

APPENDIX 4B - GRAYS TIP PROJECT AND RISK SUMMARY

Project	Project packages	Cost in TIP (£m)	Issues to resolve	Main Project Risks	Main Risks to the Council
Station Gateway Active Riverfront Connectivity	Projects Combined due to close relationships	2.64 2.51	These works are either within underpass project area or within the Public Highway.	Delay of underpass would delay commencement of project.	a. Responsibility for implementation and project risk fall to the council . b. Deliverability and programme is closely linked to delivery of the underpass. c. Could require an increased budget provision for maintenance. Proposed mitigation Full business Case passed all gateway requirements for the Future High Street Fund. The Full Business Case stage for the Town Funds to include detailed consideration of; - long term management and operation - deliverability and objectives. This will enable the Council to make an informed decision before committing to the project. If it is decided at this stage that the project is not viable there is a possibility that the funding can be transferred to another project.
	Package Total	5.15			
Riverfront and Beach Grays Beach & Kilverts Field: Leisure Destination Riverfront Activities Centre	Projects combined to Grays Riverside Park	5.59 4.57 3.037	The following could all define the approach to the scheme and the scope of long term management and need to be addressed before undertaking costly design development. 1. Some land is owned/the responsibility of others including the PLA (Owner), the Environment Agency (responsible for flood defences), Lighthouse Café (Lease and some park management) and Yacht Club (lease). The PLA, EA and Yacht Club will all influence/impact the scope of the project and the costs. 2. Need to understand ground conditions and the condition and extent of the flood defences 3. Works to flood defences and within the river will require consent from the Environment Agency as manager of the flood defences and as a statutory consultee in the planning process, and from PLA in their role of managing use and safety of the river 4. The Grays Yacht Club have a leasehold interest that impacts the scheme, policy support in EA policy, and they may be able to support long term management. Should they object their objection could impact EA and PLA support for the scheme.	1. Deliverability of creating sandy beach (technical/cost/river safety/flood capacity) 2. Cost and complexity of works to Flood defences 3. Cost and complexity of maintenance of flood defences 4. Limitations of flood defences on scope and cost of works 5. Ground conditions - weight loadings and foundation treatments 6. Ground conditions - contamination 7. Land ownerships - leases 8. Commercial viability 9. Long term cost of maintenance and mangement (including replenishment of sand) 10. Level of contingency allowance	a. Responsibility for implementation and project risk fall to the council . b. Long term costs of operation and maintenance will fall to the Council. Given the nature of the projects, higher management costs are likely to be required than at present and there may be further additional cost associated with maintaining flood defences and structures in the river. c. Complex project at early stage of development so limited level of cost certainty at present. Relatively low level of contingency currently allocated - overspend risk rests with the Council. d. Potential requirement for Council to manage a new asset. Proposed mitigation The Full Business Case stage to include detailed consideration of options for long term management and operation, and need for review of objectives to enable delivery. This will enable the Council to make an informed decision before committing to the project. If it is decided at this stage that the project is not viable there is a possibility that the funding can be transferred to another project.
	Package Total	13.197			
Jetty	Jetty	6.6	The following could all determine the suitability and availability of the preferred location and need to be addressed before undertaking costly design development. 1. Proposed site is in third party ownership. Need to understand their support and willingness to either sell or enter in to licence arrangements at reasonable cost. 2. Need to understand ground conditions and the condition of the wharf to which the jetty would be attached to understand if required works could be carried out at reasonable cost. Access required to undertake surveys. 3. Need to understand suitability of location from a river management perspective and in relation to other existing river users such as the yacht club, PLA Navigational Safety Assessment. 4. Works to flood defences and within the river will require consent from the environment agency as manager of the flood defences and as a statutory consultee in the planning process. 5. Need to establish River bus operator and London Resort support and requirements (and willingness to support and fund business case development). 6. Proposed site close to a Marine Conservation Zone.	1. Ground conditions unsuitable -weight loadings and foundation treatments 2. Ground conditions-contamination 3. PLA withhold licence for river safety/operation impact 4. Cost of works to Flood defences 5. Cost of maintenance of flood defences 6. Limitations of flood defences on scope of works 7. Requires acquisition of land at reasonable cost 8. Commercial viability or river bus to be established 9. Long term cost of operation, maintenance and management. No identifiable responsible body. 10. Level of contingency allowance 11. Complex project may not be deliverable with timeframe for spend of funding	a. Responsibility for implementation and project risk fall to the council. b. Land assembly would have to be by the Council funded from the project, and only the Council would have the powers of compulsory purchase if required. The Council would therefore own the land required and incur associated costs which could include; i. General costs of holding land including in-house resource ii. Currently unknown costs could include maintenance of the flood defences and maintenance of the open spaces. iii. Costs of insuring , maintaining and operating the jetty and payment of licence fees to the PLA for its operation unless another owner/operator can be found 2. Complex project at early stage of development so limited level of cost certainty at present. Relatively low level of contingency currently allocated - overspend risk rests with the Council. Proposed mitigation The Full Business Case stage to include detailed consideration of options for; a) Alternatives to land acquisition (e.g. licences for access and construction) b) long term management and operation c) Review deliverability and objectives. This will enable the Council to make an informed decision before committing to the project. If it is decided at this stage that the project is not viable there is a possibility that the funding can be transferred to another project.
	Package Total	6.6			
	Total	24.9			