

## **PROJECT INITIATION DOCUMENT**

**(3<sup>rd</sup> November 2017)**

**SOUTH DOCK BRIDGE PROJECT:  
INITIATION, DESIGN & PUBLIC CONSULTATION PHASES**

## Version Control

Version Number	Author and Job Title	Purpose/Change	Date
0.1	Jonathan Morris Principal Growth & Infrastructure Planning Officer  Jas Mahil-Sandhu, Infrastructure Planning Project Officer	Initial draft to IDSG Finance Subcommittee	12/10/2017
0.2	Jonathan Morris Principal Growth & Infrastructure Planning Officer  Jas Mahil-Sandhu, Infrastructure Planning Project Officer	Second draft to IDSG	17/10/2017
0.3	Jonathan Morris Principal Growth & Infrastructure Planning Officer  Jas Mahil-Sandhu, Infrastructure Planning Project Officer	Final draft	03/11/2017

## Project Initiation Document (PID)

<b>Project Name:</b>	<b>SOUTH DOCK BRIDGE PROJECT</b>		
<b>Project Start Date:</b>	October 2017	<b>Project End Date:</b>	31 <sup>st</sup> March 2020
<b>Relevant Heads of Terms:</b>			
<b>Responsible Directorate:</b>	Place		
<b>Project Manager:</b>	Jas Mahil-Sandhu		
<b>Tel:</b>	020 7364 2541	<b>Mobile:</b>	
<b>Ward:</b>	Canary Wharf		
<b>Delivery Organisation:</b>	LB Tower Hamlets		
<b>Funds to be passported to an External Organisation? ('Yes', 'No')</b>	No		
<b>Does this PID involve awarding a grant? ('Yes', 'No' or 'I don't know')</b>	No		
<b>Supplier of Services:</b>	Council & External Consultants		
<b>Is the relevant Lead Member aware that this project is seeking approval for funding?</b>	Yes – Mayor Biggs and Cllr Blake the Lead Member for Strategic Development & Waste		
<b>Is the relevant Corporate Director aware that this project is seeking approval for funding?</b>	Yes – Ann Sutcliffe, the Corporate Director of Place has been briefed		
<b>Does this PID seek the approval for capital expenditure of up to £250,000 using a Recorded Corporate Director's Action (RCDA)? (if 'Yes' please</b>	No		

<b>append the draft RCDA form for signing to this PID)</b>	
<b>Has this project had approval for capital expenditure through the Capital Programme Budget-Setting process or through Full Council? ('Yes' or 'No')</b>	No
<b><u>S106</u></b>	
<b>Amount of S106 required for this project:</b>	£0.00
<b>S106 Planning Agreement Number(s):</b>	n/a
<b><u>CIL</u></b>	
<b>Amount of CIL required for this project:</b>	£270,000
<b>Total CIL/S106 funding sought through this project</b>	£270,000
<b>Date of Approval:</b>	Tbc

**This PID will be referred to the Infrastructure Delivery Steering Group (IDSG):**

<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>
LBTH – Place	Ann Sutcliffe	Acting Corporate Director of Place
LBTH – Place	Owen Whalley	Divisional Director Planning & Building Control
LBTH – Resources	Paul Leeson	Business Manager
LBTH – Place	Andy Scott	Acting Service Head for Economic Development
LBTH – Place	Matthew Pullen	Infrastructure Planning Manager
LBTH – Governance	Fleur Francis	Team Leader, Planning Legal
LBTH – Governance	Andy Simpson	Business Improvement & S106 Programme Manager

