# St Edmundsbury A561

# Project Close out Report

PROJECT TITLE	PROJECT REF.	DATE OF THIS REPORT	COMPLETED BY	CONFIRM FINAL PROJECT STATUS REPORT (PSR) COMPLETED	ANY OTHER DOCUMENTS ATTACHED?	DID A FORMAL LESSONS LEARNED SESSION TAKE PLACE? (DATE)	WHO ATTENDED FORMAL LESSONS LEARNED SESSION? (INITIALS)	PROJECT SPONSOR NAME	PROJECT MANAGER NAME
Queen Street Enhancement Scheme Haverhill		24 February 2010	Patsy Dell	yes		Yes – 8 February	PD,GR,SB,TH,JH,CR,RK	S.	P. Dell

#### FINAL FINANCIAL STATUS

Original Budget	£480,000
Original Estimated Cost	£440,000
Final Budget	£TBC
Final Total Cost	£TBC

Cost funded from (List Below)	
Tesco s.106	£300,000
Suffolk County Council	£180,000
	£480,000

#### **PROGRAMME STATUS**

	Orig Est End Date	Nov 2009
Actual End Date		Nov 2009

#### WERE THE ORIGINAL OBJECTIVES ACHIEVED? (LIST KEY ACCOMPLISHMENTS)

- Yes transformational scheme delivered at no capital cost to St Edmundsbury,
- Positive feedback on results from members, traders and town stakeholders
- Other funding secured during life of project e.g. shop fronts grant schemes
- Delivered below budget
- Lessons learnt from Jubilee Walk and all put into practice successfully

#### HOW WILL RESOURCES STAND DOWN AND BE DISPERSED

Residual capital funding agreed to be put towards High Street enhancement scheme project when budget outturn completed.

## WERE ANY UNEXPECTED OPPORTUNITIES IDENTIFIED AND REALISED?

- A number of property owners have improved their own properties as a result e.g.
   Woolpack, Chinese restaurant, pie and mash shop
- New brick wall in Murton Slade
- Fence USA Chicken
- Member support for Drakes Yard gateway feature

#### HAVE PROJECT DOCUMENTS BEEN COMPLETED? WHERE ARE THEY ARCHIVED?

Being collated, engineering and planning services archives

#### LIST THINGS GONE RIGHT (TGR)

- Good internal project team
- Good communication with traders and members during life of project
- Good communication with Town Council
- Contractor very good, especially site manager
- Good quality materials used in scheme
- Weekly update meetings held
- Weekly news letters to traders and residents sent out
- Listened and responded quickly to traders queries
- Good opening event

#### LIST THINGS GONE WRONG (TGW)

- Communication with SCC regarding street lighting needed to be earlier and they should have been in the project team from start
- Need to find better ways to engage and involve young people
- Public art commissioning process has lessons for next time

#### TEAM / INDIVIDUAL SUCCESS FACTORS WORTHY OF SPECIAL PRAISE

- Communications on the ground problem solving and keeping traders happy: Tina, Chris, Jeff and John Bounds
- Scheme Design Ray
- o Breheny Contract management Jeff and John Bounds
- o Shop fronts scheme Tom Purser, Tina, Ray and Chris

#### CLEAR ACTIONS RESULTING FROM THE PROJECT CLOSE OUT REVIEW

- Future projects to have weekly project team meetings scheduled in from start and for duration of project
- SCC included at an earlier stage to ensure street lighting etc is factored in and problems solved as and when the plans are drawn up
- Consultation material to be less impressionistic and more realistic in appearance
- Need to engage young people better
- Weekly news letters/updates to Members, Town Council, traders and any residents essential.

#### REFERENCING THE ATTACHED PSR, SUMMARIZE AND EXPLAIN VARIANCES

No variances, project followed timetable and with the exception of the public art element is within budget.

## WERE RISKS IDENTIFIED AND MITIGATED (TRY TO GIVE EXAMPLES)

- o Implementation and construction were over spring and summer so benefited from better weather
- Regular meetings kept track of key elements and progress
- Trading impact was communicated and managed with real focus on mitigating this with the contractor and through constant communication

W:\Democratic WP Services\Committee\Reports\Haverhill Area Working Party\2010\10.03.11\A561 Queen Street Enhancement Scheme - Close Out Report.doc