

Lowestoft Town Council

For the attention of all Councillors

You are summoned to attend a **Town Hall Project Committee [In-person]** meeting of Lowestoft Town Council, which will be held at **Hamilton House, Battery Green Road, Lowestoft, NR32 1DE** at **10:00 AM** on **Thursday, July 10, 2025**.

The meeting is held in accessible premises and open to the public and press to attend.

Those attending shall be informed that the meeting may be reported on (including recording, photographing and filming). This does not apply to confidential items. Comments can also be submitting regarding any item on the agenda in advance of the meeting. Members of the public can join the meeting remotely via [Teams](#). The meeting can also be observed via [YouTube](#).

In providing any comments members of the public accept that, where they are suitable, they may be considered at the meeting and published in our minutes. Any individual submitting the comments should ensure that their name, address and contact details are included in their communication and should note that anonymous submissions will not be accepted. Members of the public accept that their name may be noted and recorded at the meeting. However, their contact details will not be noted and reported publicly.

Councillors must register relevant interests and declare them at a meeting if they have such an interest in a matter to be considered. Under the Localism Act 2011, a councillor with relevant interests in matters on the agenda cannot take part or vote on those matters, unless they have been granted a dispensation. Under the Council's Code of Conduct, a councillor must leave the meeting room if they have such an interest, unless they have been granted a dispensation. There may be other interests or matters in which councillors might be considered to be biased or predetermined in which case they will need to consider whether they should leave the room.

The Council has a duty to pay due regard to preventing crime and disorder and to conserve biodiversity as part of relevant decisions.

S. L. Foote

.....
Sarah Foote, Acting Town Clerk and Responsible Financial Officer
03 July 2025

Lowestoft Town Council
Town Hall Project Committee [In-person]
Hamilton House, Battery Green Road, Lowestoft, NR32 1DE
10:00 AM on Thursday, July 10, 2025

AGENDA

15 Welcome

To explain the fire evacuation procedure, welcome the meeting, and remind councillors and members of the public of the right to report.

16 To receive and consider approval of apologies for absence

17 Declarations of Interests and dispensations

17.1 To receive declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary, Other Registerable and Non-Registerable interests from members on items on the agenda

17.2 To consider written requests for dispensations for Disclosable Pecuniary Interests and note dispensations granted

18 To consider the draft minutes of the meeting on 12 June 2025

19 Public forum

An opportunity for the public to make comments on any matters on this agenda, and to consider any advance comments from the public.

20 To receive an update report from the Project Manager, including the following:

20.1 An update on contractual matters

20.2 Any planned actions to be authorised for progression

20.3 The Risk Register

20.4 Updated Business Plan

20.5 An update on tenant-related matters (some aspects may be confidential)

21 Finance, budget monitoring and payments (see report):

Lowestoft Town Council
Town Hall Project Committee [In-person]
Hamilton House, Battery Green Road, Lowestoft, NR32 1DE
10:00 AM on Thursday, July 10, 2025

22 Recruitment (some aspects may be confidential)

22.1 Heritage Apprentice

22.2 Town Hall Manager

23 To consider financial planning for the year

24 Date of next meeting

Thursday 14 August 10:00

25 Items for the next agenda and close

26 Admission to meetings

To resolve that under the Public Bodies (Admission to meetings) Act 1960, the public be excluded from the meeting on the grounds that publicity would be prejudicial to public interest by reason of the confidential nature of the business to be transacted, namely any employment matters and legal issues relating to the matters on this agenda

Lowestoft Town Council
Town Hall Project Committee
Hamilton House, Battery Green Road, Lowestoft, NR32 1DE
Thursday 12 June 2025 at 10:00 AM

MINUTES

Present: Cllrs Sonia Barker, Nasima Begum (Chair), Wendy Brooks, Neil Coleby, Andy Pearce, Bernadette Rappensberger. Non-Councillor members Helen Johnson and Ben Porter (East Suffolk Council Officers)

In attendance: Sarah Foote (Acting Town Clerk), Taylor Williams (Committee Clerk and Planning Assistant) and John Chamberlain (Heritage Officer)

Also in attendance: Sheila MossKing (Project Manager)

1 Welcome

The fire evacuation procedure and public right to report was explained and the meeting was welcomed.

2 To receive and consider approval of apologies for absence

Apologies were received from Cllr Nick Webb with reasons provided. Cllr Rappensberger proposed approval; seconded by Cllr Barker; all.

Cllr Neil Coleby was absent.

3 Declarations of interests and dispensations

3.1 To receive declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary, Other Registerable and Non-Registerable Interests from members on items on the agenda – There were no declarations.

3.2 To consider written requests for dispensations for Disclosable Pecuniary Interests and note dispensations granted – No written requests for dispensations had been received.

4 To consider the draft minutes of the meeting on 8 May 2025

Cllr Brooks proposed approval of the draft minutes; seconded by Cllr Barker; five votes in favour and two abstentions (as the members were absent from the meeting).

5 To review and adopt Committee arrangements

5.1 To note the membership of the town hall project committee – Cllrs Sonia Barker, Nasima Begum, Wendy Brooks, Neil Coleby, Andy Pearce, Bernadette Rappensberger and Nick Webb were members of the Committee. East Suffolk Council Officers Helen Johnson and Ben Porter were non-Councillor members of the Committee.

5.2 To appoint the Deputy Chair of the Town Hall Project Committee – Cllr Brooks proposed, as agreed last year, no Deputy Chair be appointed for this Committee; seconded by Cllr Rappensberger; all in favour.

5.3 To consider the Terms of Reference – Cllr Pearce proposed to adopt the Terms of Reference; seconded by Cllr Rappensberger; all in favour.

5.4 To agree the meeting schedule – Cllr Brooks proposed the schedule be maintained as second Thursday of the month at 10:00; seconded by Cllr Pearce; all in favour.

5.5 To review the delegations of this Committee – Cllr Pearce proposed the delegations be accepted as set out in the Terms of Reference; seconded by Cllr Rappensberger; all in favour.

6 Public Forum

An opportunity for the public to make comments on any matters on this agenda, and to consider any advance comments from the public – No advance comments had been received and no members of the public were in attendance.

7 To receive an update report from the Project Manager, including the following:

Lowestoft Town Council
Town Hall Project Committee
Hamilton House, Battery Green Road, Lowestoft, NR32 1DE
Thursday 12 June 2025 at 10:00 AM

- 7.1 An update on contractual matters – Two draft proposals for consultants are to be reviewed under item 9 for support of the activity plan, and the Project Manager advised this be discussed in confidential session.
- 7.2 Any planned actions to be authorised for progression - Hutton + Rostron have been onsite to review the dry rot and were due to send further information and costs for actions to be taken.

The Acting Town Clerk entered the chamber at 10:09

The Design Team were due to draw up amendments for the design of the Council space on the second floor of the Newmarket Inn section of the building, in order to provide more space for the office team. The incurred costs for this would be covered under the professional fees.

- 7.3 The Risk Register – There was no update to provide on the Risk Register and the project was reported to be on schedule.
External funding was still being monitored. An application had been submitted to Hornsea Community Fund for £49,000 to cover the cost of the PVP panels for the hall. The application for the Historic England grant has also been submitted for £707,000 to be used for restoration costs.
- 7.4 The updated Business Plan – Updates had been made to the Business Plan as part of the preparation work for the Historic England grant submission.
The Project Manager had reviewed the café operations and advised the Committee it would not be feasible to run the café inhouse. It was agreed to discuss this further in confidential session.

8 Finance, budget monitoring and payments (see report):

To note and consider income and expenditure

- 8.1 Monitoring the budget – There were no comments on the budget.
- 8.2 Any payments for approval – There were no payments for approval.

