

Date of issue: Wednesday, 23 January 2019

MEETING	BERKSHIRE LOCAL TRANSPORT BODY	
	Member	Authority
	Councillor Bicknell	The Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead
	Councillor Brunel-Walker	Bracknell Forest Council
	Councillor Carter	Slough Borough Council
	Councillor Clifford	West Berkshire Council
	Councillor Jorgensen	Wokingham Borough Council
	Councillor Page (Chair)	Reading Borough Council
	Stuart Atkinson	Thames Valley Berkshire LEP
	Charles Eales (Vice-Chair)	Thames Valley Berkshire LEP
	Malcolm Kempton	Thames Valley Berkshire LEP
	Bob Mountain	Thames Valley Berkshire LEP
	Simon Ratcliffe	Thames Valley Berkshire LEP
	Matthew Taylor	Thames Valley Berkshire LEP
DATE AND TIME:	THURSDAY, 31ST JANUARY, 2019 AT 4.00 PM	
VENUE:	THE CURVE - WILLIAM STREET, SLOUGH, BERKSHIRE, SL1 1XY	
DEMOCRATIC SERVICES OFFICER: (for all enquiries)	NICHOLAS PONTONE	01753 875120

NOTICE OF MEETING

You are requested to attend the above Meeting at the time and date indicated to deal with the business set out in the following agenda.



JOSIE WRAGG
Chief Executive

AGENDA

PART 1



<u>AGENDA ITEM</u>	<u>REPORT TITLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>	<u>WARD</u>
	Apologies for absence.		
1.	BLTB Membership		-
	<i>To welcome Bob Mountain to BLTB following his recent appointment by Thames Valley Berkshire LEP.</i>		
2.	Declarations of Interest		-
	<i>It is a principle of the BLTB that the interests of the Thames Valley Berkshire area will take precedence over a member's own interests or those of their nominating authority.</i>		
	<i>All members must declare, and take relevant action, if they believe they have a pecuniary or other interest on a matter to be considered at the meeting in accordance with the Code of Conduct of the nominating authority or LEP. The Chair will invite any member representing a local authority seeking financial approval for a scheme to declare that interest.</i>		
3.	Briefing Note - TVB LEP/BLTB 'How We Work' - To Note		1 - 2
4.	Revised Local Growth Fund Programme 2015/16 to 2020/21		3 - 10
5.	Business Rates Retention Pilot Year 2 - Approvals		11 - 16
6.	TfSE - Proposal to Seek Statutory Status - Informal Engagement Process		17 - 44
7.	Financial Approval for 2.32 Maidenhead: Housing Sites Enabling Works Phase 1		45 - 72
8.	Financial Approval for 2.34 Slough MRT Phase 2		73 - 100
9.	Business Rates Retention Pilot - Revenue Support		101 - 106
10.	Date of Next Meeting - 14th March 2019		-

Press and Public

You are welcome to attend this meeting which is open to the press and public, as an observer. You will however be asked to leave before the Committee considers any items in the Part II agenda. Please contact the Democratic Services Officer shown above for further details.

The Council allows the filming, recording and photographing at its meetings that are open to the public. By entering the meeting room and using the public seating area, you are consenting to being filmed and to the possible use of those images and sound recordings. Anyone proposing to film, record or take photographs of a meeting is requested to advise the Democratic Services Officer before the start of the meeting. Filming or recording must be overt and persons filming should not move around the meeting room whilst filming nor should they obstruct proceedings or the public from viewing the meeting. The use of flash photography, additional lighting or any non hand held devices, including tripods, will not be allowed unless this has been discussed with the Democratic Services Officer.

How we work

Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership (TVB LEP) and the Berkshire Local Transport Body (BLTB) – investing in local transport schemes

This briefing note is intended to set out the way TVB LEP works with BLTB to invest Local Growth Funds in transport schemes.

1. TVB LEP is a business-led organisation responsible for determining the key funding priorities to which Local Growth Funds (LGF) and other public resources are directed in order to implement a Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) and meet its commitments in the TVB Growth Deals. As a company limited by guarantee (registered at Companies House No. 07885051) it operates according to its Articles of Association, which comply with the Companies Act 2006. As a publicly-funded body it behaves in accordance with an Assurance Framework, which determines the practices and standards necessary to provide assurance to government and local partners that decisions over (all government) funding are proper, transparent and deliver value for money. **[LEP Assurance Framework (AF) January 2017]**
2. BLTB consists of six elected members (usually the lead member for transport or related portfolio), and six private sector representatives recruited and appointed by the LEP. **[LEP AF 1.11]**. It is a Joint Committee of the six unitary authorities in Berkshire and its constitution is set out in its [Founding Document](#).
3. TVB LEP recognises BLTB as “the competent body to a) prioritise and b) implement transport capital schemes on its behalf. In practice the LEP will accept any BLTB recommendations or refer them back but will not substitute its own recommendations.” **[LEP AF 1.12]**
4. The process established by government for making Growth Deals is to invite LEPs to submit competitive proposals, and after due consideration to make awards based on all or part of a LEP bid. To date TVB LEP has agreed three Growth Deals. Each of these has included, among other things, the award of capital funds for individual transport schemes that were prioritised in the TVB LEP bid and named in the Growth Deal settlement.
5. TVB LEP works with its partners to identify and prioritise suitable schemes. It is a lobbying organisation, and, via Growth Deals, a joint-funder of selected schemes promoted by (usually, but not always) a local transport authority. **[BLTB Founding Document (FD) 11-13]**
6. BLTB requires promoters to develop each scheme in accordance with current WebTAG guidance published by DfT. In order to receive financial approval from BLTB, the Full Business Case must be subject to independent assessment and a positive recommendation about value for money. **[BLTB FD 14-16]**
7. The scheme promoter is responsible for all aspects of the design, risk management, insurance, procurement, construction and implementation of the scheme, including their responsibilities as highway and planning authorities, any other statutory duties, and any financial or other liabilities arising from the scheme. **[BLTB FD 18]**
8. The time taken between an initial government call for bids and the final announcement of a new Growth Deal can be in excess of a year. TVB LEP (together with BLTB for transport schemes) must go through a number of steps to respond to a government call for bids. Similarly, a transport scheme promoter also must go through several steps:



• LEP receives a call from government or Growth Deal proposals

• LEP asks BLTB to issue a call for transport capital schemes, which meet the Growth Deal criteria

• BLTB consults on and publishes prioritisation methodology for assessing schemes

• Local Transport authorities and other promoters propose schemes for inclusion
 • BLTB applies the prioritisation methodology and recommends a priority order of schemes for inclusion in the overall LEP Growth Deal bid

• LEP submits Growth Deal bid including transport schemes

• Government announces Growth Deal approvals (if any) including named schemes and provisional financial allocation

• BLTB awards schemes named in the new Growth Deal “programme entry” status. This reserves the provisional financial allocation for each named scheme until the scheme promoter comes forward with a Full Business Case (FBC), which demonstrates at least “good value for money”

• The scheme promoter works up the detail of the scheme, including planning permission and any other regulatory approvals, design, costs, environmental and other impact assessments. The scheme FBC is then subject to independent scrutiny and a report is made to BLTB

BERKSHIRE LOCAL TRANSPORT BODY (BLTB)

REPORT TO: BLTB

DATE: 31 January 2019

CONTACT OFFICER: Joe Carter, Director of Regeneration, Lead Officer to the BLTB

PART I

Item 4: Revised Local Growth Fund Programme 2015/16 to 2020/21

Purpose of Report

1. To report on the delay to the progress of scheme 2.14 and 2.25 East Reading MRT Phases 1 and 2, and the subsequent confirmation from the scheme promoter that it cannot be delivered within the current Local Growth Fund (LGF) programme, i.e. by the end of 2020/21.
2. To propose the re-allocation of £19,067,000 LGF allocated to scheme 2.14 and 2.25 East Reading MRT Phases 1 and 2 - to seven schemes taken from the previously agreed prioritised list.

Recommendation

3. You are recommended to delete scheme 2.14 and 2.25 East Reading MRT Phases 1 and 2 from the LGF programme following notification from Reading Borough Council that it cannot now be progressed before March 2021.
4. You are recommended to grant programme entry status to the following schemes (agreed at the meeting of the BLTB in July 2018):
 - a. 2.35 Reading: Reading West Station Upgrade
 - b. 2.36 Wokingham: Coppid Beech Park and Ride
 - c. 2.37 Bracknell: A322 A329 Corridor Improvements
 - d. 2.38 Theale: Theale Station Park and Rail Upgrade
 - e. 2.39 Wokingham: Coppid Beech northbound on-slip widening
 - f. 2.40 Windsor: Town Centre Package
5. You are recommended to defer consideration of programme entry status for scheme 2.41 Slough: SMaRT Phase 3 A4 West Park and Ride until the meeting of the BLTB in March.

Other Implications

Financial

6. The LGF programme covers six financial years, 2015-16 to 2020-21, and the expectation is that the funds allocated to Thames Valley Berkshire LEP will be spent in that period, or failing that, fully committed to schemes that have started

on site by March 2021 and have a “tail” of funding carried over into financial year 2021-22.

7. Reading Borough Council (RBC), in accordance with the conditions of the capital grant, have notified the LEP that they cannot now achieve a start on site for the East Reading (ER) MRT scheme. There is therefore, £19,067,000 of LGF available for reallocation. This report recommends that seven new schemes from the previously agreed list be considered for programme entry status.
8. The amount available for reallocation is £20,233,000, comprising £1,166,000 as yet unallocated (at November 2018) and £19,067,000 from the ER MRT scheme. The total of the seven schemes considered for programme entry status is £18,744,931.

Table 1: Reallocation amounts

	Unallocated amount as at November 2018	1,166,000	
Add:	2.14 and 2.25 East Reading MRT phases 1 and 2	19,067,000	
			20,233,000
Less:	2.35 Reading: Reading West Station Upgrade	3,100,000	
	2.36 Wokingham: Coppid Beech Park and Ride	2,400,000	
	2.37 Bracknell: A322 A329 Corridor Improvements	1,200,000	
	2.38 Theale: Theale Station Park and Rail Upgrade	4,000,000	
	2.39 Wokingham: Coppid Beech northbound on-slip widening	2,322,431	
	2.40 Windsor: Town Centre Package	1,562,500	
		14,584,931	
		Available	5,648,069
Less:			
if agreed	2.41 Slough: SMaRT Phase 3 A4 West Park and Ride	4,160,000	
		Available	1,488,069

9. Although the vast majority of LGF is ringfenced for strategic transport schemes there remains the possibility that the LEP will bring forward skills capital projects for consideration, if these offer VfM, make more of a strategic impact and can be delivered swiftly. This will be confirmed before the BLTB meeting in March.
10. If no new schemes are given programme entry status and the £20,233,000 remained uncommitted at March 2021, it would have to be returned to the government unspent.

Risk Management

11. There remains a risk that the new schemes identified in this report will be unable to mobilise quickly enough to achieve the necessary start on site by March 2021; in that event any LGF not committed would be liable for return the government unspent.
12. This risk has been anticipated and the pipeline of prioritised schemes agreed to allow for rapid deployment.

Human Rights Act and Other Legal Implications

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

Supporting Information

14. East Reading MRT Phases 1 and 2 is a proposed public transport, walking and cycling link between central Reading town centre and the proposed Thames Valley Park and Ride site to the east of the Reading urban area, running parallel to the Great Western Mainline. The scheme includes a new structure across Kennetmouth, which requires planning permission from both RBC (the western section) and Wokingham Borough Council (WBC) (the eastern section).
15. Phase 1 was given programme entry status in July 2013, and Phase 2 in March 2017. The scheme was a named scheme in the March 2014 Strategic Economic Plan and supported by government in Growth Deal 1 (Phase 1) and Growth Deal 3 (Phase 2).
16. The full business case was approved by the BLTB in November 2017, and on 12 January 2018, the LEP issued a capital grant letter to RBC for £19,067,000.
17. On 30 May 2018, the scheme was granted planning consent by RBC but on 25 June 2018, Wokingham Borough Council (WBC) refused planning consent.
18. This was reported to the BLTB in November 2018, and that meeting supported RBC's intention to amend the planning application and resubmit to WBC. The meeting also rehearsed the scenario whereby the scheme was refused planning consent again.
19. On 12 December 2018, WBC refused a second planning application for the scheme; RBC has subsequently written to the LEP confirming that it cannot now meet the deadline of March 2021 for achieving a start on site.
20. The BLTB's Assurance Framework states at paragraph 15.4.d [that]

"... after considering routine progress reports BLTB may [...] delete the scheme from the Programme"

and at paragraph 19 that

"... the capital grant letter, will cover timing and triggers for payments, any conditions about contributions from other funders, the consequences of scheme delay or failure to meet conditions, and formal audit and clawback provisions."

Precedent

21. At the BLTB meeting on 16 November 2018, LGF monies were re-allocated from the Maidenhead Station project when the total allocated could not be spent by RBWM:

“...it was agreed that the prioritisation methodology was robust and remained the most appropriate way to allocate the funding in this instance given the limited sum for allocation and the availability of a strong scheme. Members asked whether the Business Case for the next scheme on the list, Wokingham, Winnersh Parkway, was ready and it was responded that it would be prepared once it was given programme entry status. The LTB voted in favour of Option A – Award Programme Entry Status to the next Scheme of the 2016 Prioritised List (Wokingham, Winnersh Parkway), with the exception of Councillor Bicknell who voted against”.

Pipeline of prioritised schemes

22. At your meeting in July 2018, a list of 16 potential LGF schemes was considered and prioritised. They are listed at Appendix 1. See Appendix 2 for short summaries of each scheme and hyperlinks to detailed scheme proformas.
23. The first three on the list were awarded programme entry status at that meeting.
24. The scheme promoters of the next seven schemes in the prioritised list have been consulted about their readiness to proceed, and the following schemes have all indicated that they are in a position to achieve a start on site by March 2021:
- a. 2.35 Reading: Reading West Station Upgrade
 - b. 2.36 Wokingham: Coppid Beech Park and Ride
 - c. 2.37 Bracknell: A322 A329 Corridor Improvements
 - d. 2.38 Theale: Theale Station Park and Rail Upgrade
 - e. 2.39 Wokingham: Coppid Beech northbound on-slip widening
 - f. 2.40 Windsor: Town Centre Package
25. The seventh scheme, 2.41 Slough: SMaRT Phase 3 A4 West Park and Ride, which requires the co-operation of colleagues from South Bucks District Council and Buckinghamshire County Council, is not yet in a position to respond and has requested further time to liaise with partners.

Overall priorities for the LEP LGF programme

26. By March 2019 it is likely that skills capital projects will be competing for LGF. As noted in the financial implications section above, there will be at least £1.48m unallocated in March and possibly more if Slough SMaRT Phase 3 is not ready to proceed.
27. A further report will be made to the March meeting.

Conclusion

28. The delay to the East Reading MRT scheme is an opportunity to bring forward at least six smaller schemes from the prioritised list.

Supporting Information

29. Correspondence between RBC and LEP and the proforma for each of the schemes on the prioritised list is available on the TVB LEP website.

APPENDIX 1 – Local Growth Deal list of prioritised schemes agreed in July 2018

	Weighting Factor	1.5	2	4	1.5	0.5	0.5			GD3	
	Factor	SEP	Deliverable	Econ Impact	TVB area	Natural Capital	Social Value	Total Score	Rank	£m Bid for	Cumulative
2.31	Slough: Stoke Road Area Regeneration	4.5	6	12	3	1	1.5	28	1=	7,650,000	Programme entry July 18
2.32	Maidenhead: Housing Sites Enabling Works	4.5	6	12	3	1	1.5	28	1=	4,660,000	Programme entry July 18
2.33	GWR: Maidenhead to Marlow Branch Line Upgrade	4.5	6	8	4.5	1	1.5	25.5	3	1,525,000	Programme entry July 18
2.35	Reading: Reading West Station Upgrade	4.5	6	8	3	1	1.5	24	4=	3,100,000	3,100,000
2.36	Wokingham: Coppid Beech Park and Ride	4.5	6	8	3	1.5	1	24	4=	2,400,000	5,500,000
2.37	Bracknell: A322 A329 Corridor Improvements	4.5	6	8	3	0.5	1.5	23.5	6=	1,200,000	6,700,000
2.38	Theale: Theale Station Park and Rail Upgrade	4.5	6	8	3	1	1	23.5	6=	4,000,000	10,700,000
2.39	Wokingham: Coppid Beech northbound on-slip widening	4.5	6	8	3	0.5	1	23	8	2,322,431	13,022,431
2.40	Windsor: Town Centre Package	4.5	4	8	3	1	1	21.5	9	1,562,500	14,584,931
2.41	<i>Slough: SMaRT Phase 3 A4 West Park and Ride</i>	4.5	2	8	3	0.5	0.5	18.5	10	4,160,000	18,744,931
	Wokingham: Barkham Bridge	3	4	8	1.5	0.5	1	18	11	4,235,641	
	Slough: A355 Route Enhancement Phase 2	4.5	2	8	1.5	0.5	0.5	17	12	3,600,000	
	Slough: Town Centre to M4 Junction 6 Link	3	2	8	1.5	0.5	1	16	13	9,600,000	
	Wokingham: Tan House Crossing	4.5	2	4	1.5	1	1	14	14	1,200,000	
	Slough: Chalvey Regeneration	3	2	4	3	0.5	0.5	13	15	28,000,000	
	Wokingham: California Crossroads	1.5	4	4	1.5	0.5	1	12.5	16	3,581,129	

Appendix 2

Rank	Bidder	Short Title	Short Description	Notes	Amount Sought
1=	Slough	Slough Stoke Road Area Regeneration	Sustainable transport infrastructure and highway works to support regeneration of six major brownfield sites at Stoke Road and improved interchange and parking at Slough station.	Programme Entry July 2018	7,650,000
1=	Windsor and Maidenhead	Maidenhead Housing Sites Enabling Works Phases 1 and 2	Junction improvements and new highway infrastructure required to deliver major housing developments and town centre regeneration in Maidenhead. Phase 1 £5.825m; phase 2 £21.300m.	Programme Entry July 2018	4,660,000
3	GWR	GWR Maidenhead to Marlow Branch Line Upgrade	Infrastructure works to allow two direct trains per hour between Marlow and Maidenhead and improvements to intermediate stations See note at paragraph 15 below	Programme Entry July 2018	1,525,000
4=	Reading	Reading West Station Upgrade	Delivering improved passenger experience and multi-modal interchange through a new station building, highway changes and improvements to platform facilities and the Tilehurst Road entrance.	Recommended for programme entry	3,100,000
4=	Wokingham	Wokingham Coppid Beech Park and Ride	Coppid Beech Park and Ride will improve access to Wokingham and Bracknell Town centres, railway stations and employment sites by tackling congestion in east Wokingham.	Recommended for programme entry	2,400,000
6=	Bracknell Forest	Bracknell A322 A329 Corridor Improvements	Capacity improvements to two key junctions along the A329/A322 corridor building on schemes delivered through the Local Growth, Pinch Point and National Productivity Investment Funds.	Recommended for programme entry	1,200,000
6=	West Berkshire	Theale Station Park and Rail Upgrade	Station enhancements at Theale to improve sustainable transport interchange, increase Park and Rail capacity and enhance customer facilities.	Recommended for programme entry	4,000,000
8	Wokingham	Wokingham Coppid Beech northbound on-slip widening	Widening of the northbound on-slip at the Coppid Beech (A329(M)/London Road) Junction.	Recommended for programme entry	2,322,431
9	Windsor and Maidenhead	Windsor Town Centre Package	Measures to improve pedestrian priority and streetscape around the castle and eastern gateway, purchase of vehicles for a demand-responsive bus service, and car park expansion.	Recommended for programme entry	1,562,500
10	Slough	Slough SMaRT Phase 3 A4 West Park and Ride	Park and ride to serve Slough, Maidenhead and Windsor town centres with bus priorities on the A4 to link with SMaRT Phase 1 infrastructure.	Recommended for further consideration	4,160,000
11	Wokingham	Wokingham Barkham Bridge	A new bridge next to the existing Barkham Bridge (located between Barkham Street and Langley Common Road) to facilitate 2-way traffic through the existing bottleneck.		4,235,641
12	Slough	Slough A355 Route Enhancement Phase 2	Extending the existing A355 Route Enhancement to address congestion north of the Three Tuns A4/A355 intersection with carriageway widening, bus priorities and a new footbridge.		3,600,000
13	Slough	Slough Town Centre to M4 Junction 6 Link	Link between A332 and A355 to provide a direct route from Slough town centre to M4 Junction 6 avoiding A4 Bath Road and Tuns Lane.		9,600,000
14	Wokingham	Wokingham Tan House Crossing	A new Disability Discrimination Act compliant crossing of the railway where an at-grade crossing was previously provided. A temporary footbridge is currently provided but is not "step free".		1,200,000
15	Slough	Slough Chalvey Regeneration	Conversion of heavy rail to bus-based mass rapid transit, new roads, pedestrian and cycling infrastructure, flood alleviation and waste heat recovery to support regeneration.		28,000,000
16	Wokingham	Wokingham California Crossroads	A public realm project that will deliver an enhanced user experience for residents, shoppers, patrons and all who travel through California Crossroads.		3,581,129

This page is intentionally left blank

BERKSHIRE LOCAL TRANSPORT BODY (BLTB)

REPORT TO: BLTB

DATE: 31 January 2019

CONTACT OFFICER: Joe Carter, Director of Regeneration, Lead Officer to the BLTB

PART I

Item 5: Business Rates Retention Pilot Year 2 - Approvals

Purpose of Report

1. Following the successful application for a second Berkshire-wide Business Rates Retention Pilot in 2019-20 (BRRP 2), and the agreement of priorities in November 2018, this report recommends an allocation of the BRRP 2 monies.
2. The Berkshire Treasurers' Group has calculated a planning figure of £11m for allocation in 2019-20.
3. The terms of the Pilot remain unchanged for year 2: they allow for the money to be allocated to major infrastructure projects which support housing development or major regeneration projects.

