

APPENDIX A
Project Documentation

ACOUSTIC BAFFLES IN LIGHTWELLS AT PARKSIDE- CAPITAL WORKS 2013/14

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: 11/06/13

Part A - Document Control

A 1 - Key personnel

| | |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| Title | Project Initiation Document |
| Author | David Blanchard |
| Approver | Dawn Garton(Sponsor) |
| Owner | John Brammall |

| |
|---|
| <p>A 2 - Project Organisation Structure</p> <p>Owner – Deliver acoustic improvements from Parkside reception</p> |
| |

A 3 - Version history

| Version | Date | Summary of changes | Changes marked |
|---------|----------------------------|--------------------|----------------|
| 1 | 11 th June 2013 | | |
| | | | |

A 4 - Distribution

| Name | Area |
|-----------------------------|------------------|
| Dawn Garton & John Brammall | Central Services |
| | |

A 5 - References

| Doc reference | Document title |
|----------------|---|
| Mandate | Reception Acoustics PB 4/12/12 |
| PFA 23/01/2013 | Capital programme 2013/14 – Mandate £11k approved & recommended for inclusion |
| | |
| | |
| | |

Part B – Business Case –

Parkside reception improvements to acoustics

B 1 - General

Intrusive break out noise in reception was identified as an issue at an early stage since Parkside opened. Reverberating sound off hard surfaces travels from the ground floor reception onto first and second floor areas. Noise also travels downwards into reception from staff sit down areas on the first floor.

Specialist sound engineers tested the noise levels in reception and tests results suggest that noise reverberation is unacceptably high.

B 2 –Service / Service / Function

Increase privacy for customers in reception

B 3 – Strategic fit

- Parkside is a leading example of a single building delivering multi agency services in the locality and when service issues/ problems are identified we aim to address them. With JCP are moving to Parkside in October and this will increase the volume of people using the reception area.

B 4 - Options appraisal

Several options were presented in the Project Mandate considered by members at PFA on 23/01/2013 and members selected a preferred option of geometric shaped panels to be suspended horizontally across the lightwells.

-

B 5 - Achievability

Works to be instructed immediately following approval of business case.

B 6 - Legal Issues (if applicable)

A contract for the works will be placed

B 7 Specification

Works specification available upon request

B 8 - Financial Implications

| <i>Cap / Rev</i> | | |
|-------------------------|------------|---|
| | £ | Comment |
| Initial Costs | Up to £11k | Approved PFA 23/01/13 |
| External Funding | None | Contribution from Partners to be collected via service charge. Subject to any caps negotiated with licencees. |
| Net Cost | Up to £11k | |
| Ongoing Savings | | Railway Sidings - Estimated income retained for 3 months for 80 spaces Car Park Surface works - Prolong the life of the surfaces by preventing water ingress |
| Phasing | None | |

B 9 – Project Scoring Matrix

Using the Matrix I calculate that a formal methodology is not required (1 to 6 points).

| Scoring – for your project – calculate the points | | | |
|--|-----------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| Criteria | 1 Point | 2 Points | 3 Points |
| Cost £ (budget, time and human | <£10k | £10k - £50K | >£50K |

| | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|--|---------------------|
| resource) | | | |
| 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.

Appendix B2, – Standard Risk Management Template

Project Name: Acoustic Baffles Parkside reception -
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 | Green | DB | Impact of private conversations being overheard in Parkside offices. | | | | | Notices displayed in Parkside | | Medium / Low priority works |
| 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) |