

## BERKSHIRE LOCAL TRANSPORT BODY (BLTB)

**REPORT TO:** BLTB

**DATE:** 14 November 2019

**CONTACT OFFICER:** Josie Wragg, Chief Executive Slough Borough Council,  
lead Chief Executive to the BLTB

### PART I

#### Item 5: Thames Valley Berkshire Local Growth Funds – Call for bids - Process

##### *Purpose of Report*

1. Following the successful bidding and allocation of both Local Growth Fund (LGF) monies (2015-2021) and Business Rates Retention Pilot (BRRP) monies (2018-2020) across Thames Valley Berkshire, this report sets out the requirements to create a new call for bids in order to meet anticipated additional funding being made available for Berkshire.
2. At this point, the amount, and source, of funding is to be confirmed, but it may come from reallocation of existing LGF or BRRP scheme monies or new funding sources (e.g. UK Shared Prosperity Fund).
3. As specified in the BLTB Assurance Framework 4.0, the BLTB will issue a call for capital schemes, including eligibility criteria:
  - a minimum threshold value in order to encourage major schemes
  - a minimum level of detail in order to be able to establish the nature, purpose and content of the scheme
  - a minimum matching funding percentage in order to ensure local commitment to the scheme

Schemes which do not meet the eligibility criteria may be refused entry to the programme, or referred back to the promoter for further development.

4. This report sets out the detailed arrangements for assessing and prioritising potential projects based upon the changes to the Prioritisation Methodology approved at your July 2019 meeting, [item 10<sup>1</sup>](#).

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.slough.gov.uk/moderngov/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=601&MId=6330&Ver=4>

## ***Recommendation***

5. You are recommended to approve a new call for bids as set out in Appendices 1 to 3 and per the agreed LGF prioritisation methodology.

## ***Background***

6. In March 2018, the BLTB approved a new call for bids, in advance of the new BRRP. The process allowed for existing LGF projects to have their funding replaced with BRRP funds, thus freeing up LGF in the process. The call for bids therefore sought bids for the BRRP and replacement LGF schemes. A new pipeline was created for both funding streams and in July 2018, programme entry status was awarded to three schemes. In January 2019, LGF for the 2.14 &/ 2.25 East Reading MRT scheme was withdrawn. At the extraordinary BLTB meeting in January 2019, Programme Entry Status was awarded to six new LGF projects utilising the withdrawn funds and a further scheme in March 2019. These instances have resulted in the top ten of the LGF pipeline created in July 2018 being awarded funding.
7. In November 2018 and January 2019, each of the six Unitary Authorities were awarded £100,000 revenue funding from the BRRP, in order to help develop business cases for future projects. This work is progressing, and it is expected that new business cases should be ready shortly.
8. In addition, Transport Officers have been creating a long list of indicative future schemes, should future funding become available.

## ***Other Implications***

### *Financial*

9. The lead authority for the control of Local Growth Funds allocated to infrastructure or regeneration projects is the Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead, the LEP's Accountable Body.

### *Risk Management*

10. The risks associated with large scale infrastructure investments are well known, and the BLTB has established risk management arrangements for the Local Growth Fund transport capital programme (£113m over six years), referred to as the BLTB Assurance Framework.
11. As part of the Local Growth Fund oversight a new BLTB Assurance Framework (Third Revision) was approved by the BLTB in July 2019, item 11<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.slough.gov.uk/moderngov/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=601&MId=6330&Ver=4>

12. Compliance with the Assurance Framework and the updated prioritisation methodology is specifically designed to address the risks inherent with planning and managing a major capital programme of investment. The objectives are to identify, prioritise and support individual capital schemes which will:
  - 12.1. Support economic development in general and the LEP's strategy in particular
  - 12.2. Represent good or better value for money
  - 12.3. Be delivered on time and to budget
  - 12.4. Follow appropriate procurement procedures.
13. Promoters of infrastructure projects seeking funding will need to follow the Assurance Framework and updated prioritisation methodology for any additional funding. This means that the pipeline of schemes will be prioritised having met the eligibility criteria, according to the evaluation process, moving to Programme Entry Status acceptance, followed by submission and independent assessment of a WebTAG compliant Full Business Case before being considered for financial approval.