Recommendation

You are recommended to:

4. Confirm the following allocation of BRRP funds in 2019-20:
 - i. Slough MRT Phase 2 £3.058m (top up from BRRP1)
 - ii. Maidenhead Housing Sites Enabling Works Phase 1 £1.068m (20% own contribution from LGF)
 - iii. South Wokingham Distributor Road – Eastern Gateway £5.000m
 - iv. Further revenue support for the development of infrastructure business cases, the balancing amount (£1.874m based on a £11m overall approval), subject to a detailed report to a future meeting of BLTB
5. Grant programme entry status to 2.42 Wokingham: South Wokingham Distributor Road – Eastern Gateway.
6. Correct Minute 7 of the BLTB meeting of 19th July 2018 in relation to Slough MRT Phase 2, by reiterating that in order to cap the level of BRRP commitment at £25m, the funding for the Slough MRT scheme was agreed to be reduced from £13.3m to £10.242m.

Implications

Financial

7. The lead authority for the Pilot and the process of operating the Business Rates element (agreeing baseline amounts, managing the pool of retained funds) is Bracknell Forest Council.
8. The lead authority for the control of funds allocated to infrastructure or regeneration projects is the Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead, the LEP's Accountable Body.
9. The Pilot has been approved for a second financial year (2019-20) and no change is proposed to administrative arrangements.
10. The planning figure of £11m is based on current estimates of business rates collection in 2019-20. This figure may go up or down during the year but has a sufficient level of confidence to be used as the planning figure for this scheme.
11. An anomaly has been identified between the approved BLTB minutes of 19th July 2018 and the BRRP programme. The BRRP approval paper (item 7) that was considered in July, proposed awarding Slough MRT phase 2 the full amount requested of £13.3m, however this sum would have taken the total package above the ceiling of £25m. Several options were discussed in the meeting and it was agreed to reduce the initial sum allocated to the Slough MRT scheme.
12. The minute of the meeting at item 7 stated the following decision "To amend Option B by reducing the approval for Slough Mass Rapid Transit (SMaRT) Phase 2 from £13.3m to £8.3m in 2018/19 and 2019/20. The approval of the remaining £5m in 2020/21 to be subject to the successful renewal of the BRRP scheme beyond its first year...". However, this figure is not accurate, and it was commonly understood that the agreement was that: "...in order to cap the level of BRRP commitment at £25m, the funding for the Slough MRT scheme will be reduced from £13.3m to £10.242m". The sum of £10.242m has been included in all subsequent papers to BLTB, however, it is necessary to formally correct the record and members are therefore asked to confirm the amended decision for clarity.

Risk Management

13. The risks associated with large scale infrastructure investments are well known, and the BLTB has established risk management arrangements for the LGF programme (£111m over six years), referred to as the [Assurance Framework](#)¹.

¹<http://www.thamesvalleyberkshire.co.uk/berkshire-strategic-transport-forum>

14. As part of the LGF oversight, government officials have recently reviewed this Assurance Framework and found it fit for purpose.
15. The BRRP has identified the LEP and its associated processes as an appropriate framework for managing the sums available; in this instance this means the Berkshire Local Transport Body. The LEP Forum ratified this approach on 27 March. The detailed arrangements for allocating available resources were agreed at meetings of the BLTB on 15 March and 15 November 2018.
16. The implication is that promoters of infrastructure projects seeking funding from the Pilot (2) will need to follow the same Assurance Framework as for LGF. This means acceptance at “programme entry” stage, followed by submission and independent assessment of a WebTAG compliant Full Business Case (FBC) before being considered for financial approval.

Human Rights Act and Other Legal Implications

17. Slough Borough Council will provide legal support for the BLTB should any questions arise on the application of the Business Rates Retention Pilot.

Supporting Information

18. The Berkshire Treasurers’ Group has calculated a planning figure of £11m for BRRP 2.
19. The previously agreed terms of the BRRP allow for the money to be allocated to major infrastructure projects, which support housing development, major regeneration or digital infrastructure projects. No change is proposed for BRRP 2.
20. At the meeting on 15 November 2018 you agreed the following allocation of BRRP 2 funds and this was included in the application to MHCLG for BRRP status in 2019/20:

Table 1: Allocation of BRRP2 Funds

Rank	Scheme	£m	Cumulative
1	Top-up of Slough MRT Phase 2	3.058	3.058
2	Maidenhead Housing Sites Enabling Works Ph 1 (20% own funds contribution)	1.068	4.126
3=	East Reading MRT Phases 1 and 2 (20% own funds contribution) (subject to planning permission)	0	4.126
3=	South Wokingham Distributor Road – Eastern Gateway	5.000	9.126
4	Further revenue support for the future infrastructure business cases, the balancing amount	1.874	11.000
		11.000	

21. Two items should be noted: as reported elsewhere, the East Reading MRT scheme has been delayed and is no longer eligible for an allocation from BRRP

2; the initial planning figure for BRRP 2 was £10m, this has since been increased to £11m.

22. A further report will be brought to a future meeting of the BLTB recommending how to allocate the £1.874m identified for development of infrastructure business cases.

23. You are asked to note that in the BRRP:

- i. there is no requirement for matching funds;
- ii. all infrastructure schemes receiving “programme entry” status under the BRRP allocation will need an independently assessed FBC to achieve financial approval;
- iii. the following is our best estimate of the Year 2 timetable:

Timescale for scheme development / approval		
All dates 2019		
31 January	BLTB	Grant of programme entry status and additional funds
Feb-May	Scheme Development	Submission of WebTAG compliant Full Business Case for Independent Assessment
14 March	BLTB	Update on progress
26 March	LEP Forum	Update on progress
18 Jun	BSTOF	Consider draft papers for July BLTB, including the FBC draft assessments
18 Jul	BLTB	Update on progress, possible full business case submission
23 Jul	LEP Forum	Committed spend

24. See Appendix 1 for short summaries of each scheme, their current funding status and hyperlinks to detailed scheme proformas.

Conclusion

25. There is an opportunity to invest a further £11m in major infrastructure or regeneration schemes in 2019/20, in addition to the LGF capital programme. This is a welcome development.

Background Papers

26. The BRRP bid proforma are available on the LEP website. Correspondence between the Berkshire Treasurers’ Group and MHCLG concerning the BRRP 2 application and approval.

APPENDIX 1 – Updated BRRP list of prioritised schemes

Bidder	Short Title	Short Description	Notes	Funding Sought
Priority 1: MRT schemes - East				
Slough BC	Slough Mass Rapid Transit (SMaRT) Phase 2	Highway, bus and cycling infrastructure improvements, a park and ride and public realm enhancements on the A4 corridor between Langley and Heathrow.	Programme entry status July 2018. Part funded (£10.242m) from BRRP1	£3.058m
Priority 1: MRT schemes - West/Central				
Reading BC	South Reading MRT Phases 3 and 4	South Reading MRT is a segregated public transport scheme on the A33 corridor between Reading town centre and the Mere oak P&R site.	Scheme currently on site. Part funded (£7.808m) from BRRP1 and (£2.34m) from GD3	N/a
Priority 2a: Large Housing Sites – East				
RB Windsor and Maidenhead	Maidenhead Housing Sites Enabling Works Phases 1 and 2	Junction improvements and new highway infrastructure required to deliver major housing developments and town centre regeneration in Maidenhead. Phase 1 £5.825m; phase 2 £21.300m.	Programme entry status July 2018. Part funded (£4.66m) from re-prioritisation of GD3	£1.068m A further £21.3m is sought for Ph 2
Priority 2a: Large Housing sites - West				
Wokingham BC	Wokingham Winnersh Relief Road Phase 2	Phase 2 will connect the B3030 King Street Lane to the A329 Reading Road and complete the Winnersh Relief Road.	Phase 1 was funded (£6.5m) by developer contributions and recently opened to traffic. Phase 2 was funded in GD3 and is now funded (£6.26m) from BRRP1	N/a
Wokingham BC	South Wokingham Distributor Road – Eastern Gateway	This scheme will comprise a single carriageway distributor road connecting Montague Park with Waterloo Road, including a new road bridge over the Waterloo rail line.	This scheme is part of the Wokingham Distributor Roads Programme supported in GD1	£5.000m A further £10.96m from CIL/s.106
Wokingham BC	North Wokingham Distributor Road – West of Old Forest Road	Part of the NWDR, the scheme will comprise a single-carriageway distributor road section between the Old Forest Road/Toutley Road Junction and A329 Reading Road.	This scheme is part of the Wokingham Distributor Roads Programme supported in GD1	£5.000m A further £16.22m from CIL/s.106
Priority 2b Major Regeneration Projects and Priority 2c– Pan-Berkshire Digital Infrastructure – No bids received				

This page is intentionally left blank

BERKSHIRE LOCAL TRANSPORT BODY (BLTB)**REPORT TO:** BLTB**DATE:** 31 January 2019**CONTACT OFFICER:** Joe Carter, Director of Regeneration, Lead Officer to the BLTB**PART I****Item 6: TfSE – Proposal to Seek Statutory Status – Informal Engagement Process*****Purpose of Report***

- 1) On Monday 10 December 2018 the Transport for the South East Shadow Board (TfSE) approved a draft Proposal to Government for informal engagement (See Appendix 1). Staff from TfSE have separately approached each of the Berkshire Unitary Authorities and Thames Valley Local Enterprise Partnership to gather responses to the draft proposal.
- 2) The informal engagement period will close on 1 March 2019, and a final Proposal will be recommended to the Shadow Partnership Board meeting on 18 March 2019, which will be followed by a formal period of consultation which will run from 2 May to 31 July 2019.
- 3) Unfortunately, this timetable does not quite fit with your schedule of meetings. Therefore, the purpose of this report is to set out a process in which officers submit a response on behalf of BLTB by the deadline, and make it clear that the response which will be subject to your full consideration of the matter on 15 March 2019.

Recommendation

- 4) You are recommended to
 - i) note that the officers will prepare a response on behalf of BLTB which will be subject to your further consideration and response on 15 March 2019
 - ii) note that TfSE proposes to conduct formal consultation on its final proposal to government and that this will be the subject of a further report to your meeting on 18 July 2019

Other Implications***Financial***

- 5) TfSE collects an annual contribution from its constituent authorities. The current rate is £58,000 per county authority and £30,000 per unitary authority. The six Berkshire Unitary Authorities have previously chosen to act together and join TfSE via this joint committee (BLTB). Therefore, for the purposes of

subscriptions, BLTB has been treated as a county authority. Slough BC, acting as the lead authority for the joint committee has paid the subscription and collected a one-sixth share from each unitary (£9,667 each).

- 6) TfSE received a contribution towards the development of its Transport Strategy of £1m from the DfE.

Risk Management

- 7) There are no significant risks for BLTB.

Human Rights Act and Other Legal Implications

- 8) Slough Borough Council will provide legal support for the BLTB should any questions arise.

Supporting Information

- 9) The subject of the consultation is the exact terms of a Proposal to Government requesting statutory status for TfSE, which if approved by Parliament, will become a second sub-national transport body alongside Transport for the North, which was confirmed in April 2018. The draft proposal is set out in Appendix 1.
- 10) The statutory basis for sub-national transport bodies is set out in [Part 5A of the Local Transport Act 2008](#)¹, as amended by the Cities and Local Government Devolution Act 2016, which says that “the Secretary of State may by regulations establish a sub-national transport body for any area in England outside Greater London” (s102E(1)) and it goes on to set the conditions and limits for such arrangements.
- 11) The twin purposes of creating sub-national transport bodies are to facilitate the development of a transport strategy and so promote economic growth for the area.
- 12) The Act requires a new sub-national transport body to be promoted by its constituent authorities, to have the consent of its constituent authorities, and that the Proposal has been the subject of consultation within the area and with neighbouring authorities. TfSE are planning that the formal consultation running from 2 May – 31 July 2019 will be carried out in a way that meets this condition.
- 13) The Proposal must also set out the membership, voting powers, decision-making arrangements, functions and general powers.
- 14) The attached draft Proposal to government confirms that the 16 constituent authorities are proposed as: Bracknell Forest; Brighton and Hove; East Sussex; Hampshire; Isle of Wight; Kent; Medway; Portsmouth; Reading; Slough; Southampton; Surrey; West Berkshire; West Sussex; Windsor and

¹ <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2008/26/part/5A>

Maidenhead; and Wokingham. It also confirms that the six Berkshire Unitaries will act together via this joint committee, the Berkshire Local Transport Body.

- 15) The Proposal sets out arrangements for involving the five Local Enterprise Partnerships; two National Park Authorities, 44 Boroughs and Districts and the transport industry voice in governance
- 16) The Proposal identifies the powers TfSE wants to draw down from central government; it goes on to identify a number of powers it hopes to exercise concurrently with local authorities. The Proposal emphasises that it will only ever exercise these local powers with the consent of the local authority concerned.
- 17) In a separate exercise, TfSE is currently developing its Transport Strategy, and will also be subject to consultation with constituent authorities and other stakeholder partners.
- 18) For more information please visit www.transportforthesoutheast.org.uk
- 19) Members of BLTB will recall that Transport for the South East was debated on 16 March 2017 when you resolved to "...participate in the shadow arrangements for a sub-national transport body for the south east; and that Councillor Page represent BLTB at the shadow board meetings." (minute 22 refers).
- 20) Members will further recall that TfSE subscriptions and membership were debated and agreed on 16 November 2017 (minute 19 refers); and that on 19 July 2018 you authorised Joe Carter (Director of Regeneration Slough BC) to sign the collaboration agreement on your behalf (minute 15 refers).

Conclusion

- 21) The emergence of Transport for the South East as a potential sub-national transport body including the Berkshire area is to be welcomed.

Background Papers

- 22) Correspondence with TfSE



TRANSPORT FOR THE SOUTH EAST

Draft Proposal for Informal Engagement

December 2018

1. Executive Summary

- **Why TfSE needs Statutory Status** – the document needs to clearly set out the value the STB will add beyond a joint committee or collaboration. The impact of not having TfSE is that the current pressures on strategic transport infrastructure will continue to grow. Without TfSE there will not be a regional organisation to make the case for investment in infrastructure, leading to increased congestion, inability to consider multi-modal investments or cross boundary schemes that will benefit the end user.
 - Traction with Government and key stakeholders (Highways England & Network Rail) who will need to have 'due regard' to the Transport Strategy. TfSE will need to have statutory status if it is to take on specific legal power and responsibilities relating to the operation of the transport system in its area
 - Permanence – STB needs to be in place on permanent basis if it is to deliver on its strategy in the longer term. Achieving statutory status will enable TfSE to operate on a permanent basis and will provide a governance structure that matches the lifecycle of major infrastructure projects.
 - Facilitate the delivery of jobs, housing and growth – the Transport Strategy will identify the strategic transport priorities. Implementation of the schemes will connect economic centres and international Gateways. The region has a significant impact on GVA and this can be increased with investment in strategic infrastructure.
 - Geography of TfSE region – polycentric nature of the region means that strategic transport corridors cross local authority boundaries and can best be addressed by a body with the regional scale of TfSE.
- **Aims of the Transport Strategy:** Local Transport Authorities and Local Enterprise Partnerships across South East England, operating in partnership with TfSE, will develop a long term and ambitious Transport Strategy. The Strategy will identify the strategic transport priorities for the region and will develop an investment plan to support the delivery of the identified schemes.
- **Powers and Functions of TfSE:** The Executive Summary will set out the powers and functions which TfSE is seeking, including General Functions and more specific Transport Functions, such as influencing the development of rail franchise specifications and implementation of an integrated, smart ticketing scheme.

- **Timescale:** TfSE is aiming to secure statutory status in 2020. The draft Proposal will be subject to a public consultation from May 2019 to July 2019, prior to being submitted to Government in December 2019.
- **Stakeholder Engagement:** the draft Proposal has been developed in partnership with TfSE's members and stakeholders. The constituent authorities and Local Enterprise Partnerships have steered the development of the Proposal, with input from the various members of the Transport Forum. We will secure support from key businesses in the TfSE area prior to submission to Government and will engage with a range of partners during the public consultation exercise. Letters of support from key stakeholders and businesses will be attached to the Proposal.

2. Transport for the South East

2.1 Transport for the South East (TfSE) was established in shadow form in June 2017. It brings together 16 Local Transport Authorities, five Local Enterprise Partnerships and other key stakeholders, including environmental groups, transport operators, district and borough authorities and national agencies, to develop an ambitious Transport Strategy for the South East region.

2.2 TfSE will support the growth of the South East economy, ensuring the delivery of a high quality, sustainable and integrated transport system:

- that supports increased productivity to grow the South East and UK economy and compete in the global marketplace
- that works to improve safety, quality of life and access to opportunities for all
- that protects and enhances the South East's unique natural and historic environment

2.3 TfSE is in the process of developing its Transport Strategy, which will run until 2050 and it will be accompanied by a clear investment plan for strategic infrastructure schemes in the South East. It will identify how targeted investment in strategic infrastructure could enable the GVA of the South East to grow up to £500 billion by 2050, with almost 3 million additional jobs.

2.4 During its operation in Shadow form, TfSE has already added considerable value in bringing together key partners and stakeholders to influence Government thinking. To date TfSE has contributed to the Roads Investment Strategy 2 and Major Road Network consultation.

2.5 The TfSE area and its key issues:

- Overview of the TfSE area drawing on the analysis given in the Economic Connectivity Review, Strategic Economic Plans and emerging Local Industrial Strategies. Include a map of the key towns, gateways, transport corridors and key sectors.
- Overview of the economy
- Economic Outcomes of Transport
- Context the key issues which need addressing e.g. where high levels of usage of the transport system is blocking the full growth potential and where links need to be enhanced to access a wider range of opportunities.
- Highlight housing challenge, importance of international gateways, end user benefits and air quality. Need to highlight the importance of innovation and digital and the impact that it is likely to have on transport – links to Innovation South.

2.6 The scale of the challenge and why change is needed:

- Continuing underinvestment in the south east (IPPR research on investment per head outside of London)
- Underperformance of coastal strip
- Poor connectivity – particularly orbital routes
- Region is not reaching its full potential (Economic Connectivity Review data to support this)

3. The Ambition – this section will set out the vision for TfSE, highlight the economic characteristics of the area and the background to TfSE

The South East is crucial to the UK economy and is the nation's major international gateway for people and businesses.

We will grow the South East's economy by facilitating the development of a high quality, integrated transport system that makes the region more productive and competitive, improves access to opportunities for all and protects the environment.

3.1 The South East is a powerful regional economy contributing more than £200 billion to the UK economy each year. It is home to major international gateways, including Gatwick and Heathrow airports, as well as Dover, Southampton and Portsmouth ports. It has rail connections with the rest of the UK and into Europe, and a considerable road network, including key parts of the Strategic Road Network, proposed Major Road Network and a number of highly significant local roads.

3.2. Many international and national companies are based in the region, alongside a large number of thriving, innovative SMEs. *Key Sectors – include reference here.*

3.3 However, our infrastructure is operating beyond capacity and unable to sustain ongoing growth. Underinvestment in road and rail infrastructure is causing issues for our residents and businesses.

3.4 Proximity to London – and impacts, including travel to work patterns. The nature of the relationship with London means that there are good connections into London, but orbital routes have suffered from lack of investment.

3.5 Environment and protected landscapes – the South East is an area of unrivalled natural beauty. It is home to two National Parks, a number of Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and much of the region is allocated as Green Belt. TfSE will play a role in maintaining and protecting the landscape. Additionally, there are a number of areas with air quality issues. It will be important that TfSE is enabled to address these issues and improve air quality for our residents.

