

## BERKSHIRE LOCAL TRANSPORT BODY (BLTB)

REPORT TO: BLTB

DATE: 4 June 2020

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

### Item 5: Financial Approval 2.37 Bracknell: A322/ A329 Corridor Improvements – re-profiled

#### ***Purpose of Report***

1. To consider giving financial approval to the re-profiled scheme 2.37 Bracknell: A322/A329 Corridor Improvements. This amended scheme focuses on the Bracknell Sports Centre Roundabout which forms part of an on-going wider programme of enhancements to the A322/A329 corridor that aligns well with the strategic priorities of the sub-region. In addition, it addresses localised issues of congestion at the junction.

#### ***Recommendation***

2. You are recommended to give the re-profiled scheme 2.37 Bracknell: A322/A329 Corridor Improvements full financial approval in the sum of £400,000 in 2020/21 on the terms of the funding agreement set out at paragraph 11 step 5 below.

#### ***Other Implications***

##### *Financial*

3. In January 2019, programme entry status was awarded to scheme 2.37 Bracknell A322/A329 Corridor Improvements and allocated £1,200,000. A further £800,000 was allocated at the [July 2019](#)<sup>i</sup> BLTB meeting, bringing the total funds allocated to the scheme to £2,000,000.
4. Notification was provided at the March 2020 BLTB meeting that scheme 2.39 Wokingham Coppid Beech Northbound On-Slip Widening was being withdrawn. Due to the linked nature of schemes 2.39 and 2.37, Bracknell Forest Council decided to reduce the scope of scheme 2.37 Bracknell A322/A329 Corridor Improvements. This reconfigured scheme is now requesting £400,000 of its original allocation of £2,000,000 to deliver part of the scheme.
5. The funding agreement set out at paragraph 11 step 5 sets out the roles and responsibilities, reporting and auditing arrangements, timing and triggers for payments, contributions from other funders, consequences of delay, consequences of failure, claw back, and evaluation requirements at one and five years on.

##### *Risk Management*

6. The risk management arrangements already put in place by the Local Transport Body are as follows:
- The [Assurance Framework](#)<sup>ii</sup> has been drafted following DfT guidance and has been approved by the DfT for use in allocating capital funds for transport schemes
  - Hatch Regeneris have been appointed as Independent Assessors and have provided a full written report (see Appendix 1) on the full business case for the scheme
  - The funding agreement set out at paragraph 11, step 5 makes clear that the financial risk associated with implementation of the scheme rests with the scheme promoter.

### Human Rights Act and Other Legal Implications

7. The scheme promoter is a local authority and they have to act within the law. Slough Borough Council will provide legal support for the BLTB, should any questions arise.

### **Supporting Information**

8. The scheme will be carried out for Bracknell Forest Council.
9. The full details of the scheme are available from the [Bracknell Forest website](#)<sup>iii</sup>. A summary of the key points is given below:

Task	Timescale
Procurement	Via the Council's Term Contractor
Contractor appointed	As above
Construction	January 2021
Completion	March 2021

Activity	Funder	Cost (approx)
Scheme development	Bracknell Forest Council	£117,658
Major scheme funding	Berkshire Local Transport Body	£400,000
<b>Total</b>		<b>£517,658</b>

10. The table below sets out the details of this scheme's compliance with steps 1-5 of paragraph 14 of [Assurance Framework](#)<sup>iv</sup>.