Organisation	Name	Title
LBTH – Governance	Vicky Allen	S106 Portfolio Coordinator
LBTH – Governance	Tope Alegbeleye	Strategy, Policy & Performance Officer
LBTH – Governance	Oscar Ford	Service Manager - Strategy, Performance & Resources
LBTH – Health, Adults and Community	Flora Ogilvie	Associate Director of Public Health
LBTH – Place	Adele Maher	Strategic Planning Manager
LBTH – Place	Paul Buckenham	Development Manager
LBTH – Place	Alison Thomas	Head of Housing Strategy, Partnerships and Affordable Housing Strategy, Sustainability and Regeneration
LBTH – Place	Richard Chilcott	Head of Asset Management
LBTH – Place	Jonathan Taylor	Sustainable Development Team Leader
LBTH – Place	Abdul J Khan	Service Manager, Energy & Sustainability
LBTH – Place	Christopher Horton	Infrastructure Planning Team Leader

### Related Documents

ID	Document Name	Document Description	File Location
<b>If copies of the related documents are required, contact the Project Manager</b>			
	South Dock Bridges – Feasibility Study	Business Case	M:\INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING\IP INFRA PROJECTS\IoD - South Dock Bridges\SD Feasibility & Design Study\Phase 1 Feasibility\Outputs & Reports\Phase 1 Report - Final Version

## **CONTENTS**

1.0	Purpose of the Project Initiation Document.....	7
2.0	Section 106/CIL Context.....	7
3.0	Equalities Analysis.....	8
4.0	Legal Comments.....	9
5.0	Overview of the Project.....	10
6.0	Business Case.....	11
7.0	Approach to Delivery and On-going Maintenance/Operation.....	11
9.0	Opportunity Cost of Delivering the Project.....	13
10.0	Local Employment and Enterprise Opportunities.....	14
11.0	Financial Programming and Timeline.....	14
12.0	Project Team.....	18
13.0	Project Reporting Arrangements.....	18
14.0	Quality Statement.....	18
15.0	Key Risks.....	18
16.0	Key Project Stakeholders.....	20
17.0	Stakeholder Communications.....	21
18.0	Project Approvals.....	21

## 1.0 Purpose of the Project Initiation Document

- 1.1 This project builds on the work already undertaken by a feasibility study into new pedestrian and cycling links across South Dock (Isle of Dogs – South Dock Feasibility & Design Study 2016). The study identified a strong business case for the delivery of a new walking and cycling link identified as South Dock Bridge on the Upper Bank Street Alignment to support the large quantum of development now underway on South Quay and the Isle of Dogs.
- 1.2 This Project Initiation Document (PID) sets out the details for the following phases of the project (as below) and will set out the resources needed to undertake this work.
- Project initiation
  - Design & public consultation
- 1.3 This PID should be read alongside the Programme Overview PID for the South Dock Bridge Project which sets out the programme for delivering the project. This PID details the work that needs to be undertaken for the above phases, including obtaining planning consent, undertaking detailed design and public consultation. The primary purpose of this PID is to:
- Provide a subordinate document to detail the delivery of project phases comprising Project Initiation and Design & Public Consultation, against which the Project Team, Project Managers and the Project Board can assess progress, review changes and review cost.
- 1.4 Further PIDs subordinate to the Programme Overview PID will be prepared for subsequent phases of the project.

## 2.0 Section 106/CIL Context

### Background

- 2.1 Section 106 (S106) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 allows a Local Planning Authority (LPA) to enter into a legally-binding agreement or planning obligation with a developer over a related issue. Planning Obligations/S106 agreements are legal agreements negotiated between a LPA and a developer, with the intention of making acceptable development which would otherwise be unacceptable in planning terms.

- 2.2 CIL is a £ per square metre charge on most new development. In April 2015, the Council adopted its own CIL Charging Schedule. CIL must be spent on the provision, improvement, replacement, operation or maintenance of infrastructure, where a specific project or type of project is set out in the [Council's Regulation 123 List](#).
- 2.3 On the 5<sup>th</sup> January 2016, the Mayor in Cabinet agreed the implementation of a new Infrastructure Delivery Framework which will help ensure the process concerning the approval and funding of infrastructure using CIL/S106 will be appropriately informed and transparent.

#### S106

- 2.4 No S106 funding is being sought for this PID.