4. TfSE: Strategic and Economic Case

- **Background to STBs** – the Government introduced powers to establish Sub-national Transport Bodies through the Cities and Local Government Devolution Act 2016. The legislation sets out that STBs will have General Functions, including to develop a Transport Strategy and provide advice to the Secretary of State. Once statutory status has been secured the Government must have due regard to the Transport Strategy which means that they must actively consider and respond to TfSE proposals. As well as exerting strategic influence there is also the potential for the STB to propose specific transport functions, including the operation of smart ticketing schemes, highway improvement construction and maintenance and rail franchising.
- **Why do we need TfSE**
 - Why TfSE covers the geography designated
 - How TfSE will sustain and grow the South East’s contribution to the UK economy
 - How TfSE will help sustain growth in the regional economy
 - How TfSE will help facilitate strategic transport improvements
 - How TfSE will help improve social inclusion through improved access to jobs education and health facilities
- The value that could be added by establishing TfSE as a statutory STB:
 - **One voice for strategic transport in the South East** – Transport for the South East will offer an effective mechanism for Government to engage with local authorities and LEPs in the region. The collective strength of the partnership will offer a more effective way to develop clear priorities for investment and to influence critical spending decisions. This will provide traction with Government and key stakeholders (Highways England & Network Rail) who will need to have ‘due regard’ to the Transport Strategy.
 - **Local Democratic Accountability** – the Partnership Board will comprise elected representatives and business leaders who will have responsibility for the delivery of the Transport Strategy. TfSE offers a route to engage with other emerging STBs and Transport for London.
 - **Delivering benefits for the end user** – TfSE can support the delivery of region wide programmes that will offer considerable benefits to the end user. Integrated travel solutions, combined with smart ticketing will operate more effectively at a regional scale and can best be facilitated by a regional body, than by individual organisations.
 - **Facilitating economic growth** –The Transport Strategy will facilitate the delivery of jobs, housing and growth. Implementation of strategic, cross-boundary schemes, particularly investment in the orbital routes, will connect economic centres and international Gateways. The region has a significant impact on GVA and this can be increased with investment in strategic infrastructure.
 - **Access to International Gateways** – The Economic Connectivity Review highlighted the importance of key corridors connecting the international gateways in the South East to the rest of the UK. TfSE will work to ensure improved access to these gateways including first mile- last mile connectivity.
 - **Permanence** – securing statutory status offers TfSE the security to deliver the Transport Strategy to 2050. Achieving statutory status will enable TfSE to operate on

a permanent basis and will provide a governance structure that matches the lifecycle of major infrastructure projects.

- **Geography of TfSE region** – polycentric nature of the region means that strategic transport corridors cross local authority boundaries and can best be addressed by a body with the regional scale of TfSE. Improved orbital connections required to enhance regional cohesion and improve access to international gateways. This will support the national economy, given the importance of these gateways..

- **The strategic and economic case for each of the powers and responsibilities being sought**

The powers will be sought in a way which means they will operate concurrently and with the consent of the constituent authorities.

- **Strategic influence:** the benefits of being able to set a single vision for the longer term. Acting as a statutory consultee and influencing the development of national programmes, such as the Road Investment Strategy and Major Road Network. TfSE has already worked with Government on a number of proposals that will help to support economic growth in the region, including RIS2, influencing rail franchising discussions and providing collective views on schemes such as southern and western rail access to Heathrow.

- **Collective voice on strategic transport planning:** the benefits of a single voice and promoting cross regional transport priorities

- **Complement existing powers and responsibilities of LTAs**

- **Environmental enhancement and protection as a key part of scheme delivery.**

- **Delivering improvements in air quality and reductions in carbon dioxide emissions**

- **Lobbying for investment in transport projects**

- **Liaison with key stakeholders and delivery partners**

- **Taking forward joint issues**

- **Effective working with other organisations who operate at a similar level**

- **Possible development and sponsorship of transport initiatives such as integrated ticketing** – working to improve customer journeys and implement digital transport solutions.

- **Possible operation/delivery of transport initiatives at a regional scale where there is a clear business case for doing so.**

5. Constitutional Arrangements

Transport for the South East's ("TfSE") proposal to form a Sub-National Transport Body ("STB") builds on our track record to date and our objective to act as a strong voice for the whole of the South East. Our draft proposal sets out how TfSE would strengthen existing arrangements, ensuring we align with primary legislation. This proposal sets out a summary of our proposal which should be proportionate and effective to build on our current strength of business and civic leadership.

Requirements from Legislation

Name

5.1 The name of the STB would be 'Transport for the South East ("TfSE")' and the area would be the effective boundaries of our 'constituent members'. A map would be provided as part of any formal proposal.

Members

- 5.2 The membership of the STB is listed below:
- Bracknell Forest Borough Council
 - Brighton and Hove City Council
 - East Sussex County Council
 - Hampshire County Council
 - Isle of Wight Council
 - Kent County Council
 - Medway Council
 - Portsmouth City Council
 - Reading Borough Council
 - Slough Borough Council
 - Southampton City Council
 - Surrey County Council
 - West Berkshire Council
 - West Sussex County Council
 - The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Council
 - Wokingham Borough Council

Partnership Board

5.3 The current Partnership Board is the only place where all 'constituent members' are represented at an elected member level². Therefore this Board will need to have a more formal role, including in ratifying key decisions. This would effectively become the new 'Partnership Board' and meet at least twice per annum. The Partnership Board could agree through Standing Orders if it prefers to meet more regularly.

5.4 Each constituent authority will appoint one of their councillors / members or their elected mayor as a member of TfSE on the Partnership Board. Each constituent authority will also appoint another one of their councillors / members or their elected

² The six constituent members of the Berkshire Local Transport Body (BLTB) will have one representative between them on the Partnership Board.

Mayor as a substitute member (this includes directly elected Mayors as under the Local Government Act 2000). The person appointed would be that authority's elected mayor or leader, provided that, if responsibility for transport has been formally delegated to another member of the authority, that member may be appointed as the member of the Partnership Board, if so desired.

5.5 The Partnership Board may delegate the discharge of agreed functions to its officers or a committee of its members in accordance with a scheme of delegation or on an ad hoc basis. Further detail of officer groups and a list of delegations will be developed through a full Constitution.

Co-opted Members

5.6 TfSE propose that governance arrangements for a statutory STB should maintain the strong input from our business leadership, including LEPs and other business representatives. The regulations should provide for the appointment of persons who are not elected members of the constituent authorities to be co-opted members of the TfSE Partnership Board.

5.7 A number of potential co-opted members are also set out in the draft legal proposal. Co-opted members would not automatically have voting rights but the Partnership Board can resolve to grant voting rights to them on such issues as the Board considers appropriate.

Chair

5.8 The Partnership Board will agree to a chair and vice-chair of the Partnership Board.

The Partnership Board may also appoint a single or multiple Vice-Chairs from the constituent members. Where the Chair or Vice-Chair is the representative member from a Constituent Authority they will have a vote.

Proceedings

5.9 It is expected that the Partnership Board will continue to work by consensus but to have an agreed approach to voting where necessary.

5.10 Whilst there is a clear expectation that the Partnership Board would work by consensus, where consensus cannot be reached and for certain specific decisions an agreed mechanism is needed to ensure that decisions can be made.

5.11 A number of voting options were considered to find a preferred option that represents a straightforward mechanism, the characteristics of the partnership and which does not provide any single authority with an effective veto. We also considered how the voting metrics provide a balance between county and other authorities, urban and rural areas and is resilient to any future changes in local government structures.

5.12 The Steering group considered these options and preferred the population weighted option based on the population of the Constituent Authority with the smallest population, the Isle of Wight with 140k.

5.13 This option requires that the starting point for decisions will be consensus, and if that can't be achieved then decisions will require a simple majority of those Constituent Bodies who are present and voting. The decisions below will however require both a super-majority, consisting of three quarters of the weighted vote in favour of the decision, and a simple majority of the constituent authorities appointed present and attending at the meeting:

- (i) The approval and revision of Transport for the South East's ("TfSE") Transport Strategy;
- (ii) The approval of TfSE annual budget;
- (iii) Changes to the TfSE constitution.

The population weighted vote would provide a total of 54 weighted votes, with no single veto. A table showing the distribution of votes across the constituent authorities is set out in Appendix 1. This option reflects the particular circumstances of TfSE, being based on the population of the smallest individually represented constituent member who will have one vote, and only a marginally smaller proportionate vote. It is considered that this option is equitable to all constituent authority members, ensures that the aim of decision making consensus remains, and that smaller authorities have a meaningful voice, whilst recognising the size of the larger authorities in relation to certain critical issues.

5.14 The population basis for the weighted vote will be based on ONS statistics from 2016 and reviewed every 10 years.

5.15 The Partnership Board is expected to meet twice per year, where full attendance cannot be achieved, the Partnership Board will be quorate where 50% of Constituent Members are present.

Scrutiny Committee (To be confirmed – pending outcome of discussions with DfT)

5.16 TfSE will establish a scrutiny committee and each 'constituent authority' will be entitled to appoint a member to the committee and a 'substitute' nominee. Such appointees cannot be otherwise members of TfSE, including at the Partnership Board.

5.17 The scrutiny committee appointed by TfSE may not include a member, substitute member or co-opted member of TfSE, but may include co-opted persons representative of non-constituent authorities and non-councillor representatives of passengers, road users, employers and employees.

Standing Orders

5.18 TfSE will need to be able to make, vary and revoke standing orders for the regulation of proceedings and business, including that of the scrutiny committee. This will ensure that the governance structures can remain appropriate to the effective running of the organisation.

5.19 In regards to changing boundaries and therefore adding or removing members, TfSE would have to make a new proposal to Government under Section 102Q of the Local Transport Act 2008 and require formal consents from each Constituent Authority.

Miscellaneous

5.20 It may be necessary that certain additional Local Authority enactments are applied to TfSE as if TfSE were a Local Authority, including matters relating to staffing arrangements, pensions, ethical standards, and provision of services etc. These are set out in the draft legal proposal.

5.21 TfSE also proposes to seek the functional power of competence as set out in section 102M of the Local Transport Act 2008.

5.22 TfSE will consider options for appointing to the roles of a Head of Paid Service, a Monitoring Officer and a Chief Finance Officer whilst considering possible interim arrangements.

Funding

5.23 TfSE will work with partners and Department for Transport (“DfT”) to consider a sustainable approach to establishing the formal STB as effectively as possible.

Governance

Transport Forum and Senior Officer Group

5.24 The Partnership Board will appoint a Transport Forum. This will be an advisory body to the Senior Officer Group and Partnership Board, comprising a wider group of representatives from user groups, operators, District and Borough Councils as well as Government and National Agency representatives.

5.25 The Transport Forum will meet four times a year and be chaired by an independent person appointed by the Partnership Board. The Transport Forum may also appoint a Vice-Chair for the Transport Forum, who will chair the Transport Forum when the Chair is not present.

5.26 The Transport Forum’s terms of reference will be agreed by the Transport for the South East Partnership Board. It is envisaged that the Transport Forum will provide technical expertise, intelligence and information to Senior Officer Group and the Partnership Board.

5.27 The Partnership Board and Transport Forum will be complemented by a Senior Officer Group representing members at official level providing expertise and co-ordination to the TfSE programme. The Steering Group will meet monthly.

6. Functions

Transport for the South East's proposal is to become a statutory Sub National Transport Body as set out in section part 5A of the Local Transport Act 2008. The precise legal proposal is set out in a separate document but includes the following functions.

General Functions

6.1 Transport for the South East proposes to have the 'General Functions' as set out in Section 102H (1) including:

- a. to prepare a Transport Strategy for the area;
- b. to provide advice to the Secretary of State about the exercise of transport functions in relation to the area (whether exercisable by the Secretary of State or others);
- c. to co-ordinate the carrying out of transport functions in relation to the area that are exercisable by different constituent authorities, with a view to improving the effectiveness and efficiency in the carrying out of those functions;
- d. if the STB considers that a transport function in relation to the area would more effectively and efficiently be carried out by the STB, to make proposals to the Secretary of State for the transfer of that function to the STB;
- e. to make other proposals to the Secretary of State about the role and functions of the STB. (2016, 102H (1))⁵

6.2 The General Functions are regarded as the core functions of a Sub-National Transport Body and will build on the initial work of Transport for the South East in its shadow form. To make further proposals to the Secretary of State regarding constitution or functions, Transport for the South East will need formal consents from each 'Constituent Member'.

6.3 Transport for the South East recognises that under current proposals the Secretary of State will remain the final decision-maker on national transport strategies, but critically that the Secretary of State must have regard to a Sub-National Transport Body's statutory Transport Strategy. This sets an important expectation of the strong relationship Transport for the South East aims to demonstrate with Government on major programmes like the Major Road Network and Rail Upgrade Plan.

Local Transport Functions

6.4 Initial work has identified a number of additional powers that Transport for the South East may require that will support the delivery of the Transport Strategy. The table below provides an assessment of these functions and will be used to support the informal engagement with constituent authorities and members of the Shadow Partnership Board.

6.5 The powers which are additional to the general functions relating to STBs will be requested in a way that means they will operate concurrently and with the consent of the constituent authorities.

Table 1: Powers and Responsibilities for further discussion

Function/Power	Description of existing function/power	What is TfSE seeking	Why power is being sought	Added benefit of TfSE having this power
General functions				
Section 102 H of the Local Transport Act 2008	Prepare a transport strategy, advise the Secretary of State, co-ordinate the carrying out of transport functions, make proposals for the transfer of functions, make other proposals about the role and functions of the STB.	All the general powers set out in Section 102H.	Functions required for TfSE to operate as a STB and meet the requirements of the enabling legislation to facilitate the development and implementation of transport strategies for the area and thereby further the economic growth objective.	
Rail				

Function/Power	Description of existing function/power	What is TfSE seeking	Why power is being sought	Added benefit of TfSE having this power
Right to be consulted about new rail franchises (Section 13 of the Railways Act 2005 – Railway Functions of Passenger Transport Executives)	The right of a Passenger Transport Executive to be consulted before the Secretary of State issues an invitation to tender for a franchise agreement	The right to be consulted about rail franchises in its area.	TfSE requires a strong, formal role in decision making over and above that which is available to individual constituent authorities. The right of consultation is important because it confirms TfSE's role as a strategic partner. This power would enable TfSE to exert strategic influence over future rail franchises to ensure the potential need for changes to the scope of current services and potential new markets identified by TfSE are considered.	TfSE acts as the collective voice of constituent authorities and delivers a regional perspective and consensus on the priorities for rail in its area.

Function/Power	Description of existing function/power	What is TfSE seeking	Why power is being sought	Added benefit of TfSE having this power
Set High Level Output Specification (HLOS) for Rail (Schedule 4A, paragraph 1D, of the Railways Act 1993)	Power of Secretary of State to set the HLOS setting out objectives for next railway control period.	Power to act jointly with the Secretary of State to set the HLOS for the rail network in TfSE area.	Exert strategic influence over the future development of the rail network in the TfSE area. The power to influence the objectives within the HLOS would enable TfSE's aspirations for transformational investment in rail infrastructure that will facilitate economic growth	TfSE acts as the collective voice of constituent authorities and delivers a regional perspective and consensus on the priorities for rail in its area.

Function/Power	Description of existing function/power	What is TfSE seeking	Why power is being sought	Added benefit of TfSE having this power
Highways				
<p>Set Road Investment Strategy (RIS) for the Strategic Road Network (RIS)</p> <p>(Section 3 and Schedule 2 of the Infrastructure Act 2015)</p>	<p>Power of Secretary of State to set and vary the RIS</p>	<p>Power to act jointly with the Secretary of State to set and vary the RIS in the TfSE area.</p>	<p>TfSE requires a strong, formal role in decision making over and above that which is available to individual constituent authorities. This power would enable TfSE to exert strategic influence, and ensure TfSE's aspirations for transformational investment in road infrastructure that will facilitate economic growth as identified in its Transport Strategy are reflected in the RIS.</p>	<p>TfSE acts as the collective voice of its constituent authorities and delivers a regional perspective and consensus on the priorities for the RIS.</p>
<p>Enter into agreements to undertake certain works on Strategic Road Network, Major Road Network or local roads. (Section 6(5) of the Highways Act 1980, (trunk roads) & Section 8 of the Highways Act 1980 (local roads)</p>	<p>Power that local highway authorities currently have to enter into an agreement with other highway authorities to construct, reconstruct, alter, improve or maintain roads</p>	<p>Concurrent power to enter into such agreements with highway authorities for trunk roads and local roads</p>	<p>These powers will enable TfSE to promote and expedite the delivery of regionally significant schemes, across boundaries that otherwise might not be progressed,</p>	<p>TfSE could overcome the need for complex 'back-to-back' legal and funding agreements between neighbouring authorities improving efficiency by reducing scheme development time and reducing overall costs.</p>

Function/Power	Description of existing function/power	What is TfSE seeking	Why power is being sought	Added benefit of TfSE having this power
Acquire land to enable construction, improvement, or mitigate adverse effects of highway construction. (Sections 239,240,246 and 250 of the Highways Act 1980)	Power to acquire land for various purposes.	Concurrent power	Allow preparations for the construction of a highways scheme to be expedited where highway authorities are not in a position to acquire land. Power only to be exercisable with the consent of the highway authority	Enable TfSE to expedite the delivery of regionally significant schemes, that otherwise might not be progressed. Land acquisition by TfSE could facilitate quicker scheme delivery.
Construct highways, footpaths, bridleways (Sections 24,25 & 26 of the Highways Act 1980)	Powers to construct highways, footpaths and bridleways.	Concurrent powers that will enable TfSE to promote, coordinate and fund road schemes	Without these powers TfSE would not be able to enter into any contractual arrangement in relation to procuring the construction, improvement or maintenance of a highway or the construction or improvement of a trunk road.	Enable TfSE to enter into contractual arrangements that will expedite the delivery of regionally significant schemes set out in its Transport strategy that cross constituent authority boundaries that otherwise might not be progressed.

Function/Power	Description of existing function/power	What is TfSE seeking	Why power is being sought	Added benefit of TfSE having this power
Make capital grants for public transport facilities				
Make capital grants for the provision of public transport facilities (Section 56(2) of the Transport Act 1968)	Power of a local authority to pay capital grants for the provision of facilities for public passenger transport.	TfSE to be granted this power concurrently with local authorities.	This will enable TfSE to fund public transport improvements.	This will enable TfSE to support the funding and delivery of joint projects with constituent local authorities.
Bus Service Provision				
Duty to secure the provision of Bus Services (Section 63(1) Transport Act 1985)	Local transport authorities and Integrated transport have a duty to secure the provision of such public passenger transport services as it considers appropriate and which would not otherwise be provided.	TfSE to have this duty concurrently with the local transport authorities in its area	Would enable TfSE to fill in identified gaps in bus service provision in its geography or secure the provision of regionally important bus services covering one or more constituent authority areas in the future which would not otherwise be provided.	Travel to work areas do not respect local authority boundaries. Potential for TfSE to secure regionally important bus services that would not otherwise be provided

Function/Power	Description of existing function/power	What is TfSE seeking	Why power is being sought	Added benefit of TfSE having this power
Quality Bus Partnerships (The Bus services Act 2017 Sections 113C – 113O & Sections 138A – 138S)	Powers to enable local transport authorities and Integrated Transport Authorities to enter into Advanced Quality Partnerships and Enhanced Partnership Plans and Schemes to improve the quality of services and facilities within an identified area.	Concurrent power for TfSE to be able to enter into Advanced Quality Partnerships and Enhanced Plans and Schemes.	To facilitate the introduction of Quality Partnership schemes to be introduced in an area covering more than one constituent authority.	To expedite the introduction of Quality Partnership schemes covering more than one local transport authority area which otherwise might not be introduced
Bus Service Franchising (The Bus Services Act 2017)	Power of Mayoral Combined Authorities to implement bus franchising in their area.	Power for TfSE to implement bus service franchising in its area	To facilitate the introduction of bus service franchising in an area covering more than one constituent authority.	To expedite the introduction of franchising arrangements covering more than one local transport authority area which otherwise might not be introduced.

Function/Power	Description of existing function/power	What is TfSE seeking	Why power is being sought	Added benefit of TfSE having this power
Smart Ticketing				
Introduce Integrated Ticketing Schemes (Sections 134C- 134G & Sections 135-138 Transport Act 2000)	Powers of local transport authorities to make advanced, joint and through ticketing schemes	Concurrent powers with local transport authorities in the TfSE area	These powers will enable TfSE to procure services, goods, equipment and/or infrastructure; enter into contracts to deliver smart ticketing and receive or give payments.	Expedite the introduction of a cost effective smart and integrated ticketing system on a regional scale
Air Quality				
Establish Clean Air Zones (Sections 163-177A of the Transport Act 2000 – Road User Charging)	Power of local traffic authority and integrated transport authorities to make local charging schemes imposing charges in respect of the use or keeping of motor vehicles on roads.	Powers to introduce road user charging schemes to enable charged clean air zones to be introduced	Air quality issues do not respect local authority boundaries which may necessitate Clean Air Zones being introduced across constituent authority boundaries.	Ability to expedite the introduction of larger scale air quality zones where air quality issues extend across existing boundaries. Reduced implementation and operating costs compared to two or more continuous zones.