#### Human Rights Act and Other Legal Implications

14. Slough Borough Council will provide legal support for the BLTB should any questions arise.

#### **Supporting Information**

15. The following qualifying criteria will be applied to all bids; however, each call for bids will have its own eligibility criteria depending on the source of the capital funds. Colleagues will recall that the recent Business Rates Retention Pilot and Local Growth Deal funds each came with their own conditions. These eligibility criteria usually cover the following factors:
  - 15.1 Revenue or capital expenditure
  - 15.2 Overall scheme financial value – either minimum or maximum or both
  - 15.3 Percentage of matching funds required to be supplied by the scheme promoter
  - 15.4 Opening and closing of a time period during which the funds must be spent

Depending on the source of the funds, other eligibility criteria may be added.

16. Following the July 2019 review, this report recommends the use of that prioritisation methodology. Although there are no identified funds available at

present, this report recommends opening a new call for bids based upon the timings below in order to be in a position to proceed should they do so.

- i. Timing: will depend on funding source and specified criteria:
  - a. Local Growth Fund – reallocated funding from existing projects, deemed non deliverable. Timing will require mobilisation in 2019/20 or early 2020/21, and project needs to be well advanced, if not actually delivered, by March 2021.
  - b. Local Growth Fund – Government “windfall” – in anticipation of last-minute government announcement on additional LGF funds becoming available. Timing as per a.) above.
  - c. Business Rates Retention Pilot - reallocated funding from existing projects deemed non deliverable or allocation of remaining funds. Timings as per a.) above.
  - d. New – non LGF – funding streams – e.g. UK Shared Prosperity Fund other. Timing / criteria unknown.
- ii. Scale: a minimum scheme size of £5m and/or minimum-size associated housing development of 500 houses
- iii. Focus is on strategic investment in urban areas/around conurbations

<b>Timescale for scheme development / approval</b>		
All dates 2019 - 2020		
<b>2019</b>		
14 November	Berkshire LTB (BLTB)	Recommends the formal process to call for bids, with scoring methodology based on updated prioritisation methodology agreed by BLTB July 2019
26 November	LEP Forum	Approves process as above – Triggers the call for Infrastructure Scheme bids
<b>2020</b>		
28 January	LEP Forum	Update on progress
31 January	Closing date for bids (start of scoring and moderation)	LEP leads on scoring and moderation with scheme promoters
20 February	BSTOF	Consider draft papers for March BLTB, including the recommended prioritised list
12 March	BLTB	Provisional approval of prioritised list of schemes. Should any funding be available at that time, this would also grant programme entry status
24 March	LEP Forum	Ratification for consideration by Berkshire Leaders Group

<b>The following stages are dependent on additional, relevant funding being available</b>		
April-July	Scheme Development	Submission of WebTAG compliant Full Business Case for Independent Assessment
16 July	BLTB	Final recommendations
28 July	LEP Forum	Committed spend
Q3/Q4	Scheme mobilisation	Subject to procurement, statutory permissions.

***Conclusion***

17. There is an opportunity to identify and allocate additional forward funding in major Thames Valley Berkshire infrastructure or regeneration schemes. This is a welcome future-proofing exercise.

## APPENDIX 1 – PRIORITISATION METHODOLOGY

1. The following methodology is substantially the same as that used in Growth Deal 1, 2, 3 (2016), 3 (2018), BRRP1 and BRRP2 bidding rounds.
2. First bids are checked for compliance with the overall eligibility criteria for the funding round. Schemes with missing, incomplete, inadequate or late pro-forma information may not be considered. All schemes declared eligible are then scored and allocated a priority ranking on the long list, or pipeline, of schemes. All qualifying schemes are scored and placed in order in the pipeline.
3. As and when funds become available, schemes are proposed for programme entry status following the “cab-rank” principle. Before being granted programme entry status, each scheme is assessed against its place in the prioritised list, available funds and its readiness to proceed to financial approval.
4. On each factor, a scheme will be awarded high (3 marks), medium (2 marks) or low (1 mark), see appendix 3 for the details of how marks are allocated. On each factor, each scheme is bound to score at least one mark, and will be given the highest mark that is supported by the information in the pro-forma. So, if a scheme submission matches both the examples for a medium and a high judgement, it will be judged high.
5. These raw scores are then weighted to reflect the relative importance of the six factors as follows:

<b>Factor</b>	<b>Weighting</b>
Infrastructure Projects will contribute to the delivery of the Thames Valley Berkshire SEP*	15%
Deliverability	20%
Long-term, sustainable economic growth	40%
Tangible benefit to the sub-region	15%
Investing in natural capital	5%
Maximising social value	5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>

\*The Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) will be augmented with the Local Industrial Strategy (LIS) in due course

6. The calculation will be performed according to the following table:

Factor	Raw Scores			Weighting	Weighted scores		
	High	Med	Low		High	Med	Low
Contribute to the implementation of the Thames Valley Berkshire SEP	3	2	1	x 1.5	4.5	3.0	1.5
Deliverability	3	2	1	x 2.0	6.0	4.0	2.0
Long-term, sustainable economic growth	3	2	1	x 4.0	12.0	8.0	4.0
Tangible benefit to the sub-region	3	2	1	x 1.5	4.5	3.0	1.5
Investing in natural capital	3	2	1	x 0.5	1.5	1.0	0.5
Maximising social value	3	2	1	x 0.5	1.5	1.0	0.5
<b>Total</b>				<b>Max =</b>	<b>30.0</b>	<b>Min=</b>	<b>10.0</b>

7. The range of possible scores will be 30 (all high scores) - 10 (all low scores). A ranking putting all the submitted schemes in order will be produced.
8. The schemes are first scored by staff from the LEP, and then moderated with the scheme promoter. Once all the scores are moderated and agreed, the draft prioritised list is published for further checking before being recommended to BLTB for approval.
9. As agreed at the July 2019 BLTB meeting, and following on from the concerns about deliverability, the independent assessor suggested adding an extra stage of assurance and checking at the point where a scheme is converting from next in line in the priority list to programme entry status.

Schemes seeking programme entry status from BLTB will therefore need to meet three conditions:

- a) To have the highest priority in the long-list of pipeline schemes
- b) There being sufficient available uncommitted funds in the relevant funding programme
- c) To have submitted a Full Business Case development programme to the satisfaction of the LEP's Independent Assessor

The Full Business Case development programme will include, amongst other things:

- a) a timetable for producing an Appraisal Specification and Option Assessment Reports as well as the five cases of the Full Business Case
- b) a statement of what modelling tools are available
- c) a commitment to delivering sufficient design work and operational planning prior to FBC submission



## APPENDIX 2 - THE SCORING METHODOLOGY FOR THE SIX FACTORS

1. Infrastructure Projects will contribute to the implementation of the Thames Valley Berkshire SEP or emerging Local Industrial Strategy

