

## Appendix E

<b>NAME OF PROJECT</b>	<b>PRINCES STREET ENHANCEMENT SCHEME PHASE 2</b>
------------------------	--

### Project Number

### Financial Summary

Budget:

SSDC funding	Area South Capital	£80,000
	Yeovil Vision	£30,000
External Funding	YTC	£24,000
Total Budget		£134,000

Total Actual Expenditure		£134,000
Commitments		0
Project under/over spend		£0

### Project Duration Summary

	Original Estimated Date	Actual Date
Project Commenced	September 2009	September 2009
Project Completed	December 2011	June 2013

### Milestones

Key Milestones	Estimated Date	Actual Date	Reasons for Difference
<i>Stage one – Design scheme (brief, appointment of consultants, concept design signed off)</i>	September 2010	June 2011	This element was more time consuming than originally perceived. The appointment of consultants was straightforward, but the sign off of the recommended design option was lengthy and protracted. The consultant's work was put on hold until changes to the final design were agreed.
<i>Stage two – technical engineering &amp; installation drawings &amp; funding</i>	September 2011	March 2012	County Highways encountered delays to progressing the technical engineering designs due to workload issues and further changes to the design to satisfy safety audit led to further delays with sign off by the project team. Funding was secured in a fairly short time.
<i>Stage three – implementation</i>	January 2012	June 2013	Implementation was scheduled however delayed due to further

			workload capacity issues with SCC. SCC also identified significantly higher costs to implement the scheme than they had originally estimated. This caused delay to the start of the works in order to sort out how the scheme could be amended to ensure that the project could be completed within the agreed budget. The main construction began in October 2012 and was completed by December 2012. Some remedial works were required and changes to TROs and the complete works were not fully signed off by the Steering group until June 2013.
--	--	--	--

### Officer Time

Officer	Original Estimate per capital appraisal	Estimate of actual time spent on project	Reasons for Difference
Chereen Scott/Sara Kelly	200 hours	400	As project manager, the delays in developing designs, internal review, and Highway delays heavily impacted the amount of time to progress the work.
Pauline Burr	37	20	The public art element of the project was not progressed to the same extent as originally intended
Kim Close	20	25	The delays in progressing the project impacted the number of meetings project team members were required to attend, as well as additional technical advice required.
Garry Green	20	37	As above
Steve Fox	37	45	As above
Andrew Tucker	20	25	As above
Project support	100	200	As above
Marie Ainsworth	0	5	Due to secondment of project manager, extra hours spent to complete the financial element and minor snagging issues.

### **Objectives of the Project** (per the capital appraisal)

Through consultation with traders, shoppers and visitors identified a number of issues, reaffirming those raised by the Urban Development Framework and the County Council study:

- Dominating vehicles create an imbalance between pedestrians and drivers
- Narrow footways
- Poor quality street scene

- Illegally parked vehicles on footways
- Existing wide pedestrian crossing point is difficult to negotiate
- An abundance of street furniture clutter
- Poor signage and paths not corresponding with desire line
- Unwelcoming subway
- Overgrown vegetation and clutter around subway entrances

The overall scheme objectives identified by the Princes Street steering group were;

- Improve pedestrian links between the town centre, college and hospital,
- Reduce vehicle speeds entering Princes Street from Park Road,
- Enhance the character of Princes Street,
- Shift the emphasis of the street from motorist to pedestrian,
- Improve the subways and its environs,
- Integration of creativity and public art where achievable.

### **How were the Objectives Met?**

Outline enhancement proposals and options were developed following the consultant's initial site analysis, traders survey and review of wider consultation conducted since 2007. Consultation activities then took place between May and June 2010 to give members of the public the opportunity to view the scheme options and have their say on outline proposals.

The results of these various consultation activities were considered by the Princes Street Enhancement Steering Group and helped inform further development of the final design scheme.

Some further amendments to the scheme were required in order to satisfy Somerset County Council's safety audit, including a larger raised table crossing, additional bollards and cycle racks. The existing street lighting system has also been replaced as part of these works.

All the objectives were met with the exception of the integration of creativity and public art because the public art element of the project was not progressed to the same extent as originally intended.

Separate to this, the Area South Development team installed a number of planters at appropriate locations on Park Road and Princes Street to enhance the scheme further. They also organised the improvement of the subways and its environs because of the higher costs to implement the scheme by Somerset County Council.

### **Please add details of any additional benefits that have resulted from the project being undertaken**

- New businesses are taking up vacant premises. Before the scheme started in August 2009, there were 6 empty premises in Princes Street and just before the completion of the scheme in May 2013, there were only 2 empty premises.

### **In hindsight is there anything that you would have done differently ?**

- At project inception identify quality measures and standards regards materials and desired finish expected.
- Highways need to set out clear procedures, roles and responsibilities regards TROs, lighting installation and limited waiting signs at project inception.

- Plan well in advance suspension machine street cleaning immediately after paving is laid as there is risk of damage to bedding down of materials.
- Allow time for snagging and remedial works into the work programme.
- Little flexibility with some details with contactors once on site.
- Would be preferable to have a Highways representative supervising the works during the construction stage.

## **Summary**

Workloads of officers from within SSDC and partner organisations, along with budgetary cuts impacting capacity to progress work quickly enough, had a significant impact on the progression of the project at various stages of the work, meaning work had to be programmed at a later than expected date. However the actual construction of the improvement works was completed in a short timescale, and the general public has been generally supportive of the works being done.

---