Assurance Framework Check list	2.37 Bracknell A322/A329 Corridor Improvements – re-profiled			
	The SEP assessment process was used and the original scheme was given 23.5 points and ranked 6th of 17 schemes submitted.			
	Factor	Raw score	Weighting	Weighted score
	Strategy	3	1.5	4.5
	Deliverability	3	2.0	6.0
	Economic Impact	2	4.0	8.0

<b>Assurance Framework Check list</b>	<b>2.37 Bracknell A322/A329 Corridor Improvements – re-profiled</b>			
	TVB area coverage	2	1.5	3.0
	Environment	1	0.5	0.5
	Social	3	0.5	1.5
	Total			23.5
<p>Step 2: Programme Entry: evolution of the scheme from outline proposal to full business case, external view on the business case, and independent assessment (See paragraphs 15 and 16)</p>	<p>Programme Entry status was given by the BLTB on <a href="#">31 January 2019<sup>v</sup></a></p> <p>The <a href="#">Bracknell Forest website<sup>vi</sup></a> holds the latest details of the full business case, including the VfM statement certified by the senior responsible officer.</p> <p>Any comments or observations on the scheme received by either TVB LEP or Bracknell Forest Borough Council have been fully considered during the development of the scheme.</p> <p>The report of the Independent Assessor is attached at Appendix 1. The Independent Assessor was asked to report as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Completeness – has the promoter prepared a complete Full Business Case submission, when judged against the prevailing advice from the DfT</li> <li>• Accuracy – has the promoter performed the relevant calculations and assessments accurately and without error</li> <li>• Relevance – has the Full Business Case considered all relevant matters, including use of appropriate forecasting models and planning assumptions, and has it included any irrelevant considerations such unduly-optimistic assumptions or out of date modelling data</li> <li>• Value for Money – does the scheme promoter’s Value for Money assessment comply with the prevailing DfT guidance</li> <li>• Evaluation arrangements – has the scheme promoter made provision for appropriate post-implementation evaluation of the scheme.</li> <li>• Remedies – where the independent assessment reveals a gap between the FBC supplied and the standard anticipated by the DfT guidance, then the advice for the LTB should include recommendations for remedial actions required – e.g., collection of further data, sensitivity tests on particular assumptions etc.</li> </ul>			
Step 3: Conditional Approval	The Independent Assessor has recommended that in this case Full Financial Approval is appropriate.			
<p>Step 4: Recommendation of Financial Approval</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- High Value for Money</li> <li>- Support of the Independent assessor</li> </ul>	<p>The Independent Assessor for the LEP, Hatch Regeneris, has reviewed this revised business case and has recommended that the Sports Gyrotory roundabout scheme is still approved as a standalone scheme, and still represents “High Value” with a BCR of 3.34:1</p> <p>DfT has set thresholds of 2.00 (High VfM) and 4.00 (Very High VfM) and schemes with BCRs above these thresholds can be described as having High or Very High Value for Money.</p>			
<p>Step 5: Formal Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- roles</li> <li>- responsibilities</li> </ul>	The capital grant of £400,000 is a maximum figure which cannot be increased but may be reduced if savings are achieved during implementation. In the event that Bracknell Forest Council wishes to alter the profile of the grant payments, it must seek prior written			