#### CIL

- 2.5 This PID seeks approval for the expenditure of **£270,000** of CIL for workstreams included in the Initiation Phase and Design & Consultation Phase of the South Dock Bridge Project.
- 2.6 In accordance with Regulation 123 of the CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended), the Council has prepared a list of infrastructure that the Council intends, will be, or may be, wholly or partially funded by CIL.
- 2.7 This PID seeks funding for the initial stages of delivering South Dock Bridge, which falls under 'Roads and other transport facilities in the Council's Regulation 123 List.
- 2.8 The Council is currently preparing an Annual Infrastructure Statement (AIS) which will set out the Mayor's overall approach to investing Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funding up until 31st March 2019. The draft AIS allocates a portion of CIL funding to 'Critical Enabling' Infrastructure. 'Critical Enabling' infrastructure is defined as 'infrastructure which is deemed necessary to unlock and enable sites to be developed'. South Dock Bridge, which is listed in the AIS as an example of 'Critical Enabling' Infrastructure, will address the need for a new pedestrian and cycling connection between Canary Wharf and South Dock. South Dock Bridge is also listed as a 'Critical Enabling' project in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Framework: Evidence Base.

### **3.0 Equalities Analysis**

- 3.1 Details of the equalities analysis are available within the South Dock Bridge

programme Overview PID.

#### **4.0 Legal Comments**

- 4.1 The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is a planning charge, introduced by the Planning Act 2008 ('the 2008 Act') as a tool for local authorities in England and Wales to help deliver infrastructure to support the development of their area. It came into force on 6 April 2010 through the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 ('the 2010 Regulations').
- 4.2 CIL is a pounds per square metre charge on most new development and must be used to help deliver infrastructure to support the development of the area. It can be used to provide new infrastructure, increase the capacity of existing infrastructure or to repair failing existing infrastructure, if this is necessary to support development.
- 4.3 Infrastructure is defined by s216 of the Planning Act 2008 to include roads and other transport facilities. A footbridge is likely to fit within a wide definition of this, however; the definition is not exclusive and we are satisfied that a footbridge is infrastructure of that type and that it is vital to support the development of the Council's area.
- 4.4 A charging authority must apply CIL to funding the provision, improvement, replacement, operation or maintenance of infrastructure to support the development of its area, as set out in Regulation 59 of the 2010 Regulations.
- 4.5 South Dock Bridge has been recognised in the draft Annual Infrastructure Statement as a Critical Enabling Project. The Annual Infrastructure Statement is still in draft form as it has not yet been through the necessary internal decision making procedures to be adopted as policy. This document sets out how the Mayor shall invest CIL into infrastructure in the borough up until 31 March 2019. Critical Enabling Projects are specific infrastructure projects which have been deemed necessary to unlock and enable sites to be developed.
- 4.6 Legal Services notes from the project budget at section 11 of this PID that the amount of £270,000 requested as funding from CIL is to be used to fund various assessments and pieces of advice which are required to inform the delivery of this project. Whilst this is not infrastructure itself, Legal Services are satisfied that the delivery of significant infrastructure projects naturally require project management, design costs, consultation costs etc. and therefore such enabling costs (without which infrastructure could not be delivered) can appropriately be funded from CIL costs.

- 4.7 When approving this PID, the Council must have due regard to the need to eliminate unlawful conduct under the Equality Act 2010, the need to advance equality of opportunity and the need to foster good relations between persons who share a protected characteristic and those who do not (the public sector equality duty). A proportionate level of equality analysis is required to discharge the duty. An equalities analysis is included in the above section which is proportionate at this stage of the project.
- 4.8 These comments are limited to addressing compliance of the Council's expenditure of CIL (as based on the information detailed in the PID) and advice on any other legal matters (such as advice on procurement) should be sought separately if appropriate.

