

SE Blackburn Detailed Design Gateway Review**6th September 2019**

Attendees: Timo Murphy, Alan Niemeyer, Adrian Welsh, Walter Aspinall, Adam Nickson, Mike Cliffe, Rebekah Pittard, Trevor James, Alannah Jefferies

Apologies: Liam Hames

1. Purpose of the Gateway Review

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 Manager 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 Growth Deal 3 Projects for South East Blackburn; Haslingden Road and Blackamoor Road and how well placed both are 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 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

1. Overall Confidence Assessment

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

“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><u>Haslingden Road</u> Project Overview Junctions and Phasing The planning application will be submitted for the full scheme, however the phased approach is intended, as previously discussed. Possibly add into the Design & Access statement that we intend to deliver the scheme on a phased basis – Action RP/AJ.</p> <p>Street lighting designs have been completed – the columns will be the same height as existing columns, Blackburn with Darwen LED spec, report being prepared to submit with planning.</p> <p>Drainage strategy has been agreed with Blackburn with Darwen – we will use the existing.</p> <p><u>Blackamoor</u> Project Overview Junctions and Phasing Street lighting design is complete – same height as existing columns, looked at shorter columns but it adds quite a lot to the cost.</p> <p>Drainage – culvert runs through, alignment of culvert is undecided, intend to oversize drainage so we have the capacity to deal with the culvert connection.</p> <p>Action: to ensure red line boundary is correct on all Blackamoor drawings prior to planning submission.</p>	
02	<p>Property – Heads of Terms Legal have been instructed to complete on the hospital and RPC Containers. Could complete these in October.</p> <p>The other three critical acquisitions would need to agree terms within the next week to ensure it can complete in October – these are KFC, Kingsmere and 235 Haslingden Road.</p> <p>KFC (SASA Foods) – New Heads of Terms issued 27/08/19, TJ chased 04/09/19.</p>	

	<p>Kingsmere are becoming difficult, have asked if the Council will use their CPO powers if they refuse to sell, MC advised they will. Discussed whether their land is critical to the scheme.</p> <p>235 Haslingden Road are close to agreement, sent the drawing back to them recently as they wanted dimensions adding on to it.</p>	
03	<p>Procurement Strategy Procurement will be through the Council's framework.</p>	
04	<p>Confirmation of Meeting the Brief The scheme meets the requirement of the client brief.</p>	
05	<p>Cost Review Total cost currently sits at £11,536,000.</p> <p>Action: TJ to review property acquisitions costs.</p>	
06	<p>Funding Funding is £11.4m = £8.9m LEP and £2.5m LTP so currently £136,000 over the funding that is available.</p>	
07	<p>Programme Due on site 17/02/2020 which will not be a problem if current timescales are met. We are on programme currently but there is not much scope within the programme for any delays.</p> <p>TFL date has moved to 30/01/2020 – Action TM to update the programme with that and new LEP Board date also.</p>	
08	<p>Risk Register and Risk Management There is active management of risk on the project. A risk workshop is to be scheduled for the 20th September 2019.</p>	
09	<p>Planning Update All surveys that are needed for planning have been received, need to finalise drawings and put together application form next week. Geotech full results will not be back in time for planning, may need to submit these at a later date.</p> <p>We will be submitting both a hard copy and an electronic copy of the planning application on Friday 13th September.</p>	
10	<p>LEP Full Business Case Submission Going to arrange a meeting with Jacobs to discuss information sharing etc. WA and MC have discussed which sections do not need any amendments and can be submitted early, will confirm dates soon.</p> <p>Still had no formal feedback on the ASR.</p> <p>Letters of support – Growth Team will be able to assist with this, MC will discuss with Subhan Ali, and will work with some local business who could provide letters.</p>	

	Action TM and WA to discuss dates for sending documents to Jacobs and add to the programme.	
11	Consensus to Continue Planning All agreed.	
12	AO Consultation - Letter drop, will be posted online next week and will also do a press release prior to the planning submission.	

Table 2