		Examples of Descriptors	Scoring Guide
Contribute to the implementation of the Thames Valley Berkshire SEP	High 3 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Housing SDL cannot proceed without this Distributor Road; investment in this scheme will unlock £££'s of private investment</li> <li>This scheme is identified as part of Core Policy XX Town Centre Regeneration in the Council's adopted Core Strategies Document</li> <li>The development of MRT on this corridor is key to increasing the capacity of the network to deliver the journeys that will support the growing economy</li> </ul>	<p>A high score will be awarded to proposals for direct investment which:</p> <p>Support one or more of the objectives<sup>1</sup> in the SEP, in particular (see page 30):</p> <p>3 Labour Supply: Address congestion; Bring forward planned housing</p> <p>6 Functioning Towns: Infrastructure within towns; Infrastructure between towns; Town centre investment</p> <p><b>AND/OR</b></p> <p>Are directly linked to the following connectivity issues named in the SEP Implementation Plan<sup>2</sup> section on Infrastructure (page 9):</p> <p>Packages 1, 2 and 3: further phases or extensions of projects funded in Growth Deal 1, 2 and 3</p> <p>Package 5: MRT schemes</p> <p>Package 6: Access to London Heathrow; Access to London via motorway and rail; Electrification beyond Newbury; Rail links to London Gatwick; Third Thames Crossing near Reading</p> <p><b>AND/OR</b></p> <p>Promote local sustainable transport networks (see Strategy p 17)</p>
	Medium 2 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This infrastructure will help unlock a housing scheme of [less than 100] units</li> <li>This scheme will support the regeneration of the industrial estate, and contribute to the retention of x,000 jobs in the borough</li> </ul>	<p>A medium score will be awarded to proposals for other investments which support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Education Estate</li> <li>Employment Sites</li> <li>Utilities</li> <li>Local housing sites</li> </ul>
	Low 1 mark		<p>A low score will be awarded to all other proposals</p>

<sup>1</sup> The objectives of the SEP are (see page 30 of <http://www.thamesvalleyberkshire.co.uk/getfile/Public%20Documents/Strategic%20Economic%20Plan/TVB%20SEP%20-%20Strategy.pdf?inline-view=true>)

### PEOPLE

1. Use better those who are already in the workforce
2. Inspire the next generation and build aspirations and ambition
3. Ensure that economic potential is not restricted by labour supply issues

### IDEAS

4. Ensure that knowledge is effectively commercialised and grown within Thames Valley Berkshire
5. Strengthen networks and invest in the 'soft wiring' to use ideas better
6. Make Thames Valley Berkshire's towns genuine hubs in the ideas economy

<sup>2</sup><http://www.thamesvalleyberkshire.co.uk/getfile/Public%20Documents/Strategic%20Economic%20Plan/TVB%20SEP%20-%20Implementation%20Plan.pdf?inline-view=true>

## 2. Deliverability

2		Examples of Descriptors	Scoring Guide
Deliverability	High 3 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outline Planning permission and/or positive planning history</li> <li>• Partnership finance clearly identified</li> <li>• Preliminary Benefit cost ratio (BCR) calculated as positive</li> </ul>	<p>A high score will be awarded to capital proposals which have a strong prospect of a start on site in the relevant period for this call for bids. This will be awarded if there is a positive assessment of all of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Land assembly, ownership or control</li> <li>b) Planning permission</li> <li>c) Optimism bias in preliminary value for money calculations</li> </ul> <p><b>AND</b> (where relevant) a positive assessment of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>d) Partnership arrangements across boundaries or agencies</li> </ul>
	Medium 2 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Features in published Local Plan</li> <li>• Finance subject to further discussion</li> <li>• No preliminary BCR calculation, but comparable schemes have recently been positively assessed</li> </ul>	<p>A medium score will be awarded to proposals which have a reasonable prospect of a start on site the relevant period for this call for bids. This will be awarded if there is a positive assessment of two of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Land assembly, ownership or control</li> <li>b) Planning permission</li> <li>c) Optimism bias in preliminary value for money calculations</li> </ul> <p><b>AND</b> (where relevant) a positive assessment of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>d) Partnership arrangements across boundaries or agencies where relevant</li> </ul>
	Low 1 mark		<p>A low score will be awarded to all other proposals</p>

