

APPENDIX

Project Documentation

Insert Project Waterfield Leisure Centre – Car Park Extension

Incorporating business case, project brief and project management document

Part A – Document Control

Part B – Business Case, Project Background and technical issues

Part C – Project Brief

Part D – Project Management Document

Version no: 1

Date: 30th March 2015

Part A - Document Control

A 1 - Key personnel

Title	Waterfield Leisure centre- Car park extension
Author	David Blanchard
Approver	Harry Rai
Owner	David Blanchard

A 2 - Project Organisation Structure

This section should describe the organisation, covering specific roles and responsibilities.

The main roles and responsibilities will include:

A 3 - Version history

Version	Date	Summary of changes	Changes marked

A 4 - Distribution

Name	Area

A 5 - References

Doc reference	Document title
PFA report	Business Case 10 th July 2013 for WLC Extension

Part B – Business Case, Project Background / technical issues

B 1 - General

At PFA on 10th July 2013 Members approved funding of £65k for WLC car park extension where costs were to be met partially by SLM. However, planning permission for this scheme was not granted and therefore an alternative project was required. There have been several issues of irresponsible parking since this date ,parking that blocks emergency access and parking adjacent to the highway, there were complaints from local residents regarding insufficient parking provision at the leisure centre and customers parking in residential areas. Members requested that officers sought a solution to this matter and gave the matter high priority due to the Health & Safety concerns.

Officers worked with consultants to identify a scheme that would meet parking needs but minimise any adverse impact on local residents. The end scheme was an extension of the existing car park that creates an additional 20 spaces. The scheme is as shown on the attached plan.

B 2 –Service / Service / Function

The WLC is managed within the Communities & Neighbourhoods Service.

The car park extension works will be jointly managed with the Property team within central services.

B 3 – Strategic fit

The extension to existing car park would mitigate the current risk, whereby users are parking on Dalby Road during peak periods.

The proposal to extend existing rather than build on green field is less intrusive and therefore addresses some of the objections. The scheme being implemented does not require planning consent.

The project fits in with the councils priorities around a healthier community, and vulnerable people.

B 4 - Options appraisal

Many other options for alternative provision were investigated ,SLM will contribute £20K to the scheme.

B 5 - Achievability

The project is clearly achievable.

The matrix score for his project is $3+2+2+2+2+1 = 12$

B 6 - Legal Issues (if applicable)

No legal issues have been identified. The project does not require planning consent.

B 7 Specification

A design map is attached with this Business case

B 8 - Financial Implications

<i>Cap / Rev</i>		
	£	<i>Comment</i>
<i>Initial Costs</i>	£52.5K	
<i>External Funding</i>	£20K	<i>Please note contribution from SLM payable in 2015/16</i>
<i>Net Cost</i>	£32.5K	
<i>Ongoing Savings</i>		
<i>Phasing</i>		

B 9 – Project Scoring Matrix

<i>Scoring – for your project – calculate the points</i>			
Criteria	1 Point	2 Points	3 Points
Cost £ (budget, time and human resource)	<£10k	£10k - £50K	>£50K
Timescale	< 6 months	6 – 12 months	> 12 months
Impact if project failed on the organisation	Minor disruption	Moderate	Major
Melton's Track Record	Done Successfully Many Times Before	Done Successfully Once or Twice Before	New Area of Working
Stakeholder Interest (internal and external)	Minimal	Moderate	Major
Project Complexity	Straight-forward	Moderately Complex	Highly Complex

Projects scoring 6 – 10 points - Formal methodology **not** necessary
 Projects scoring > 10 points - Formal methodology **is** necessary

Note

The business case must be submitted initially to the Programme Board and will allow schemes to be prioritised and feasibility to be assessed.

Part C – Project Brief

The Project Brief sets out the direction, scope and objectives of the project and forms essentially the “contract” between the Project Sponsor and Project Manager as to what will need to be delivered.

C 1 - Project Objectives, outcomes and benefits

To extend current car park serving WLC due to the success of the refurbished facility, which is now causing overcrowding during peak times..., with users having to park on Dalby Road. Address Health & Safety concerns.

Part D – Project Management

D 1- Key Business Risks/Contingency Plans/Exit Strategy

The project will lead managed by the property team within central services in consultation with the Communities & Neighbourhoods service, which have service responsibility for WLC

D 2 - Key Stakeholders

This section should identify the key stakeholders, both internal and external to Melton Borough Council, for example:

External Stakeholders

General Public - There will be a good interest from the general public, as the refurbishment was a high profile project and with the increased usage figures there will be on-going interest.

The Media – The media have shown interest, especially about the link to a significant increase of users to the facility. A press release on the works was released prior to contractor entry.

Internal Stakeholders

Finance –The head of central services has been consulted in the development of this project

Legal –Planning consent will be required and the necessary applications are being drafted..

***For guidance on their management strategies refer back to Step 2 –
Prioritisation, page 16***

D 3 - Communication Plan

A highlight report will be presented to the council's programme board as necessary..

D 4 - Project Controls

This section of the PID should highlight the key controls that have been put in place to aid the management of the project. This may include:

Quality Control

The council's corporate property officer will directly oversee the project.

Key Controls for Project Closure

The Programme Board will control Closure and confirm in writing its acceptance that the project has been completed in line with the initial PID approval.

Appendix B2, – Standard Risk Management Template

Project Name:

Updated:

Col 1	Col 2	Col 3	Col 4	Col 5	Col 6	Col 7	Col 8	Col 9	Col 10	Col 11
Risk No.	Grade [red, amber, green]	Risk Owner	Cause	Potential Consequences	Current Score	Original Score	Movement [↔,↑,↓]	Current controls [working]	Adequacy of mitigation measures	Planned actions (For key risks only)
1				•						
2				•						
3				•						
4				•						
5				•						

Last updated:

Risk Number	This is the unique identification number given to each individual risk
Owner/project	Who is the risk owner and therefore responsible for ensuring the mitigation work is undertaken
Cause	This describes the existing, potential or perceived risk/threat to the project objectives
Consequence	The impact of the cause is often a chain of events that can impact on many stakeholders
Current score and original score	Based on the risk matrix, how is the risk likelihood scored e.g. A, B, C, D or E Based on the risk matrix, how is the impact scored e.g. 1, 2, 3 or 4 The original score is as per the first time it was raised.
Current mitigation	The existing measures that are in place to control /prevent the risk (risk mitigation)
Adequacy	An assessment on the suitability of the current mitigation measures (adequate, poor, good)