## **5.0 Overview of the Project**

- 5.1 The Isle of Dogs is experiencing high levels of residential and commercial growth and a wide range of infrastructure improvements are needed. South Dock Bridge is necessary to connect new residential areas of the transport, services and jobs in the Canary Wharf Town Centre.
- 5.2 This project is in accordance with and supported by the London Plan, the emerging Isle of Dogs Opportunity Area Planning Framework (OAPF), the boroughs emerging Local Plan and the South Quays Master Plan.

### Project objectives

- 5.3 The following objectives are identified for Project Initiation and Design & Public Consultation phases of the South Dock Bridge project. These phases are the first stages in delivering a walking and cycling bridge on the Upper Bank Street Alignment by 2020/21:
1. *Negotiate the necessary legal agreements with key stakeholders & landowners*
  2. *Obtain all necessary permissions including planning consent*
  3. *Undertake necessary public and stakeholder consultation*
  4. *Assess and where required mitigate project impacts*
- 5.4 Please refer to the South Dock Bridge Programme Overview PID for a detailed overview of the project.

## 6.0 Business Case

- 6.1 As above stated, the Isle of Dogs – South Dock Feasibility & Design Study has identified a strong business case for the delivery of a new walking and cycling link identified as South Dock Bridge, to support the large quantum of development coming forward in South Quay and the Isle of Dogs and to relieve congestion on the existing Wilkinson Eyre Bridge.
- 6.2 The study considered different options with the provision of the South Dock Bridge on the Upper Bank Street Alignment proving to be the most feasible and appropriate option.
- 6.3 The detailed business case for the South Dock Bridge is set out in the Programme Overview PID.

## 7.0 Approach to Delivery and On-going Maintenance/Operation

### Delivery Phases & Workstreams

- 7.1 The South Dock Bridge project will be split into four phases including:
- Project Initiation
  - Design & Public Consultation
  - Land Acquisition & Planning
  - Construction
- 7.2 Each phase comprises a number of workstreams and further PIDs will be submitted to outline specific details in relation to each phase.
- 7.3 As stated, this PID focuses on the Initiation and Design & Public Consultation Phases. The following workstreams have been identified for these phases.

### **Initiation Phase**

- 7.4 **Undertake land ownership assessment:** It is important to identify the different landowners around the site to progress negotiations with the Canal and Rivers Trust (CRT), Canary Wharf Group and Berkeley Homes (and any other identified stakeholders), as well as inform a potential Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) if required. Advice will be sought from the Council's Asset Management team and external consultants will be procured if necessary.
- 7.5 **Undertake commercial assessment of impacts on South Dock moorings:**

External consultants will be procured to identify the economic impacts on the South Dock moorings that will be displaced as a consequence of the bridge; it is a statutory requirement for the Council to identify and mitigate any impacts on the moorings. The commercial impacts assessment will also help inform negotiations with CRT and any CPO application should it be necessary.

**7.6 Procurement of consultants to prepare planning application documents:** Planning consultants will be procured to prepare and lead the planning application process for South Dock Bridge. They will also be responsible for preparing a Planning Statement and to coordinate planning impact assessments.

**7.7** Steer Davies Gleave have been already engaged to undertake Phase 2 of the IoD – Feasibility & Design Investigation (detailed design) which has now been authorised. They will need to feed in directly with the appointed Planning Consultant.

**7.8** A number of specialist consultants will need to be procured to assess relevant impacts of the bridge to prepare the following impact statements/assessments as part of the planning application submission:

- Air Quality Assessment
- Biodiversity Survey & Report
- Environmental Statement
- Heritage Assessment
- Lighting Assessment
- Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment
- Transport Assessment
- Wind Impact Statement

**7.9 Prepare Communications & Public Consultation Management Strategy:** A Communications & Public Consultation Management Strategy will be developed together with the Council's Communications and Marketing Department to set out a strategy for engaging stakeholders and the public and to develop key messages for the project. We will endeavour to prepare the strategy in-house.

