

Date of issue: Wednesday, 7 July 2021

MEETING	BERKSHIRE LOCAL TRANSPORT BODY	
	Member	Authority
	Councillor Anderson	Slough Borough Council
	Councillor Brunel-Walker	Bracknell Forest Council
	Councillor Clark	The Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead
	Councillor Jorgensen	Wokingham Borough Council
	Councillor Page	Reading Borough Council
	Councillor Somner	West Berkshire Council
	Stuart Atkinson	Thames Valley Berkshire LEP
	Laura Fitzgerald	Thames Valley Berkshire LEP
	Malcolm Kempton	Thames Valley Berkshire LEP
	Bob Mountain	Thames Valley Berkshire LEP
	Nigel Nawacki	Thames Valley Berkshire LEP
	Simon Ratcliffe	Thames Valley Berkshire LEP
DATE AND TIME:	THURSDAY, 15TH JULY, 2021 AT 4.00 PM	
VENUE:	COUNCIL CHAMBER - OBSERVATORY HOUSE, 25 WINDSOR ROAD, SL1 2EL	
DEMOCRATIC SERVICES OFFICER: (for all enquiries)	NICHOLAS PONTONE	07749 709 868

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.	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.</i>		
	<i>The Chair will invite any member representing a local authority seeking financial approval for a scheme to declare that interest.</i>		
2.	Election of Chair for 2021/22		-
	<i>To elect the Chair of BLTB for 2021/22 from amongst the Local Authority Members.</i>		
3.	Election of Vice-Chair for 2021/22		-
	<i>To elect the Vice-Chair of BLTB for 2021/22 from amongst the TVB LEP Members.</i>		
4.	Minutes of the Meeting held on 11th March 2021	1 - 6	
5.	Briefing Note - TVB/BLTB 'How We Work'	7 - 8	
6.	Thames Valley Berkshire Local Growth Deal 2015-16 to 2020-21	9 - 20	
7.	Financial Approval: Scheme 2.37 Bracknell A322/A329 Corridor Improvements: Birch Hill Junction Upgrade	21 - 40	
8.	Final update on One Year Scheme Evaluations	41 - 42	
9.	BLTB Forward Plan	43 - 44	
10.	Date of Next Meeting - 11th November 2021		-

Press and Public

Attendance and accessibility: 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 any items in the Part II agenda are considered. For those hard of hearing an Induction Loop System is available in the Council Chamber.

Webcasting and recording: The public part of the meeting may be filmed by the Council for live and/or subsequent broadcast on the Council's website. If so, the footage will remain on our website for 12 months. A copy of the recording will also be retained in accordance with the Council's data retention policy. 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.

In addition, the law allows members of the public to take photographs, film, audio-record or tweet the proceedings at public meetings. Anyone proposing to do so 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.

Emergency procedures: The fire alarm is a continuous siren. If the alarm sounds Immediately vacate the premises by the nearest available exit at either the front or rear of the Chamber and proceed to the assembly point: The pavement of the service road outside of Westminster House, 31 Windsor Road.

This page is intentionally left blank

Berkshire Local Transport Body – Meeting held on Thursday, 11th March, 2021.

Present:-

Councillor Page (in the chair)	Reading Borough Council
Councillor Anderson	Slough Borough Council
Councillor Brunel-Walker	Bracknell Forest Council
Councillor Clark (from 4.09pm)	RBWM
Councillor Jorgensen	Wokingham Borough Council
Councillor Somner	West Berkshire Council
Stuart Atkinson	Thames Valley Berkshire LEP
Laura Fitzgerald	Thames Valley Berkshire LEP
Malcolm Kempton	Thames Valley Berkshire LEP
Bob Mountain	Thames Valley Berkshire LEP
Nigel Nawacki	Thames Valley Berkshire LEP
Simon Ratcliffe	Thames Valley Berkshire LEP

Also present under Rule 30:- Councillor Atkinson (Bracknell Forest Council)

Apologies for Absence:- None

PART 1

46. Declarations of Interest

None were declared.

47. Minutes of the Meeting held on 12th November 2020

Resolved – That the minutes of the meeting of the Berkshire Local Transport Body held on 12th November 2020 be approved as a correct record.

48. Briefing Note - TVB/BLTB 'How We Work'

Members noted a briefing note that summarised the process by which Thames Valley Berkshire LEP and the Berkshire Local Transport Body operated in investing in local transport schemes.

Resolved – That the BLTB 'How We Work' briefing note be noted.

49. Thames Valley Berkshire Local Growth Deal 2015/16 to 2020/21

A report was considered that updated on the overall schemes approved from funding via Local Growth Deal, Business Rates Retention Pilot (BRRP) and the Getting Building Fund (GBF).