Assurance Framework Check list	2.37 Bracknell A322/A329 Corridor Improvements – re-profiled
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- implementation</li> <li>- reporting</li> <li>- auditing</li> <li>- timing and triggers for payments,</li> <li>- contributions from other funders,</li> <li>- consequences of delay,</li> <li>- consequences of failure,</li> <li>- claw back,</li> <li>- evaluation one and five years on</li> </ul>	<p>permission from TVB LEP, having first raised the matter with the BLTB. The grant is made subject to the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>Roles</u>: TVB LEP is a part funder of the scheme. Bracknell Forest Council is the scheme promoter and is the relevant highway and planning authority.</li> <li>2. <u>Responsibilities</u>: TVB LEP is responsible for allocating the capital finance in accordance with its Assurance Framework. Bracknell Forest Council is responsible for all aspects of the design, risk management, insurance, procurement, construction and implementation of the scheme, including its responsibilities as highway and planning authority, any other statutory duties, and any financial or other liabilities arising from the scheme.</li> <li>3. <u>Implementation</u>: In addition to any reporting requirements within Bracknell Forest Council, the scheme promoter will use the proforma supplied by TVB LEP to make reports on progress of the implementation of the capital scheme to each meeting of the BLTB until the build is complete. In particular, Bracknell Forest Council will report on any further change in the size, scope or specification of the scheme; and on any substantial savings against the scheme budget whether achieved by such changes to the size, scope or specification of the scheme, or through procurement, or through the efficient implementation of the scheme.</li> <li>4. <u>Reporting</u>: The scheme promoter must provide accurate, timely, verified and quality assured quarterly monitoring and forecast data, which relate to defined output and outcome indicators agreed between TVB LEP and government as a condition of the Growth Deal. This scheme will not be required to participate in an evaluation as set out in the Growth Deal Monitoring and Evaluation Plan.</li> <li>5. <u>Auditing</u>: Bracknell Forest Council will keep financial records such that the expenditure on the scheme is readily identifiable, and if and when BEIS, DfT or other government department or the Accountable Body for TVB LEP requests access to financial or other records for the purposes of an audit of the accounts, Bracknell Forest Council will co-operate fully.</li> <li>6. <u>Timing and Triggers for payments</u>: See the Claim Proforma at Appendix 1 of the Capital Grant Letter – available on request.</li> <li>7. <u>Contributions from Other Funders</u>: Bracknell Forest Council capital programme will contribute £117,658 in 2020/10. This includes developers contributions of £59,000. In the event that the scheme experiences or it is anticipated that the scheme will experience a shortfall in these contributions, Bracknell Forest Council will be required to notify TVB LEP of these developments. The provisions of clauses 8, Consequences of Delay; 9, Consequences of Change to the Design or Specification of the Scheme; or 10, Consequences of</li> </ol>

Assurance Framework Check list	2.37 Bracknell A322/A329 Corridor Improvements – re-profiled
	<p>Failure will then be applied.</p> <p>8. <u>Consequences of Delay</u>: In the event that the scheme experiences minor delays to its overall Business Case programme (no more than 10 weeks), Bracknell Forest Council will report these delays and the reasons for them, and the proposed remedial action to the next available meeting of the BLTB. In the event that the scheme experiences major delays to its overall Business Case programme (11 weeks or longer) Bracknell Forest Council will be required to seek permission from TVB LEP to reschedule any payments that are due, or may be delayed in falling due because of the delay to the overall Business Case programme.</p> <p>9. <u>Consequences of Change to the Design or Specification of the Scheme</u>: In the event that Bracknell Forest Council wishes to change the design or specification of the scheme such the scheme delivered will vary in any material aspect from the description given in the overall business case, Bracknell Forest Council will be required to seek prior written consent from TVB LEP. Failing this permission, no further monies will be paid to Bracknell Forest Council after the change becomes apparent to TVB LEP. In addition, consideration will be given to recovering any monies paid to Bracknell Forest Council in respect of this scheme.</p> <p>10. <u>Consequences of Failure</u>: As soon as it becomes apparent to Bracknell Forest Council that it will not be possible to deliver the scheme within the current LGF programme, i.e. by the end of 2020/21, written notice shall be given to the Accountable Body for TVB LEP. No further monies will be paid to Bracknell Forest Council after this point. In addition, consideration will be given to recovering any monies paid to Bracknell Forest Council in respect of this scheme.</p> <p>11. <u>Claw back</u>: If the overall scheme achieves savings against budget, these savings will be shared by TVB LEP and the other funders noted above in proportion to the amounts set out in the Financial Profile. The Accountable Body for TVB LEP reserves the right to claw back any amounts of grant that have been spent on purposes other than the scheme as approved and any repayments due as a consequence of changes to the design or specification of the scheme or scheme failure.</p> <p>12. <u>Evaluation One and Five Years On</u>: Bracknell Forest Council will produce scheme evaluations One and Five years after practical completion that comply with DfT guidance.</p> <p><u>Other Conditions of Local Growth Funds</u>: Bracknell Forest Council will acknowledge the financial contribution made to this scheme through Local Growth Funds and follow the “<a href="#">Growth Deal Identity Guidelines</a>”<sup>vii</sup> It will also give due regard to the <a href="#">Public Services (Social Value) Act</a><sup>viii</sup>, particularly through the employment of apprentices across the scheme</p>

<b>Assurance Framework Check list</b>	<b>2.37 Bracknell A322/A329 Corridor Improvements – re-profiled</b>
	supply chain.