### **Design & Public Consultation Phase**

**7.10 Undertake detailed design:** Phase 1 of the Feasibility and Design Investigation has been undertaken by Steer Davies Gleave. The investigation focused on identifying two new links across South Dock and the subsequent business case for these links. This work was completed in May 2016 and the findings are presented as the business case for the wider project in the Programme Overview PID. Phase 2 of this investigation will focus on the detailed design of the two links recommended as preferred options by the Phase 1 Feasibility Investigation. The detailed design will also be undertaken by Steer Davies Gleave and has been approved by a previous PID.

- 7.11 **Assessment of planning impacts:** The planning implications for the South Dock Bridge Project will be assessed as part of the planning application for the project. These include impacts on biodiversity, light pollution, visual intrusion and wind funnelling on the areas adjacent to the bridge.
- 7.12 **Procurement of consultants to undertake public consultation:** Specialist consultants will be procured to undertake consultation on the South Dock Bridge proposal in alignment with the project's Communication & Public Consultation Management Strategy. Prior to the procurement exercise, the Council's Communications Team will be consulted on the most appropriate approach to the consultation exercise.
- 7.13 **Incorporation of any public consultation design changes:** Consultation will be undertaken with stakeholders and the wider public on the design of the bridge and the likely impacts. This consultation will be undertaken simultaneously whilst the planning impact assessments are being undertaken so these workstreams can inform each other and have a meaningful bearing on the bridge design.
- 7.14 **Review any additional planning impacts:** The Infrastructure Planning team will consider any additional planning impacts from the project as they emerge and will consult with the appointed planning consultants regarding any necessary changes to the design.

## 8.0 Infrastructure Planning Evidence Base Context

- 8.1 The Isle of Dogs – South Dock Bridges Feasibility & Design Study (May 2016) (Appendix A) provides the evidence base for this project.
- 8.2 The project is included in the Infrastructure Planning Evidence Base Project List with a priority of 1 'Critical Enabling' and is also identified in the Council's AIS (see section 2.14).

## 9.0 Opportunity Cost of Delivering the Project

- 9.1 As mentioned the AIS allocates a portion of CIL funding to 'Critical Enabling' Infrastructure. The Infrastructure Delivery Framework: Evidence Base identifies 6 Critical Enabling projects which are scheduled to be delivered within the next 5 years and may require CIL funding. Given the amount of CIL funding allocated to 'Critical Enabling' projects over the next five years in the draft AIS and the opportunities currently being explored for match funding, including the four bids the Council has put forward for the Housing Infrastructure Fund, it is not considered that approving the funding set out in this PID will detract from the opportunities for CIL funding being used for the other five Critical Enabling projects.
- 9.2 Furthermore, the Business Case set out in Section 6.0 of this PID details out why

this project is essential for supporting growth in Canary Wharf.

- 9.3 As well as the bid for the Housing Infrastructure Fund detailed in para 6.23, other funding sources for this project are being explored. Funding of 50% of the cost of the feasibility study and detailed design has been met by TfL. Officers have also lobbied TfL to contribute MCIL to the project, given the strategic importance of this infrastructure. In spite of this, TfL have indicated that they will not be able to provide further funding towards the bridge delivery. Nonetheless officers will continue to work closely with TfL and utilise any funding opportunities if they become available.
- 9.4 Opportunities for corporate sponsorship are also being considered. Berkely Homes and the Canary Wharf Group have been approached, however ruled out any funding contributions to this project.

## 10.0 Local Employment and Enterprise Opportunities

- 10.1 Local firms will be used to provide services for delivering these phases of the South Dock Bridge Project where possible. The Council's Employment and Enterprise team will be engaged throughout the process to ensure that the project delivers local economic benefits.

## 11.0 Financial Programming and Timeline

### Project Budget

- 11.1 The following Table 1 below outlines the capital funding required to fund the work streams included in the Initiation Phase and Design & Consultation Phase of the South Dock Bridge Project up to September 2018.