Function/Power	Description of existing function/power	What is TfSE seeking	Why power is being sought	Added benefit of TfSE having this power
Other Powers				
Promote or oppose bills in Parliament Section 239 Local Government Act 1972	Local Authorities have the power to promote or oppose Bills in Parliament. Under the Transport and Works Act 1992, a body that has power to promote or oppose bills also has the power to apply for an order to construct or operate certain types of infrastructure (e.g. railways, tramways waterways & piers)	Power to promote or oppose Bills in Parliament. Transport and Works Act powers to apply for orders to promote, construct or operate certain types of transport facilities.	Enable TfSE to promote coordinate and fund regionally significant infrastructure schemes Transport and Work Act powers are the means by which railway, tramway, inland waterways and coastal piers are promoted and operated.	Expedite the delivery of regionally significant schemes (including railway schemes) that cross constituent authority boundaries that otherwise might not be progressed.
Incidental amendments to the Local Government Act 1972, Localism Act 2011, Local Government Pension Scheme Regulations 2013, as per the TfN S.I.	Incidental amendments to enable TfSE to operate as a type of local authority with duties in respect of staffing, pensions, monitoring and the provision of information about TfSE.	The same incidental amendments as were included in the TfN S.I.	To enable TfSE to function as a type of local authority	

Possible Functions not being sought

6.6 Transport for the South East has also given consideration to a wide range of powers does not propose seeking the functions set out in the table below

Function not being sought	Rationale
Act as co-signatories to rail franchises	No existing involvement from constituent authorities in rail operations and no current aspirations to become involved in this area.
Be responsible for rail franchising	
Carry passengers by rail.	
Set priorities for local authorities for roads that are not part of the Major Road Network	TfSE will only be responsibility for identifying priorities on the Major road Network.
Being responsible for any highway maintenance responsibilities.	No rationale for TfSE involvement in routine maintenance of Major Road Network or local roads.
Take on any consultation function instead of an existing local authority.	
Give directions to a constituent authority about the exercise of transport functions by the authority in their area.	This power contained in the enabling legislation will not be requested.

6. Summary of Support and Engagement

- The draft Proposal will be shaped and will be endorsed by the Shadow Partnership Board in March 2019 prior to the launch of the consultation.
- During the consultation process, the draft Proposal will be made available on the TfSE website. Meetings will be held with key contacts, such as Network Rail, Highways England, Transport for London, England's Economic Heartlands and the Transport Forum.
- Following the consultation exercise TfSE will update the draft Proposal and publish a summary of the consultation comments received.
- TfSE will seek consent from its constituent authorities and the final draft Proposal will be endorsed by the Shadow Partnership Board in autumn 2019.
- The final Proposal will include a summary of the engagement process, including a list of the organisations engaged in the process and an appendix with a number of letters of support from key organisations and businesses.

Appendix 1 – Distribution of votes

TfSE Constituent Authorities	Population¹	Number of Votes²
Brighton and Hove City Council	287,173	2
East Sussex County Council	549,557	4
Hampshire County Council	1,365,103	10
Isle of Wight Council	140,264	1
The Kent County Council	1,540,438	11
Medway Council	276,957	2
Portsmouth City Council	213,335	2
Southampton City Council	250,377	2
Surrey County Council	1,180,956	2
West Sussex County Council	846,888	6
<i>Bracknell Forest Council</i>	<i>119,730</i>	
<i>Reading Borough Council</i>	<i>162,701</i>	
<i>Slough Borough Council</i>	<i>147,736</i>	
<i>West Berkshire Council</i>	<i>158,576</i>	
<i>The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead</i>	<i>149,689</i>	
<i>Wokingham Borough Council</i>	<i>163,087</i>	
Berkshire Local Transport Body (Total)	901,519	6
Total	7,552,567	54

¹ Population as per ONS 2016 Estimates

² Number of votes = Population/140,000 (the population of constituent authority with the smallest population, this being the Isle of Wight).

This page is intentionally left blank

BERKSHIRE LOCAL TRANSPORT BODY (BLTB)**REPORT TO:** BLTB**DATE:** 31 January 2019**CONTACT OFFICER:** Joe Carter, Director of Regeneration, Lead Officer to the BLTB**PART I****Item 7: Financial Approval for 2.32 Maidenhead: Housing Sites Enabling Works Phase 1*****Purpose of Report***

1. To consider giving financial approval to scheme 2.32 Maidenhead: Housing Sites Enabling Works Phase 1.
2. This scheme consists of a package of traffic management measures to deliver additional capacity at key junctions around Maidenhead where modelling has indicated that severe peak hour congestion is likely to occur as a result of planned development and regeneration activity. It will facilitate economic growth by unlocking major housing and commercial development. It will also improve journey times for passengers accessing the Great Western Main Line / Elizabeth Line. The works will be progressed in phases in order to minimise the impact on the local road network.

Recommendation

3. You are recommended to give scheme 2.32 Maidenhead: Housing Sites Enabling Works Phase 1 conditional financial approval in the sum of £2,123,200 in 2019/20 and £2,090,000 in 2020/21 on the terms of the funding agreement set out at paragraph 12 step 5 below, subject to meeting the following conditions:
 - 3.1. The supply of further evidence which supports the conclusions reached in the Full Business Case in respect of:
 - Additional detail outlining the approach adopted to determine the dependent development sites and preferred junction enhancements.
 - Further detail on how the package of junction improvements will address the secondary objectives relating to accidents, air quality and accessibility for walking & cycling.
 - Additional detail on the RBWM-HM2 model, its baseline calibration and validation, and how it reflects current junction performance.
 - Detailed workings to support the outputs of the quantified economic assessment.
 - Inclusion of sensitivity tests to understand the impact of any variability in the benefits and costs of the scheme.

- Full assessment of environmental and social impacts of the scheme and inclusion of an Appraisal Summary Table.
- Further detail around scheme costs, contingency (linked to a quantified risk assessment), and levels of cost inflation.
- Clarifications to the Commercial Case in relation to the procurement processes.
- Provision of a full project programme, risk register and Quantified Risk Assessment
- That the scheme retains high or better value for money once these conditions have been met.

Other Implications

Financial

4. Scheme 2.32 Maidenhead: Housing Sites Enabling Works Phase 1 is a replacement scheme being funded from the [Thames Valley Berkshire Growth Deal 3ⁱ](#) announced on [2 February 2017ⁱⁱ](#).
5. In July 2018, you re-allocated some previously approved Local Growth Deal schemes for funding from the Business Rates Retention Pilot. This scheme was submitted as part of the process to reallocate Local Growth Deal allocations.
6. This report recommends that the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead be authorised to draw down the capital sum £4,213,200 from the Local Transport Body funding for this scheme.
7. The funding agreement set out at paragraph 12 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

8. The risk management arrangements already put in place by the Local Transport Body are as follows:
 - The [Assurance Frameworkⁱⁱⁱ](#) 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

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

Supporting Information

10. The scheme will be carried out for the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
11. The full details of the scheme are available from the [Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead](#)^{iv}. A summary of the key points is given below:

Task	Timescale
Procurement	July 2019
Contractor appointed	As above
Construction	August 2019
Open to public	March 2020

Activity	Funder	Cost (approx)
Scheme development	Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead	£0.657m
Major scheme funding	Berkshire Local Transport Body	£4.213m
Section 106 agreements	Developers etc	£0.396m
Total		£5.267m

12. The table below sets out the details of this scheme's compliance with steps 1-5 of paragraph 14 of [Assurance Framework](#)^v.

Assurance Framework Check list	2.32 Maidenhead: Housing Sites Enabling Works Phase 1			
	<p>The scheme was originally developed by the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead as a package of traffic management measures to deliver additional capacity at key junctions around Maidenhead where modelling has indicated that severe peak hour congestion is likely to occur as a result of planned development and regeneration activity. It will also unlock major housing and commercial development and improve journey times for passengers accessing the Great Western Main Line / Elizabeth Line.</p> <p>The SEP assessment process was used and the scheme was given 28 points and ranked joint 1st equal of 16 schemes submitted in July 2018 as part of the Growth Deal 3 reallocation process.</p>			
	Factor	Raw score	Weighting	Weighted score
	Strategy	3	1.5	4.5
	Deliverability	3	2.0	6.0
	Economic Impact	3	4.0	12.0
	TVB area coverage	2	1.5	3.0
	Environment	2	0.5	1.0

Assurance Framework Check list	2.32 Maidenhead: Housing Sites Enabling Works Phase 1			
	Social	3	0.5	1.5
			Total	28.0
<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 19 July 2018.</p> <p>The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead website^{vi} 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 Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead 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"> • Completeness – has the promoter prepared a complete Full Business Case submission, when judged against the prevailing advice from the DfT • Accuracy – has the promoter performed the relevant calculations and assessments accurately and without error • 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 • Value for Money – does the scheme promoter’s Value for Money assessment comply with the prevailing DfT guidance • Evaluation arrangements – has the scheme promoter made provision for appropriate post-implementation evaluation of the scheme. • 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. 			
<p>Step 3: Conditional Approval</p>	<p>The Independent Assessor has recommended that in this case Conditional Approval is appropriate. This is on the basis that further evidence is supplied which supports the conclusions reached in the Full Business Case in respect of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional detail outlining the approach adopted to determine the dependent development sites and preferred junction enhancements. • Further detail on how the package of junction improvements will address the secondary objectives relating to accidents, air quality and accessibility for walking & cycling. • Additional detail on the RBWM-HM2 model, its baseline calibration and validation, and how it reflects current junction performance. • Detailed workings to support the outputs of the quantified economic assessment. • Inclusion of sensitivity tests to understand the impact of any variability in the benefits and costs of the scheme. 			

Assurance Framework Check list	2.32 Maidenhead: Housing Sites Enabling Works Phase 1
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full assessment of environmental and social impacts of the scheme and inclusion of an Appraisal Summary Table. • Further detail around scheme costs, contingency (linked to a quantified risk assessment), and levels of cost inflation. • Clarifications to the Commercial Case in relation to the procurement processes. • Provision of a full project programme, risk register and Quantified Risk Assessment • That the scheme retains high or better value for money once these conditions have been met.
<p>Step 4: Recommendation of Financial Approval</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - High Value for Money - Support of the Independent assessor 	<p>The scheme has a Benefit- Cost Ratio (BCR) of 3.2.</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"> - roles - responsibilities - implementation - reporting - auditing - timing and triggers for payments, - contributions from other funders, - consequences of delay, - consequences of failure, - consequences of change to the design or specification of the scheme - claw back, - evaluation one and five years on - other conditions of Local Growth Funds 	<p>The capital grant of £4,213,200 is a maximum figure which cannot be increased, but may be reduced if savings are achieved during implementation. In the event that Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead wishes to alter the profile of the grant payments, it must seek prior written permission from TVB LEP, having first raised the matter with the BLTB. The grant is made subject to the following:</p> <p>Roles: TVB LEP is a part funder of the scheme. Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead is the scheme promoter, and is the relevant highway and planning authority.</p> <p>Roles: TVB LEP is a part funder of the scheme. Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead is the scheme promoter, and is the relevant highway and planning authority.</p> <p>Responsibilities: TVB LEP is responsible for allocating the capital finance in accordance with its Assurance Framework. Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead 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.</p> <p>Implementation: In addition to any reporting requirements within Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead, the scheme promoter will use the pro forma 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, Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead will report on any 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.</p>

Assurance Framework Check list	2.32 Maidenhead: Housing Sites Enabling Works Phase 1
	<p>Reporting: 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.</p> <p>Auditing: Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead 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, Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead will co-operate fully.</p> <p>Timing and Triggers for payments: Payments will only be made against an invoice and accompanying certificate of work completed, along with proof of planning consent.</p> <p>Contributions from Other Funders: Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead capital programme will contribute £534,100 in 2019/20 and £123,000 in 2020/21; in addition, there were £396,200 of s.106 contributions secured by Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead £236,100 in 2019/20 and £160,100 in 2020/21. In the event that the scheme experiences or it is anticipated that the scheme will experience a shortfall in these contributions, Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead 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 Failure will then be applied.</p> <p>Consequences of Delay: In the event that the scheme experiences minor delays to its overall Business Case programme (no more than 10 weeks), Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead 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) Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead 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>Consequences of Change to the Design or Specification of the Scheme: In the event that Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead 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, Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead will be required to seek prior written consent from TVB LEP. Failing this permission, no further monies will be paid to Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead after the change becomes apparent to TVB LEP. In addition, consideration will be given to recovering any monies paid to Royal Borough of Windsor and</p>

Assurance Framework Check list	2.32 Maidenhead: Housing Sites Enabling Works Phase 1
	<p>Maidenhead in respect of this scheme.</p> <p>Consequences of Failure: As soon as it becomes apparent to Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead that it will not be possible to deliver the scheme at all, written notice shall be given to the accountable body for TVB LEP. No further monies will be paid to Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead after this point. In addition, consideration will be given to recovering any monies paid to Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead in respect of this scheme.</p> <p>Claw back: 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>Evaluation One and Five Years On: Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead will produce scheme evaluations One and Five years after practical completion that comply with DfT guidance.</p> <p>Other Conditions of Local Growth Funds: Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead will acknowledge the financial contribution made to this scheme through Local Growth Funds and follow the 'Growth Deal Identity Guidelines'^{vii}. It will also give due regard to the Social Value Act, particularly through the employment of apprentices across the scheme supply chain.</p>

Conclusion

- The scheme will improve traffic flow through critical junctions in Maidenhead, thus supporting the expected increase in housing.

Background Papers

- The LTB and SEP scoring exercise papers are available on request

ⁱhttps://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/589268/170202_Thames_Valley_Berkshire_LEP_GD_factsheet.pdf

ⁱⁱ <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/multi-million-pound-cash-boost-to-help-create-local-jobs-and-growth>

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

^{iv}

https://www3.rbwm.gov.uk/info/200133/strategies_plans_and_policies/229/strategic_economic_plan

^v<http://www.thamesvalleyberkshire.co.uk/berkshire-strategic-transport-forum>

^{vi}https://www3.rbwm.gov.uk/info/200133/strategies_plans_and_policies/229/strategic_economic_plan

^{vii} <http://www.thamesvalleyberkshire.co.uk/documents?view=files&folder=230>

This page is intentionally left blank



HATCH
REGENERIS

Independent Assessment Summary Report: Maidenhead Housing Sites Enabling Works

A Final Report by Hatch Regeneris Consulting
January 2019

Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership

Independent Assessment Summary Report: Maidenhead Housing Sites Enabling Works

January 2019

www.regeneris.co.uk

Contents Page

Executive Summary	i
Scheme Summary	i
Review Findings	i

1. Introduction	1
Submitted Information	1
Report Structure	1

2. Option Assessment Report	2
Overview	2
Review	2

3. Appraisal Specification	3
Overview	3
Review	3

4. Full Business Case	4
Overview	4
Key Input Assumption and Parameters	4
Strategic Case	5
Economic Case	7
Financial Case	9
Commercial Case	9
Management Case	10
Summary and Conclusions	12

Executive Summary

- i. This technical note provides an independent assessment of the Maidenhead Housing Sites Enabling Works (HSEW) Scheme Business Case submission to the Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership.

Scheme Summary

- ii. The full business case submission sets out the case for investment in capacity improvements at eight key junctions around Maidenhead. The schemes will provide congestion relief associate with background growth in traffic, alongside trips generated by specific development sites within the town centre, most notably at Maidenhead Golf Course, where 2,000 units are proposed.
- iii. The six junctions are spread across the town centre, as follows:
 - A308(M) / A308 / A330 / The Bingham
 - A4 / A308
 - A4 / B4447 / Market Street
 - A4 / B3028 / Lassell Gardens
 - A4 / A4094 / Guard Club Road
 - A308 / Stafferton Way / Rushington Avenue
- iv. The improvements encompass a range of measures include carriageway widening, signalisation, and junction reconfiguration, with some associated improvements to cycling provision.

Review Findings

Conclusions

- v. The strategic case demonstrates alignment with strategic priorities and provides underlying evidence of the need to deliver highway improvements to support housing development across the town.
- vi. Whilst the case for dependent development has followed due process, additional evidence could be presented to demonstrate the selection of final development sites and the final junction locations.
- vii. The approach to modelling the economic benefits is generally robust and demonstrates the scheme is likely to deliver high value for money. Confirmation of all input parameters and assumptions will verify the assessment and a full Appraisal Summary Table will confirm the full range of impacts of the scheme.
- viii. The financial case appears sound and, whilst the information presented does not permit full verification, there is considered to be sufficient contingency to support a robust case for investment.

- ix. The commercial and management cases are generally sound, but some information is absent. This is considered unlikely to affect the robustness of the case for delivery of the package of measures.
- x. It is our conclusion that whilst the overall case for funding the package of measures appears strong, the evidence presented within the business case does not currently permit an unconditional approval of the scheme.

Recommendations

- xi. Whilst the overall case for funding the package of measures appears strong, it is our conclusion that the overall evidence presented within the business case does not currently permit an unconditional approval of the scheme.

Conditions for Approval

- xii. We recommend the following series of conditions are applied before the scheme is taken forward:
 - 1) Additional detail outlining the approach adopted to determine the dependent development sites and preferred junction enhancements.
 - 2) Further detail on how the package of junction improvements will address the secondary objectives relating to accidents, air quality and accessibility for walking & cycling.
 - 3) Additional detail on the RBWM-HM2 model, its baseline calibration and validation, and how it reflects current junction performance.
 - 4) Detailed workings to support the outputs of the quantified economic assessment.
 - 5) Inclusion of sensitivity tests to understand the impact of any variability in the benefits and costs of the scheme.
 - 6) Full assessment of environmental and social impacts of the scheme and inclusion of an Appraisal Summary Table.
 - 7) Further detail around scheme costs, contingency (linked to a quantified risk assessment), and levels of cost inflation.
 - 8) Clarifications to the Commercial Case in relation to the procurement processes.
 - 9) Provision of a full project programme, risk register and Quantified Risk Assessment
 - 10) That the scheme retains high or better value for money once these conditions have been met

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This report provides an independent assessment of the Full Business Case (FBC) submitted by Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead (RBWM) for a range of capacity improvements at six key junctions around Maidenhead.
- 1.2 The report considers the evidence presented and whether it presents a robust case for the investment of Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership (TVB LEP) growth deal funds.
- 1.3 The independent assessment has applied criteria from TVB LEP assurance framework and the requirements for transport scheme business cases set out within the Department for Transport (DfT) WebTAG.

Submitted Information

- 1.4 The independent assessment process for the Maidenhead Housing Sites Enabling Works (HSEW) submission has been conducted on the following set of documentation submitted by RBWM and their consultant team (Project Centre):
 - Option Assessment Report (18th January 2019)
 - Full Business Case Report (18th January 2019)
- 1.5 Whilst no formal Appraisal Specification Report was submitted by the Applicant, and the overall approach to be adopted, was discussed at a meeting in December 2018 RBWM, Project Centre and WSP.

Report Structure

- 1.6 This Independent Assessors Report responds to the formal submission of documentation, as well as the informal engagement process with RBWM and their consultants, to provide a review of information provided, assess its suitability and robustness against TVB LEPs assurance requirements, and provide recommendations in relation to the approval of LEP funding for the proposed scheme.
- 1.7 The report is structured as follows:
 - Section 2: Option Appraisal Report – provides a brief commentary upon the process by which the initial short list of scheme options was identified.
 - Section 3: Appraisal Specification Report – presents a high-level review of the proposed approach to the full business case appraisal and its acceptability
 - Section 4: Full Business Case Submission – presents an initial summary of scheme elements included in business case submission, alongside the details presented within each of the five 'cases' (Strategic, Economic, Financial, Commercial, Management). It also sets out the recommendations to the LEP Local Transport Body relating to the suitability of the scheme for funding.

2. Option Assessment Report

Overview

- 2.1 The Option Appraisal Report provides a summary of the options assessed for various junction improvements around Maidenhead to accommodate residential and commercial development identified within the submitted Borough Local Plan.
- 2.2 As part of work undertaken by RBWM to develop their Local Plan, an assessment of the impact of development growth upon the operation of the highway network in RBWM and surrounding areas was undertaken. This identified a series of 'priority' junctions where the forecast future year operation of the junction may notably deteriorate. Eleven of these junctions were within RBWM and were taken forward to consider potential mitigating measures.
- 2.3 Three of the junctions were removed from further consideration as one was under the jurisdiction of Highways England, another already had improvement works being undertaken, and the third was considered to be outside the spatial scope of Maidenhead Housing Site.
- 2.4 The remaining eight junctions were taken forward for further consideration within the Options Assessment Report. The range of potential scheme options for each junction was developed and then appraised against the following framework criteria:
- Strategic Economic Plan Packages
 - Scheme Objectives
 - Deliverability Criteria
 - Infrastructure Feasibility:
 - Operational Feasibility
 - Land Requirements
 - Complexity of Delivery
 - Environmental Impact
 - Stakeholder Acceptance/Support
 - Cost
 - Affordability
 - Timescales for Delivery
- 2.5 The report concludes with a summary of the options for each junction that best meet the requirements of the framework objectives.