**Conclusion**

11. It is the conclusion of the Independent Assessor that, whilst the Sports Centre Roundabout scheme offers reduced strategic impact, it still aligns with overall strategic policy, delivers high value for money, is deliverable, and is relatively low risk. The overall value for money for the scheme is high, and on this basis, the scheme is recommended approval.

## **Appendix 1**

**Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership**

**Independent Assessment Summary Addendum Report:**

**A322/A329 Corridor Improvements – re-profiled**

**Scheme Ref: 2.37**

**March 2020**

**[www.hatchregeneris.co.uk](http://www.hatchregeneris.co.uk)**

## **Addendum Review**

### **Introduction**

- i. This technical note provides an addendum to the independent assessment of the A322/A329 Corridor Improvements Scheme Business Case submission to the Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership (TVB LEP) that was submitted in November 2019.
- ii. When Bracknell Forest Council (BFC) originally submitted its bid for the A329-A322 improvements, they envisaged that it would complement a scheme proposed by Wokingham Borough Council at the Coppid Beech to deliver up-slips heading westbound on the A329. Since November 2019, it has emerged that the Coppid Beech scheme will no longer be progressed.
- iii. Further analysis from BFC has concluded that proceeding with work at the Vigar Way junction without the Coppid Beech scheme will create additional congestion. As a result, BFC have now formally sought to remove the Vigar Way element of the A322/A329 Corridor Improvements Scheme and continue only with the Sports Centre Roundabout (SCR) element.
- iv. This addendum reviews the case for investing in the Sports Centre Roundabout scheme element to confirm that it represents high value for money and meets TVB LEP requirements.

### **Submitted Information**

- v. The independent assessment process for the A322/A329 Corridor Improvements submission has been conducted on the following set of documentation submitted by BFC:
  - Appraisal Specification Report (3rd September 2019)
  - Full Business Case Report (21st October 2019)
  - Business Case Addendum Report – Sports Centre Roundabout (24th March 2020)
- vi. The addendum report provides a separate assessment of the merits of the SCR scheme as a standalone scheme but should be read in conjunction with the main A322/A329 Corridor Improvement Full Business Case.

### **Scheme Summary**

- vii. The business case addendum submission sets out the case for investment in improvements at the SCGR along the A322 and A329 corridor.
- viii. The SCR scheme improvements will:



- Provide additional internal stacking space for east/west and west/east movements;
  - Significantly reduce the level of blocking in the north/south and south/north directions of travel; and
  - Provide additional capacity for traffic heading into the Crown Wood and Hanworth areas of Bracknell along Opladen Way and Harmanwater Road.
- ix. The scheme cost is estimated to be £517,658, with £400,000 sought from the Local Growth Fund (LGF).

## **Addendum Review Findings**

### **Strategic Case**

- x. The Addendum reiterates the importance of the A322/A329 corridor and BFC strategy of targeted improvements to manage the growth in traffic and increasing congestion and delays. The SCR scheme forms part of this wider package of improvement measures to maintain the efficiency and reliability of the corridor.

### **Independent Assessor Comment**

- xi. Whilst the SCR scheme represents relatively minor improvement works, and so has limited strategic importance of itself, its geographic location at the heart of the A322/A329 corridor means that it offers greater strategic importance in parallel with the other improvement works that have been undertaken along the corridor.