<b>Table 1</b>			
<b>Financial Resources</b>			
<b>Description</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Funding Source</b>	<b>Funding (Capital/ Revenue)</b>
Land Ownership Assessment	£15,000	CIL	Capital
Public Consultation	£20,000	CIL	Capital
Compulsory Purchase Legal Advice	£50,000	CIL	Capital
Commercial Impacts Assessment - Moorings	£15,000	CIL	Capital
Planning Impacts Assessment	£120,000	CIL	Capital

<b>Table 1</b>			
<b>Financial Resources</b>			
<b>Description</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Funding Source</b>	<b>Funding (Capital/ Revenue)</b>
Contingency	£50,000	CIL	Capital
<b>Total</b>	<b>£270,000</b>		

### Project Management

- 11.2 The project will have two project managers; one under the Infrastructure Planning Team representing the 'client', and the other will be under the Capital Delivery Team acting as 'delivery' project manager. Please refer to the Programme Overview PID for more details.

### Financial Profiling

<b>Table 2</b>					
<b>Financial Profiling</b>					
<b>Description</b>	<b>17/18</b>				<b>Total 17/18</b>
	<b>Q1</b>	<b>Q2</b>	<b>Q3</b>	<b>Q4</b>	
Land Ownership Assessment				£15,000	£15,000
Compulsory Purchase Legal Advice				£12,500	£12,500
Public Consultation				£20,000	£20,000
Contingency				£10,000	£10,000
	<b>18/19</b>				<b>Total 18/19</b>
	<b>Q1</b>	<b>Q2</b>	<b>Q3</b>	<b>Q4</b>	
Compulsory Purchase Legal Advice	£12,500	£12,500	£12,500		£37,500
Commercial Impacts Assessment - Moorings	£15,000				£15,000
Planning Impacts Assessment	£120,000				£120,000
Contingency	£10,000	£10,000	£10,000	£10,000	£40,000
<b>Total 17/18 – 18/19</b>					<b>£270,000</b>

## Outputs/Milestone and Spend Profile

<b>Table 3</b>			
<b>Project Outputs/Milestone and Spend Profile</b>			
<b>ID</b>	<b>Milestone Title</b>	<b>Baseline Spend</b>	<b>Baseline Delivery Date</b>
1	Prepare & finalise Communication & Public Consultation Management Strategy	In-house	31 <sup>st</sup> December 2017
2	Finalise detailed design for public consultation	Separate PID	31 <sup>st</sup> December 2017
3	Appoint public consultation consultants	£20,000	31 <sup>st</sup> December 2017
4	Undertake Public consultation	(as above)	February-March 2018
5	Investigate land ownership - procure external consultants if required	£15,000	31 <sup>st</sup> December 2017
6	Complete land ownership assessment	As above	30 <sup>th</sup> March 2018
7	Appoint consultants for Commercial Impact Assessment – moorings	£15,000	30 <sup>th</sup> March 2018
8	Finalise Commercial Impact Assessment	(as above)	30 <sup>th</sup> June 2018
9	Complete detailed design	Separate PID	30 <sup>th</sup> September 2018
10	Procure Planning consultants	£120,000	31 <sup>st</sup> March 2018
11	Preparation of Planning Application & Planning Impacts Assessments	(as above)	30 <sup>th</sup> September 2018
12	Expert Legal Advice – CPO & Negotiations Support	£50,000	December 2018
13	Contingency	£50,000	n/a
<b>Total</b>		<b>£270,000</b>	

## 12.0 Project Team

- 12.1 The majority of the work for these phases will be completed by the Client Team (Jas Mahil- Sandhu) supported by the wider project team, the project board and procured consultants.
- 12.2 Please Refer to South Dock Bridge Programme Overview PID for further details.

