



Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership

## **Independent Assessment Summary Report: Langley Station and Access Improvements**

Business Case Independent Assessment

Report No. RT-A087383-18

WYG  
Executive Park  
Avalon Way  
Anstey  
Leicester  
LE7 7GR

9<sup>th</sup> November 2016  
Copyright © WYG EPT Ltd 2016



## REPORT CONTROL

Document: Business Case Independent Assessment

Project: Langley Station and Access Improvements

Client: Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership

Job Number: A087383

File Origin: N:\Projects\A087383 - Thames Valley LTB Support\reports\2016-11\_Reports\RT18 - Langley Station

Document Checking:

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

Contributor	Panagotis Thrasylvoulou	Initialled:	PT
-------------	-------------------------	-------------	----

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

Issue	Date	Status	Checked for Issue
1	13/10/2016	Draft	GD
2	09/11/2016	Final	CS



## Contents

1	Executive Summary .....	1
2	Submitted Information.....	3
3	Option Assessment Report .....	4
4	Appraisal Specification Report .....	5
5	Full Business Case - Review .....	6
	Appendix A – Business Case Checklist.....	7

## Appendices

Appendix A – Business Case Checklist

# 1 Executive Summary

- 1.1 This technical note provides an independent review of the Langley Station and Access Improvements Business Case submission to the Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership.

## SCHEME SUMMARY

- 1.2 The Langley Station and Access Improvements scheme provides a series of interventions with the intention of improving station facilities at Langley; and enhancing accessibility to the station from the residential areas at the east of the Borough as well as the neighbouring area of South Buckinghamshire.
- 1.3 The Core Scheme aims to improve pedestrian and cyclist access to Langley Station, provide reconfigured parking arrangements and drop-off facility for the station, and improve the perception of safety and security at and around the station. This includes measures such as new provisions and improvements of pedestrian facilities, introduction of shared use areas for pedestrians and cyclists, improvement of cycling facilities both within and around the station, reconfiguration of station car park including a new drop-off (kiss-and-ride) area in the station forecourt, and improvement in the landscaping around the station as well as the public realm. The scheme will also include elements undertaken by Crossrail/Rail for London under their On-Station Improvement Programme Step Free Access scheme.

## REVIEW FINDINGS

- 1.4 The Business Case Submission is well set out, detailed and comprehensive.
- 1.5 The first draft of the business case [ref: 5149496-DOC-001-1.1 Langley business case] was reviewed in October 2016. There were a number of clarifications raised in that review [ref: WYG\_RT-087383-18 - Langley Station\_Review\_Rev1]. All the issues have now been addressed and presented in an updated business case document [ref: 5149496-DOC-001-1.3 Langley business case].
- 1.6 The Value for Money assessment has been conducted correctly by using the NPV and NPV/Capital Cost as recommended in WebTAG and the report conclusion shows a High value for Money.



- 1.7 It is now possible to fully recommend the business case for the Langley Station improvements at this time as all the clarifications have been addressed.

## 2 Submitted Information

2.1 The Business Case independent assessment was carried out based upon the following reports and appendices submitted by Slough Borough Council and their consultant team (ATKINS):

1. Langley Station and Access Improvements - Business Case (5149496-DOC-001-1.1 Langley business case.pdf); inclusive of

- Appendix A - Scheme Designs - updated (supplied separately);
- Appendix B - Landscape and Architecture Preliminary Design (supplied separately);
- Appendix C - OSR (supplied separately);
- Appendix D - ASR (supplied separately);
- Appendix E – Modelling Report (supplied separately);
- Appendix F - AST (supplied separately);
- Appendix G - PERS and VURT (supplied separately);
- Appendix H - Risk (supplied separately);
- Appendix I - Programme (supplied separately);
- Appendix J - Flooding (supplied separately);
- Appendix K – Supporting Letters (supplied separately).

2.2 Following the first review, clarifications were presented and minor changes to the Linsig modelling and TUBA where undertaken, the results of which were presented in the following updates:

2. Technical note\_Atkins response to WYG comments\_Final;

3. Langley Station and Access Improvements - Business Case (5149496-DOC-001-1.3 Langley business case.pdf); inclusive of

- Appendix E - Modelling Report (supplied separately);
- Appendix F - AST (supplied separately).

### 3 Option Assessment Report

- 3.1 The Option Assessment Report (OAR) has been previously submitted for assessment and reviewed by WYG [ref: WYG\_Langley Station-ASR\_OAR\_Review\_(2016-09-05)].
- 3.2 The OAR is well written and fulfils the requirements. The option descriptions are general rather than detailed, which is acceptable for the stage at which the OAR would normally be produced. The options assessment could perhaps have been improved by separating some of the options from DS2 and assessing options separately where possible.
- 3.3 The Options Assessment Report is acceptable.