9 To receive updates on the Activity Plan, including to comment on briefs for consultants:

- 9.1 Pop Culture Project Facilitator – This item would be discussed in confidential session.
- 9.2 Schools Learning Resource Consultant – This item would be discussed in confidential session.

The Heritage Officer provided an update on the Activity Plan.

The popup shop had recently been vacated and it had proven an excellent opportunity to engage with various community groups and raise awareness of the Town Hall Project.

The Heritage Officer was due to attend various town-wide events over the summer and would be working with volunteers to progress the digitisation of the Town Council's civic collection.

A competition had been held with East Coast College to design the hoardings for the Town Hall and the Heritage Officer was due to meet with the College next week to discuss the entries.

The potential offer of work experience placements has been discussed with Barnes Construction's Social Value Coordinator, who confirmed this would be feasible in the next academic year.

10 To consider staffing requirements and budget preparations (some aspects may be confidential)

The Project Manager and Acting Town Clerk were due to begin reviewing the job description for the Town Hall Manager.

11 To consider any recommendations to Full Council

There were no recommendations made to Full Council.

Lowestoft Town Council
Town Hall Project Committee
Hamilton House, Battery Green Road, Lowestoft, NR32 1DE
Thursday 12 June 2025 at 10:00 AM

12 Date of next meeting

Thursday 10 July 2025 10:00

13 Items for the next agenda and close

An item was requested to discuss financial planning for the year.

14 Admission to Meetings

To resolve that under the Public Bodies (Admission to meetings) Act 1960, the public be excluded from the meeting on the grounds that publicity would be prejudicial to public interest by reason of the confidential nature of the business to be transacted, namely any employment matters and legal issues relating to the matters on this agenda – Cllr Rappensberger proposed the meeting be moved into confidential session; seconded by Cllr Barker; all in favour.

The Chair closed the meeting to the public and moved into confidential session at 10:42

7.4 The updated Business Plan – A document that detailed the finances of different café models was reviewed.

Cllr Pearce proposed the inhouse model for the café be removed as an option and for the Project Manager to continue exploring the commercial or community model for the café; seconded by Cllr Brooks; all in favour.

9 To receive updates on the Activity Plan, including to comment on briefs for consultants:

9.1 Pop Culture Project Facilitator

9.2 Schools Learning Resource Consultant

The briefs were reviewed and it was noted that the funding would be allocated from the Contingency budget.

The Chair closed the meeting at 11:47

Signed:

10 July 2025

Lowestoft Town Hall Project

Progress Report for July 2025 Steering Committee

This report covers the period to 7 July 2025.

Construction

- As reported previously, we have significant damage to the timbers in the roofs, particularly along the Compass Street elevation. Barnes have issued a delay notification, given the works needed and, critically, the requirement for scaffolding down to ground floor level internally to support the roofs during repair. This will prevent any work being undertaken on floors below roofs being repaired, so there is an impact on the critical path. I will discuss this further in the steering committee meeting.
- Any approved delay will have financial consequences, both in additional costs from Barnes and also from professionals, including some design team members, QS, contract admin and project manager. We will fully assess the cost implications once the extent of the delay is fully understood; costs will be covered by contingency.
- The gable wall on the north end of the Compass Street elevation was very unstable. Following a visit by Momentum engineers, it was agreed that Barnes would take this down and rebuild. The demolition has taken place already, due to safety concerns. This will be a contingency item.
- Despite anti-pigeon measures being in place, birds have accessed the Council Chamber roof via an air brick on the north elevation. There is a significant amount of pigeon guano to be removed, and all woodwork will have to be treated with anti-mite spray. This will add £5.5k to the cost, which will come from contingency.
- The weathervane has been reinstated, as reported at the last meeting.
- UKPN will be starting work later this month to deliver power to the site. It is hoped that the (expedited) Land Registry transfer will complete in the next two weeks, so that the lease transfer to UKPN can be executed.
- I have instructed Openreach to attend site to assess and remove numerous redundant comms cables, including some coming in from the street.
- Suffolk Brick and Stone have prepared multiple mortar samples to match with existing in areas where repointing will be required. We are not repointing the entire building, so there will inevitably be some mismatches, but HAT and RGA are confident that as good a match as possible has been agreed.

Social Value

- The first two site visits took place in late June, with staff, councillors and a representative of Registrars on the first, and Heritage Focus Group members plus other guests on the second. Feedback was very positive, including praise for the sustainability strategy that aims to reuse materials wherever possible in the building.

Procurement

- There is no new procurement to report in this period.

Design Requirements

- We have held a detailed review session with Auditel, our AV suppliers, and modified the list somewhat to include some additional microphones to ensure those in the Council Chamber can stay in situ.
- We will attempt to reuse as many AV screens as possible from Hamilton House. The equipment is in good condition and provided it is compatible with the future AV infrastructure, there is no reason not to retain it.

Activity & Interpretation

- John Chamberlain attended First Light Festival on behalf of the project and delivered a 'chip shop bird' making activity for children, which was very well received.
- Scripting is completed bar a few tweaks; a discussion is ongoing regarding how to introduce quick facts about the heritage of the town in a way that is consistent and accessible for all.
- Five students from East Coast College will have their work showcased on the hoardings, having entered a competition organised by the project. Each student will have a decorated panel, which are being printed currently. The learning outcome was principally about how to put together a bid for a creative piece.
- Julian Claxton, the project's filmmaker, has completed the first edit of a short film about how the Town Hall project is run and how the architect's designs are turned into reality onsite. He has interviewed our architect, QS, Barnes' design manager and others and filmed site meetings in progress.
- Our advert has gone live for the freelance Pop Culture Project Facilitator to plan and oversee the delivery of an intergenerational oral history project centred around Pop Culture in Lowestoft from the 1960s to the early 2000s.

Funding

- Historic England have requested multiple additional pieces of information, including a development appraisal (working out the end value of the Town Hall, if rented out/sold, and therefore whether there is a funding deficit – there is!).
- We have yet to hear the outcome – we believe the panel was at the end of last week...

Business Plan/Staffing

- The business plan updates continue. I am hoping to meet with an advisor in the next week or so to review what lease arrangements could be put in place for the café, and what level of income could be expected.
- Sarah Foote and I met to discuss the role profile for the Town Hall manager. We are proposing that the manager is brought on board in the Autumn, to help oversee the development of the Town Hall as a profit centre. The TH manager will also manage both the Heritage Officer and Heritage Apprentice.

Staffing

- The Heritage Apprenticeship role has now closed. An assessment centre will be held next week.

Financials

- Total spend to date is below:

Lowestoft Town Hall Project (NL-21-00031)	
Spend to date	TOTALS
Budget	£ 12,561,234
Actual spend to date	£ 1,777,071
Balance remaining	£ 10,784,163

- Invoices since the last report are below:

Lowestoft Town Hall Project (NL-21-00031)			Delivery Stage	Invoice control sheet				
Invoice Date	Inv Ref N	Supplier	Description	Amount	VAT	Total inc VA	Project PO	
16/06/25	LTH270	Haward Horological Ltd	Weather vane repair	£ 5,300.00	£ 1,060.00	£ 6,360.00	TH98	
13/06/25	LTH271	Jess Johnston	Heritage PM May 25	£ 3,240.00	£ -	£ 3,240.00	TH53	
31/05/25	LTH272	Andrew Morton Associates	QS May 25	£ 2,576.01	£ 515.20	£ 3,091.21	TH52	
05/06/25	LTH273	Hutton+Rostron	Review of roofs re dry rot/degradation May 25	£ 4,940.00	£ 988.00	£ 5,928.00	TH106	
26/06/25	LTH274	Modes	Cataloguing software	£ 900.00	£ 180.00	£ 1,080.00	TH105	
01/07/25	LTH275	Julian Claxton	filmmaking May/June at Town Hall	£ 296.89	£ -	£ 296.89	TH89	
01/07/25	LTH276	Julian Claxton	Filmmaking /editing shorts Town Hall	£ 927.76	£ -	£ 927.76	TH89	
04/07/25	LTH277	Dr Harriet Foster	Evaluation May/June 25	£ 1,117.70	£ -	£ 1,117.70	TH82	
03/07/25	LTH278	Barnes Group	Main construction contract June 25	£ 135,643.50	£ 27,128.70	£ 162,772.20	TH99	
07/07/25	LTH279	MossKing Associates Limited	Project mgmt June 25	£ 5,046.00	£ -	£ 5,046.00	TH50	
02/07/25	LTH280	Jess Johnston	Heritage PM June 25	£ 2,790.00	£ -	£ 2,790.00	TH53	
04/07/25	LTH281	Andrew Morton Associates	QS June 25	£ 2,571.48	£ 514.30	£ 3,085.78	TH52	
30/06/25	LTH282	People Landscape Buildings	Interpretation RIBA 4 Jun 25	£ 2,200.00	£ 440.00	£ 2,640.00	TH58	
Total spend to date				£ 1,777,070.89	£ 291,998.98	£ 2,069,069.87		

I will be submitting a claim to NLHF later this week. The grant repayment will be in the region of £170k.

Next steps

- Over the next month, I will be managing/undertaking the following:
 - Responding to construction related queries, attending site meetings and approving instructions in liaison with nominated officers.
 - Continuing to drive business requirements/design issues in liaison with staff.
 - Investigating how to support Registrars' requirements re parking/cars.
 - Developing charging proposals for Registrars/working towards Agreement to Lease.
 - Developing the job description for Town Hall Manager with the acting Town Clerk.
 - Updating the business plan
 - Financial control over expenditure to support the above (in line with approved budgets).
 - Reporting as necessary to other funders.

Sheila Moss King
Project Manager

LTH Delivery Project Risks V3.3 revised 4/7/25 (updates in royal blue) revised 1/5/25 (updates in cyclamen) revised 7/4/25 (updates in turquoise) revised 12/3/25 (updates in red); revised 8/1/25 (updates in green) revised 13.11.24 (updates in olive); revised 20.10.24 (updates in dark blue); revised 11.9.24 (updates in burgundy); revised 15.7.24 (updates in brown); revised 30.5.24 (updates in purple); revised 24.4.24 (updates in orange); revised 11.3.24 (updates in blue); revised: 13.2.24 (updates in pink). revised: 11.1.24 (updates in leaf green). Relevant Stage 1 (Development Project) risks/comments are retained in black.

ID	Date Raised/Updated	Risk	Category	1-5 Prob	1-5 Impact	Score P x I	Discussion on cause, impact and mitigations	Response(s)
3	5/1/24 15/7/24 13/11/24 12/3/25 1/5/25	PWLB loan rates restrict the amount that can be borrowed	Financial	4 4 5	4 4 4	16 16 20	- Loan interest rates are much higher than when funding plan was built. Commitment to electorate is that the loan will not trigger a rise in the precept, therefore there is a limit re how much can be borrowed, based on the affordability of the annual servicing cost. - The loan will be drawn down in tranches as needed (to reduce repayment costs early in the project when the council has to service the loan without benefitting from the savings that will arise from vacating Hamilton House. This means that there is greater uncertainty for the later drawdowns (interest rates could go up or down). - Current instability in the Middle East, the Ukraine war, and the fallout globally from Covid, are all contributing to higher interest rates. - Interest rates are fixed for the duration of the loan, ie 50 years, regardless of future economic changes. - First loan drawdown will be required for cashflow support within next 2 months so risk is likely to crystallise soon.	- The PWLB loan includes contingency cover. Therefore, there is some headroom, potentially. - The nightmare scenario is that the project costs use all contingency AND interest rates are higher than currently modelled. - If this were the case, Council could resolve to use the income from the caravan park (£90kpa) to service the loan, but this would only be temporary, as that income is required to build up reserves. - An alternative is to cut project spend at the latter stages of the project, although scope will be quite limited (eg fitout). - Affordability assessment for the loan was based on interest rates at 5%, so we are only at risk above this level. - PWLB loan rates currently 5.53% over 50 yrs. - Rates down to 5.32 over 50 years. - Following UK autumn budget, rates have increased once more. 5.85% on 13/11/24 - With increased government spending and international instability, rates have moved further out to 6.21%. - Interest rate at 6.44%, so additional funding is alongside careful management of contingency expenditure would alleviate the pressure.

LTH Delivery Project Risks V3.3 revised 4/7/25 (updates in royal blue) revised 1/5/25 (updates in cyclamen) revised 7/4/25 (updates in turquoise) revised 12/3/25 (updates in red); revised 8/1/25 (updates in green) revised 13.11.24 (updates in olive); revised 20.10.24 (updates in dark blue); revised 11.9.24 (updates in burgundy); revised 15.7.24 (updates in brown); revised 30.5.24 (updates in purple); revised 24.4.24 (updates in orange); revised 11.3.24 (updates in blue); revised: 13.2.24 (updates in pink). revised: 11.1.24 (updates in leaf green). Relevant Stage 1 (Development Project) risks/comments are retained in black.

ID	Date Raised/Updated	Risk	Category	1-5 Prob	1-5 Impact	Score P x I	Discussion on cause, impact and mitigations	Response(s)
								- Interest rate softened to 6.37%. Additional funding would still be very helpful.
2	5/1/24 30/5/24 15/7/24 11/9/24 20/10/24 8/1/25 1/5/25	Capital project costs come back higher than budgeted	Financial	3 4 4 5 3 2	5 5 5 5 3 5	15 20 20 25 9 10	- Cost inflation in the construction industry continues. - Any delays to the start of construction works will increase the risk of costs increasing - Cost plan at RIBA3 resulted in an overall £9.2m project, so option to increase funding was taken. Raised request to NLHF was successful, plus the decision made to apply for a £4m PWLB loan (ie £900K greater than required to fund the current project costs). - ESC support also sought for the project. - Contingency of c. 10% already in project, so £900K extra funds almost doubles this. - Inflation in construction market continues to be relatively high. - Delays to the issuance of the tender to end June 24 means cost risk is increased. - Inflation confirmed at ~2% in construction sector so improved over previously. - All four tenders returned higher than budget by a significant margin, more than the headroom in the budget can cover.	- PWLB loan increased to up to £4m; increased ask to NLHF. - ESC made capital grant of £900K. - Next opportunity for cost reduction will be at tender stage, once a contractor is selected, VE options then. - Design team very aware of issue with cost management a key element of all design team work. Also undertaking more surveys to identify any specific costs relating to degradation that can be designed out of the building (eg most ground floors to be solid is in plan, meaning no costs to deal with rotten joists). - An updated assessment of the cost impact, in inflation terms, is being sought - VE has reduced overrun by c. £0.6m, but will still require additional funding. - NLHF has agreed to consider an uplift request. - PWLB will consider an application for up to £5m on same basis as previous £4m agreed, ie affordability. This is demonstrable so relatively positive, but see risk 3. - ESC considering an uplift in funding.

LTH Delivery Project Risks V3.3 revised 4/7/25 (updates in royal blue) revised 1/5/25 (updates in cyclamen) revised 7/4/25 (updates in turquoise) revised 12/3/25 (updates in red); revised 8/1/25 (updates in green) revised 13.11.24 (updates in olive); revised 20.10.24 (updates in dark blue); revised 11.9.24 (updates in burgundy); revised 15.7.24 (updates in brown); revised 30.5.24 (updates in purple); revised 24.4.24 (updates in orange); revised 11.3.24 (updates in blue); revised: 13.2.24 (updates in pink). revised: 11.1.24 (updates in leaf green). Relevant Stage 1 (Development Project) risks/comments are retained in black.