### 3. Long term sustainable economic growth

		Examples of Descriptors	Scoring Guide
Long-term, sustainable economic growth	High 3 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This scheme will also support development which will add 39,322 sq m of retail space and bring 400 jobs to the area</li> <li>The scheme will facilitate development of 25,000m2 of retail space 60,000m2 of office space and 800 new dwellings.</li> <li>85,800sqm of employment development.</li> <li>SDL incorporates up to 15,000sqm of employment.</li> </ul>	A high score will be awarded to a proposal which can quantify (in terms of commercial or retail floor space, jobs or houses) a major regeneration, large new development or other substantial impact on the economy which is directly linked to the transport scheme
	Medium 2 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enabling commercial and residential development</li> <li>Enabling redevelopment for housing of frontage properties currently blighted.</li> <li>Enhancing the attractiveness of town centre and associated major redevelopment sites</li> <li>Supporting Town Centre Regeneration</li> </ul>	<p>A medium score will be awarded to a proposal which can quantify (in terms of commercial or retail floor space, jobs or houses)</p> <p><b>EITHER</b></p> <p>a minor regeneration, small new development or other minor impact on the economy which is directly linked to the scheme;</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>a major regeneration, large new development or other substantial impact on the economy which is indirectly linked to the scheme</p>
	Low 1 mark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GVA to be investigated</li> <li>Improving journey times and reliability</li> <li>Customers and suppliers will also benefit from better access, improved journey times, and lower vehicle operating costs</li> <li>Reducing congestion on a key highway corridor</li> </ul>	A low score will be awarded to all other proposals.

#### 4. Tangible benefit to the sub-region

		Examples of Descriptors	Scoring Guide
Tangible benefit to the sub-region	High 3 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The scheme will support x,000 jobs, which will provide employment for people from across the TVB area</li> <li>The planned catchment for the new retail units is a 25-mile radius</li> <li>The proposed route runs through three boroughs</li> </ul>	A high score will be awarded to proposals which have significant impact well beyond a local area
	Medium 2 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>X,000 sq m of refurbished employment space will allow the borough to be more competitive in retaining jobs</li> </ul>	A medium score will be awarded to proposals which have a major impact, but only in a local area
	Low 1 mark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The primary school will support the development of 100 houses in the neighbourhood</li> </ul>	A low score will be awarded to all other proposals

## 5. Investing in Natural Capital

		Examples of Descriptors	Scoring Guide
Investing in Natural Capital	High – 3 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No adverse noise, biodiversity, heritage or water environment impacts and enhancement of landscape features</li> <li>The proposal includes the decontamination of xx hectares of former industrial land</li> <li>The proposal includes on site generation of electricity from renewable sources</li> </ul>	<p>A high score will be awarded to proposals which</p> <p><b>EITHER</b></p> <p>can quantify a positive impact</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>can demonstrate that mitigating measures will significantly reduce any negative impacts on one or more of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>greenhouse gas emissions;</li> <li>air quality;</li> <li>noise disturbance;</li> <li>natural environment, heritage and landscape; and</li> <li>streetscape and urban environment.</li> </ul>
	Medium – 2 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>minor benefits in terms of air quality / carbon emissions compared to the 'do nothing' situation</li> <li>Reducing slow moving/ queuing traffic would contribute to reduction in NO2 emissions in AQMA</li> </ul>	<p>A medium score will be awarded to proposals which</p> <p><b>EITHER</b></p> <p>make un-quantified positive claims about impact on the above environmental factors</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>can demonstrate that mitigating measures will reduce negative impacts</p>
	Low – 1 mark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Carbon emissions will be reduced through a more direct route for freight vehicles</li> <li>Decrease in the number of people affected by noise and improvements in local air quality</li> <li>Positive impact on carbon emissions.</li> <li>Promoting public transport over private car use</li> </ul>	<p>A low score will be awarded to all other proposals</p>

