



Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership

Independent Assessment Summary Report: Bracknell Town Centre Business Case

Full Business Case Independent Assessment

Report No. RT-A087383-14

WYG
Executive Park
Avalon Way
Anstey
Leicester
LE7 7GR

11th November 2015
Copyright © WYG EPT Ltd 2015

REPORT CONTROL

Document: Full Business Case Independent Assessment

Project: Bracknell , Business Case

Client: Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership

Job Number: A087383

File Origin: RT-A087383-14 - Bracknell Town Centre FBC_Review (2015-11-11).docx

Document Checking:

Primary Author	Gabriel Davis	Initialled:	GD
----------------	---------------	-------------	----

Contributor	Panagiotis Thrasyvoulou	Initialled:	PT
-------------	-------------------------	-------------	----

Review By	Colin Shields	Initialled:	CS
-----------	---------------	-------------	----

Issue	Date	Status	Checked for Issue
1	26/10/2015	Draft	CS
2	06/11/2015	Final	CS
3	11/11/2015	Final	CS



Contents

1	Executive Summary	1
2	Process.....	4
3	Submitted Information.....	5
4	Review	6

Appendices

Appendix A – Business Case Checklist
Appendix B – Meeting Minutes

1 Executive Summary

- 1.1 This technical note provides an independent review of the Bracknell Town Centre Infrastructure Improvements Business Case submission to the Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership.

SCHEME SUMMARY

- 1.2 The Bracknell Town Centre Infrastructure Improvements are a package of highway and public realm improvements designed to support the £200m regeneration of Bracknell town centre.

- 1.3 The improvements consist of:

- Millennium Way signal controlled junction
- Weather Way realignment
- Met Office Rbt and Station Rbt – Capacity/Operational Improvements
- Bond Way drop-off / collection point
- Conventional highway signage
- Variable message signing
- Real Time Bus Information (RTI)
- Urban Traffic Management Control (UTMC) system
- Cycle improvements
- Pedestrian improvements
- Charles Square service yard / multi-storey car park / hotel entrance improvements.

Review Findings

- 1.4 The review of the submitted Business Case identified the following:
- 1.5 The Business Case is well structured, containing most of the main areas expected within a major scheme Business Case submission (see checklist in **Appendix A**).

- 1.6 It is important to note that the infrastructure improvements are explicitly to support the specific development, namely the town centre regeneration project. The North section of the development is identified as dependent on the scheme.
- 1.7 The predicted initial Benefit to Cost Ratio (BCR) of the total package is reported to be 3.651, which represents high Value for Money (VfM).
- 1.8 Prior to acceptance of the FBC the following omissions should be taken into account when considering the overall benefits of the scheme:
- i) The highway parts of the package are assessed using Linsig junction-assessments only. There is some discussion of the shortcomings of Linsig-only assessments. No validation of the Linsig models to existing surveys is presented.
 - ii) The only future year used in the junction assessments is 2016, yet the appraisal is over 60 years. The economy assessment does not use TUBA, yet no details are given about the calculations that have been used instead. How the future year traffic flows were derived is also missing.
 - iii) The assessments do not include an interpeak model, therefore not allowing the interpeak period to be assessed. This could result in an overestimate of the scheme benefits due to the reliance on signalisation.
 - iv) The other large part of the scheme benefits come from the signalisation of Station Way roundabout. Information on the surveys and validation of the Linsig at this junction are required to form a view on how realistic these benefits are.
 - v) No Low and High Growth scenarios have been assessed. In fact, as a consequence of only 2016 flows being used for a 60 assessment, the presented scenario could be considered a 'No growth' scenario.
 - vi) No new air quality or noise assessments have been carried out, instead qualitative assessments from the Planning Application Environmental Statement from 2007 are relied upon. These predict minor adverse and negligible impacts for air quality and noise respectively.

- 1.9 The predicted initial Benefit to Cost Ratio (BCR) of the total package is reported to be 3.651, which represents high Value for Money (VfM).
- 1.10 Therefore, it is not possible to fully recommend the business case as submitted and it is considered that the business case will require updating in order to be considered suitable for final submission. At this stage a conditional approval, subject to addressing the Strategic Case and modelling and economic queries raised within a re-submitted case, is considered to be an appropriate way forward.