ID	Date Raised/Updated	Risk	Category	1-5 Prob	1-5 Impact	Score P x I	Discussion on cause, impact and mitigations	Response(s)
							- VE underway, could reduce capital cost by more than £500k. - Additional grant funding to be sought from NLHF, ESC and other funders. - Increase in PWLB loan to be sought. - Tender now in place, work underway and most strip out happened, so risk is reduced, but impact increased. -	- LTC climate emergency fund can support PV and air source heat pump installation. - Increased funding secured from NLHF, ESC and PWLB loan, so project fully funded once more - 15% contingency in place, so intention is to manage within this regardless. - PWLB interest rates have reduced funding available, therefore risk of capital costs exceeding budget is raised once more.
1	5/1/24 30/5/24 11/9/24 20/10/24 13/11/24 8/1/25	Delivery project overruns timetable	Time/Financial	4 5 5 3 4	4 4 4 4 4	16 20 20 12 16	- PTS not likely to be secured until end March (dependent on PWLB loan agreement). - Unknown is build time, this will not consolidate until tenders returned. - Degradation surveys and strip outs should have reduced some of the preliminary work and also reduce risk of 'surprises' during construction that lead to delays. - Enabling contract not feasible given the timescales, so demolitions will be in main contract. - Given project goes beyond 3Q 2025, likely to see increased professional fees, covering additional period These are likely to be restricted to project management and contract admin/QS if the construction project is longer than 18 months (which	- Decision taken to start RIBA4 and other delivery work, 'at risk'. Main driver for this is knowledge that delays to start of main construction works will result in higher costs, due to inflation (estimated at c. £80k per quarter). - Fees agreed with design team up to end 2025 (biggest single fee area). - PTS approved and RIBA4 complete end May (1 month slippage) - RIBA5 work continues whilst tender is out, so no significant delay there. - Contingency budget partly allocated to fees recognising some professionals could have additional work to do. - Additional funding to be sought will delay the majority of construction works beginning until ? Feb 25; new TH Open Date c. 9/9/26

LTH Delivery Project Risks V3.3 revised 4/7/25 (updates in royal blue) revised 1/5/25 (updates in cyclamen) revised 7/4/25 (updates in turquoise) revised 12/3/25 (updates in red); revised 8/1/25 (updates in green) revised 13.11.24 (updates in olive); revised 20.10.24 (updates in dark blue); revised 11.9.24 (updates in burgundy); revised 15.7.24 (updates in brown); revised 30.5.24 (updates in purple); revised 24.4.24 (updates in orange); revised 11.3.24 (updates in blue); revised: 13.2.24 (updates in pink). revised: 11.1.24 (updates in leaf green). Relevant Stage 1 (Development Project) risks/comments are retained in black.

ID	Date Raised/Updated	Risk	Category	1-5 Prob	1-5 Impact	Score P x I	Discussion on cause, impact and mitigations	Response(s)
	12/3/25 4/7/25						requires additional reviews by these two professionals). - Quantify fees so we understand what the impact would be. - Tender issue delayed to late June meaning likely completion of project, on estimated timescales, slips out to end May 26 - Tender returns over budget, meaning VE and delays whilst increased funding is sought. Timescales likely to extend further, unless a way to secure a preferred supplier can be established promptly. - The roof condition has been identified as extremely poor in multiple places, and extensive work is required to remediate this. Scaffolding to support works will prevent much work happening below roofs.	- Later opening date means less time to deliver on outcomes before NLHF project ends (Sep 28) but should still achieve them within timescales. - We will appoint a contractor subject to securing funding, and to issue a letter of intent for some early works (eg roof encapsulation) to prevent further degradation. This will be 'at risk' ie LTC will have to cover cost if funding is not secured. To be agreed at Full Council 22/10. - Contractor award agreed at Full Council, 12/11/24. A Letter of Intent will be considered but multiple constraints around its issuance re risk. See separate risk item 18, below. - Letter of Intent issued. Start date onsite, subject to contract and insurances, is 10 Feb 25. - Site prep started 10/2/25, contract signed 5/3/25 (ie on schedule) with predicted completion date 31/7/26. - Barnes to review programme implications and to see if the delays can be minimised through re-programming elements. Note that certain items, eg new build of Events Hall, can't be moved from last as it would constrain access to the site.

LTH Delivery Project Risks V3.3 revised 4/7/25 (updates in royal blue) revised 1/5/25 (updates in cyclamen) revised 7/4/25 (updates in turquoise) revised 12/3/25 (updates in red); revised 8/1/25 (updates in green) revised 13.11.24 (updates in olive); revised 20.10.24 (updates in dark blue); revised 11.9.24 (updates in burgundy); revised 15.7.24 (updates in brown); revised 30.5.24 (updates in purple); revised 24.4.24 (updates in orange); revised 11.3.24 (updates in blue); revised: 13.2.24 (updates in pink). revised: 11.1.24 (updates in leaf green). Relevant Stage 1 (Development Project) risks/comments are retained in black.

ID	Date Raised/Updated	Risk	Category	1-5 Prob	1-5 Impact	Score P x I	Discussion on cause, impact and mitigations	Response(s)
11	20/3/23 8/5/23 5/1/24 24/4/24 15/7/24 20/10/24 13/11/24 1/5/25	Building is in worse condition than expected	Financial	3 4 3 4 5 5 3	3 3 2 2 2 2 2	9 12 6 8 10 10 6	- Degradation arrest works contract out for quotes March/Apr 23, expected appointment due imminently. - Probable approach for delivery stage will be very early enabling works contract which will strip out remaining unnecessary elements and allow full understanding of condition. - Delays in appointing contractor for degradation works and need for second stage of works, meant insufficient time to undertake enabling works (which would have been unaffordable in cashflow terms for Council in any case, and also at risk, given timing prior to NLHF decision). - The delay in appointing a main contractor means that the building will have another winter's deterioration, leading to further degradation and cost. - Most strip out now undertaken, 3rd dry rot survey identified key issues with roof plates etc and now costed in; window repair schedule complete and costed.	- Further surveys have been done (eg brick testing, condition survey on clock etc) to clarify works required. - Ceilings on first floor that were suffering dry rot have now been stripped back. - A range of additional structural interventions has been introduced to deal with condition issues (eg brickwork below Council Chamber). This will increase costs, but these have not yet been calculated. - 2nd dry rot survey showed positive response to mitigations in several areas; however, damp remains, so further windows opened to improve air circulation. - Once we have a preferred contractor awarded pending funding, we will discuss with them potential remediation works, prior to the funding decision being made (at LTC risk). - See risk 18.
21	12/3/25	High insurance excesses are incurred	Financial	1	5	5	- Insurance excesses are £50k for fire damage or escape of water. - This has been reduced from £100k for water by paying an additional premium.	- Site management procedures are in place and tightly controlled.

LTH Delivery Project Risks V3.3 revised 4/7/25 (updates in royal blue) revised 1/5/25 (updates in cyclamen) revised 7/4/25 (updates in turquoise) revised 12/3/25 (updates in red); revised 8/1/25 (updates in green) revised 13.11.24 (updates in olive); revised 20.10.24 (updates in dark blue); revised 11.9.24 (updates in burgundy); revised 15.7.24 (updates in brown); revised 30.5.24 (updates in purple); revised 24.4.24 (updates in orange); revised 11.3.24 (updates in blue); revised: 13.2.24 (updates in pink). revised: 11.1.24 (updates in leaf green). Relevant Stage 1 (Development Project) risks/comments are retained in black.