Review

- 2.6 The analysis undertaken as part of the Local Plan work appears robust and demonstrates a link between the delivery of development growth and the need for improvements at these eight junctions.
- 2.7 The appraisal framework development is comprehensive, covering strategic priorities for the area, scheme objectives and measures of deliverability.
- 2.8 Further option assessment work will be required as part of the development of the full business case in order to demonstrate a clear case for investment in each individual junction improvement scheme.

3. Appraisal Specification

Overview

- 3.1 Whilst no formal Appraisal Specification Report was submitted by the Applicant, the overall approach to be adopted was discussed during a face-to-face meeting in December 2018, with RBWM, Project Centre and WSP.
- 3.2 These discussions focused upon:
- The description of the scheme and the location of the proposed improvements;
 - The objectives of the scheme;
 - An understanding of local development proposals and who these will impact upon levels of trip generation;
 - An overview of the current and future highway network operating performance; and
 - The proposed appraisal methodology, with a specific focus upon the approach to the Economic Case.

Review

- 3.3 The primary purpose of the discussion was to agree whether the specific development sites identified as benefiting from the junction improvements were specifically 'dependent development' (as defined by WebTAG/MHCLG).
- 3.4 After initial modelling work was undertaken, it was concluded that the level of trips generated by the developments was unable to be satisfactorily accommodated by the existing highway network. It was, therefore, agreed that a significant number of development sites were considered to be 'dependent development' and that highway junction improvements were required to "unlock" those developments.
- 3.5 It was therefore agreed that the Applicant would follow the approach outlined within WebTAG Unit A2-2 'Induced Investment' to determine the economic impact of delivering the junction improvements to unlock specific development sites across the town. This will include assessing the uplift in land value for the sites that are unlocked.
- 3.6 It was also emphasised to the Applicant that it will be important to demonstrate the contribution that all selected junctions make to delivering housing and improving the highway network performance.
- 3.7 The rest of the business case submission was understood to follow standard DfT WebTAG protocols and so should, therefore, be acceptable as long as there is sufficient detail to match the scale of the funding ask.

4. Full Business Case

Overview

- 4.1 The full business case submission sets out the case for investment in six key junctions around Maidenhead that will help unlock 4,025 housing units across the town centre. In summary, this includes:
- A308(M) / A308 / A330 / The Bingham
 - A4 / A308
 - A4 / B4447 / Market Street
 - A4 / B3028 / Lassell Gardens
 - A4 / A4094 / Guard Club Road
 - A308 / Stafferton Way / Rushington Avenue
- 4.2 The delivery of these schemes has been deemed necessary to provide sufficient highway network capacity to accommodate the additional vehicle trips associated with the housing development. Without these schemes, the developments could not proceed without causing significant detrimental impact upon the performance of the highway network.

Key Input Assumption and Parameters

- 4.3 The overarching business case is based upon a range of key assumptions, as follows:
- That a number of junctions across Maidenhead are, or will be, subject to significant delays that will restrict the ability to delivery housing development in and around the town centre.
 - That housing development will proceed according to the Local Plan once the junction improvements have been delivered
 - That a range of highway measures will be delivered as part of development plans to connect individual development sites to the existing highway network. In particular, the external delivery of a new access road to the Maidenhead Golf Course Development Site.

Independent Assessor Comment

- 4.4 From reviewing previous modelling outputs that assessed the impact of Local Plan development upon the operation of the local highway network, it is apparent that the scale of the development, without mitigation, will cause significant congestion and delays. At a strategic level, it is, therefore, clear that much of the proposed Local Plan development is dependent upon a package of highway measures being delivered. The following sections of the business case provide the detail as to what scale of development is dependent upon which junction improvements.
- 4.5 Whilst there will always be uncertainty and variation in the delivery of Local Plan growth, the assumption that the growth will proceed once the package of scheme measures have been delivered is considered sound. A standard sensitivity test would be to consider alternative high and low growth projections.
- 4.6 The delivery of the package of junction enhancements will not, in themselves, provide vehicular access to specific development sites. For some of the larger sites, such as

Maidenhead Golf Course, specific link roads and junctions are required. The outcomes of this business case are predicated on these highway links being provided and so these are considered to be key dependencies. As a central case assumption, it is considered reasonable to assume the required infrastructure will be delivered.

Strategic Case

- 4.7 The Strategic Case provides an overview of the strategic context and contribution of the scheme to strategic priorities, as well as a clear presentation of the need for highway investment to enable specific housing development to proceed.
- 4.8 An overview of the study area **context** is presented in relation to economic growth and exiting travel patterns. The contribution of the scheme to national, regional and local **strategic priorities** is set out, specifically highlighting housing need, growth aspirations, and development of Maidenhead Town Centre. This includes a summary of major town centre development sites and their potential timeline for delivery, along with committed transport schemes.
- 4.9 An overview of the work undertaken to inform the **Local Plan development** is presented, detailing how the impacts of growth were assessed in terms of the future operation of the highway network. This identified a series of highway junctions where the operation of the highway network was likely to become heavily constrained as a result of the additional vehicle trips generated from development growth. Eleven junctions were identified within RBWM as priorities for improvement, of which eight were prioritised for improvements.
- 4.10 All but one of the eight junctions were predicted by the **strategic highway modelling work** to become highly congested. The eighth junction was identified as a key part of the inner ring road around Maidenhead and is considered to be congested, albeit this not replicated by the strategic transport model outputs.
- 4.11 The impacts of trips generated from developments (housing and commercial) across Maidenhead were tested, on an incremental basis, to identify the points at which individual junctions begin to suffer from increasingly poor operating conditions. This identified four of the eight junctions already perform poorly, even without any additional development trips added to the network, with others becoming more congested as trips are added. This analysis formed the basis of an assessment of 'deadweight development' - development that could come forward without significant mitigating measures. The analysis concluded that 16 of the 24 Local Plan housing sites could come forward in some form without the junction improvements, and so represented 'deadweight' development.
- 4.12 The analysis concludes by identifying six out of the initial short-list of eight junctions as being critical to the delivery of the remaining eight housing sites, and that the 4,025 dwellings on these sites are fully dependent upon delivery of infrastructure improvements at these six junctions. A full description of each junction is provided.
- 4.13 The **primary scheme objective** is defined as providing junction capacity to mitigate the impact of housing development on the eight identified sites. **Secondary objectives** relate to reducing accidents, improving air quality, and improving access for pedestrians and cyclists. A series of **measures of success** are set out.
- 4.14 The proposed enhancements for each junction location are set out. The main **constraints** in delivering the schemes are stated to relate to the phasing of construction work for both the junctions and the wider development sites.
- 4.15 A discussion on **inter-dependencies** is included, although it focuses more broadly upon project risks. Key **stakeholders** who will need to be consulted are listed.
- 4.16 An overview of the **option development** process for each junction is included.

Independent Assessor Comment

- 4.17 The Strategic Case is considered to present a good overview of the issues, objectives and preferred transport solutions for supporting housing growth across Maidenhead Town Centre.
- 4.18 The policy context is well established, with a clear understanding of the priorities of national, regional and local bodies.
- 4.19 The summary of the Local Plan development work provides good context around the issues of delivering housing developments within the town centre. It demonstrates how a series of junctions were identified as likely to require enhancements to support housing growth aspirations.
- 4.20 The strategic transport modelling work demonstrates the impact of increasing levels of development upon the operational performance of the local highway network. The outputs demonstrate the extent to which the full aspirations of the Local Plan housing growth could not be delivered without creating significant delays at a series of junctions across the town centre.
- 4.21 Whilst it is noted that the strategic highway model does not accurately represent delays at each and every junction in the town centre, alternative evidence is presented as part of the process of identifying key junctions for improvement. This is considered acceptable.
- 4.22 The process by which dependent development, deadweight, and the prioritisation of junctions has been undertaken is considered to acceptable, although could be articulated in a manner that is easier to follow. In particular, a separate discussion around the commercial development and how it impacts the modelling would be beneficial. This would enhance the logic around the final selection of the six junctions for enhancement.
- 4.23 The established scheme objectives are clear and logical, and the identified measures of success align well with the objectives.
- 4.24 The discussion on constraints to the project focuses upon how the series of junction enhancement can be delivered with minimal impact upon the overall operation of the transport network. This is considered particular important given the additional potential construction impacts from housing and commercial site development and general regeneration of the town centre.
- 4.25 The section on inter-dependencies is not considered to pick up on any wider issues around the deliver of the housing sites, in particular the site-specific highway improvements works associated with the Golf Course site.
- 4.26 In the discussion of stakeholders, there is no indication of any initial engagement with these groups and the level of support for the proposed schemes.
- 4.27 The options assessment section, and associated appendices, demonstrate that due consideration has been given to the optimum scheme designs for each junction. It also indicates that an appropriate scheme option prioritisation process has been undertaken for each individual junction.
- 4.28 Overall, the Strategic Case is considered to provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate the need to deliver enhancements to a range of junctions to support delivery of housing within the town centre. The specific selection of housing sites that are considered fully dependent upon the capacity improvements could be presented more clearly. Similarly, the evidence supporting final choice of the six junctions could be set out in a more logical manner. There is also limited evidence presented around how the scheme will deliver against the secondary objectives established.

Economic Case

- 4.29 The Economic Case sets out the transport modelling approach and the scenarios that have been considered to assess the scheme benefits.
- 4.30 The approach to transport modelling describes the use of the RBWM Highway Model 2 (RBWM-HM2) to assess the scheme impacts. This is a VISUM model covering two peak periods (AM = 8am to 9am; PM = 5pm to 6pm) and was developed to represent 2016 conditions. Reference is made to a 'Data Collection Report' and a 'Local Model Validation Report' that provide evidence of the robustness of the model.
- 4.31 A future year 2032 model was available to assess future year impacts but no other interim model year (e.g. 2021) was available.
- 4.32 Three separate model scenarios are utilised within the assessment:
- **Reference Case** – Without the junction improvements or the development dependent upon the junction improvements
 - **Do Something 1** – With the junction improvement but without the development dependent upon the junction improvement
 - **Do Something 2** – With both the junction improvements and the development dependent upon the junction improvement
- 4.33 The types of scheme benefit that have been assessed include accident benefits, journey time savings, vehicle operating costs, carbon savings, and the impact upon indirect tax revenues.
- 4.34 The capital costs of each junction improvement scheme have been estimated, with a contingency applied to each scheme, representing 40% of overall base capital costs. An allowance of 6% uplift for optimism bias has been applied. Taking account of the profile of capital cost expenditure, this generates an estimated Presented Value of Costs (PVC) of around £4.75m
- 4.35 A conventional assessment of **transport user benefits** is assessed by comparing the outcomes between the Do-Something 1 Scenario and the Reference Case to demonstrate the benefits of the scheme to existing highway users. This estimates a Present Value of Benefits of around £15.18 million. Set against the PVC this generates a basic Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) of around 3.2 to 1.
- 4.36 A separate assessment of **transport external costs** is undertaken, comparing Do-Something 2 Scenario against Do-Something 1 to demonstrate the impact of the additional trips generated by the dependent development upon existing highway users. This estimates a negative Present Value of Benefits of around £-89.6 million.
- 4.37 An assessment of **land value uplift** is presented to determine the economic benefit from "unlocking" the dependent development. This incorporates an allowance for 'deadweight' and 'additionality impact'. The estimated land value uplift is presented as £124.7 million.
- 4.38 Combining the conventional transport user benefits, the transport external costs, and the land value uplift gives an overall forecast assessment of Present Value of Benefits of £50.29 million. Set against the scheme PVC would generate an adjusted BCR in excess of 4 to 1, representing very high value for money. It is indicated that the scheme would need to realise 86% of the land value uplift to achieve an adjusted BCR in excess of 2 to 1 (high value for money).
- 4.39 A short **Value for Money Statement** concludes the Economic Case, summarising the BCRs.

Independent Assessor Comment

- 4.40 The overarching approach adopted within the Economic Case is considered robust, including the modelling approach, scenarios considered, and benefits assessed.
- 4.41 There is no reference to the options assessment process within the Economic Case, but it is acknowledged that it is covered in other areas of the business case.
- 4.42 The modelling tools used are considered appropriate but there is no specific discussion of the calibration or validation of the model and its accuracy in replicating traffic conditions within Maidenhead Town Centre. Reference is made to separate documentation not included with the business case submission. The absence of an underlying discussion of the RBWM-HM2 model is considered important given the Strategic Case refers to one junction where the model is not considered to replicate known delay and congestion.
- 4.43 No specific outputs are presented in the Economic Case from the base model, the reference case or the do-something scenarios that demonstrate the overarching issues or impacts of either the scheme measures or the dependent development trips.
- 4.44 The overall assessment of types of benefits is considered appropriate. The capital costs include a significant contingency allowance; however, it is not clear how this value has been determined. As such, whilst a low level of optimism bias (6%) might seem acceptable, it would be useful to understand the approach in more detail.
- 4.45 The assessment of transport user benefits is considered appropriate. It would be useful to have commentary on why 'economic efficiency' benefits are positive for 'consumer - commuters' but negative for 'consumer - other' and 'business' travellers.
- 4.46 The assessment of transport external cost is also considered appropriate and the outputs to be expected for a scenario test of this type.
- 4.47 The calculation of land value uplift appear appropriate but relatively limited detail is presented of the input assumptions. This includes assumed existing and future land values.
- 4.48 The overall quantified assessment of value for money appears to demonstrate that the scheme delivers at least high value for money from investment. The overall approach adopted is considered robust but verification of the some of the input assumptions is required.
- 4.49 The economic case covers the key assessment of quantified benefits but does not appear to consider all environmental and social impacts. In particular, two of the stated secondary objectives relate to air quality and access for walking and cycling, and yet neither are specifically referenced.
- 4.50 Whilst the final secondary objective, accidents, is clearly presented, there is no commentary on the fact that the negative impacts derived through the transport external costs exceeds the benefits through the conventional transport user benefits. It is acknowledged that potentially the number of accidents per vehicle movement may be neutral, but this is not considered within the assessment.
- 4.51 There is no reference to an overall Appraisal Summary Table. This should include assessments of all the potential environmental and social impacts, even if only qualitatively.
- 4.52 There is also no consideration of sensitivity test in relation to any key input assumptions or parameters. This would include different patterns of housing and commercial growth.

Financial Case

- 4.53 The Financial Case provides an overview of scheme capital costs, cost profiles and funding sources.
- 4.54 The overall scheme **capital costs** are described but no specific detail is presented about how they have been developed and they appear to only relate to outline scheme designs. The level of contingency applied is 40% of the base capital costs, which is considered a robust amount, but again no detail of how this was derived is presented. Standard allowances for design and preliminaries, totalling 25% of base scheme costs, are included. An allowance for compulsory purchase of land for one scheme is included.
- 4.55 Consideration of **maintenance costs** is presented and it is concluded that these are more likely to decrease than increase as a result of the scheme, as it will refurbish existing carriageway. This is not considered to be an unreasonable assumption.
- 4.56 The **profile of costs** is set out between 2018/19 and 2020/21. Similarly, the source and profile of **funding** is set out.

Independent Assessor Comment

- 4.57 The individual scheme costs are presented previously within the economic case and are not replicated within the financial case. It would appear they are at a relatively early phase of development and so a relatively high level of contingency has been applied. It would be helpful to have a greater understanding of the robustness of the costs involved and whether a specific quantified risk assessment has been undertaken.
- 4.58 There is no specific indication of whether construction inflation has been taken into account within the cost profiling.
- 4.59 Further surety over the sources of match-funding would also enhance the financial case.

Commercial Case

- 4.60 The Commercial Case provides outlines the procurement strategy of for the schemes and provides information payment mechanisms, risk allocation, contract length and contract management.
- 4.61 Four strategic **outcome objectives** are listed in relation to achieving cost certainty; ensuring a robust implementation programme is developed; that preparation costs are minimised; and there is contractor input into risk management.
- 4.62 The **procurement strategy** outlines three long-term framework contracts for delivery of the project. It demonstrates that these contracts were let in 2017 through a rigorous competitive tender process to ensure best value for money.
- 4.63 Given the scheme includes standard highway improvements that fit the scope of the construction framework it is concluded that this is the most appropriate approach to procuring the works at preferential rates. This includes consideration of the timescales required for delivery that would create challenges if a full procurement process was undertaken. Furthermore, delivery through the framework contractor will enable better co-ordination with other works being undertaken across the Maidenhead highway network.
- 4.64 The existing term contracts are based on an NEC3 contract model option B, permitting penalty clauses in relation to over-running. It is stated that **payments** are made in arrears to the value of 80% of the contract, subject to checks. The final 20% is paid upon completion.

- 4.65 **Risk allocation and transfer** will be highlighted during contract negotiations with partners and allocated to the party best suited to manage it. The Project Board will primarily manage strategic risk. The Project Manager will have overall responsibility for the risk management process.
- 4.66 There is reference to the 'design and build' elements and 'construction of signals' being procured separately.
- 4.67 The current construction framework contract runs till 2021 but would be extended for job specific projects.
- 4.68 The ability for the contractor to resource the project effectively will be scrutinised at the procurement stage. Design resource is stated as being readily available.
- 4.69 The contracts will be managed through as combination of workshops, reviews, meetings, and day-to-day operation.

Independent Assessor Comment

- 4.70 Overall the commercial case sets out how the scheme can be delivered through existing framework contracts that offer high value for money and an effective and efficient procurement process.
- 4.71 The outputs-based specification details what is to be achieved through the procurement process, as opposed to what the overall contract will need to deliver.
- 4.72 The procurement strategy does not consider any alternative approaches to procurement other than the existing framework contracts. However, the case for using the frameworks is well made and it is clear that the required construction works clearly fit with the core the specification of the construction framework.
- 4.73 The payment terms, including potential penalty clauses, are well set out for the main construction framework contract.
- 4.74 There is some uncertainty in the document around procurement in relation to 'design and build' and 'construction of signals' elements that needs to be clarified.
- 4.75 Whilst there is a useful description of general risk management protocols, more information could be presented on how contract negotiations will ensure risk allocation and transfer will be shared and apportioned to most appropriate partner.
- 4.76 Consideration is also given to contract lengths, human resource issues, and contract management, which provides useful additional understanding of the commercial case.
- 4.77 Overall it is concluded that use of the framework contracts is appropriate, but some further clarifications are required on overall procurement processes.

Management Case

- 4.78 The Management Case presents information on how the proposal will be successfully delivered and managed.
- 4.79 Several examples of **previous transport projects** are presented that are considered similar or relevant to the highway schemes being delivered through this project. This is accompanied by evidence of the proposed delivery partners involvement in one of the schemes, alongside other projects they have delivered separately.
- 4.80 A list of **project dependencies** is set out and centres around ensuring general support and liaison and financial backing. It is stated that none of the schemes are directly dependent upon other projects but that the overall delivery will need to be carefully managed to

minimise overall disruption caused by delivering six junction improvements, alongside other schemes being brought forward in the town, including regeneration projects.

- 4.81 A detailed account of roles and jobs titles in RBWM management and **governance arrangements** is included.
- 4.82 A detailed **project plan/programme** is referred to within an appendix. A summary of key milestones is set out and describes two separate phases of construction.
- 4.83 An **assurance and approval plan** is set out that includes sign-off procedures by the Project Board.
- 4.84 An overarching **communications and stakeholder management plan** is outlined.
- 4.85 Responsibilities for **programme and project reporting** are set out. In addition, the key workstreams for **implementing the project** are summarised.
- 4.86 A summary section on **risk management** is presented, with reference to a risk register in an appendix. Risks are categorised in four areas: Strategic, Design, Financial, Construction. Five main risks, in terms of severity, are highlighted, including land acquisition, costs, and a range of issues relating to statutory undertakings and unknown services.
- 4.87 A section on **benefits realisation** sets out the **monitoring and evaluation strategy** with key performance indicators specified and a process evaluation process specified.