## 6. Maximise Social Value

		Examples of Descriptors	Scoring Guide
Maximise social value	High – 3 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This stretch of road, including the junction, is responsible for an annual 40 slight injury accidents (approx 5% of the Borough’s overall figure) and a further 8 KSI accidents in the last three years. The scheme is designed to reduce both these figures by half in three years following completion.</li> <li>This scheme will create xx apprenticeships in association with the local college</li> </ul>	<p>A high score will be awarded to proposals which can</p> <p><b>EITHER</b> quantify a positive impact on,</p> <p><b>OR</b> can demonstrate that mitigating measures will significantly reduce any negative impacts in relation to one or more of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>personal affordability;</li> <li>physical activity;</li> <li>road accidents;</li> <li>crime and security;</li> <li>access to a range of goods and services; and</li> <li>community severance</li> </ul> <p><b>OR</b> can open up apprenticeships or new jobs associated with the proposal to local unemployed and long-term unemployed people</p>
	Medium – 2 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Positive impact for the communities affected by rat-running</li> <li>Facilitates residential development including new primary school and extra care home facility</li> <li>Reduced risk of accidents as result of better management of traffic and better provision for road crossings.</li> <li>It is likely that the scheme would lead to impacts that would require full SDI appraisal.</li> </ul>	<p>A medium score will be awarded to proposals which</p> <p><b>EITHER</b> make un-quantified positive claims about impact in relation to the above social/distributional issues</p> <p><b>OR</b> can demonstrate that mitigating measures that will reduce but do not eliminate negative social/distributional impacts</p>
	Low – 1 mark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allowing opportunities to develop local walking and cycling improvements</li> <li>Improved journey times to and from London</li> <li>There are no significant impacts.</li> <li>It is unlikely that the scheme would lead to any impacts that would require full SDI appraisal. The expected impacts are likely to be both marginal in extent and dispersed among people groups or spatially.</li> </ul>	<p>A low score will be awarded to all other proposals</p>

## APPENDIX 3 - PRO-FORMA BID

*{Town – Scheme Name}*

### Summary and overview

#### **Scheme name:**

*{Town – Scheme Name}*

#### **Scheme promoter:**

*{...} Council / other*

#### **Contact details: (name, email, telephone numbers)**

*{...}*

#### **Brief description of the scheme and the main activities within it:**

*{please use 25 words or fewer: this summary will be used in schedules and other covering reports. Words over the limit will be deleted}*

#### **Location of the scheme:**

Local Authority: *{...}* Council

Parliamentary Constituency: *{this is important for briefing the MP – and embarrassing if not accurate}*

Postcode: *{as accurate as you can please, for plotting on a map}*

### Rationale for the scheme and strategic fit

**{not used}**

#### **How will the scheme contribute to the delivery of Thames Valley Berkshire's Strategic Economic Plan (SEP)?**

*{Please reference the SEP, which is available at <http://www.thamesvalleyberkshire.co.uk/documents?folder=192&view=files>}*

*{Information supplied here will be scored against 1. Infrastructure Projects will contribute to the delivery of the Thames Valley Berkshire SEP}*

#### **What is the rationale for the scheme?**

*{Please describe the overall case for developing this scheme}*

#### **What barriers to growth will it address? What is the evidence?**

*{Please quantify where possible}*

*{Information supplied here will be part of the information used to score against 3. Long-term, sustainable economic growth}*

**What other options have been considered?**

*{Please describe any other solutions considered but not pursued}*

*{Information supplied here will be part of the information used to score against 2. Deliverability – a WebTAG compliant Full Business Case requires an Option Appraisal Report}*

**What would be the consequences of a “do nothing” option?**

*{Please describe}*

**Which partner organisations are involved in, and committed to, the scheme?**

*{Please list your partners and distinguish between essential partners (eg Network Rail); funders; supporters; etc}*

*{Information supplied here will be part of the information used to score against 2. Deliverability – cross boundary or cross agency partnership arrangements should be underpinned with some evidence of their commitment}*

**Value for money**

**What outputs will the scheme deliver?**

*{Information supplied here will be part of the information used to score against 2. Deliverability – a WebTAG compliant Full Business Case requires an Economic Case}*



<b>Outputs</b>		<b>2019/ 20</b>	<b>2020/ 21</b>	<b>2021/ 22</b>	<b>2022/ 23</b>	<b>2023/ 24</b>	<b>Later</b>	<b>Total</b>
Houses (units)	LGF/Growth Deal							
	Other public sector (specify which)							
	Private sector							
	Total							
Jobs	LGF/Growth Deal							
	Other public sector (specify which)							
	Private sector							
	Total							
Employment floorspace (sq m)	LGF/Growth Deal							
	Other public sector (specify which)							
	Private sector							
	Total							
Businesses created	LGF/Growth Deal							
	Other public sector (specify which)							
	Private sector							
	Total							
Business assists	LGF/Growth Deal							
	Other public sector (specify which)							
	Private sector							
	Total							
Other (specify)	LGF/Growth Deal							
	Other public sector (specify which)							
	Private sector							
	Total							