ID	Date Raised/Updated	Risk	Category	1-5 Prob	1-5 Impact	Score P x I	Discussion on cause, impact and mitigations	Response(s)
							- Both fire and escape of water are under the control of Barnes Construction who are now in possession of the site, and who would be liable for 50% of any excess.	- All hot works are required under permit, and all waste is stored more than 5m from the building, in line with insurance stipulations. - Security on the site is tight (ie to prevent malicious damage via fire or water). - Escape of water is managed via site procedures and daily shutdown of site at end of day.
6	5/1/24 24/4/24 13/11/24 7/4/25	Lack of cooperation/ coordination between LTC admin & project team	Time/Quality	3 1 2 1	5 5 5 5	15 5 10 5	- LTC Admin represent the Council as client throughout the project, specifying requirements, agreeing priorities etc. - The team have little experience of major projects and have a full schedule of their normal work to undertake, meaning that project work could of necessity take lower priority. - Meanwhile, Admin team must ensure that all procedures are followed correctly, and that decisions taken are done lawfully. This has potential to create conflict and/or delay. - As project progresses, consider seconding a team member to the project (part time), ensuring their normal role is covered by others. Formalising this might assist the admin team in planning their work and would ensure that LTC's needs are fully	- Close cooperation with the project manager is essential. A regular meeting has been established (informal) between PM, deputy clerk and admin manager, to review issues, progress etc. - Terms of Reference for the steering committee have been approved, and the admin team support meetings (agendas, minutes and recording) ensuring they run correctly. - If issues are not resolved and either party has a concern, this must be raised with the steering committee. - Regular informal update meetings held between Acting Town Clerk, Admin/Events Manager and PM, which are proving very useful. - Excellent team working and cooperation. - With the return of the Clerk after a prolonged absence, it will be essential to ensure that the existing, successfully functioning relationships are

LTH Delivery Project Risks V3.3 revised 4/7/25 (updates in royal blue) revised 1/5/25 (updates in cyclamen) revised 7/4/25 (updates in turquoise) revised 12/3/25 (updates in red); revised 8/1/25 (updates in green) revised 13.11.24 (updates in olive); revised 20.10.24 (updates in dark blue); revised 11.9.24 (updates in burgundy); revised 15.7.24 (updates in brown); revised 30.5.24 (updates in purple); revised 24.4.24 (updates in orange); revised 11.3.24 (updates in blue); revised: 13.2.24 (updates in pink). revised: 11.1.24 (updates in leaf green). Relevant Stage 1 (Development Project) risks/comments are retained in black.

ID	Date Raised/Updated	Risk	Category	1-5 Prob	1-5 Impact	Score P x I	Discussion on cause, impact and mitigations	Response(s)
							incorporated into the building's design and operation. - Establishing mechanisms to ensure parties work harmoniously and ensuring all have the time to do so, is key.	not altered in any way. Close monitoring of the situation will be required. - Committee determined the probability of a breakdown should be increased to 2 (October Committee) and that this should be reviewed in January 25. - The Acting Town Clerk and project manager are working very productively together, and along with the lead Architect and LTC's Assets Manager hold monthly client meetings. The former Clerk has no contact with the project.
5	5/1/24 13/2/24 11/3/24 24/4/24 15/7/24 12/3/25 1/5/25	UKPN substation is delayed	Financial/organisational	3 2 2 1	5 5 5 5	15 10 10 5	- A UKPN substation is required for the Town Hall. The fees have been agreed in principle. Work is required to design the enclosure for the substation to mitigate the impact on the Town Hall and the street scene. - Planning/LB consent may be required because of its location. TBD. - ESC, who own the land, have agreed to provide the necessary space. This now needs agreement with UKPN re access rights etc (legal teams either side). - A decision is required re the specific location of the substation so that designs can be done, and detailed costs agreed with UKPN/order placed.	- Continued discussions with ESC reps on Project Steering Committee to ensure ESC Assets team is fully aware of all issues and need for rapid decisions. Now taken. - Query issued to ESC planning re whether there is a need for consents (site is not listed and outside conservation area). ESC wish a planning app to be submitted in order to maintain transparency and give local people a say. - Decision on location now taken, but meeting re planning requirements/landscaping etc not due till 26/2. This will delay the design work and costing. - To minimise delays, steering committee could decide to place order £162k excl VAT, and this would start the legal work. At risk would be UKPN

LTH Delivery Project Risks V3.3 revised 4/7/25 (updates in royal blue) revised 1/5/25 (updates in cyclamen) revised 7/4/25 (updates in turquoise) revised 12/3/25 (updates in red); revised 8/1/25 (updates in green) revised 13.11.24 (updates in olive); revised 20.10.24 (updates in dark blue); revised 11.9.24 (updates in burgundy); revised 15.7.24 (updates in brown); revised 30.5.24 (updates in purple); revised 24.4.24 (updates in orange); revised 11.3.24 (updates in blue); revised: 13.2.24 (updates in pink). revised: 11.1.24 (updates in leaf green). Relevant Stage 1 (Development Project) risks/comments are retained in black.

ID	Date Raised/Updated	Risk	Category	1-5 Prob	1-5 Impact	Score P x I	Discussion on cause, impact and mitigations	Response(s)
							- There is a risk that ESC does not have the same urgency as the project to get this resolved. UKPN work slowly, and until the planning/design/legalities are completed, the work will not be scheduled. - There is a risk that the Town Hall could be ready to open but does not have the adequate power supply to do so... - Legal work continues to drag on, despite LTC consultant's best efforts. I have now instructed UKPN to do detailed design work, which is 'at risk' if we do not proceed with the substation. However, this is so unlikely, the risk is tiny. - However, UKPN would not start work until the lease is in place, so the issue remains very important. - Work scheduled to start in August, expectation is Land Registry will complete this month.	design fees and legal fees, which would be payable even if the project did not progress. The cost of this is approx.. £3.2k excl VAT. - Committee agreed at Feb meeting to order substation; Full Council ratified. Awaiting discussion with RFO re timing of this (cashflow). - UKPN order placed, and legal work beginning. Headlease to be granted for 125yrs to LTC from ESC, then LTC can sublease for 99 years to UKPN. This is viewed as best to take ESC legal out of the loop. - Planning has agreed no application is required, and can be done under PD. UKPN, ESC and planners have all agreed enclosure design however. - ESC has decided to transfer land free of charge including UKPN compound. This removes the complication of 'nested' leases, and should speed legal process.
8	13/3/23 8/5/23 5/1/24 24/4/24	UXOs onsite/risk of UXOs	Financial, Operational	2 2 2	5 4 5	10 8 10	- During site investigations, the preliminary risk assessment came back as 'medium'. Therefore, UXO Detailed Risk Assessment commissioned to understand risk in more detail and specify mitigations.	- Additional cost added to prof fees to cover onsite support during groundworks in delivery stage. - The risk of UXOs remains, but we have the strategy in place to identify them. - Risk of UXOs and need for mitigation will be included in tender.

LTH Delivery Project Risks V3.3 revised 4/7/25 (updates in royal blue) revised 1/5/25 (updates in cyclamen) revised 7/4/25 (updates in turquoise) revised 12/3/25 (updates in red); revised 8/1/25 (updates in green) revised 13.11.24 (updates in olive); revised 20.10.24 (updates in dark blue); revised 11.9.24 (updates in burgundy); revised 15.7.24 (updates in brown); revised 30.5.24 (updates in purple); revised 24.4.24 (updates in orange); revised 11.3.24 (updates in blue); revised: 13.2.24 (updates in pink). revised: 11.1.24 (updates in leaf green). Relevant Stage 1 (Development Project) risks/comments are retained in black.