Independent Assessor Comment

- 4.88 The management case, in general, provides a comprehensive range of information that provides assurance around the delivery arrangements in place for the project.
- 4.89 The evidence of delivering previous projects showcases some schemes that are directly similar in nature to the highway construction works in this project, although others are less directly relevant. The examples provided in relation to delivery partners is useful.
- 4.90 The project dependencies focus upon the inter-relationships between the six junction schemes themselves, as well as other major schemes (transport and regeneration) occurring in the town. There is no specific reference to enabling works for some of the development sites themselves, including the Golf Course Site, where it is understood new accesses will need to be provided.
- 4.91 The section of governance is considered detailed, although describes generic positions without reference to who will fill these positions and their individual experience.
- 4.92 The detailed project programme did not appear to be attached within the appendices and so has not been reviewed but the overarching programme is presented, and consideration of construction phasing given.
- 4.93 The assurance and approval plan, communication and stakeholder management plan, programme/project reporting, and implementation sections provide an acceptable overview of proposed processes.
- 4.94 The detailed risk register did not appear to be attached within the appendices and so has not been reviewed, but there is demonstration that overall risks to the project have been considered.
- 4.95 The benefits realisation section does not directly comment upon mechanisms to ensure that the identified benefits of the scheme are delivered and maximised. The monitoring and evaluation plan provides clear target metrics, although the reference case against which they will be assessed is not clear.

Summary and Conclusions

Summary

4.96 The review of the five cases has identified a series of points for further consideration. These are summarised below:

- The strategic case demonstrates evidence for the need to deliver enhancements to a range of junctions to support delivery of housing within the town centre. Whilst a clear selection of housing development sites are identified as fully dependent upon the junction capacity improvements, the evidence to support this selection could be presented more clearly. Similarly, the evidence supporting final prioritisation of the six junctions could be set out in a more accessible manner.
- The strategic case establishes a clear primary objective and demonstrates how the package of scheme measures will address this objective. There is also a set of secondary objectives, relating to accident reduction, air quality, accessibility for walking & cycling. The manner in which these objectives are addressed by the package of scheme measures is less well evidenced.
- The overall economic assessment has been conducted in an appropriate manner for a package of transport schemes that unlocks housing development. The conventional assessment of benefits to existing road users demonstrates that the proposed schemes deliver strong benefits. Whilst the imposition of additional vehicle trips associated with the 'unlocked' development inevitably creates negative impacts of congestion for existing road users, the analysis indicates that these are off-set by the economic value created through the housing unlocked. Whilst the overall value for money from the scheme investment appears strong, there is a lack of supporting evidence to verify all of the calculations.
- There is limited commentary around the economic case to explain some of the outcomes presented. In addition, the scope of the assessment is limited and does not include consideration of a number of environmental or social impacts. This is particularly the case for issues around air quality and accessibility for walking and cycling, which are part of the secondary objectives of the scheme. An overall Appraisal Summary Table is required.
- The financial case for the schemes appears relatively robust, at an overarching level, with a significant contingency allowance included. More information could be presented around the development of the scheme costs and the degree to which specific risks have been considered.
- The commercial case is well presented. Whilst it only focuses upon a single procurement strategy, relating to the use of existing framework contracts, sufficient evidence is presented to demonstrate that this is a reasonable approach to adopt. Some additional clarity is required around the 'design' and 'construction of signals' elements, along with risk allocations.
- The management case provides a comprehensive range of information around management and delivery protocols. Some detailed elements, such as the project programme and risk register, have not yet been supplied, although the summaries suggest that due consideration has been given. Further evidence around project inter-dependencies and how this affects the project programme is required.

Conclusions

- 4.97 The strategic case demonstrates alignment with strategic priorities and provides underlying evidence of the need to deliver highway improvements to support housing development across the town.
- 4.98 Whilst the case for dependent development has followed due process, additional evidence could be presented to demonstrate the selection of final development sites and the final junction locations.
- 4.99 The approach to modelling the economic benefits is generally robust and demonstrates the scheme is likely to deliver high value for money. Confirmation of all input parameters and assumptions will verify the assessment and a full Appraisal Summary Table will confirm the full range of impacts of the scheme.
- 4.100 The financial case appears sound and, whilst the information presented does not permit full verification, there is considered to be sufficient contingency to support a robust case for investment.
- 4.101 The commercial and management cases are generally sound, but some information is absent. This is considered unlikely to affect the robustness of the case for delivery of the package of measures.
- 4.102 It is our conclusion that whilst the overall case for funding the package of measures appears strong, the evidence presented within the business case does not currently permit an unconditional approval of the scheme.

Conditions for Approval

- 4.103 We recommend the following series of conditions are applied before the scheme is taken forward:
 - 1) Additional detail outlining the approach adopted to determine the dependent development sites and preferred junction enhancements.
 - 2) Further detail on how the package of junction improvements will address the secondary objectives relating to accidents, air quality and accessibility for walking & cycling.
 - 3) Additional detail on the RBWM-HM2 model, its baseline calibration and validation, and how it reflects current junction performance.
 - 4) Detailed workings to support the outputs of the quantified economic assessment.
 - 5) Inclusion of sensitivity tests to understand the impact of any variability in the benefits and costs of the scheme.
 - 6) Full assessment of environmental and social impacts of the scheme and inclusion of an Appraisal Summary Table.
 - 7) Further detail around scheme costs, contingency (linked to a quantified risk assessment), and levels of cost inflation.
 - 8) Clarifications to the Commercial Case in relation to the procurement processes.
 - 9) Provision of a full project programme, risk register and Quantified Risk Assessment
 - 10) That the scheme retains high or better value for money once these conditions have been met.



www.regeneris.co.uk

London: 0207 336 6188

Manchester: 0161 234 9910

This page is intentionally left blank

BERKSHIRE LOCAL TRANSPORT BODY (BLTB)**REPORT TO:** BLTB**DATE:** 31 January 2019**CONTACT OFFICER:** Joe Carter, Director of Regeneration, Lead Officer to the BLTB**PART I****Item 8: Financial Approval for 2.34 Slough MRT Phase 2*****Purpose of Report***

1. To consider giving financial approval to scheme 2.34 Slough MRT Phase 2 from the Business Rates Retention Pilot.
2. The A4 forms the spine of a 12km strategic public transport corridor that links Maidenhead, Slough and Heathrow and plays an important role in providing surface access to the airport. Phase 2 will extend the Slough Mass Rapid Transit (SMaRT) project from its current end point at Langley and take it onto the Heathrow service road. Bus lanes and other priority measures will be provided in the new section between Langley and Heathrow.
3. The scheme will also provide a 600-car park and ride site at Brands Hill.

Recommendation

4. You are recommended to give scheme 2.34 Slough MRT Phase 2 full financial approval in the sum of £10,242,000 in 2019/20 on the terms of the funding agreement set out at paragraph 12 step 5 below.

Other Implications***Financial***

5. Scheme 2.34 Slough MRT Phase 2 is funded by the Business Rates Retention Pilot. This scheme has been previously submitted for funding from the Local Growth Deal as far back as 2014. Though Phase 2 was never prioritised for funding, Phase 1 was included in the first Local Growth Deal approvals as scheme 2.08, which was completed in 2018.
6. Scheme 2.34 Slough MRT Phase 2 was originally presented to BLTB requesting £13,300,000 but received Programme Entry Status for a lower amount, due to limited funds being available. The remaining top-up funding of £3,058,000 would be made available to Slough Borough Council as a priority for BRRP 2 funds, should the pilot be successful.

7. This report recommends that Slough Borough Council be authorised to draw down the capital sum £10,242,000 from BRRP funds for this scheme.
8. The funding agreement set out at paragraph 12 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

9. The risk management arrangements already put in place by the Local Transport Body are as follows:
 - The [Assurance Framework](#)ⁱ 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 12, 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

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

Supporting Information

11. The scheme will be carried out for Slough Borough Council.
12. The full details of the scheme are available from the Slough [website](#)ⁱⁱ. A summary of the key points is given below:

Task	Timescale
Procurement	Via the Council's Term Contractor
Contractor appointed	As above
Construction	May 2019
Open to public	April 2020

Activity	Funder	Cost (approx)
Scheme development	Slough Borough	£0
Major scheme funding	Berkshire Local Transport Body	£10,242m
Section 106 agreements	Developers etc	£0
Total		£10,242m

13. The table below sets out the details of this scheme's compliance with steps 1-5 of paragraph 14 of [Assurance Framework](#)ⁱⁱⁱ.

Assurance Framework Check list	Scheme 2.34 Slough MRT Phase 2			
	<p>The scheme was originally developed by Slough Borough Council in response to growth pressures and the need to promote better public transport access to Heathrow Airport. Phase 1 of Slough MRT was completed in 2018.</p> <p>The SEP assessment process was used and the scheme was given 23 points and was the only scheme submitted in Priority 1 – MRT schemes East.</p>			
	Factor	Raw score	Weighting	Weighted score
	Strategy	3	1.5	4.5
	Deliverability	2	2.0	4.0
	Economic Impact	2	4.0	8.0
	TVB area coverage	3	1.5	4.5
	Natural Capital	1	0.5	0.5
	Social Value	3	0.5	1.5
	Total			23.0
<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 19 July 2018^{iv}.</p> <p>The Slough website^v 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 Slough 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"> • Completeness – has the promoter prepared a complete Full Business Case submission, when judged against the prevailing advice from the DfT • Accuracy – has the promoter performed the relevant calculations and assessments accurately and without error • 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 as unduly-optimistic assumptions or out of date modelling data • Value for Money – does the scheme promoter's Value for Money assessment comply with the prevailing DfT guidance • Evaluation arrangements – has the scheme promoter made provision for appropriate post-implementation evaluation of the scheme. • 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. 			
<p>Step 3: Conditional</p>	<p>The Independent Assessor has recommended that in this case a Full</p>			

Assurance Framework Check list	Scheme 2.34 Slough MRT Phase 2
Approval	Approval is appropriate.
Step 4: Recommendation of Financial Approval <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - High Value for Money - Support of the Independent assessor 	The scheme has a Benefit-Cost Ratio (BCR) of 2.2. 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.
Step 5: Formal Agreement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - roles - responsibilities - implementation - reporting - auditing - timing and triggers for payments, - contributions from other funders, - consequences of delay, - consequences of failure, - consequences of change to the design or specification of the scheme - claw back, - evaluation one and five years on - other conditions of Local Growth Funds 	<p>The capital grant of £10,242,000 is a maximum figure which cannot be increased but may be reduced if savings are achieved during implementation. In the event that Slough Borough Council wishes to alter the profile of the grant payments, it must seek prior written permission from TVB LEP, having first raised the matter with the BLTB. The grant is made subject to the following:</p> <p>Roles: TVB LEP is a part funder of the scheme. Slough Borough Council is the scheme promoter and is the relevant highway and planning authority.</p> <p>Responsibilities: TVB LEP is responsible for allocating the capital finance in accordance with its Assurance Framework. Slough Borough 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.</p> <p>Implementation: In addition to any reporting requirements within Slough Borough Council, the scheme promoter will use the pro forma 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, Slough Borough Council will report on any 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.</p> <p>Reporting: 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 Business Rates Retention Pilot. In addition, this scheme will be required to participate in an evaluation as set out in the Growth Deal Monitoring and Evaluation Plan.</p> <p>Auditing: Slough Borough Council will keep financial records such that the expenditure on the scheme is readily identifiable, and if and when a government department or the accountable body for TVB LEP requests</p>

Assurance Framework Check list	Scheme 2.34 Slough MRT Phase 2
	<p>access to financial or other records for the purposes of an audit of the accounts, Slough Borough Council will co-operate fully.</p> <p>Timing and Triggers for payments: Payments will only be made against an invoice and accompanying certificate of work completed, along with proof of planning consent.</p> <p>Contributions from Other Funders: This scheme will be 100% funded from the BRRP. In the event that the scheme experiences or it is anticipated that the scheme will experience a shortfall in these contributions, Slough Borough 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 Failure will then be applied.</p> <p>Consequences of Delay: In the event that the scheme experiences minor delays to its overall Business Case programme (no more than 10 weeks), Slough Borough 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) Slough Borough 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>Consequences of Change to the Design or Specification of the Scheme: In the event that Slough Borough 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, Slough Borough Council will be required to seek prior written consent from TVB LEP. Failing this permission, no further monies will be paid to Slough Borough Council after the change becomes apparent to TVB LEP. In addition, consideration will be given to recovering any monies paid to Slough Borough Council in respect of this scheme.</p> <p>Consequences of Failure: As soon as it becomes apparent to Slough Borough Council that it will not be possible to deliver the scheme at all, written notice shall be given to the accountable body for TVB LEP. No further monies will be paid to Slough Borough Council after this point. In addition, consideration will be given to recovering any monies paid to Slough Borough Council in respect of this scheme.</p> <p>Claw back: 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>

Assurance Framework Check list	Scheme 2.34 Slough MRT Phase 2
	<p>Evaluation One and Five Years On: Slough Borough Council will produce scheme evaluations One and Five years after practical completion that comply with DfT guidance.</p> <p>Other Conditions: Slough Borough Council will also give due regard to the Social Value Act, particularly through the employment of apprentices across the scheme supply chain.</p>

Conclusion

14. Phase 2 of the Slough MRT will continue the investment already made in Phase 1 and will promote public transport access to Heathrow Airport.

Background Papers

15. The LTB and SEP scoring exercise papers are available on request

i <http://www.thamesvalleyberkshire.co.uk/berkshire-strategic-transport-forum>
 ii <http://www.slough.gov.uk/parking-travel-and-roads/plans-for-the-future.aspx>
 iii <http://www.thamesvalleyberkshire.co.uk/berkshire-strategic-transport-forum>
 iv <http://www.slough.gov.uk/Moderngov/documents/s52176/Item%207%20LTB%2019%20July%202018%20BRRP%20bids%20July%202018.pdf>
 v <http://www.slough.gov.uk/parking-travel-and-roads/plans-for-the-future.aspx>



HATCH
REGENERIS

Independent Assessment Summary Report: Slough Mass Rapid Transit Phase 2

A Final Report by Hatch Regeneris Consulting
January 2019

Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership

Independent Assessment Summary Report: Slough MRT Phase 2

January 2019

www.regeneris.co.uk

Contents Page

Executive Summary	i
Scheme Summary	i
Review Findings	i
1. Introduction	1
Submitted Information	1
Report Structure	1
2. Option Assessment Report	2
Overview	2
Review	3
3. Appraisal Specification Report	4
Overview	4
Review	4
4. Full Business Case	5
Overview	5
Key Input Assumption and Parameters	5
Strategic Case	6
Economic Case	8
Financial Case	11
Commercial Case	12
Management Case	13
Summary and Conclusions	14

Executive Summary

- i. This technical note provides an independent assessment of the Slough Mass Rapid Transit Phase 2 (MRT 2) Scheme Business Case submission to the Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership.

Scheme Summary

- ii. The full business case submission sets out the case for investment in a range of highway, public transport, and urban realm improvements along the A4 between Junction 5 on the M4 and Sutton Lane and includes a new Park & Ride (P&R) site. In summary this includes:
 - Widening the South East quadrant of the M4 Junction 5 roundabout from 3 to 4 lanes with modified slip road for eastbound traffic;
 - London Road link widening to 2 lanes westbound between M4 Junction 5 roundabout and Sutton Lane;
 - Park & Ride site located on land adjacent to M4 Junction 5 and Sutton Lane;
 - Modifications and signal provision at the Sutton Lane gyratory; and
 - Public realm enhancements on the northern frontage of the A4 between Langley High Street and the M4 J5 roundabout.

Review Findings

Conclusions

- iii. The overall scheme aligns well with strategic priorities and supports the development of the SMaRT bus network that will support the growth and expansion of both Slough Town Centre and the area around Heathrow. It has been demonstrated that, in general, the scheme will meet the stated objective to minimise stop/start travel along the A4 and improve the reliability of journey times, although this is not necessarily the case for westbound trips in the PM peak, which could see increases in journey times as a result of changes to traffic signal priorities.
- iv. The P&R element of the scheme will encourage mode shift away from private car trips, although it is less clear the extent to which the wider scheme will enhance existing bus services sufficiently to encourage higher bus patronage.
- v. The P&R site itself is forecast to be well utilised by 2036, with at least 85% of the parking capacity used on a typical working day. It will, however, be reliant upon the delivery of the SMaRT bus services by Heathrow Airport Ltd and the long-term commercial viability of the site is not discussed within the business case.
- vi. The scheme is forecast to have a marginal adverse impact upon air quality and this needs to be considered carefully within the context of the AQMAs that cover parts of the scheme impact area.
- vii. The overall economic case forecasts the scheme will deliver high value for money, although the extent to which the benefits are sensitive to external factors is not fully examined. There is potential for £1.5m of private sector funding provision which, if secured, would significantly enhance the margin of return on public sector investment.

- viii. The financial case appears robust, with significant contingency in place. It will be important to establish the conditions and mechanism for securing the potential private sector contribution that may become available.
- ix. The commercial and management cases are generally considered to be robust, although limited in detail in some areas. There is no specific assessment of the commercial viability of the P&R operation, particularly the SMaRT bus services, although it is accepted that this will be part of DCO conditions that Heathrow Airport Ltd will need to deliver. It is not clear, however, how long this agreement would extend and, hence, the duration of commitment to operate the SMaRT service. Ensuring that this agreement is in place, and the SMaRT service in operation, in advance of the delivery of the P&R site will be important to maximise the benefits. Similarly, there are some uncertainties over the land requirements for the scheme and, in particular, when precisely Highways England will release the main site to enable the P&R facilities to be developed.
- x. It is our conclusion that there appears to be a strong overarching case for the scheme, with good strategic alignment and offering high value for money from investment. Whilst there are some concerns about potential negative impacts upon westbound vehicle movements along the A4, potential negative air quality impacts, the delivery of the P&R element, and the on-going operation of P&R services, sufficient clarifications have been provided to demonstrate that these can be addressed, or managed, as part of the detailed development of the scheme.

Recommendations

- xi. On this basis that the potential negative impacts on westbound traffic movements and air quality are minimised through careful detailed design, and that the risks to programme delivery are swiftly and effectively resolved, we recommend the scheme for approval.

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This report provides an independent assessment of the Full Business Case (FBC) submitted by Slough Borough Council (SBC) for a range of enhancements to highway, public transport, and urban realm along the A4 between Junction 5 on the M4 and Sutton Lane and includes a new Park and Ride (P&R) site.
- 1.2 The report considers the evidence presented and whether it represents a robust case for the investment of Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership (TVB LEP) growth deal funds.
- 1.3 The independent assessment has applied criteria from TVB LEP assurance framework and the requirements for transport scheme business cases set out within the Department for Transport (DfT) WebTAG.

Submitted Information

- 1.4 The independent assessment process for the Slough Mass Rapid Transit Phase 2 (MRT 2) submission has been conducted on the following set of documentation submitted by SBC and their consultant team (Atkins):
 - Option Assessment Report (8th October 2018)
 - Appraisal Specification Report (8th October 2018)
 - Full Business Case Report (17th January 2019)
 - Clarification e-mail (17th January 2019)
- 1.5 In addition to these formal documents, Hatch Regeneris have engaged with Atkins between September 2018 and January 2019 to discuss the requirements of the final business case submission and comment upon the acceptability of the proposed appraisal approach and input assumptions and parameters.

Report Structure

- 1.6 This Independent Assessors Report responds to the formal submission of documentation, as well as the informal engagement process with SBC and their consultants, to provide a review of information provided, assess its suitability and robustness against TVB LEPs assurance requirements, and provide recommendations in relation to the approval of LEP funding for the proposed scheme.
- 1.7 The report is structured as follows:
 - Section 2: Option Assessment Report – provides commentary upon the OAR and the process by which a preferred scheme option has been identified.
 - Section 3: Appraisal Specification Report – presents a high-level review of the ASR and the acceptability of the proposed appraisal approach to be adopted
 - Section 4: Full Business Case Submission – presents an initial summary of scheme elements included in business case submission, alongside the details presented within each of the five 'cases' (Strategic, Economic, Financial, Commercial, Management). It also sets out the recommendations to the LEP Local Transport Body relating to the suitability of the scheme for funding.

