

**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**

<b>Title</b>	Project Initiation Document
<b>Author</b>	David Blanchard
<b>Approver</b>	Dawn Garton( Sponsor)
<b>Owner</b>	John Brammall

**A 2 - Project Organisation Structure**

Owner – Deliver acoustic improvements from Parkside reception

**A 3 - Version history**

Version	Date	Summary of changes	Changes marked
1	11 <sup>th</sup> 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.

#### **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>		
	<b>£</b>	<b>Comment</b>
<b>Initial Costs</b>	Up to £11k for acoustic baffles.	Approved PFA 23/01/13
<b>External Funding</b>	None	
<b>Net Cost</b>	Up to £11k	
<b>Ongoing Savings</b>		
<b>Phasing</b>	None	

## B 9 – Project Scoring Matrix 8.

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

<i>Scoring – for your project – calculate the points</i>			
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>1 Point</b>	<b>2 Points</b>	<b>3 Points</b>
<b>Cost £ (budget, time and human resource)</b>	<b>&lt;£10k</b>	<b>£10k - £50K</b>	<b>&gt;£50K</b>
<b>Timescale</b>	<b>&lt; 6 months</b>	<b>6 – 12 months</b>	<b>&gt; 12 months</b>
<b>Impact if project failed on the organisation</b>	<b>Minor disruption</b>	<b>Moderate</b>	<b>Major</b>
<b>Melton's Track Record</b>	<b>Done Successfully Many Times Before</b>	<b>Done Successfully Once or Twice Before</b>	<b>New Area of Working</b>

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:**

<b>Risk Number</b>	This is the unique identification number given to each individual risk
<b>Owner/project</b>	Who is the risk owner and therefore responsible for ensuring the mitigation work is undertaken
<b>Cause</b>	This describes the existing, potential or perceived risk/threat to the project objectives
<b>Consequence</b>	The impact of the cause is often a chain of events that can impact on many stakeholders
<b>Current score and original score</b>	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.

<b>Current mitigation</b>	The existing measures that are in place to control /prevent the risk (risk mitigation)
<b>Adequacy</b>	An assessment on the suitability of the current mitigation measures (adequate, poor, good)