### **Economic Case**

- xii. The economic case has focussed upon assessing the reduction in journey times generated from the scheme and the economic value associated with these benefits to business, commuters and other road users.
- xiii. The previous combined A322/A329 scheme was forecast to generate 'very high' value for money, with a benefit to cost ratio of 5.18 to 1. For the SCR scheme alone, the present value of benefits is estimated at around £1,500,000 and present value of costs at £448,763, generating a benefit to cost ratio of 3.34 to 1.

### **Independent Assessor Comment**

- xiv. Whilst the benefit to cost ratio for the SCR scheme is lower than the previous combined scheme, it still represent 'high' value for money from investment.

### **Financial Case**

- xv. The scheme costs for the SCR project remain at £517,658, as detailed within the main FBC document, and incorporate an allowance for contingency and risk.

- xvi. The funding sources for the scheme will be £400,000 from LGF funding, and a local contribution from BFC of £118,000, which includes developer contributions of £59,000.

### **Independent Assessor Comment**

- xvii. The overall financial case for the SCR scheme element is considered to remain robust, with a suitable allowance for risk.

### **Delivery and Risk**

- xviii. Whilst not yet scheduled in detail, it is planned that the project will begin shortly after Christmas 2020 and is anticipated to take no more than 8 weeks to complete.
- xix. Project risk will be managed as an on-going process as part of the scheme governance structure. It is anticipated that some utility diversions will be required as a consequence of the schemes. Whilst these could involve some engineering challenges, early contractor involvement is planned to mitigate against this risk, including trial holes at the commencement of the project along with early co-ordination with utility companies.

### **Independent Assessor Comment**

- xx. The SCR scheme is relatively straightforward to deliver in engineering terms and so the 8-week programme is considered realistic. Until trial holes have been completed, the risk of additional utilities work will remain, which could affect project costs and delivery; however, mitigation measures are in place to accommodate these potential outcomes.

### **Conclusions**

- xxi. The Strategic Case reiterates that the SCR scheme forms part of an on-going wider programme of enhancements to the A322/A329 corridor that aligns well with strategic priorities of the sub-region. The localised issues of congestion at the junction is identified within the main FBC report, albeit the potential impacts upon strategic movements along the corridor is absent due to limitations in the analysis tools available.
- xxii. The Sports Centre Gyrotory scheme element is relatively small in nature but is forecast to deliver positive impacts, with a 'high' value for money rating.
- xxiii. The Financial Case is considered sound, with sufficient information presented and clear allowances for inflation, risk and contingency.
- xxiv. The Commercial and Management Cases have not been directly referenced within the Addendum Report but remain valid from the main FBC. The update on the delivery plan and risks provide assurance that there is a clear management process for the delivery of the project.
- xxv. It is our conclusion that, whilst the Sports Centre Roundabout scheme offers reduced strategic impact, it still aligns with overall strategic policy, delivers high value for money, is deliverable, and is relatively low risk.

## **Recommendations**

- xxvi. We continue to recommend the Sports Gyratory Roundabout scheme for approval as a stand-alone scheme.

## Appendix 2

### **A322 / A329 Corridor Improvements**

#### **Addendum Report – Sports Centre Roundabout**



## **1. Introduction**

- 1.1 This addendum report has been prepared following required modifications to the previously submitted A329 / A322 Corridor Improvements scheme that included improvements to Vigar Way Roundabout and Sports Centre Roundabout.
- 1.2 The following sections of this addendum report outline the justification for the improvements to Sports Centre Roundabout by presenting key points supported by evidence referred to from the original Business Case.
- 1.3 Section two to this report outlines the revised scope of works associated with the project and the required modifications to the overall project, whilst section three outlines the strategic impact of the revised proposals.
- 1.4 The Economic and Financial cases are detailed in sections four and five respectively and section six summarises the delivery and risk elements of the project.
- 1.5 Finally, section seven provides a summary of this short report.