2 Process

LIAISON

- 2.1 A meeting between WYG and WSP was held on 14 July 2015 to discuss the content and method for the Appraisal Specification Report. The draft minutes submitted by WSP and some comments from WYG are given in **Appendix B**.

OPTION ASSESSMENT REPORT (OAR) / APPRAISAL SPECIFICATION REPORT (ASR)

- 2.2 No stand alone OAR has been submitted as part of the assessment. This was agreed as a special case at the meeting of the 14th July on the grounds that the works formed part of a consented planning approval for the town centre development. As such there is little scope for different options to be realistically considered within the timescales of the project.
- 2.3 The ASR has a number of shortcomings which are detailed in **Appendix A**. The overall modelling methodology for the assessment of the scheme has, in the most part, been included within the Economic Case chapter of the Business Case.

REVIEW

- 2.4 The ASR was submitted for review in advance of the meeting on the 3rd July 2015. The Full Business Case was submitted for review on the 1st October 2015 (including all appendices).
- 2.5 WYG issued our review of the first business case on 26th October 2015.
- 2.6 A second business case was issued in light of the first review on 2nd November 2015.
- 2.7 This document is a review of the second submitted business case.
- 2.8 Submitted documents are summarised in Section 3. Section 4 then provides a summary of the review findings.

3 Submitted Information

3.1 The Business Case independent assessment was carried out based upon the following reports submitted by Bracknell Forest Council and their consultant team WSP:

- 150702 Bracknell Town Centre Business Case - Appraisal Specification Report (dated 01 July 2015)
- Bracknell Town Centre MSBC Submission Document (dated October 2015)
- Bracknell Town Centre MSBC Revised Submission Document (dated November 2015)

4 Review

OPTIONS ASSESSMENT

- 4.1 There are no alternative options considered and no Options Appraisal Report (OAR) has been submitted. This situation is far from ideal as the process of option sifting and further assessment in WebTAG is designed to provide for the best possible way to solve the problem with public funds.
- 4.2 However, this situation was agreed as a special case at the meeting of the 14th July on the grounds that the works formed part of a consented planning approval for the town centre development. As such there is little scope for different options to be realistically considered within the timescales of the project.
- 4.3 In addition it is assumed that the current package has gone through some optioneering and iteration of design during the previous planning processes, although this is not visible in the business case.
- 4.4 It is unlikely any assessment of the previous options followed the WebTAG Option Appraisal Guidance, and the rationale for selecting the proposed scheme is not clear within the Full Business Case. Notwithstanding this, the package of schemes is stated as consented and so the review proceeds on this basis.

APPROACH TO MODELLING

- 4.5 The scheme consists of a package of measures designed to support the redevelopment of Bracknell town centre.
- 4.6 Having reviewed the modeling information in regard to the proposal, several issues are outstanding which are set out in the following paragraphs of this section.
- 4.7 The highway parts of the package are assessed using Linsig only. It would be normal to use a highway assignment transport model to assess the impacts of interventions of this sort. A review is provided of the existing VISUM transport model of the area. The principal reason given for not using this model is that it is validated to a 2007 base year, which is older than permitted in WebTAG.

- 4.8 There remains no discussion of the general shortcomings of Linsig-only assessments nor the assumptions that would apply in order for the assessment to be robust. In particular the lack of ability to take account of reassignment effects is still a particular concern. It is unusual to be able to ignore the effects of reassignment on individual junction congestion. Justification is still needed to support the current methodology since junction-only assessments can significantly overestimate the scheme benefits. The statement on page 19 that “the location of the junctions...[is] not seen as necessarily creating a strategic re-assignment of traffic...” is insufficient for this task. Testing with the 2007 validated VISUM model or a more cogent argument should be put forward.
- 4.9 The calibration and validation of the Linsig models has not been presented. This is an important part of model building and is a requirement if the models are to be relied upon to predict base and future junction delays, as is the case here.
- 4.10 The single year used in the junction assessments is 2016. The modelled flows/turning movements used in the assessments are now given in the appendix in the form of Linsig outputs. The with-development core scenario is the only one considered and flows for this have been taken from the developers transport assessment. How these future year traffic flows were derived still needs to be presented, with the inclusion of the Developers Transport Assessment with the submission.
- 4.11 The reliance on opening year (2016) forecast flows is a concern. The economic appraisal is has a 60 year horizon. The seeming implicit assumption of flat future growth requires justification.
- 4.12 TUBA has not been used for the economy assessment. Details are required of the calculations and assumptions that have been used in its stead.
- 4.13 The assessments do not include an interpeak model, and therefore the interpeak period has not been assessed. Assessing the interpeak is usual practice when performing economic appraisal to justify the spending of public funds. This omission is likely to result in an overestimate of the scheme benefits due to the reliance on signalisation. Saturday flows are predicted to increase by some 41% yet no assessment of a Saturday peak has been provided. The interpeak and the Saturday peak should form part of the assessment unless a strong

justification can be provided that an omission does not result in an over-estimation the highway benefits.

