

Furthergate

Detailed Design Gateway Review

Wednesday 23rd March 2018

One Cathedral Square

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 Furthergate project and how well place 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 **green**.

“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”

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 successfully progressed through detailed design and the 3D modelling is now complete, although there have been some minor changes to the design (reflected in the revised drawings) including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Side Roads added to the link roads to open development sites. • Roundabout has reduced due to the identified reduction in need. • Widened the junction at Burnley road to improve access to the new link road. <p>Signage strategy has now been prepared. Scheme appraisal to be tested based on 30 mph and 40 mph speed limit on the new link road. The scope of the commission is fixed although there is still some uncertainty as to the extent of landscaping and speed limits.</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Progress on the basis that the new link road will be set at a 40-mph speed limit – Dan Vipham / Walter Aspinall within 2 weeks 2. Pedestrian refuge to be removed on Burnley road to improve resident parking – Dan Vipham 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 30% risk allowance (including optimism bias). The costs reflect the whole scheme costs which include fees and surveys. Possibility of reduction in Stat costs due to protection rather than diversion.</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide updated cost plan once revised stats costs received. – Dan Vipham within 2 weeks 	
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. The LEP funding is subject to approval of the Final Business Case. Contribution for Furthergate split: LEP - £3.6m BwD - £0,.4m</p>	

05	<p>Programme 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 strict LEP funding approval timescales. The timeline for the LEP approvals and Council approvals have been confirmed as this will impact on the appointment of a contractor. EOI to be issued to BwD Contractor Framework w/c 26/03. Not all tender drawings will be complete when tenders are issued however, tender amendments will be issued in the first week and half of the tender period.</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Add Draft OBC deadline to programme – Timo Murphy within 2 weeks 	
06	<p>Risk Register and Risk Management It is evident that 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 Ground Investigations and contaminated land surveys have been commissioned, trial pits have been completed. A key risk is with regards to the drainage design as the drainage survey has not been commissioned due to difficulties with procurement. Additional surveys for planning refresh have been commissioned. SRO's to be advertised for 6 weeks prior to construction.</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Issue paper order for drainage survey as agreed with BwD – Alan Niemeyer within 1 week 2. Initiate legal to commence SRO adverts – Mike Cliffe within 1 week 3. Check with Simon Kirby (Environment) whether an air quality survey is needed – Walter Aspinall within 1 week 	
08	<p>Procurement Strategy The procurement strategy has been confirmed with utilisation of the Council's Contractor and Development Framework. Agreed process for tender upload to the chest through BwD procurement.</p>	
09	<p>Planning Strategy A case officer is to be assigned to the project for the planning refresh. Capita to pull together the planning response.</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Allocate planning case officer to scheme – Mike Cliffe within 1 week 2. Provide detail of requirements for planning submission – Mike Cliffe within 1 week 	

	<p>3. Transport Assessment update to be based on recent traffic surveys – Walter Aspinall within 3 weeks</p>	
10	<p>Team Resources The necessary people are in place to deliver the scheme. There are no gaps in team resources. 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 due programme manager moving roles.</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Combined Capita and Client Organogram to be produced – Adam Nickson within 1 week 	
11	<p>Stakeholder Communication and Engagement There is no stakeholder communication and engagement plan in place. Stakeholder analysis and consultation has been undertaken previously through the Pennine reach programme. A consultation event is to take place on the 17th of April.</p> <p>Action</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Produce communication and engagement plan Mike Cliffe within 2 weeks 2. Provide a consultation summary following the event – Mike Cliffe after event 	
12	<p>Governance and Decision Making The established Growth and Development board will be utilised as the project board. There are no formal governance arrangements in place.</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Combined Capita and Client Organogram to be produced showing governance arrangements and escalation routes – Adam Nickson within 1 week 	
13	<p>LEP Strategic Outline Business Case Submission The scheme has LEP programme entry and the Strategic Outline Business Case is being developed. The scheme will be submitted to Jacobs for approval as a draft on 16th April 2018. Final SOBC with included tendered costs to be submitted on the 9th May 2018 to Jacobs. The timescales for approval are known and are demonstrated in the programme.</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Risk Register to be kept up to date throughout project lifecycle. Some revisions may need to be made to ensure consistency between QRA and Cost Report – Adam Nickson Ongoing 2. Support Letters to be provided - Mike Cliffe within 3 weeks 3. Environmental Impacts to be considered contact Environmental Health at BwD for tube readings and provide narrative on reduced congestion = lower emissions, etc. – Walter Aspinall within 3 weeks 4. Provide Land Acquisition Details - Mike Cliffe within 1 week 	

Table 2