## **2. Scope of Works**

- 2.1 When Bracknell Forest Council (BFC) originally submitted its bid for the A329-A322 improvements, BFC were in discussion with Wokingham Borough Council (WBC) about a joint bid which included their improvements to the Coppid Beech up slips onto the westbound A329.
- 2.2 These schemes were linked in terms of their interaction with each other, i.e. the Vigar Way junction improvement would benefit from the A329 up-slip improvement without which congestion will continue on the westbound A329.
- 2.3 WBC have now paused work on their project, since the up-slip improvement design solution requires a more strategic approach involving possible changes to M4 junction 10 which continues to be the root cause of the issues on the A329.
- 2.4 Until this collective approach is clarified the improvements to Vigar Way cannot be implemented as strategic modelling of the junction without the other A329 improvements illustrates a worsening situation for congestion and journey times.
- 2.5 This modelled delay appeared to be attributable to the knock-back effect of slow moving A329 traffic. In short, if progressed alone the Vigar Way junction would become locked and create more problems than currently exist at the site.

- 2.6 It is proposed to remove the Vigar Way element from the bid, however BFC still propose to progress with the Sports Centre Roundabout element of the bid.
- 2.7 Within the Sports Centre Roundabout improvements, BFC still propose to provide additional internal stacking space for east/west and west/east movements whilst significantly reducing the level of blocking in the north/south and south/north directions of travel.
- 2.8 This proposed improvement will also provide additional capacity for traffic heading from the roundabout into the Crown Wood and Hanworth areas of Bracknell along Opladen Way and Harmanswater Road.
- 2.9 It is important that these works are still carried out as they represent good value for money on this key corridor as outlined in the Business Case, with the reduction in congestion and delay along with enhancing safety at this busy junction.

### **3. Strategic Impacts**

- 3.1 The proposed improvement is part of a corridor-wide improvement plan over a period to deliver incremental improvement to journey times without needing heavy investment on major infrastructure projects to achieve similar or desired outcome.
- 3.2 If the proposed improvement is not implemented, the long-term benefits to be delivered from a number of schemes would be in jeopardy as an individual scheme would fail to deliver the expected contributions to the overall outcome. Therefore, the growth in traffic will further exacerbate traffic condition and resulting in a deterioration of the performance of the A322 and A329.
- 3.3 This in turn would prompt Planning Authority to refuse permission for major developments which could have adverse impact on the local economy.
- 3.4 For the A322/A329 corridor BFC had examined various schemes including major infrastructure over the years. Whilst these schemes had the potential to relieve congestion and improve journey time reliability, delivery of these were reliant on substantial investment over and above what the Council could afford to invest.
- 3.5 Some developer improvements have been received and are provided in the financial case. Also, the return was not commensurate with the investment. Hence the Council explored approaches to other practical low-cost solution.
- 3.6 As a result, BFC came up with a corridor wide improvement plan over a period that required continuous investment that the Council could raise the necessary finances for. This involves improvements at identified sites and making greater use of urban traffic control.

- 3.7 It is this approach that the Council has adopted to deliver improvements that provide much better value for money and the Sports Centre junction improvements remain an important part of the package of measures along this key corridor.

## **4. Economic Case**

- 4.1 As part of the business case, a Benefit to Cost Ratio of 5.18:1 was established for the combined schemes. The methodology for establishing the Present Value of Benefits and Present Value of Costs is detailed in section 4 of the Business Case.
- 4.2 For the purposes of this addendum report, the Present Value of Costs and Present Value of benefits were extracted from the Business Case for the Sports Centre element of the project.
- 4.3 As noted in the Business Case Table 4.17, the Sports Centre Roundabout generates a Present Value of Benefits of £1,500,000.
- 4.4 The present Value of Costs for the Sports Centre Roundabout detailed in Table 4.22 of the Business case was shown as £448,763.
- 4.5 This results in a Benefit to Cost Ratio for the Sport Centre improvements of 3.34:1 which is considered High.