- 4.14 Alternative growth scenarios should be provided as set out in WebTAG.
- 4.15 The majority of the scheme benefits appear to come from the World Health Organisation (WHO)/Europe Health Economic Assessment Tool (HEAT). Inputs that have been used for this tool are supplied, along with a summary output sheet in the appendix. The calculations and assumptions used to arrive at some of the inputs have been supplied for this major component of the appraisal.
- 4.16 The other large part of the scheme benefits come from the signalisation of Station Way roundabout. Information on the surveys and validation of the Linsig at this junction are required to form a view on how realistic these benefits are.
- 4.17 TEE, PA and AMCB tables are required.
- 4.18 No new air quality or noise assessments have been carried out, instead qualitative assessments from the Planning Application Environmental Statement from 2007 are relied upon. These predict minor adverse and negligible impacts for air quality and noise respectively. The Environmental Statement relied upon for this assessment should be included with the submission.

BUSINESS CASE

Format and Content

- 4.19 The Business Case is well structured, containing most of the main areas expected within a major scheme Business Case submission (see checklist in **Appendix A**).
- 4.20 This checklist confirms whether each of the expected sub-sections within the 5 cases have been adequately covered within the submitted Business Case and provides explanatory notes where a specific area may not be fully addressed. There are still a number of items listed in the checklist that should be addressed.

- 4.21 It is important to note that the infrastructure improvements are explicitly to support the specific development, namely the town centre regeneration project. The North section of the development is identified as dependent on the scheme.

Value for Money

- 4.22 The predicted initial Benefit to Cost Ratio (BCR) of the total package is reported to be 3.651, which represents high Value for Money (VfM).
- 4.23 The separate parts of the scheme package have been separately costed and their predicted benefits separately itemised which is best practice when considering a package of measures.
- 4.24 The three signalized highway schemes have the economic breakdown as presented in **Table 1** below, as found on page 32 and 33 of the business case. It is noted here that for the Millennium Way signalized junction scheme in the business case the Net Present Value (NPV) has been incorrectly stated, whilst the BCR, stated as 0, is more properly left blank. The NPV correctly calculated from the PCV and PVB is given in **Table 1** below.

Table 1 – Breakdown of Economics by Individual Junction

Junction	Present Value Costs (PVC)	Present Value Benefits (PVB)	Net Present Value (NPV)	Benefit to Cost Ratio (BCR)
Met Office Signalised Roundabout	£ 430 000	£ 436 000	£ 6 000	1.014
Station Way Signalised Roundabout	£ 537 000	£ 8 130 000	£ 7 593 000	15.140
Millennium Way New Signalised Junction	£ 2 066 000	-£ 2 531 000	-£ 4 597 000	N/A

- 4.25 Several things stand out from this table which are detailed below.
- 4.26 Firstly, the Met Office Signalised Roundabout scheme provides low value for money, with a BCR only just above unity, and is very close to poor value for money. The delay savings presented in the business case appear to be marginal. Without evidence to the contrary, it would be expected that a redesign of the Met Office Roundabout scheme would provide for better benefits.
- 4.27 The argument put forward for the Met Office design is that it has been previously agreed with the developer to provide nil detriment. A design providing nil detriment, while suitable to mitigate a development, may not make the best use of public funds. The fact remains that an alternative design could offer superior value for money for the public and it would be highly preferably that such avenues are explored. However, as with the lack of options assessment, it is accepted that the consented status of the scheme may mean a redesign causes undue delay.
- 4.28 Secondly, the Station Way Signalised Roundabout scheme appears to have very high benefits, with a BCR of over 15, representing a very high value for money. Care must be taken that these benefits will be realised however, and the junction-only methodology used here must come under greater scrutiny. More information is required regarding surveyed turning movement flows and queues at this junction before the presented benefits can be relied upon.