ID	Date Raised/Updated	Risk	Category	1-5 Prob	1-5 Impact	Score P x I	Discussion on cause, impact and mitigations	Response(s)
	1/5/25			1	5	5	- UXO mitigation will be required for all ground works during delivery stage. - Should UXOs be found, there will be delays to the project whilst they are dealt with. This will incur costs, both directly, to remove the UXO and indirectly with contractor overheads extending beyond the contracted period, potentially. - Deepest excavation (soakaway) now completed with UXO EOD supervising. No UXOs found. Slim risk of discoveries when digging footings for Events Hall only.	- Decision formalised to omit onsite archaeology activity project.
9	5/1/24 13/2/24 24/4/24 20/10/24 1/5/25	Registrars don't move into building	Financial/ Outcomes	2 1 1	5 5 5	10 5 5	- Registrars are anchor tenants, providing both regular footfall and income to the business. - Failure of Registrars to move in would mean that income would be lost, and the bespoke design of the rooms on the first floor would be wasted. Footfall would be significantly reduced, and weddings held in the building would be lower than projected (both resulting in reduced secondary income). - Detailed discussions on rent and service charges underway; design changes approved by Registrars at project cost	- ~~Head of Terms to be agreed early with Registrars (deputy clerk actioning);~~ General heads of terms now drafted, only element outstanding is rent to be paid. - If Registrars did not move in, priority would be to find an alternative tenant with similar impact, or secondly review the coworking offer and consider extending it into the vacant spaces (or move the Council in). - HoT now provided to Registrars along with rental and service charge proposals. Query from Registrars on make up of service charge - Registrars' proposal to move into building approved by SCC property board, and therefore

LTH Delivery Project Risks V3.3 revised 4/7/25 (updates in royal blue) revised 1/5/25 (updates in cyclamen) revised 7/4/25 (updates in turquoise) revised 12/3/25 (updates in red); revised 8/1/25 (updates in green) revised 13.11.24 (updates in olive); revised 20.10.24 (updates in dark blue); revised 11.9.24 (updates in burgundy); revised 15.7.24 (updates in brown); revised 30.5.24 (updates in purple); revised 24.4.24 (updates in orange); revised 11.3.24 (updates in blue); revised: 13.2.24 (updates in pink). revised: 11.1.24 (updates in leaf green). Relevant Stage 1 (Development Project) risks/comments are retained in black.

ID	Date Raised/Updated	Risk	Category	1-5 Prob	1-5 Impact	Score P x I	Discussion on cause, impact and mitigations	Response(s)
							indicates firm commitment to move, subject to agreement on charges.	they will move in, subject to a cap on service charge for initial year. This should not be problematic.
13	7/11/22 5/1/24	A shortage of key skills or staff	Organisational / Time	3 2	2 2	6 4	- Teams now building up significantly, eg architects have 6 individuals working on project so risk is significantly reduced from previously. - Only remaining risk at this stage is project manager, but again, there is much greater distribution of knowledge than previously, so the risk is lowered. Heritage Project Manager understands how to process grant reclaims and manage finances, which is the key aspect that no other individual currently involved with project has experience of. - LTC Admin team more closely involved, specifying requirements etc, so greater knowledge within the client team than previously.	- Where a key member of the team is lost, either the contracting organisation will be required to replace them or their role will be readvertised; the risk is that this causes delay/disconnect -
14	13/3/23 8/5/23 5/1/24	Volunteers become harder to recruit	Operational	2 2	3 2	6 4	- Raised as discussion point by members of Heritage Focus Group. - Volunteer effort has been reduced in delivery stage plan along with increased	- If further difficulties, may need to use professionals to deliver (contingency costs in activity plan) and/or amend activities to reduce need for volunteers.

LTH Delivery Project Risks V3.3 revised 4/7/25 (updates in royal blue) revised 1/5/25 (updates in cyclamen) revised 7/4/25 (updates in turquoise) revised 12/3/25 (updates in red); revised 8/1/25 (updates in green) revised 13.11.24 (updates in olive); revised 20.10.24 (updates in dark blue); revised 11.9.24 (updates in burgundy); revised 15.7.24 (updates in brown); revised 30.5.24 (updates in purple); revised 24.4.24 (updates in orange); revised 11.3.24 (updates in blue); revised: 13.2.24 (updates in pink). revised: 11.1.24 (updates in leaf green). Relevant Stage 1 (Development Project) risks/comments are retained in black.

ID	Date Raised/Updated	Risk	Category	1-5 Prob	1-5 Impact	Score P x I	Discussion on cause, impact and mitigations	Response(s)
							Heritage Manager time (position made full time)	
15	5/1/24	Lower level of engagement in activities than anticipated	Outcomes	1	4	4	- Evaluation of previous stage provided useful insight into reasons why certain groups' participation was lower than anticipated. - Overall, previous phase was very successful re engagement. - As vast majority of activities are free to access, highly unlikely that the current economic climate will have much bearing.	- Will continue to seek partners to access diverse audiences - Full time Heritage Manager (staff) to be appointed. This was originally part time, increased to full time reflecting the challenges of organising and delivering activities. This should give more time to engage, and/or build up with partners.
16	20/9/22 7/11/22 5/1/24	Consultation/ engagement – key stakeholders/ community not supportive	Outcomes	1 2 1	4 4 3	4 8 3	- Good communication has created widespread support. This will be continued (referring to previous consultations and consequential actions to demonstrate that public opinion is important). - Activities very successful in engaging people/gaining support on wider base. - Community support critical for PWLB process (ref ID1) - Support for the project could wane if it takes too long to deliver (looks like Jan 26 v 'summer 25' message to public earlier in	- Consultations, including for PWLB loan, resulted in very positive feedback and at least 76% of electorate supporting the project and the loan. - Ongoing communication required, greater transparency on progress. - Plans in place to create signage at TH site detailing project progress. - Social media increased, will need to be maintained throughout project (without engaging in detailed debate with disenfranchised individuals).

LTH Delivery Project Risks V3.3 revised 4/7/25 (updates in royal blue) revised 1/5/25 (updates in cyclamen) revised 7/4/25 (updates in turquoise) revised 12/3/25 (updates in red); revised 8/1/25 (updates in green) revised 13.11.24 (updates in olive); revised 20.10.24 (updates in dark blue); revised 11.9.24 (updates in burgundy); revised 15.7.24 (updates in brown); revised 30.5.24 (updates in purple); revised 24.4.24 (updates in orange); revised 11.3.24 (updates in blue); revised: 13.2.24 (updates in pink). revised: 11.1.24 (updates in leaf green). Relevant Stage 1 (Development Project) risks/comments are retained in black.

ID	Date Raised/Updated	Risk	Category	1-5 Prob	1-5 Impact	Score P x I	Discussion on cause, impact and mitigations	Response(s)	
DELETED RISKS									
ID	Date Raised/Updated	Risk	Category	1-5 Prob	1-5 Impact	Score P x I	Discussion on cause, impact and mitigations	Response(s)	Owner
17	5/1/24 30/5/24	Project steering committee does not endorse recommendation(s) of tender evaluation panel Procurement processes are robust and legally binding – risk deleted	Financial/Time	1	4	4	- As steering committee members would not have read the detailed bids, the circumstances under which it might arise are difficult to envisage. - However, if the steering committee were minded not to accept the panel's decision, it is hard to see how the issue would be resolved. - NOTE that Project Steering Committee cannot overrule tender outcome on main construction tender (or any above public procurement threshold). The outcome is determined by the scoring system, with the MEAT winning.	- Full Council could empower to the steering committee to establish tender evaluations as sub-committees as/when required, with the authority to appoint at the end of the evaluation process, rather than to recommend to steering committee. - Safeguards would have to be built into the ToRs to ensure they were quorate, and that Councillors are not outnumbered by other voting members of the panel.	Steering committee
18	8/5/23 5/1/24 11/3/24	External funding for the project (delivery phase) is not	Financial	2	5	10	- PWLB application approved end February. Risk now eliminated. - There are no viable smaller schemes that would deliver the outcomes identified	- PWLB loan rates restricting amount that could be borrowed without impacting precept. - LTC agreed to support PWLB loan of up to £4m, dependent on affordability at the time (see separate risk).	Project Manager

LTH Delivery Project Risks V3.3 revised 4/7/25 (updates in royal blue) revised 1/5/25 (updates in cyclamen) revised 7/4/25 (updates in turquoise) revised 12/3/25 (updates in red); revised 8/1/25 (updates in green) revised 13.11.24 (updates in olive); revised 20.10.24 (updates in dark blue); revised 11.9.24 (updates in burgundy); revised 15.7.24 (updates in brown); revised 30.5.24 (updates in purple); revised 24.4.24 (updates in orange); revised 11.3.24 (updates in blue); revised: 13.2.24 (updates in pink). revised: 11.1.24 (updates in leaf green). Relevant Stage 1 (Development Project) risks/comments are retained in black.

