programme entry and the Full Business Case has to be developed, submitted and approved. The scheme will be submitted for approval as a draft in April 2017. There will be a dialogue with the LEP and information submitted iteratively. A FBC workshop has been scheduled for the 9th February to identify and assign resources to contributors of the FBC. The timescales for approval of the FBC are unknown and these require confirming and inputting into the programme.</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Confirm LEP and approvals and associated timescales Mike Cliffe within 2 weeks 2. Input dates into delivery programme Timo Murphy within 2 weeks 	

Table 2

3. **Detailed Design Gateway Review**

The Detailed Design Gateway Review is scheduled for the 10th April 2017.