- 4.29 Finally, the Millennium Way New Signalised Junction presents a disbenefit rather than a benefit. This is to be expected as it is a new junction where before there was no junction at all. Information has now been provided regarding turning movement flows and forecast growth assumptions at this junction allowing decision makers to form a view on whether this junction is appropriate. It is worth noting that this junction has the North section of the development dependent upon it and also the car park for the town centre. A stronger justification for imposing this seeming disbenefit on the travelling public should be provided, however, as in the Met Office Roundabout design, it is accepted that the consented status of the scheme may mean a redesign causes undue delay.
- 4.30 It is noted that the impact on accidents has not been quantified (eg by using COBALT) and it is expected that this assessment is carried out. The qualitative assessment of 'Slightly Beneficial' still appears unlikely in light of a new signalised junction where before there was no junction. A cogent argument for this is required.

Appraisal Summary

- 4.31 A review of the appraisal summary contained within the Business Case submission is provided in **Table 2** below. Areas where the review disagrees or queries the proposed level of benefit or disbenefit associated with the scheme are detailed and explanatory notes provided.

Table 2 - Appraisal Summary

Category	Sub-category	Business Case Assessment	Agree / Disagree with Assessment	Notes
Economy	Business users & transport providers	£22,418,000	Disagree	See comments in report.
	Reliability impact on Business users	Left blank in AST	Disagree	Needs to be Not Assessed
	Regeneration	Not assessed	Agree	
	Wider Impacts	Not assessed	Agree	
Environmental	Noise	Negligible	Disagree	noise assessment should be provided
	Air Quality	Minor Adverse	Disagree	AQ assessment should be provided
	Greenhouse gases	Not assessed	Agree	
	Landscape	negligible to minor beneficial	Agree	
	Townscape	Moderate Beneficial	Agree	
	Historic Environment	Slight / Moderate Beneficial	Agree	
	Biodiversity	Slightly Adverse	Agree	
	Water Environment	Negligible	Agree	
Social	Commuting and Other users	Left blank in AST	Disagree	Needs to be included
	Reliability impact on Commuting and Other users	Left blank in AST	Disagree	Needs to be included
	Physical activity	£766,800-£807,800	Disagree	The value given in the AST is per year, when it should be over the appraisal period as a PVB. See main report for comments on data that needs to be supplied in order rely on this figure.
	Journey quality	Moderate Beneficial	Agree	
	Accidents	Slight Beneficial	Disagree	COBALT assessments can be provided. Detailed arguments on NMU crossing can be provided.
	Security	Moderate Beneficial	Agree	
	Access to services	No impact	Agree	
	Affordability	No impact	Agree	
	Severance	Slight Beneficial	Agree	
	Option and non-use values	Not Applicable	Agree	

Public Accounts	Cost to Broad Transport Budget	£6,140,000	Agree	
	Indirect Tax Revenues	Left blank in AST	Disagree	Needs to be included, AST stated this would be supplied by TUBA. Alternative calculation needs to be explained.

Risks

- 4.32 The submitted Business Case includes a Quantified Risk Assessment, which provides a detailed breakdown of the project risks and associated weighted costs relevant to the project, the key risks that have been identified have been assessed through Monte Carlo simulation, and the risk register can be seen within Appendix E of the Full Business Case.
- 4.33 The majority of the risks associated with this scheme are understood to stay with the developer of the town centre regeneration development, MACE.
- 4.34 The Council has some risks that it will seek to manage, these include:
- Strategic/Political/Policy;
 - Economic/ Financial/Management;
 - Statutory processes (TRO);
 - Stakeholder Management/Consultation, and;
 - Operation (traffic signals, VMS).
- 4.35 A risk management plan is proposed between the Council and MACE that appears to be sufficiently robust.