## 13.0 Project Reporting Arrangements

Table 4			
Group	Attendees	Reports/Log	Frequency
South Dock Bridge Project Board	Numerous – defined in ToR.	Highlight/Monitoring Report	At least bi-monthly
Asset Management & Capital Board	Numerous – defined in ToR.	Highlight/Monitoring Report	As required
IDSG Sub Group	Numerous – defined in ToR.	Monitoring Report	As required
IDSG	Numerous – defined in ToR.	Monitoring Report	As required
IDB	Numerous – defined in ToR	Monitoring Report	As required

## 14.0 Quality Statement

- 14.1 Quality standards will be defined in accordance with London Borough of Tower Hamlets’ standards. All delivery will be procured and managed to the quality required by the Council.

## 15.0 Key Risks

- 15.1 The Key project risks for these phases are set out in table 5 below; these project risks will be developed as the project progresses. The wider projects risks are set out within the Programme Overview PID for the South Dock Bridge.

**Table 5**

<b>Risk No.</b>	<b>Risk</b>	<b>Triggers</b>	<b>Consequences</b>	<b>Controls</b>	<b>Likelihood</b>	<b>Impact</b>	<b>Total</b>
1	The detailed design of the bridge does not meet the Council's expectations	Not adequately briefing consultants working on the detailed design could result in unsatisfactory outcomes	The programme would be set back if work needs to be re-done to the required specifications	Having a clear brief and properly briefing consultants at the outset and providing updates on the progress of the detailed design at South Dock Bridge Project Board meetings to feed in comments from the board, will help to minimise this risk	2	3	6
2	Lack of support for the bridge during public consultation	Not undertaking adequate consultation or sending out positive messages around the project	Objections to the project at planning application stage or general negativity around the project	Procuring a professional consultation firm to implement a thorough and inclusive public consultation exercise for the bridge and working with the Council's Communications team to send out a positive message around the proposals, will help minimise this risk	2	4	8
3	Over-spend occurring for certain tasks	Certain tasks may cost more than projected	Less resource will be available for other phases of work	Monitor budgetary spend and aim to procure the most cost effective outcomes for the	2	2	4

Table 5							
Risk No.	Risk	Triggers	Consequences	Controls	Likelihood	Impact	Total
				workstreams			

## 16.0 Key Project Stakeholders

16.1 The principal stakeholders are shown in Table 6 below and will be engaged from the earliest stages of the project and through to project closure. The key stakeholders will be engaged as required, after delivery is completed.

Table 6			
Key Stakeholders	Role	Communication Method	Frequency
Mayor John Biggs	Corporate Management	Briefing meetings	Quarterly
Deputy Mayor Jules Pipe	Deputy Mayor for planning & regeneration	Briefing papers	Quarterly
Cllr Rachel Blake	Lead member for Strategic Development	Briefing meetings	Quarterly
Local Ward Councillors	Local representatives	Briefing papers	As needed
Infrastructure Delivery Steering Group	Project direction & advice	Briefing meetings	As needed
TfL: Patricia Charlton	Strategic Planning Partner	Email & telephone	As needed
Mike Nisbet: Berkeley Homes	Affected landowner	Email, telephone & Consultation meetings	As needed
Jason Larkin: Canary Wharf Group	Affected landowner	Email, telephone & Consultation meetings	As needed

<b>Table 6</b>			
<b>Key Stakeholders</b>	<b>Role</b>	<b>Communication Method</b>	<b>Frequency</b>
Stuart Mills: Canal & River Trust	Affected landowner	Email, telephone & Consultation meetings	As needed

## 17.0 Stakeholder Communications

17.1 As set out above. A Communications & Public Consultation Management Strategy will be prepared for the project which will provide further details on stakeholder and public engagement.