2. Option Assessment Report

Overview

- 2.1 An OAR for the scheme, dated 8th October 2018, has been reviewed. This sets out the background for the scheme and its context, the evidence of the problems and challenges and the need for intervention now and in the future, the subsequent identified objectives of the scheme, and the stakeholder engagement undertaken.
- 2.2 It then develops and appraises five options for transport provision across the identified A4 corridor:
- **Do Nothing:** As existing, with background growth, committed schemes and schemes under construction
 - **Do Something 1:** highway infrastructure measures on the A4 between High Street Langley and Sutton Lane gyratory Brands Hill, introduce signalling and pedestrian facilities and public realm improvements. Junction enhancements and the provision of a segregated lane or 'track' along the A4 Colnbrook Bypass east to the Borough boundary, including real time information (SMaRT technology) measures. Facilitates accessibility to the proposed Slough International Freight Exchange (SIFE)
 - **Do Something 2:** As DS1, with the provision of a Park and Ride site
 - **Do Something 3:** As DS1, but without segregated bus lane and SMaRT technology along the A4 Colnbrook Bypass or facilitating SIFE, although compatible for future upgrades to include SMaRT technology and/or SIFE
 - **Do Something 4:** As DS1, but without segregated bus lane and SMaRT technology along the A4 Colnbrook Bypass or facilitating SIFE, although compatible for future upgrades to include SMaRT technology and/or SIFE, with the provision of a Park and Ride site.
- 2.3 Each scheme option is appraised in terms of:
- How it complements the six infrastructure investment packages within the Strategic Economic Plan;
 - How they will deliver against the three established scheme intervention objectives; and
 - How deliverable they are, with reference to:
 - Infrastructure Feasibility
 - the option.
 - Operational Feasibility
 - Land Take Requirements
 - Complexity of Delivery
 - Environmental Impact
 - Socio-Distributional Impacts
 - Wellbeing
 - Stakeholder Acceptance/Support
 - Costs
 - Affordability
 - Timescales for Delivery

- 2.4 The OAR concludes that the Do Minimum option fails to address strategic objectives. However, each of the remaining four Do Something options present certain merits to meet objectives, for varying cost.
- 2.5 It is ultimately concluded that Do Something 4 offers the potential to deliver the best benefits that align with the TVB LEP's and SBC's objectives for the scheme, at the same time as being affordable and deliverable

Review

- 2.6 The OAR represents a well set out document, providing a detailed understanding of the underlying issues along the A4 corridor and generating a specific set of objectives.
- 2.7 The introduction refers to a broader option generation process, however, a long-list of potential scheme options is not presented and the variation within the four Do-something options is relatively limited, with common elements across all of them. None-the-less, it provides evidence that some scheme optioneering has taken place.
- 2.8 One area of concern relates to the provision of the Park & Ride site. There is no discussion of potential alternative options for this provision in terms of i) absolute location; ii) overall size of provision; iii) access and egress arrangements; or iv) on-site provision. It is assumed that the chosen site represents the only viable site along the corridor, however, evidence that this is the case should ideally have been presented. This will need to be addressed within the full business case submission.
- 2.9 The option appraisal framework appears comprehensive, considering both the likely performance of each option in supporting strategic and scheme specific objectives, as well as a wide-range of deliverability issues.
- 2.10 There is a pattern of scoring between the Do Something Option without and without the Park & Ride element in relation to delivery against objectives. In all instances, the with Park & Ride outscores the without options. There is no variation between the Do Something options with and without the segregated bus lanes and SMaRT technologies. This may, in part, be due to the aggregate nature of scoring system applied, but in practice we would expect some differences and it is considered that this may underplay some of the benefits of this provision.
- 2.11 In terms of deliverability, the 'without Park & Ride Do Something' options outperform the 'with' options. In addition, the options without the segregated bus lanes and SMaRT technologies are considered to outperform those options with them included.
- 2.12 The Applicants conclusion that the Do Something 4 is the preferred option is not without reasonable logic, albeit it would appear to be a somewhat subjective assessment with the limited available knowledge in relation to the Park & Ride provision.
- 2.13 The final business case submission will need to clearly demonstrate the benefits of the Park & Ride element within the overall package of measures.

3. Appraisal Specification Report

Overview

- 3.1 The Appraisal Specification Report (ASR) was submitted for assessment and reviewed by Hatch Regeneris in October 2018. It provided:
- A summary of the scheme and its location;
 - The objectives of the scheme;
 - An overview of the challenges and issues, this implications of doing nothing, the options being considered; and issues around deliverability and risk;
 - An overview of the transport modelling that will be required, including the existing models available and their calibration/validation, and the proposed modelling approach;
 - The proposed appraisal methodology, including the approach to the economic, environmental, social and public accounts assessments, and the data sources to be utilised; and
 - An Appraisal Specification Summary Table.
- 3.2 Various meetings and telecoms were held with SBC and their consultants, (Atkins), to discuss the broad approach. A large focus of these discussions relating to the modelling tool available, with a new 2018 model being created but potentially not being ready in time to complete the modelling analysis within the required timeframes.

Review

- 3.3 The ASR sets out a clear overview of the context and the issues surrounding the development of the scheme and identifies the type of impacts that will need to be assessed.
- 3.4 The modelling work will be reliant upon the Slough Multi-Modal Transport Model (SMMTM), with public transport (EMME) and highway (SATURN) components. After a period of uncertainty, it was concluded that the 2018 refresh of the model would be available to conduct the appraisal work. This is considered critical in order to have confidence in the outputs.
- 3.5 It was agreed that, in the event the 2018 Refreshed Model could not be used for any reason, that the original model could be modified and utilised as a proxy, but that the results would need to be verified within the 2018 Refreshed Model at a subsequent date, when available.
- 3.6 In general, the model approach specified appears suitable to test the combination of highway and public transport provision, albeit the lack of detail around the specification of the park & ride provision (notable, what bus services will operate from it) creates some uncertainty.
- 3.7 The wider approach to assessing the economic, environmental, social and public accounts impacts is consistent with WebTAG requirements. A range of assessments will be qualitative in nature. Whilst in principle this is acceptable, given the scale of the scheme and some of the potential environmental impacts, there will need to be clear evidence in the final business case that more detailed quantitative assessments of impacts are not required.

4. Full Business Case

Overview

- 4.1 The full business case submission, for Slough Mass Rapid Transit (SMaRT) Phase 2 and Park and Ride (P&R), sets out the case for investment to increase the accessibility along the A4 corridor. In summary, this includes:
- Widening the South East quadrant of the M4 Junction 5 roundabout from 3 to 4 lanes with modified slip road for eastbound traffic;
 - London Road link widening to 2 lanes westbound between M4 Junction 5 roundabout and Sutton Lane;
 - Park & Ride site located on land adjacent to M4 Junction 5 and Sutton Lane;
 - Modifications and signal provision at the Sutton Lane gyratory; and
 - Public realm enhancements on the northern frontage of the A4 between Langley High Street and the M4 J5 roundabout.
- 4.2 The above outlined scheme is a component of the larger SMaRT package to improve accessibility, though a safe and reliable sustainable transport network, whilst reducing congestion, enabling economic growth, and reducing cost of travel.

Key Input Assumption and Parameters

- 4.3 The overarching business case is considered particularly reliant upon the following key assumptions:
- 60-year benefits appraisal period, with the exception for the urban realm improvements where a 15-year period has been applied
 - The highway elements of the scheme are assumed to open in 2021, with the P&R site opening in 2022, although all benefits have been assessed within the economic case from 2021. No ramping up of benefits has been applied.
 - Use of the AM peak hour transport model to assess inter-peak transport impacts, with benefits to users assumed to be 50% of peak period
 - Introduction of SMaRT bus service linking Slough Town Centre prior to P&R site opening
 - Land for the P&R site will become available in March 2020 (either in part or fully), upon release by Highways England who are using the site as part of their M4 Smart Motorways project

Independent Assessor Comment

- 4.4 The appraisal period is considered consistent with this type of infrastructure project. The assessment of full benefits from 2021 may result in a marginal over-forecasting of the Present Value of Benefits (once discounting has been taken into consideration).
- 4.5 Whilst the use of the AM peak hour transport model to predict inter-peak impacts is not without precedent, care does need to be taken that the AM peak hour model is truly reflective of behaviour in the inter-peak. In particular, there are potential issues around

changes to traffic signals in inter-peak periods having greater impact and the overall level P&R usage may be proportionally lower.

- 4.6 The P&R site will be served by the SMaRT bus service to be delivered by Heathrow Airport Ltd. At this stage no specific commitments are in place and so there is some uncertainty around the level of provision. This could affect the P&R site operations, although the business case notes that conventional bus services could serve the P&R site as well, but this would add journey time to existing bus users.
- 4.7 The development of the P&R site is dependent upon the release of land by Highway England. At this stage there is no definitive date for this to occur and so this could impact upon the delivery programme for the P&R element.

Strategic Case

- 4.8 The Strategic Case provides an overview of the key policy context for the scheme, referencing national, regional and local transport policy. Three key **problems are identified** that the scheme will aim to address and each is discussed in detail, in short to:
- Address congestion and improve journey time reliability
 - Improve the image and environment of Slough
 - Improve accessibility to housing and employment development sites
- 4.9 Existing public transport provision is set out within the corridor, in particular highlighting existing bus routes and frequencies. The **impact of no change** is presented in terms of the constraints transport will place upon growth, how congestion will deter travellers from using the corridor, and how air quality is unlikely to improve as quickly.
- 4.10 The **key drivers for change** in the area are explored, highlighting the role of Slough Trading Estate and Heathrow Airport as key focuses for growth, as well as the upcoming delivery of Crossrail and issues of HGV parking in the area.
- 4.11 A clear set of four **scheme objectives** are presented, focused around improving travel conditions on the A4, encouraging mode shift to public transport, improving the functionality of Sutton Lane Gyratory and improving the landscape and public realm within the corridor. The **measures for success** associated with these objectives are also clearly set out, relating to journey times by all modes, public transport patronage, safety and air quality. **Logic mapping** sets out how the inputs delivered by the investment will translate through into outputs in the short, medium and long-term that address the objectives.
- 4.12 A range of **constraints** are identified, relating to land requirements, statutory powers and consents. Various land acquisitions from private owners are necessary and planning permissions required for the P&R site.
- 4.13 The **dependencies** outline the need for other scheduled highway improvements to deliver the most effective solution for the P&R site.
- 4.14 A wide range of **stakeholders** have been engaged as part of the scheme development process, with letters of support provided.
- 4.15 The **options assessment** process has considered a range of potential locations for P&R based upon available sites, with a summary of why sites were discounted or determined to be sub-optimal in comparison to the selected BIFFA site.
- 4.16 The Strategic Case concludes with a clear **summary** of the component parts of the package of measures, including outline design work for the highway works, (incorporating walking, cycling and urban realm improvements) and the P&R site and why this package of measures meet the strategic needs of the corridor.

Independent Assessor Comment

- 4.17 The Strategic Case is considered to present a comprehensive overview of the issues, objectives and preferred solutions for the identified section of the A4 corridor.
- 4.18 The policy context is well established, with a clear understanding of the priorities of national, regional and local bodies.
- 4.19 There is a clear and logical presentation of the overarching problems that have been identified within the corridor, relating directly to access and movement, the wider setting of the urban environment, and the underlying requirement to delivery housing and commercial growth.
- 4.20 The direct assessment of current transport provision presents an overview of the situation, although does not directly draw upon outputs from the transport model, which would have added context and depth to the subsequent economic analysis. There is no specific discussion of current mode split to demonstrate the extent to which change is required. Likewise, the discussion around delays to car and buses is anecdotal with no quantification of delays. There is no reference to any assessment, or market testing, to determine the attractiveness of a P&R site within this corridor. Similarly, there is limited discussion about the role of walking and cycling within the context of the corridor. It would strengthen the strategic case if more consideration of the vision for transport service provision was set out.
- 4.21 The discussion of the urban environment focuses upon both the physical nature and the air quality issues in the corridor. Again, whilst it is helpful that the AQMAs are identified, there is limited discussion on how severe the issues are and what corrective measures are required.
- 4.22 The issue of accessibility to key housing and employment development areas in Slough Trading Estate and Heathrow is well set out, with clear identification of the need for enhanced transport connectivity to these areas. This is further reiterated within the section on drivers for change.
- 4.23 Whilst the impact of no change is clearly set out, it would again benefit from additional quantitative analysis about the scale of access constraints, congestion, and air quality issues.
- 4.24 There is reference to the issue of HGV overnight parking, but this section is not expansive in detail and so it is unclear to the extent of the problem and how the provision of parking on the park & ride site could resolve some or all of the issues.
- 4.25 The scheme objectives are focused, with associated desired outcomes identified, and the measures for success are considered appropriate. The logic mapping is welcomed and provides a useful understanding of the causal links between the investments and outputs and outcomes. It does, however, appear to omit the P&R element of the scheme.
- 4.26 The section on constraints and dependencies demonstrates that due consideration has been given to external factors that could affect the deliver of the schemes. These are noted as potential risks, not specifically to the overall delivery of the project, but potentially to the timeframes in which the scheme can be completed. This is a key issue that needs to be taken into account given the fixed time periods in which the funding for the project is available.
- 4.27 The list of stakeholders appears comprehensive, but it is noted that a number of these organisations, groups or entities are relatively central to the delivery of the scheme and it is unclear quite how much involvement they have had, individually, to date. Clearly Heathrow Airport Limited and the bus operators are key collaborators in relation to the SMaRT bus services that will serve the P&R site.

- 4.28 The options assessment process demonstrates that consideration has been given to a range of alternative sites for the P&R provision. Whilst not expansive, there are logical reasons given for why the BIFFA site was identified as the preferred option
- 4.29 The summary section provides a useful overview of each scheme element, with some clear outline designs provided that help visualise the outputs. It is considered that there is a strong underlying case for the package of interventions, albeit that the case is broadly reliant upon qualitative assessments without specific quantitative analysis to back up some of the key points raised.

Economic Case

- 4.30 The Economic Case provides an assessment of the transport modelling work undertaken, the benefits appraisal, the derivation of scheme costs and the scheme assessment and supporting analysis.
- 4.31 The main benefits assessed are journey times impacts, indirect fuel tax revenues, greenhouse gases, noise and air quality, and safety.
- 4.32 The **options appraised** establishes four variant scheme options, alongside the Do Minimum scenario. These comprise combinations of alternative high and low cost highway infrastructure for facilitation of SMaRT and with or without the provision of a P&R site. The low cost highway infrastructure with the P&R site is identified as the preferred option. Reference is made to the associated **scheme concept designs** presented within the Strategic Case.
- 4.33 The approach to the **transport modelling** is set out describing the use of the latest, updated Slough Multi-Modal Transport model (SMMTM17). The approach to assessing future year demand for the model is set out, along with the committed transport schemes included within the model. The model covers an average hour within a 3-hour AM peak period and an average hour within a 3-hour PM peak period.
- 4.34 The **highway element** of SMMTM17 is a SATURN model and the underlying assumptions on the trip matrix, trip purpose, peak periods, and vehicles types is presented.
- 4.35 The **public transport element** of SMMTM17 is an EMME model applying the same zoning as the SATURN model. It takes the bus network and bus journey times from the SATURN model as well. A list of public transport services included within the EMME model is presented, along with assignment parameters.
- 4.36 **P&R demand** is estimated outside of the SMMTM17 model using an absolute logit choice model formulation. The underlying assumptions and transport input data into the model is set out.
- 4.37 An overall summary of the approach to the **economic appraisal** is set out. This describes the use of a TUBA model to assess direct transport user impacts. Benefits are assessed for the AM and PM peak periods, using the AM and PM peak hour models. Inter-peak impacts are also assessed using the AM peak hour model, although only 50% of the benefits to users have been captured within the inter-peak to reflect lower levels of congestion. Benefits have been scaled up using localised traffic count data and an annulisation factor of 253, to represent the number of working days in a year.
- 4.38 It is noted that benefits from cycling improvements have not been captured within the monetised benefits assessment.
- 4.39 A section on **outputs** set out the levels of current and future year highway demand, by vehicle type. It then presents the difference in flows and average journey times/speeds between the Do minimum (DM) and Do Something (DS) [with scheme measures] scenarios.

- 4.40 The outputs generally show increases in traffic flows and reduced journey times in an eastbound direction along the A4. Westbound flows appear relatively constant and in the PM peak there are actually reductions in westbound journey times, caused by additional signal control.
- 4.41 The public transport outputs demonstrate that, despite having an additional call at the P&R site, the SMaRT bus services do not suffer any notable reduction in journey time as they benefit from congestion relief along the A4 corridor.
- 4.42 Forecast levels of **P&R patronage** are presented for the AM and PM peak periods and disaggregated by direction of travel towards with Slough or Heathrow. The distribution of these trips, in terms of their origin and final destination, is presented graphically.
- 4.43 The analysis presented indicates that 2036 AM peak 3-hour demand for P&R parking is 502 spaces out of the total 600 available. It is indicated that additional spaces may be occupied during the inter-peak period. The analysis acknowledges that demand will be influenced by a variety of external factors, including parking and car access policies around Slough and Heathrow. It is also noted that under-utilised capacity on the site could be utilised as an over-night parking facility for HGVs.
- 4.44 The **capital and operating costs** associated with the highway improvements and P&R works are set out, with the underlying adjustments made to incorporate them into the economic analysis. Optimism bias of 22% has been applied within the economic assessment.
- 4.45 Changes to **vehicle operating costs** are calculated within the TUBA modelling. A discussion of **revenue impacts** is set out in relation to parking charges and bus fares. P&R site parking revenue and bus revenue impacts are captured within the TUBA modelling but impacts upon parking in Slough or Heathrow are not and so these have been considered separately. The assumption has been made that all individuals who switch to P&R will be paying for parking in the DM scenario and so there will be a loss in associated parking revenue. This is calculated using average parking charges and assumed average durations of stay.
- 4.46 A discussion on **funding** indicates that there is potential for £1.5 million of developer funding that could contribute to the scheme. This is not yet secured, however, and so has not been included within the bid submission.
- 4.47 **Safety** has been considered in terms of the potential impacts of the scheme upon levels of accidents. Accident data is presented for the sections of highway associated with the scheme. A COBALT assessment has been carried out, using the outputs from the SATURN model, to predict the impacts upon accident levels. The outputs forecast a negative impact upon accident levels, resulting primarily from an increase in traffic flow along the route. The associated commentary provided highlights that the scheme will incorporate new pedestrian crossing and cycling facilities that will improve safety levels and that these would not be captured within the standard COBALT assessment.
- 4.48 An assessment of **journey time reliability** is presented with benefit presented quantitatively for highway users and qualitatively for public transport users.
- 4.49 An assessment of **air quality impacts** is presented, highlighting the existing issues within the designated AQMA's and on-going air quality monitoring stations in close proximity to the scheme. The assessment recognises how changes in traffic flows and road alignment could affect the level of emissions for designated receptors. The analysis would appear to conclude that there could, potentially, be negative air quality impacts as a result of the scheme. It is, though, noted that the scheme is supported by Slough Air Quality Management Plan, in terms of encouraging mode shift away from private car trips.

- 4.50 A separate assessment of the **walking and cycling impacts** is presented. This is a qualitative assessment, focusing upon the manner in which the walking and cycling infrastructure will integrate with the existing network and other planned scheme improvements.
- 4.51 A brief discussion on **landscaping impacts** is presented. This notes neutral impacts upon heritage and the water environment but a potential slight adverse impact upon biodiversity and landscape.
- 4.52 A section on **appraisal tables** sets out the required Transport Economic Efficiency, Public Accounts, and Analysis of Monetised Cost and Benefits tables. The information presented indicates the overall scheme is forecast to deliver a monetised Benefit to Cost Ratio of 2.2 to 1. This would represent high value for money from investment.
- 4.53 A clear **Value for Money Statement** is also provided, setting out an overview of the scheme, costs, monetised direct transport benefits, other wider benefits. A full **Appraisal Summary Table** is presented within the appendices.
- 4.54 The Economic Case concludes by reflecting that the scheme is forecast to deliver high value for money, even when including negative accident impacts predicted by COBALT but potentially unlikely to occur. The addition of reliability benefits would also increase the overall case for investment in the scheme.

Independent Assessor Comment

- 4.55 The Economic Case is well formulated and presents information on the approach adopted, the tools utilised, and the forecast economic costs and benefits.
- 4.56 The options assessment process is a little limited in scope but does demonstrate that alternative approaches have been considered.
- 4.57 The approach to transport modelling and forecasting of demand is broadly considered sound. The use of SATURN and EMME provides a powerful predictive tool for assessing the multi-modal impacts of the package of highway and public transport measures proposed. Both models would appear to be sufficiently robust for the purposes of the assessment, with sensible input assumptions. The P&R demand forecasting is restricted to a simple binary logit choice between car travel or P&R. Whilst this is not considered to be unreasonable it would be useful to explain the reasoning behind this approach and, specifically, identify if there is any potential (or risk) for existing bus users to switch to P&R. There is also no presentation of the underlying comparative generalised costs of travelling by P&R as opposed to car, for given origin-destination pairs. This would be useful to understand how attractive the P&R offer is from this site.
- 4.58 The use of the AM peak hour model to forecast inter-peak impacts is not without precedent; however, there is limited discussion of how representative the AM peak hour model is of inter-peak traffic movements. It is acknowledged that only 50% of the forecast AM peak user benefits are captured for the inter-peak but where there are changes to the signalisation of junctions this can potentially have adverse impacts in off-peak conditions.
- 4.59 The outputs from the SATURN model present a mixed forecast of potential impacts. The scheme appears to particularly favour eastbound traffic movements along the A4 corridor, with westbound trips forecast to have broadly neutral or, in the PM peak, negative impacts. It is understood that this relates to the junction signalisation arrangements required to access/egress the P&R site. The impact upon westbound traffic is not fully explored, particularly in terms of the operation of bus services, including the new SMaRT P&R service.