Appendix A – Business Case Checklist

Project Number: A087383
Scheme: Bracknell Town Centre
Submitted by: Bracknell Forest Council/WSP

Strategic Case	Addressed within Business Case	Notes	Economic Case	Addressed within Business Case	Notes	Financial Case	Addressed within Business Case	Notes	Commercial Case	Addressed within Business Case	Notes	Management Case	Addressed within Business Case	Notes															
Business Strategy	Y		Introduction	Y		Introduction	Y		Introduction	Y		Introduction	Y																
Problem Identified	N	The problems have to be identified as problems and not challenges. Challenges can supplement the problems to give a wider picture but the point of this chapter is to identify the problems. The problems can easily be set by the already provided challenges, i.e. traffic congestion (queues and delays) and poor air-quality in main routes of the city centre are problems. The ways to improve them are challenges. More examples of problems are poor and insufficient cycling infrastructure or low accessibility to cyclists and aging buildings and infrastructure that don't meet modern standards.	Options appraised	Y	No options appraised are presented but as the scheme is concerted we have agreed that no further options assessment is required	Costs	Y	No risk allowance was set	Output based specification	Y		Evidence of similar projects	N	There are given the projects that the companies involved in this project successfully deliver instead of successful development using similar means, that is not nesessary need to be from the involved companies															
Impact of not changing	Y		Appraisal Specification Report	N	Modelling: Nothing about the data collection and availability. No calibration, Validation and Sensitivity test of the models. Only 2016 forecast year. Economic: No justification of the used software choise. Explain the need for analysis of the social and distributional impacts of the scheme on the relevant economic indicators. Environmental: no methodology Social/Distributional Impact appraisal: The whole Social impact assessment form webtag 4.1 is missing, instead only webtag 4.2 was used.	Budgets / Funding Cover	Y		Procurement Strategy	Y		Programme / Project dependencies	Y	Appendix D															
Drivers for change	Y		Assumptions	N	no supporting details or analysis stating why no interpeak flow was used and only LINSIG models were used	Accounting Implications	N	There are no accounting implications included	Sourcing Options	Y		Governance	Y	Appendix F															
Objectives	Y	The objectives are reasonable but need to be SMART, specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time-bounded.	Sensitivity and Risk Profile	N	No alternative scenarios modelled				Payment Mechanisms	Y		Programme / Project Plan	Y	Appendix D															
Measures for success	N	measures should be measurable. If road safety is not an objective it should not be here as well.	Appraisal Summary Table	Y	Appendix A				Pricing Framework and charging mechanisms	Y		Assurances and approvals	Y																
Scope	Y		Value for Money Statement	Y					Risk allocation and transfer	Y		Communication & Stakeholders	Y																
Constraints	Y								Contract length	Y		Project Reporting	Y																
Inter-dependencies	Y								Human resource issues	y		Implementation	Y																
Stakeholders	Y								Contract management	Y		Key Issues	Y																
Options	Y	No options are presented but as the scheme is concerted we have agreed that no further options assessment is required													Contract Management	Y													
															Risk Management	Y													
															Benefits realisation	Y													
															Monitoring and evaluation	y													
															Contingency	Y													
															Options	Y													



Appendix B – Meeting Minutes

MEETING NOTES



Job Title	Bracknell Town Centre Business Case
Project Number	70013041
Date	14 July 2015
Time	10 - 11am
Venue	WSP House, Chancery Lane
Subject	Bracknell Town Centre Business Case ASR
Client	Bracknell Forest Council
Present	Gabriel Davis (GD), White Young Green Stephen Reed (SR), WSP PB Craig Drennan (CR), WSP PB Rachel Mercy (RM), WSP PB
Apologies	Stuart Jefferies, Bracknell Forest Council
Distribution	As above

Mountbatten House
Basing View
Basingstoke
RG21 4HJ

Tel: +44 (0)1256 318800
Fax: +44 (0)1256 318700

www.wspgroup.com
www.pbworld.com

MATTERS ARISING

ACTION

1.0 SCHEME DETAILS

After discussing the various aspects of the scheme, GD asked if costs had been calculated for each of the components. CD stated that at the time that the previous work was carried out, the costs were approximately £6 million for the whole package of improvements, including £2 million for the Millennium Way signalised junction, £400,000 for Station roundabout and £600,000 for Met Office roundabout.

SR said that an Appendix B will be added to the ASR, which will contain the previously submitted work. Also that WSP | PB can supply the updated cost of the scheme to WYG following the detailed design work that is currently being carried out.

SR stated that more details about the Town Centre redevelopment, which the improvements support, would be included in the Strategic Case of the Business Case.

2.0 PURPOSE OF THE SCHEME

GD asked for confirmation that the improvements are supporting a dependent development and will unlock economic benefits, rather than being a transport specific scheme. CD and SR confirmed this stating that the primary objectives of the scheme are connectivity and accessibility.