**How have these outputs been estimated?**

*{Please describe the evidence or source of your calculations}*

*{Information supplied here will be part of the information used to score against 2. Deliverability – a WebTAG compliant Full Business Case requires an Economic Case}*

**What wider outcomes will be achieved in TVB? Please quantify these if possible.**

*{Please say what other benefits, if any the scheme will deliver, and how far afield those benefits will be felt}*

*{Information supplied here will be part of the information used to score against 4. Tangible benefit to the sub-region}*

**To what extent are these outputs (and downstream outcomes/impacts) likely to be additional? What is the basis for this assessment?**

*{additional to background economic growth that is likely to occur without this project}*

**What is the nature of the resourcing package that is proposed (e.g. balance between private sector investment, loans and grants, etc.)?**

*{Information supplied here will be part of the information used to make sure that the bid meets the terms of the call for bids – eg minimum and maximum scheme value; matching funds contribution}*

**What is the funding package through which the scheme will be delivered?**

Source	Year	2019/20	2020/21	Later years	Total
Business rates retention pilot					
Growth Deal or other Government Grant	Capital				
	Revenue				
Other public sector	<i>Please specify</i>				
CIL/s.106					
Private sector	<i>Please specify</i>				
Total					

## Deliverability and risks

### How secure are the funding contributions from your own organisation and elsewhere?

*{Information supplied here will be part of the information used to score against 2. Deliverability – cross boundary or cross agency partnership arrangements should be underpinned with some evidence of their commitment}*

### What are the key scheme milestones?

*{Please include planning permission; preparation of full business case; procurement; start on site; completion of construction; other key project milestones, including if these have already been achieved}*

*{Information supplied here will be part of the information used to score against 2. Deliverability – Land assembly, ownership or control and planning permission}*

### What are the proposed arrangements for project management?

*{please say}*

*{Information supplied here will be part of the information used to score against 2. Deliverability – cross boundary or cross agency partnership arrangements should be underpinned with some evidence of their commitment}*

### What are the principal risks linked to the scheme's delivery, and what actions will be (or have been) taken to mitigate and manage these?

<b>Risk</b>	<b>Likelihood (H / M / L)</b>	<b>Severity (H / M / L)</b>	<b>Mitigating actions</b>

*{Information supplied here will be part of the information used to score against 2. Deliverability}*

**What assessment has been made of the value for money of this scheme?**

*{if any}*

*{Information supplied here will be part of the information used to score against 2. Deliverability – optimism bias in preliminary value for money calculations}*

**How will this scheme contribute to the natural capital of Thames Valley Berkshire?**

*{please say}*

*{Information supplied here will be scored against 5. Investing in Natural Capital: one or more of greenhouse gas emissions; air quality; noise disturbance; natural environment, heritage and landscape; and streetscape and urban environment}*

**How will this scheme maximise social value for Thames Valley Berkshire? In responding to this question, please say how this scheme will support apprenticeships.**

*{Information supplied here will be scored against 6. Maximise social value: one or more of personal affordability; physical activity; road accidents; crime and security; access to a range of goods and services; and community severance OR can open up apprenticeships or new jobs associated with the proposal to local unemployed and long-term unemployed people}*

*{TVB LEP supports the recommendations in the Transport Infrastructure Skills Strategy*

*[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/49590/0/transport-infrastructure-strategy-building-sustainable-skills.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/49590/0/transport-infrastructure-strategy-building-sustainable-skills.pdf) which was published in January 2016. We draw your attention to the recommendations made in “Transport infrastructure skills strategy: one year on” July 2017) <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/transport-infrastructure-skills-strategy-one-year-on>}*

**List of supporting information and evidence**