- 4.60 There is no specific assessment of the impact of the scheme upon overall public transport levels and whether scheme will encourage use of the SMaRT bus services, over and above the forecast P&R usage.
- 4.61 The presentation of forecast P&R patronage and users original and destinations is helpful. The calculation of predicted P&R site car parking space occupancy suggests that the site will operate at above 85% of parking capacity on a typical working day capacity, by 2036.
- 4.62 The assessment of economic costs and direct user benefits is considered to be robust. The forecast impact upon parking revenues is considered to be a sensible approach.
- 4.63 The submission identifies a potential £1.5 million private sector funding contribution that could come forward, but that has not been included within the scheme funding as it is not committed. Whilst this is considered to be a robust approach to take, any final funding agreement for the scheme will need to specify the circumstances in which this private sector funding could be secured in place of LGF funding.
- 4.64 The COBALT assessment of accident benefits identifies a potential negative impact of the scheme, however, the arguments presented about the tool being strategic in nature, and so does not capture some of the specific enhancement to pedestrians and cyclists, is well made.
- 4.65 The approach to adopting journey time reliability impacts for highway trips, whilst referenced, is not clear within the formal business case but has been clarified separately with the Applicant and is considered acceptable.
- 4.66 The assessment of air quality impacts is generally qualitative in nature but with some assessment of changes in vehicle flows. Whilst this approach is acceptable, the conclusions drawn imply a potential deterioration in air quality. This would appear contrary to the aims of the schemes.
- 4.67 The scheme would appear to deliver positive walking and cycling benefits, albeit these are not captured within the quantified assessment of benefits.
- 4.68 The overall assessment of the economic case concludes that the scheme offers high value for money and that there are additional, non-monetised benefits. There are no sensitivity tests presented to demonstrate whether the scheme would deliver high value for money under different input assumptions. These could include tests of high and low growth assumptions, a test with the removal of inter-peak benefits, and a test with varying P&R demand. The Applicant has provided separate commentary about potential variances in a clarification response. This provides some additional assurances that the scheme will perform strongly under a variety of scenarios.

Financial Case

- 4.69 The Financial Case provides a detailed breakdown of the capital scheme costs and the estimated funding and cost profile.
- 4.70 The total cost of the scheme and funding ask is £13.249m, of which £6.029m relates to the capital highway costs, £2.327m on the Park and Ride capital costs, £0.5m on land costs, £2.15m on preparatory and site supervision costs. A further £2.243m is set aside as a risk contingency.
- 4.71 A detailed scheme cost profile is presented, with the total per annum summarised below:
 - 2019/20 = £2,434,900
 - 2012/21 = £5,089,600
 - 2021/22 = £5,724,500

- 4.72 Operation and maintenance costs are also clearly set out for the P&R site.
- 4.73 Funding is to be sourced entirely from the 2018 Business Rates Retention Pilot with £10.1m drawn during 2018/19 and remaining £3.15m in 2019/20. There is the potential for a £1.5 private sector contribution, however this is not currently secured.

Independent Assessor Comment

- 4.74 A clear breakdown in **cost estimates** is presented demonstrating how each of the five main costs elements have been developed. A £0.5m allowance for land costs is included, although it is understood that the process of land acquisition is at a relatively early stage with negotiations with private sector land owners required. A 15% overall allowance for preparatory costs and a 10% allowance for site supervision have then been added, to provide a sub-total of £11.006 million.
- 4.75 A **Quantified Risk Budget** of £2.243m (or 20.4% of the sub-total) has been set aside to meet any unexpected costs. This is based upon a detailed assessment of risks presented within the Appendices and would appear to be a reasonable amount of contingency funding.
- 4.76 The reported **funding ask** is presented in Q4 2016 prices, rather than nominal prices. This may result in some minor discrepancies, however, any variation is likely to be covered within the allocated risk contingency.
- 4.77 As stated previously, it will be important to understand under what circumstances, and what mechanisms, the £1.5m private sector contribution could be secured.

Commercial Case

- 4.78 The Commercial Case provides an output-based specification for the scheme, an overview of potential procurement options, and the preferred procurement routes are outlined, along with the contract management procedures.
- 4.79 In total four procurement routes were considered, each judged by their offer, risk transfer, and advantages and disadvantages. These are listed in turn:
- Traditional, procurement, construction, separate maintenance;
 - Design and Build (D&B) construction, separate maintenance;
 - Early Contractor Involvement (ECI), separate maintenance; and
 - Private Finance Initiative (PFI) Funding, Design Build Operate and Maintain (DBOM).
- 4.80 The preferred route has resulted in the scheme being divided into five elements for the procurement process:
- Infrastructure design – will be competitively tendered
 - Infrastructure build – delivered through the Councils contractor for Direct Service Organisation
 - Infrastructure maintenance and renewal – to be undertaken by SBC, as an extension of existing highway and parking maintenance
 - Operation of the P&R – to be undertaken by SBC as part of its parking operation
 - Operation of additional bus services – to be secured by Heathrow Airport Ltd

- 4.81 The project will be managed internally by SBC adopting PRINCE2 methods for programme management and NEC 4 principles. Risk will be allocated during the contract negotiations in the most cost-effective manner. The contract length for the P&R services would be expected to be 8 years.
- 4.82 The procurement strategy will follow the SBC Council Procurement Strategy (2012).

Independent Assessor Comment

- 4.83 The Output-Based Specification for the scheme is relatively broad but covers the core elements of the scheme.
- 4.84 The procurement strategy outlines the framework that governs procurement. Though a detailed account of advantages and disadvantages for several procurement options were presented, this does not particularly flow through to the preferred route, although some rationale for the chosen path is presented.
- 4.85 There is some information on risk allocation and transfer, contract length, contract management that provides an overarching understanding, without presenting the detail of the proposed approach.
- 4.86 There is no specific reference to the commercial viability of the Park and Ride, particularly in relation to the SMaRT bus services that will serve the site, and, hence, how sustainable these services are in the long-term.

Management Case

- 4.87 The Management Case presents information on how the proposal will be delivered and managed.
- 4.88 Two examples of Slough Borough Council's **experience** in successfully delivering two transport infrastructure schemes are provided.
- 4.89 **Programme and project dependencies** are set out in relation to planning and CPO requirements, procurement, and engagement.
- 4.90 An organogram and **governance structure** are presented which lists the individual, job title and team. For each team, a list of responsibilities is listed. Roles will be chosen by relevant experience.
- 4.91 Reference is made to SBC's Gateway Process for assessing projects at critical stages, as part of the **assurance and approval** process. **Project reporting** processes are also set out.
- 4.92 A **Communication & Stakeholder Management Strategy** is set out with objectives, key stakeholders, communications, engaging with the public, handling of the media, and public consultation.
- 4.93 An **Implementation Plan** sets out the key workstreams and issues and milestones.
- 4.94 A **Risk Management Plan** is to be developed throughout the lifetime of the project. The associated Risk Register is included and identifies risks by their likelihood, impact and cost and are categorised as: strategic/political/policy, economic/financial/management, statutory process/legal/land acquisition, design/technical/preparatory works, stakeholder management/consultation, procurement, construction, and operation.
- 4.95 A **Benefits Realisation Plan** is set out along with a **Monitoring and Evaluation Plan** with key performance indicators and targets.
- 4.96 A **Contingency Plan** is also provided setting out contingency arrangements.

Independent Assessor Comment

- 4.97 The previous project examples of SBC delivery relate to highway elements of the project but are less relevant to the P&R element. They do demonstrate competency of delivering major transport schemes.
- 4.98 The project dependencies section is presented and draws directly from the risk register but does not identify whether the scheme is dependent on other schemes.
- 4.99 The governance structure is clear, with responsibilities outlined.
- 4.100 The SBC Gateway Process for assurance and approvals appears robust, although limited detail is presented. The responsibilities for project reporting are also clear.
- 4.101 The communication and stakeholder management strategy is considered comprehensive and covers core expectations.
- 4.102 The implementation plan sets out key workstreams covering the majority of key delivery issues, however, it is noted there is no reference to land acquisition, in particular when Highway England will vacate the land for the development of the P&R site.
- 4.103 There are some key milestone dates within the programme that relate to the delivery of the SMaRT bus services and the P&R site itself. Both of these are reliant upon external bodies.
- 4.104 The underpinning governance and management of risk is well structured and considered. The Risk Register presented is comprehensive and mitigation actions sensible but could be enhanced. The methodology to determine the estimated cost and likelihood of each risk (i.e. a £603,572 cost has been associated to “Scheme does not integrate with wider policy”) is not specifically referenced. However, as mentioned within the Financial Case, the overall contingency budget would appear robust.
- 4.105 The Benefits Realisation Plan establishes the benefits that will be tracked, although it does not specifically contain details on proactive actions that the SBC will undertake to ensure benefits are realised.
- 4.106 The Monitoring and Evaluation plan includes specific 1-year and 5-year targets for each indicator.
- 4.107 The Contingency Plan sets out a range of contingency arrangements that are considered to cover most potential outcomes, although some of the issues of land availability are not specifically referenced.

Summary and Conclusions

Summary

- 4.108 The review of the five cases has identified a series of points for further consideration. These are summarised below:
- The Strategic Case demonstrate strong policy alignment and a good case for intervention, albeit additional quantified analysis, including the reference case outputs from the transport modelling, would enhance the arguments presented in relation to the levels of underlying congestion, delays to bus services and poor accessibility to key centres in Slough and Heathrow.
 - There is underlying discussion of the value of delivering P&R provision in terms of enhancing public transport opportunities and encouraging mode shift but the Strategic Case does not present strong evidence on the underpinning demand for this type of service and how attractive it will be for individuals of differing journey

patterns. The demand forecasting analysis in the Economic Case does predict that the site will operate at above 85% capacity by 2036.

- The project is dependent upon a range of land acquisitions, planning requirements, and third-party actions and there remains some uncertainty about how great a risk this represents to overall delivery of the scheme, in particular the P&R and SMaRT bus service elements.
- Overall the economic case for the scheme appears strong. There are some areas where the scheme does not perform as strongly as might be anticipated, including reducing journey times, with the westbound PM peak hour trips along the A4 forecast to see journey times increases. The accident analysis also indicates potential negative impacts, although it is accepted that this may generally be the result of the limited sophistication of the standard available DfT modelling tool. Air quality impacts may also be marginally negative, although again not modelled in detail.
- A robust financial case is presented with a clear breakdown of costs and risk contingencies. The funding profile is presented in Q4 2016 prices, as opposed to nominal prices, which will need to be accounted for. The potential to secure £1.5m private sector contribution is not fully explored.
- The commercial and management case provide reasonably detailed information to demonstrate surety in the preferred procurement processes and the overall deliverability of the project. Land availability and third-party provisions appear to be the biggest risks associated with delivery.

Conclusions

- 4.109 The overall scheme aligns well with strategic priorities and supports the development of the SMaRT bus network that will support the growth and expansion of both Slough Town Centre and the area around Heathrow. It has been demonstrated that, in general, the scheme will meet the stated objectives to minimise stop/start travel along the A4 and improve the reliability of journey times, although this is not necessarily the case for westbound trips in the PM peak, which could see increases in journey times as a result of changes to traffic signal priorities.
- 4.110 The P&R element of the scheme will encourage mode shift away from private car trips, although it is less clear the extent to which the wider scheme will enhance existing bus services sufficiently to encourage higher bus patronage.
- 4.111 The P&R site itself is forecast to be well utilised by 2036, with at least 85% of the parking capacity used on a typical working day. It will, however, be reliant upon the delivery of the SMaRT bus services by Heathrow Airport Ltd and the long-term commercial viability of the site is not discussed within the business case.
- 4.112 The scheme is forecast to have a marginal adverse impact upon air quality and this needs to be considered carefully within the context of the AQMAs that cover parts of the scheme impact area.
- 4.113 The overall economic case forecasts the scheme will deliver high value for money, although the extent to which the benefits are sensitive to external factors is not fully examined. There is potential for £1.5m of private sector funding provision which, if secured, would significantly enhance the margin of return on public sector investment.
- 4.114 The financial case appears robust, with significant contingency in place. It will be important to establish the conditions and mechanism for securing the potential private sector contribution that may become available.

- 4.115 The commercial and management cases are generally considered to be robust, although limited in detail in some areas. There is no specific assessment of the commercial viability of the P&R operation, particularly the SMaRT bus services, although it is accepted that this will be part of DCO conditions that Heathrow Airport Ltd will need to deliver. It is not clear, however, how long this agreement would extend and, hence, the duration of commitment to operate the SMaRT service. Ensuring that this agreement is in place, and the SMaRT service in operation, in advance of the delivery of the P&R site will be important to maximise the benefits. Similarly, there are some uncertainties over the land requirements for the scheme and, in particular, when precisely Highways England will release the main site to enable the P&R facilities to be developed.
- 4.116 It is our conclusion that there appears to be a strong overarching case for the scheme, with good strategic alignment and offering high value for money from investment. Whilst there are some concerns about potential negative impacts upon westbound vehicle movements along the A4, potential negative air quality impacts, the delivery of the P&R element, and the on-going operation of P&R services, sufficient clarifications have been provided to demonstrate that these can be addressed, or managed, a part of the detailed development of the scheme. On this basis, we recommend the scheme for approval.



www.regeneris.co.uk

London: 0207 336 6188

Manchester: 0161 234 9910

BERKSHIRE LOCAL TRANSPORT BODY (BLTB)**REPORT TO:** BLTB**DATE:** 31 January 2019**CONTACT OFFICER:** Joe Carter, Director of Regeneration, Lead Officer to the BLTB**PART I****Item 9: Business Rates Retention Pilot – Revenue Support*****Purpose of Report***

1. In March 2018 you agreed to issue calls for bids for funding via the Business Rates Retention Pilot (BRRP) and the associated re-prioritisation of schemes in the Growth Deal 3 list; in July 2018 you agreed to “top-slice” the £25m BRRP allocation by £600,000 in order to establish a scheme for providing revenue support to local authorities for the development of a strong pipeline of future infrastructure schemes.
2. In November 2018 you approved the revenue support proposals and the drawdown of BRRP funds by Reading, West Berkshire, Windsor and Maidenhead and Wokingham.
3. This report recommends further payments under the revenue support scheme.

Recommendation

You are recommended to:

4. Approve the revenue support proposal and the drawdown of BRRP funds by Bracknell Forest Council set out in appendix 1.

Other Implications***Financial***

5. The lead authority for BRRP and the process of operating the Business Rates element (agreeing baseline amounts, managing the pool of retained funds) is Bracknell Forest Council. The planning figure of £25m for 2018-19 is based on current estimates of business rates collection in 2018-19, and no revisions are anticipated.
6. 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.

7. The BRRP has been approved for a single financial year (2018-19); MHCLG has since approved a second year of the pilot (2019/20) and a planning number of c.£111m has been calculated for new infrastructure investment.
8. At your meeting in July, you prioritised the following schemes:

Scheme	£'000's
Slough Mass Rapid Transit (SMaRT) Phase 2	10.242
South Reading MRT Phases 3 and 4	7.898
Wokingham Winnersh Relief Road Phase 2	6.260
Revenue Support for Scheme Development	0.600
Total	25.000

Risk Management

9. The risks associated with large scale infrastructure investments are well known, and the BLTB has established risk management arrangements for the LGF transport capital programme (£111m over 6 years), referred to as the [Assurance Framework¹](#).
10. As part of the LGF oversight, government officials have reviewed this assurance framework and found it fit for purpose.
11. The Berkshire authorities have identified the LEP and its associated processes as an appropriate framework for managing the BRRP sums available; in this instance this means programme management by the BLTB and ultimate sign-off by the LEP Forum. The LEP Forum ratified this approach on 27 March 2018.
12. The implication is that promoters of infrastructure projects seeking funding from the BRRP will need to follow the same assurance framework as for LGF. This means acceptance at “programme entry” stage, 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

13. Slough Borough Council will provide legal support for the BLTB should any questions arise on the application of the BRRP.

Supporting Information

Revenue Support for Business Case Preparation

14. In July 2018 you agreed that the £25m BRRP allocation for major capital schemes should be “top-sliced” by £600,000, which should then be allocated to the six Berkshire authorities. This would be a contribution to the development costs associated with major infrastructure projects identified in each of the emerging Local Plans.

¹ <http://www.thamesvalleyberkshire.co.uk/berkshire-strategic-transport-forum>

15. The revenue support proposal has the following details:
- a. £100,000 of BRRP funds in 2018/19 be allocated to each of the six Berkshire Unitary Authorities for the purpose of developing major infrastructure projects identified in the emerging Local Plans, subject to:
 - b. The money being spent on the development outline business cases for transport infrastructure projects which support or enable the development of housing, employment, leisure or retail projects
 - c. BLTB approving the timetable and list of projects before the money is released.
16. It is now proposed that following details be added to the revenue support scheme:
- a. When seeking BLTB approval, an Authority should identify the lead officer contact; timetable start and end date for developing the specified schemes; and also propose a schedule of progress reports to BLTB
 - b. Where known, for each infrastructure project the Authority should identify
 - i. Name of the project
 - ii. Local Plan (or emerging Local Plan) references
 - iii. Approximate Capital Value of the project
 - a. up to £2m
 - b. £2m-£5m
 - c. £5m-£10m
 - d. £10-£20m
 - e. over £20m
 - iv. The housing, employment, leisure or retail development to be enabled
 - v. Partner organisations involved (if any)
 - vi. Brief Description of Project (100 words max)
 - vii. How the resource will be used to develop the outline business case (in-house? Retained consultant? Other?)
 - c. Where specific schemes are not yet identified, and the intention is to use the revenue resource to fund the investigation of specific schemes that are consequent on the Local Plan (or emerging Local Plan) requirements, then the application should be adapted to reflect this. A specific commitment to reporting back as and when named schemes are identified should be included.
17. The proposal from Bracknell (appendix 1) is attached. The proposal from Slough is expected in March 2019.

Conclusion

18. There is an imperative to invest some of the BRRP £25m in the development of the pipeline of major infrastructure or regeneration schemes, which will support emerging local plans and be eligible for funding in future years.

Background Papers

19. The Business Rates Retention Pilot bid and approval letters.

APPENDIX 1

Revenue Support for Business Case Preparation

Local Authority **Bracknell Forest Council**

Lead Officer **Stuart Jefferies (stuart.jefferies@bracknell-forest.gov.uk)**

Purpose of the report

This report sets out Bracknell Forest Council's proposed plans for using the funding that BLTB have agreed to make available for business case preparation. A sum of £100,000 has been set aside as a contribution towards the development of outline business cases for transport infrastructure projects which support or enable the development of housing, employment, leisure or retail projects.

This report details how the Council intends to spend the money and the associated timescales for this work.

Bracknell Forest Local Plan

Bracknell Forest Council is preparing for a further consultation in 2019 in relation to a new 2036 Local Plan. Potential sites for development have been put forward by site promoters and these are being assessed by the Council.

A provisional programme for undertaking the further steps required to deliver an adopted 2036 Local Plan is underway. This will be subject to approval by the Council's Executive in the near future and will include the following steps throughout the period 2019-2020:

- Further consultation on additional growth options
- Publication
- Submission
- Examination
- Adoption

Whilst officers have some knowledge of the potential infrastructure schemes that would be required to support the delivery of the Local Plan up to 2036, further work is required to identify specific schemes with confidence. A further stage of selecting preferred options and testing the transport impacts is required before schemes and outline business cases can be developed.

Proposal for the use of revenue support funds

The Council is embarking on master planning work in order to support the development of a new Local Plan. This master planning work will need to be supported by detailed transport modelling and assessment of impacts.

Whilst some Council funding has already been allocated to this project, further work is now required following additional growth options now coming forward. The Council is proposing to split the BLTB funding between two stages of work (i) scoping/investigation; and (ii) further development of individual schemes.

The outline schemes would be assessed against the Local Growth Fund criteria and the most appropriate schemes identified for progression to outline business case. A new programme will be provided to the LEP / BLTB for approval. These schemes are likely to be taken from strategic corridors and local hot spots including:

- B3348 Bracknell Road / A3095 Foresters Way - junction improvement
- Easthampstead Road / Old Wokingham Road - key capacity and safety improvements
- B3022 Bracknell Road corridor - key junction improvements
- B3017 Swinley Road / A332 Kings Ride - capacity improvements
- Western Roundabout (Bracknell Town Centre) - improvements linked to further regeneration
- B3034/B3018 corridor - capacity improvements

Following the initial scoping/investigation work, further BLTB approval will be sought for the second stage of work to produce outline business cases for each selected scheme to ensure they represent good value for money. This work will also highlight the wider benefits to the Thames Valley Area including any environmental and social benefits.

Proposed timetable

The table below sets out the proposed timetable:

Description of Task	Start	Complete	Report to BLTB
Outline proposal for use of full £100,000 BLTB funding	December 2018	January 2019	January 2019
Stage 1: Scoping/investigation	March 2019	September 2019	March 2020
Proposal of which schemes to take forward to Outline Business Case	October 2019	January 2019	
Stage 2: Development of Outline Business Case for identified schemes	March 2020	June 2020	July 2020

This page is intentionally left blank