3.0 OPTIONS APPRAISAL

GD enquired whether any other scheme options had been considered and could be submitted as part of an OAR. SR stated that as the scheme already had planning permission, that options would have been considered as part of that application. As such, no options appraisal would be submitted as part of the business case.

GD said that WYG accepted this.

4.0 SCENARIOS TO BE ASSESSED

GD commented that the Bracknell Town Centre redevelopment works will increase the number of trips in three peaks: AM, PM and Saturday. It was agreed that if the traffic flows on Saturday do not exceed the flows in the AM or PM peak, then this peak period does not need to be assessed.

GD suggested that three scenarios should be assessed:

- Without scheme (the existing situation)

MATTERS ARISING	ACTION
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> → With scheme (the without scheme + Bracknell Town Centre forecast trips + package of improvements) → The without scheme + package of improvements <p>CD confirmed that 2016 is the forecast year to be assessed and that another forecast year is likely to be 10-15 years after this. CD to confirm.</p> <p>5.0 METHODS OF ASSESSMENT</p> <p>GD requested confirmation of the methods that will be used for the economic assessment. CD confirmed that TUBA would not be used, and that WSP PB would keep to the methods used for the previous work, using ARCADY and LINSIG to calculate the total delay. CD also confirmed that the rule of a half would still be used.</p> <p>Using these methods, it is assumed that the improvements at the roundabouts will give a positive benefit but the delay introduced at the new signalised junction will be negative. However, the calculation of the GVA benefits will lead to an overall economic benefit of the scheme.</p> <p>GD asked for clarification about whether the junction improvements in Bracknell Town Centre would lead to reassignment effects in the transport modelling. WSP PB confirmed that there would be no reassignment effects as the only additional trips on the network will be those accessing Bracknell Town Centre. No through trips would be attracted to the route around the town centre, as the A329(M) / A322 corridor is quicker and a more direct route.</p> <p>5.1 Walking and Cycling</p> <p>GD enquired whether the scheme is expected to generate an increase in walking and cycling. CD stated that it was and that data from comparable schemes would be used to estimate the level of increase.</p> <p>WSP PB suggested that NTS data for the borough, and a factor calculated from Census 2011 Travel to Work data to disaggregate down to ward level, would be used to estimate the existing level of walking and cycling.</p> <p>GD recommended that WSP PB look at TfL's PERS method of assessment of the pedestrian environment to estimate the benefits to the public realm. WSP PB stated that they would look at this method to see if it is applicable.</p> <p>6.0 SUBMISSION</p> <p>SR requested whether the Business Case could be submitted to WYG in five individual chapters for review before the submission of the final report. GD said that he would get back to WSP PB about whether WYG will accept a phased submission approach.</p>	

gabriel.davis

From: gabriel.davis
Sent: 14 July 2015 16:18
To: 'Reed, Stephen'; Drennan, Craig
Cc: Stuart Jefferies; colin.shields; 'Richard Tyndall'
Subject: RE: BFC Town Centre Transport Business Case - ASR and Meeting

Stephen and Craig,

I hope the meeting this morning was useful. A few points that were raised:

- As the transport scheme supports the regeneration of the town centre we expect to see the four scenarios assessed as laid out in WebTAG unit A2-3;
- The traditional BCR may not be the most important thing in the context of the development;
- With this in mind, the costs and benefits of each part of the package should be clearly set out to enable the LTB to form a view;
- We discussed the probable lack of reassignment effects: some justification set out in the FBC would be required.

I discussed with colleagues the idea of sending through chapters of the FBC as they are finalised. We feel that it is important to review the document in its entirety and as such would prefer the FBC to be sent through only once it is complete.

Kind Regards

Dr Gabriel Davis MMath PhD MSc CMath MIMA
Principal Consultant

WYG

Executive Park, Avalon Way, Anstey, Leicester, LE7 7GR

Tel: +44 116 234 8164

Fax: +44 116 234 8001

Mob: +44 7500 954 050

www.wyg.com

.....

WYG Environment Planning Transport Limited. Registered in England number: 3050297. Registered Office: Arndale Court, Otley Road, Headingley, Leeds, West Yorkshire LS6 2UJ VAT No: 431-0326-08



From: Reed, Stephen [mailto:Stephen.Reed@WSPGroup.com]
Sent: 07 July 2015 09:43
To: gabriel.davis; Corbin, Maria