## **5. Financial Case**

- 5.1 The scheme costs for the Sports Centre Roundabout improvements remain at £517,658 and detailed in Paragraph 5.2.1 of the Business Case and broken down further in Table 5.2 of the Business Case.
- 5.2 This value does not include optimism bias in accordance with HM Treasury guidance document "Early financial cost estimates of infrastructure programmes and projects and the treatment of uncertainty and risk- March 2015".
- 5.3 This cost is based on a contribution of £400,000 of LGF funding and includes a local contribution from Bracknell Forest Council of £118,000. This local contribution will include developer funding of £59,000.

## 6. Delivery and Risk

- 6.1 It is envisaged that the project will begin shortly after Christmas 2020 and is anticipated to take no more than 8 weeks to complete.
- 6.2 Project risk will be managed as an on-going process as part of the scheme governance structure. A scheme risk register is maintained and updated at each of the two-weekly Steering Group meetings. Responsibility for the risk register being maintained is held by BFC's Senior Responsible Officer and is reported as part of the monthly Progress Reports.
- 6.3 Any high residual impact risks are then identified on the highlight report for discussion at the Steering Group meeting. Required mitigation measures are discussed and agreed at the meeting and actioned by BFC's Project Manager, as appropriate.
- 6.4 It is anticipated that some utility diversions will be required as a consequence of the schemes. These diversions could involve some engineering challenges; however, early contractor involvement will mitigate against any potential utility or construction risks. Trial holes will be undertaken to establish the location of apparatus in key areas to ensure an accurate assessment of impacts and costs can be made at the very start of the project.
- 6.5 Investigation by trial holes will be undertaken at the commencement of the project along with early co-ordination with utility companies identified through the completed C3 process to minimise risk during the construction programme.
- 6.6 The sum defined within the business case of £53,626 for risk and contingencies is still considered to be appropriate for these improvements as a standalone project.

## 7. Summary

- 7.1 Following additional strategic modelling on the Vigar Way element of the A322/A329 Corridor study, along with the cancellation of additional interlinked projects along the A329M corridor, it was noted that the Vigar Way element would not work in isolation so the decision has been taken to remove this element of the bid.
- 7.2 BFC are still keen to undertake the Sports Centre Roundabout element of the bid, since this still represents good value for money on a key corridor as a result of the improvements to queuing and delay along with enhancements of the safe operation of the roundabout by introducing additional stacking space on the circulatory and reducing the number of conflict points.
- 7.3 The Sports Centre element of the bid is calculated to deliver a Benefit to Cost Ratio of 3.34:1 which is considered to be High.



- 7.4 The scheme cost is £517,658, which is comprised of £400,000 LGF contribution along with a local contribution from BFC of £118,000. This local contribution will include developer funding of £59,000.
- 7.5 It is envisaged that the project will begin shortly after Christmas 2020 and is anticipated to take no more than 8 weeks to complete.

---

<sup>i</sup> <http://www.slough.gov.uk/moderngov/documents/g6330/Printed%20minutes%2018th-Jul-2019%2016.00%20Berkshire%20Local%20Transport%20Body.pdf?T=1>

<sup>ii</sup> <http://www.thamesvalleyberkshire.co.uk/berkshire-strategic-transport-forum>

<sup>iii</sup> <https://www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/roads-parking-and-transport/roads/strategic-economic-plan/background>

<sup>iv</sup> <http://www.thamesvalleyberkshire.co.uk/berkshire-strategic-transport-forum>

<sup>v</sup> <http://www.slough.gov.uk/moderngov/documents/s54539/Report%20and%20Appendices.pdf>

<sup>vi</sup> <https://www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/roads-parking-and-transport/roads/strategic-economic-plan/background>

<sup>vii</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/regional-growth-fund-identity-guidelines>

<sup>viii</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/social-value-act-information-and-resources/social-value-act-information-and-resources>