DELETED RISKS									
ID	Date Raised/Updated	Risk	Category	1-5 Prob	1-5 Impact	Score P x I	Discussion on cause, impact and mitigations	Response(s)	Owner
	20/10/24 8/1/25	secured – major funding currently unsecured is PWLB loan All funding increases secured. Risk deleted		4	5	20	- PWLB decision is not expected until Feb 24. - Without PWLB loan making up remainder of the project funding, the project cannot go ahead. The risk of not getting it is fairly low, unless DLUHC decide that affordability is questionable. - Main construction tenders returned at several million about budget, due to design development, Anglian Water constraints, condition of building and market forces. - No means to cut significantly from budgets – eg not doing new build, as this impacts outcomes so severely. - Therefore additional funding is required or <u>project will cease.</u> - VE exercise undertaken (constrained by public procurement forcing design team to identify areas for savings and submit these to all 4 tenders for costing. Without the public procurement constraint, could have approached lowest bidder to request VE suggestions. This will be done post award.)	- Application being processed by DLUHC currently. Questions raised have been responded to. No further actions required at this stage. - New application to be submitted to PWLB for increased amount (£5m) in light of tender returns. This will be assessed on same basis as previously, ie affordability/public support & awareness, and therefore we can have some confidence of approval. - Application for uplift to NLHF also submitted (£1.2m). - Application to ESC for additional funds submitted. - Additional funds from LTC Climate Emergency fund towards PV panels and air source heat pumps.	

LTH Delivery Project Risks V3.3 revised 4/7/25 (updates in royal blue) revised 1/5/25 (updates in cyclamen) revised 7/4/25 (updates in turquoise) revised 12/3/25 (updates in red); revised 8/1/25 (updates in green) revised 13.11.24 (updates in olive); revised 20.10.24 (updates in dark blue); revised 11.9.24 (updates in burgundy); revised 15.7.24 (updates in brown); revised 30.5.24 (updates in purple); revised 24.4.24 (updates in orange); revised 11.3.24 (updates in blue); revised: 13.2.24 (updates in pink). revised: 11.1.24 (updates in leaf green). Relevant Stage 1 (Development Project) risks/comments are retained in black.

DELETED RISKS									
ID	Date Raised/Updated	Risk	Category	1-5 Prob	1-5 Impact	Score P x I	Discussion on cause, impact and mitigations	Response(s)	Owner
~~12~~	5/1/24 13/2/24	Fire detection above the Council Chamber Decision taken risk deleted	~~Operational~~	~~4~~	5	5	- There is no straightforward mechanism to install fire detection in the void above the Council Chamber - The void has no installed equipment. The void only covers the Council Chamber and there is no link to the remainder of the building. - There is no access to the void, other than from the outside of the building using a large cherry picker/similar located in Mariner Street. - Aspirating systems have been considered, but these require regular maintenance and the attic must be cleaned out periodically to remove dust (which triggers false alarms). - Recommendation from the design team is that there is no detection in this location, but the client needs to accept this risk.	- To be discussed at project steering committee. - Council steering committee agreed to exempt this area. - Steering committee agreed at January meeting to accept that smoke detection in the void was not viable/operationally supportable and noted this as a risk.	
~~10~~	5/1/24 13/1/24	Project governance structure delays decision	~~Financial/Time~~	~~2~~ 1	5 5	~~10~~ 5	- Lowestoft Town Council has ultimate responsibility for the programme and all decisions. The new steering committee structure is more formal than the previous project board, and there is normally a lead	- Meetings can be organised as extraordinary meetings (with members in person as previously and held in public except where there are commercial issues). This will help to some extent.	Project steering committee

LTH Delivery Project Risks V3.3 revised 4/7/25 (updates in royal blue) revised 1/5/25 (updates in cyclamen) revised 7/4/25 (updates in turquoise) revised 12/3/25 (updates in red); revised 8/1/25 (updates in green) revised 13.11.24 (updates in olive); revised 20.10.24 (updates in dark blue); revised 11.9.24 (updates in burgundy); revised 15.7.24 (updates in brown); revised 30.5.24 (updates in purple); revised 24.4.24 (updates in orange); revised 11.3.24 (updates in blue); revised: 13.2.24 (updates in pink). revised: 11.1.24 (updates in leaf green). Relevant Stage 1 (Development Project) risks/comments are retained in black.

DELETED RISKS									
ID	Date Raised/Updated	Risk	Category	1-5 Prob	1-5 Impact	Score P x I	Discussion on cause, impact and mitigations	Response(s)	Owner
	15/7/24 12/3/25	making and results in programme delays and contractual issues Risk no longer an issue/ governance proven to work. Risk deleted.					time before meetings (7 days) when all agendas/papers etc must be circulated. Meetings are held in public, and voting members must attend in person. The project manager and clerk may advise, but have no vote. This has the potential to restrict open discussion and dynamic decision making, with the knock on effect of delays and increase costs (particularly during construction). - Escalation to Full Council is required where a power has not been delegated to the steering committee or project manager. - If delays to decision making impact on the main contractor's ability to deliver the project on time, significant contractual issues/claims could arise. - Approach is currently working well, and only one extraordinary meeting has been called to date. No impact on decision making; delegation to subcommittee means procurement decisions are more straightforward too. -	- To counter the loss of quality/dynamism, because of the constraints of items having to be on the agenda and meetings being held in public, working groups could tackle specific issues. - Detailed planning is required to anticipate issues as much as possible, and to ensure that the appropriate delegation has been secured in advance from Full Council to avoid any delay. - Temporary sub committees could reduce the delay between recommendation and action. - Full Council delegated power to Steering Committee to set up sub-committees to progress actions within the committee's remit. This means a decision can be taken by a constituted sub-comm if needed. Full Council approved delegation of decisions on Architect's Instructions (ie contingency spend) to officers in liaison with the project manager.	

LTH Delivery Project Risks V3.3 revised 4/7/25 (updates in royal blue) revised 1/5/25 (updates in cyclamen) revised 7/4/25 (updates in turquoise) revised 12/3/25 (updates in red); revised 8/1/25 (updates in green) revised 13.11.24 (updates in olive); revised 20.10.24 (updates in dark blue); revised 11.9.24 (updates in burgundy); revised 15.7.24 (updates in brown); revised 30.5.24 (updates in purple); revised 24.4.24 (updates in orange); revised 11.3.24 (updates in blue); revised: 13.2.24 (updates in pink). revised: 11.1.24 (updates in leaf green). Relevant Stage 1 (Development Project) risks/comments are retained in black.