## 18.0 Project Approvals

The PID has been reviewed and approved by the Chair of the IDSG and the Divisional Director for the Directorate leading the project.			
<b>Role</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>
IDSG Chair	Ann Sutcliffe		
Divisional Director for Place & Building Control	Owen Whalley		

## Project Closure

*[Please note that once this project has been completed a Project Closure Document is to be completed and submitted to the Infrastructure Planning Team and the S106 Programme Manager.]*

## Appendices

## Project Closure Document

<b>Project Closure Document</b>			
<b>1.</b>	<b>Project Name:</b>		
<b>2a.</b>	<b>Outcomes/Outputs/Deliverables</b> I confirm that the outcomes and outputs have been delivered in line with the conditions set out in the any Funding Agreement/PID including any subsequently agreed variations.		<b>Please Tick ✓</b>
	<b>Yes</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>No</b>
<b>2b.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key Outputs <i>[as specified in the PID]</i></li>   <li>• Outputs Achieved <i>[Please provide evidence of project completion/delivery e.g. photos, monitoring returns / evaluation]</i></li>   <li>• Employment &amp; Enterprise Outputs Achieved <i>[Please specify the employment/enterprise benefits delivered by the project]</i></li> </ul>		
<b>3a.</b>	<b>Timescales</b> I confirm that the project has been delivered within agreed time constraints.		<b>Please Tick ✓</b>
	<b>Yes</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>No</b>
<b>3b.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Milestones in PID <i>[as specified in the PID]</i></li>   <li>• Were all milestones in the PID delivered to time <i>[Please outline reasons for any slippage encountered throughout the project]</i></li>   <li>• Please state if the slippage on project milestone has any impacts on the projects spend (i.e. overspend) or funding (e.g. clawback)</li> </ul>		
<b>4a.</b>	<b>Cost</b> I confirm that the expenditure incurred in delivering the project was within the agreed budget and spent in accordance with PID		<b>Please Tick ✓</b>
	<b>Yes</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>No</b>
<b>4b.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Code</li>   <li>• Project Budget <i>[as specified in the PID]</i></li>   <li>• Total Project Expenditure <i>[Please outline reasons for any over/underspend]</i></li>   <li>• Was project expenditure in line with PID spend profile <i>[Please outline reasons for any slippage in spend encountered throughout the project]</i></li> </ul>		

5.	<b>Closure of Cost Centre</b> I confirm that there is no further spend and that the projects cost centre has been closed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff employment terminated</li> <li>• Contracts /invoices have been terminated/processed</li> </ul>	Please Tick ✓			
		Yes		No	
		Yes		No	
6.	<b>Risks &amp; Issues</b> I confirm that there are no unresolved/outstanding Risks and Issues	Please Tick ✓			
		Yes		No	
7.	<b>Project Documentation</b> I confirm that the project records have been securely and orderly archived such that any audit or retrieval can be undertaken.	Please Tick ✓			
		Yes		No	
These records can also be accessed within the client directorate using the following filepath: <i>[Please include file-path of project documentation]</i>					
8.	Lessons learnt				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project set up <i>[Please include brief narrative on any issues faced/lessons learned project set up]</i></li> </ul>				
	<hr/> <hr/>				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outputs <i>[Please include brief narrative on any issues faced/lessons learned in delivering outputs as specified in the PID, including the management of any risks]</i></li> </ul>				
	<hr/> <hr/>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Timescales <i>[Please include brief narrative on any issues faced/lessons learned in delivering project to timescales specified in PID]</i></li> </ul>					
<hr/> <hr/>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Spend <i>[Please include brief narrative on any issues faced/lessons learned regarding project spend i.e. sticking to financial profiles specified in the PID, under or overspend]</i></li> </ul>					
<hr/> <hr/>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Partnership Working <i>[Please include brief narrative on any issues faced/lessons learned re: internal / external partnership working when delivering the project]</i></li> </ul>					
<hr/> <hr/>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Closure <i>Please include brief narrative on any issues faced/lessons learned project closure]</i></li> </ul>					

	<p>-----</p> <p>-----</p>		
<b>9.</b>	<p><b>Comments by the Project Sponsor including any further action required</b>  <i>[Use to summarise project delivery and any outstanding actions etc]</i></p> <p>-----</p> <p>-----</p>		
<b>10.</b>	<p>The Project Sponsor and Project Manager are satisfied that the project has met its objectives and that it can be formally closed.</p>		
	Sponsor (Name)		Date
	Project Manager (Name)		Date