## 4 Appraisal Specification Report

- 4.1 The Appraisal Specification Report (OAR) has been previously submitted for assessment and reviewed by WYG [ref: WYG\_Langley Station-ASR\_OAR\_Review\_(2016-09-05)].
- 4.2 On the whole the methodology for assessing the scheme, as set out in the ASR, is sound. Some details and requirements are missing from the ASR, particularly details of the scheme itself and of passenger demand forecasts. These details have since been supplied in the business case.
- 4.3 In this context the Appraisal Specification Report is acceptable.

## 5 Full Business Case - Review

- 5.1 The Business Case Submission is well set out, detailed and comprehensive. The scheme appears to offer high value for money.
- 5.2 Highway user benefits (from journey times derived from LinSig model) are presented in the text and the AST (Appendix F) as £184,000.
- 5.3 Two scenarios have been assessed: the Core scenario and the Alternative scenario. The Core scenario includes the Network Rail funded 'Step Free Access' works. These works cost account for three quarters of the costs in the Core scenario yet are not assessed for benefits.
- 5.4 This review has been based on the evidence for the Alternative scenario, which excludes the 'Step Free Access' work costs from the analysis.
- 5.5 Revenue of £1,955,000 is expected from security benefits as new fare revenue for the 15 year appraisal period, utilising PDFH. Only the 1st year's revenue (£95,000) appears as benefit to the private provider as the current service is going to be refranchised for the remaining years of the appraisal period. The full amount appears in the TEE as revenue to the private provider, while the final 14-year amount appears as grant/subsidy to central government. The process that was followed complies with Webtag Unit A5.3 Rail Appraisal.
- 5.6 The Value for Money assessment has been conducted correctly by using the NPV and NPV/Capital Cost as recommended in WebTAG and the report conclusion shows a High value for Money.
- 5.7 In conclusion, it is now possible to **fully recommend the business case for Langley Station Improvements**. The case for the scheme is positive, with the scheme offering **High Value for Money** with an **NPV/k value of 0.96** in the Alternative Scenario.



## Appendix A – Business Case Checklist

Project Number: A087383  
 Scheme: Langley Station and Access Improvements  
 Submitted by: Slough Borough Council

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		Options appraised	Y		Costs	Y		Output based specification	Y		Evidence of similar projects	Y	Heart of Slough, Burnham Station and Access Improvements, A355 Copthorne roundabout improvement
Problem Identified	Y	Problems identified in section 3.42 and evidence are in sections 3.45 to 3.49	Assumptions	Y		Budgets / Funding Cover	Y		Procurement Strategy	Y		Programme / Project dependencies	Y	
Impact of not changing	Y	Sections 3.50 to 3.53	Sensitivity and Risk Profile	Y	Added after review	Accounting Implications	Y		Sourcing Options	Y		Governance	Y	
Drivers for change	N	Not required	Appraisal Summary Table	Y	Within the Appendix F				Payment Mechanisms	Y		Programme / Project Plan	Y	Included within section 7.14 and Appendix i
Objectives	Y	Included in table 3-2	Value for Money Statement	Y					Pricing Framework and charging mechanisms	Y		Assurances and approvals	Y	Included within section 7.15 to 7.17
Measures for success	Y	Included in sections 3.57-3.59 (Comparisons between before and after conditions)							Risk allocation and transfer	Y		Communication & Stakeholders	Y	
Scope	Y								Contract length	Y		Project Reporting	Y	
Constraints	Y	Included in section 3.61							Human resource issues	Y		Implementation of work streams	Y	
Inter-dependencies	Y	Included in section 3.64							Contract management	Y	The contract will follow a traditional NEC 3 format, ensuring that the contractual / commercial arrangement will be well defined. During contract negotiations, risk will be allocated to the party best able to manage it the most cost effective way.	Key Issues	Y	Included within Section 7.28 and Table 6-2
Stakeholders	Y	the main stakeholders are outlined but their contribution not										Contract Management	Y	Added after review
Options	Y	Within Table 3.3 and appendix C										Risk Management	Y	Included within Section 6.21 to 6.32 and Table 6.2
												Benefits realisation	Y	
												Monitoring and evaluation	Y	
												Contingency	Y	Included in section 7.37 to 7.38
												Options	Y	Included in section 7.39 to 7.40