DELETED RISKS									
ID	Date Raised/Updated	Risk	Category	1-5 Prob	1-5 Impact	Score P x I	Discussion on cause, impact and mitigations	Response(s)	Owner
~~19~~	13/11/24 8/1/25 12/3/25	A Letter of Intent issued to main construction contractor results in a claim for lost profits Contract now signed, risk deleted.	Financial	3 1	5 5	15 5	- A Letter of Intent (LOI) could be issued to the main construction contractor covering the period between award and securing the necessary funding to confirm the project will go ahead. In the event of funding not being secured, the project would be cancelled. The LOI would cover temporary works either to speed progress on the project, or to protect the building over the winter (or a combo of both). - If incorrectly constructed, LTC solicitors have advised (on another project) that the work could be deemed to have started, and therefore a claim for lost profits could be lodged by the contractor. - The cost of fighting such a claim could be significant, and if unsuccessful, could lay the Council open to paying several hundred thousand pounds, plus costs, potentially more. - If the work specified in the LOI required the contractor to work in a different sequence to that in their plan, there could be a claim for an uplift/variation in costs,	- A meeting between the design team lead, QS, project manager, LTC and their solicitors may be able to find a path through this. - The alternative is to conclude that the risks outweigh the potential short-term gains (including protecting the building from further water ingress damage) and it is better to simply await the contract implementation. - Discussions with procurement advisor concluded that there was minimal risk provided funds secured and contract in good shape to progress. - LOI was restricted to preliminary works with a cost limit of £65k, and a time limit to end January 25. - the Letter of intent issued 23/12, and Barnes Construction are working to onsite start date of 10/2/25.	Project Manager

LTH Delivery Project Risks V3.3 revised 4/7/25 (updates in royal blue) revised 1/5/25 (updates in cyclamen) revised 7/4/25 (updates in turquoise) revised 12/3/25 (updates in red); revised 8/1/25 (updates in green) revised 13.11.24 (updates in olive); revised 20.10.24 (updates in dark blue); revised 11.9.24 (updates in burgundy); revised 15.7.24 (updates in brown); revised 30.5.24 (updates in purple); revised 24.4.24 (updates in orange); revised 11.3.24 (updates in blue); revised: 13.2.24 (updates in pink). revised: 11.1.24 (updates in leaf green). Relevant Stage 1 (Development Project) risks/comments are retained in black.

DELETED RISKS									
ID	Date Raised/Updated	Risk	Category	1-5 Prob	1-5 Impact	Score P x I	Discussion on cause, impact and mitigations	Response(s)	Owner
							and potentially time delays due to inefficiencies.		
20	8/1/25	Insurance taken out by the Employer (LTC) is required. Delays to implementing this could impact start date Insurance in place, risk deleted	~~Timescale~~	2 0	4 0	8 0	- JCT Option C insurance is required (taken out by employer in joint names, covering a) works and b) existing building). This is included in the contract preliminaries and is the only standard route for works involving an existing building. - Securing a good policy could take several weeks, since the market is more nervous following high profile project failures (eg Glasgow School of Art) - Insurance must be in place before the contractor starts onsite. - It would seem the Council's insurers are not able to provide cover (without reference to head office and specialist underwriters).	- Project manager has contacted two commercial insurance brokers and provided detailed project construction information to them. - One broker expects to revert by 10/1/25 confirming which insurers are interested and giving outline prices before progressing if acceptable. The other is taking a more detailed approach up front, so will take longer to confirm offers from insurers. - Insurance in place, contract signed 5/3/25, within timescale that does not of itself impact completion.	Project Manager
7	11/3/24 24/4/24	Challenge is made against main contract tender decision	~~Financial/Time~~	2 1	5 5	10 5	- With a large contract such as ours, risk is increased re a legal challenge being made against the tender evaluation. - This could arise from the tender pack being misleading, or evaluation criteria being insufficiently clear.	- Advice is required on procurement in general, and on the specific aspects of the main contract tender for the Town Hall. - We will need to amend our evaluation panel to have expert input on certain elements of the tender.	Project Manager/ Town Clerk.

LTH Delivery Project Risks V3.3 revised 4/7/25 (updates in royal blue) revised 1/5/25 (updates in cyclamen) revised 7/4/25 (updates in turquoise) revised 12/3/25 (updates in red); revised 8/1/25 (updates in green) revised 13.11.24 (updates in olive); revised 20.10.24 (updates in dark blue); revised 11.9.24 (updates in burgundy); revised 15.7.24 (updates in brown); revised 30.5.24 (updates in purple); revised 24.4.24 (updates in orange); revised 11.3.24 (updates in blue); revised: 13.2.24 (updates in pink). revised: 11.1.24 (updates in leaf green). Relevant Stage 1 (Development Project) risks/comments are retained in black.

DELETED RISKS									
ID	Date Raised/Updated	Risk	Category	1-5 Prob	1-5 Impact	Score P x I	Discussion on cause, impact and mitigations	Response(s)	Owner
		No challenge received, risk deleted.					- However, it is most likely to arise from an unsuccessful bidder viewing that the evaluation of their bid was unfair (eg the panel was not experienced to evaluate aspects of their tender, or the process was run inappropriately). - Key issues for our process will be how we score the technical aspects of the bid, and how we manage the evaluation panel process. - We will also need to be very careful about the Reg 84 final tender report and how we feedback to all tenderers.	- A moderator will be required for the panel itself, with some guidance provided to evaluators in advance. All need to keep detailed notes of evidence. - We should consider recording the panel. - Council has agreed to appoint a very experienced public procurement consultant, who is now working closely with design team, QS and PM to move the tender forward. - Only design team and CDM will evaluate contracts, now agreed by steering committee. SC members will attend the moderation meeting, to be chaired by procurement consultant, and will officially appoint, based on recommendations/moderated scores.	
4	11/3/24 15/7/24 11/9/24	Limited number of tenders for main contract 4 tenders received, risk deleted	Financial/ Quality/Time	3 2 0	5 5 5	15 10 0	- Market is seeing lower level of engagement from major contractors, fewer bids coming in against tender. Tendering is major effort for firms, and they are becoming fussier about what they bid for. - Given size of contract, we require firm with turnover c. £6m+ per annum, but it is still a relatively small contract. This could restrict	- PM participated in a Meet the Buyer event organised by East Suffolk Council – open event for which 85 people registered. - Proposed to hold an open day at Town Hall for contractors to see building in advance of tender and get a better understanding of what the project entails – again, open to all (but need to ensure well advertised). Open day at Town Hall	Project Manager

LTH Delivery Project Risks V3.3 revised 4/7/25 (updates in royal blue) revised 1/5/25 (updates in cyclamen) revised 7/4/25 (updates in turquoise) revised 12/3/25 (updates in red); revised 8/1/25 (updates in green) revised 13.11.24 (updates in olive); revised 20.10.24 (updates in dark blue); revised 11.9.24 (updates in burgundy); revised 15.7.24 (updates in brown); revised 30.5.24 (updates in purple); revised 24.4.24 (updates in orange); revised 11.3.24 (updates in blue); revised: 13.2.24 (updates in pink). revised: 11.1.24 (updates in leaf green). Relevant Stage 1 (Development Project) risks/comments are retained in black.

DELETED RISKS									
ID	Date Raised/Updated	Risk	Category	1-5 Prob	1-5 Impact	Score P x I	Discussion on cause, impact and mitigations	Response(s)	Owner
							tenders from contractors at both bottom and top of market. - Could potentially receive insufficient tenders to offer viable option, may need to retender (time lost, costs increase). - Could receive sufficient tenders but quality limited/may not be able to award. - Need to 'warm up' market and provide as much advance notice as possible so estimators can be booked in. - Essential to provide a tender pack that has maximum clarity to avoid losing bidders due to perceived uncertainties etc. - Must allow sufficient time for tenders. - Four compliant tenders received. Unless we have to move to a retender situation, this risk can be deleted.	well attended, with qualified experienced contractors giving every indication of interest. - Time for tender extended to six weeks, with the option to offer a further two weeks. - Key to get tender out by end May to avoid hitting holiday period (currently scheduled 17/5). - 17/5 looking a tight date, given stage of documentation at end April. - Date slipped to 24/6 to ensure quality documentation package - Strong interest in tender package, and at least five active bidders remaining. Extension granted to 19/8 has helped retain some of these.	