(Councillor Clark joined the meeting)

The total funding for schemes in the programme was £174m and the figures in Table 2 of the report showed the breakdown of funding year on year and by funding stream. Funding from Local Growth Deals and BRRP would come to an end in March 2021. There was £2.1m funding from GBF in 2021/22. It was highlighted that the figures in Table 3 showed that nearly 50% of the total spend was on directly sustainable projects such as mass rapid transit (MRT) schemes, park and ride and cycling infrastructure. A member asked which category cycling schemes came under in Table 3. It was responded that cycling would be under 'other', but that in future the LEP would seek to improve the management reporting of sustainable schemes so they could be identified more clearly. Some MRT schemes would also include measures to promote cycling.

BLTB noted the capital swaps between authorities which utilised the LEPs freedoms and flexibilities to manage the funds in the final year of the LGF programme. A member queried if the level of capital swaps was in line with expectations and whether there were any lessons to be learned about the timescales for project delivery to ensure they were completed before the end of the programme. It was responded that capital swaps had been higher than originally envisaged and that this was largely due to Covid-19 delays which had pushed back some completion dates and necessitated more adjustments than had been anticipated in the final year of the LGF programme. Some of the rail projects which tended to more complex came later in the programme. The LEP would carry of a review to learn the lessons for future programmes.

At the conclusion of the discussion the report was noted.

Resolved – That the progress on the schemes previously given programme entry status as set out in the report be noted.

50. Allocation of the unallocated Getting Building Fund monies

A report was considered that sought approval to allocate the remaining £450,000 of GBF money to a Bracknell transport project. It was proposed that an increment be made to an already approved LGF project, scheme 2.37 Bracknell: A322 A329 Corridor Improvements.

BLTB noted that the £450,000 had become available as it had been returned to the pot following a reassessment of a previously approved skills project. GBF required projects to be fully delivered by 31st March 2022 and funding needed to be allocated quickly to ensure delivery within this timescale.

The approved pipeline of schemes had been agreed by BLTB in November 2020 and discussions had been held with owners of the prioritised project list to ascertain which could be delivered within the tight timescale and the available funding. The Bracknell A322 Smart Corridor project ranked 4th out of the 16 prioritised project but was deemed to be the top ranking project that meet the criteria. It built upon the current LGF scheme 2.37 and it was therefore proposed that the additional funds be issued as a project extension

rather than seeking programme entry for a new scheme. If agreed, a full business case was expected to come back to BLTB in July.

The project sponsor commented that this was one of last remaining major pinchpoints in the corridor and would improve access points and safety. After due consideration BLTB agreed the recommendations.

Resolved –

- (a) That the remaining £450,000 of GBF money be allocated to a transport project that would contribute to the implementation of the Recovery & Renewal Plan (RRP) and Strategic Economic Plan (SEP).
- (b) That it be agreed that scheme 2.37 Bracknell: A322-A329 Corridor Improvements receive an additional allocation of £450,000 GBF, to take the total funding allocated for the scheme to £850,000. A full business case, reviewed by the LEPs independent assessor, Hatch Regeneris, would be presented for financial approval at the July 2021 BLTB.

51. Update: Scheme 2.24: Newbury Station Improvements - Business Start-up units re-profiled

A report was considered that updated on revised design proposals and a reduction in outputs for the business start-up units within scheme 2.24 Newbury Railway Station Improvement project.

The Newbury Railway Station Improvement Scheme included provision of a two-storey building on Platform 1 intended to support business start-ups. The project was being delivered in three main phases and the business start up units were in the final phase. The benefits of delivering the start-up units were attributed to the new employment generated on the site, although it was noted that the original 2018 full business case did not quantify these benefits. Development of the scheme and the completion of electrification works had led to design changes with a swap of the location of the building with the planned location of a cycle hub on the site of a Network Rail compound in the southern car park.

The business case for the additional funding envisaged the amount of lettable space as 610m², although the specification was undefined. The subsequent development of the scheme, informed by the outcome a demand analysis study and interest expressed from potential tenants, had led to a design which had a usable floor space of 280m². The main reason was that the design was now for a single storey structure rather than the two-storey originally proposed. The final design may include the option of future-proofing to enable a second storey to be added at a later stage. Whilst members were supportive of this in principle it was recognised that adding a second floor in the future may be impractical due to the disruption it would cause tenants.

BLTB was informed that whilst the outputs for the start-up unit element of the scheme had been reduced the project would still deliver high value for money with a benefit cost ratio in excess of 2:1 and the scheme was therefore still fit for purpose. The demand analysis carried out by Vail Williams showed there was encouraging demand for the units which would make an important contribution to the post-Covid economic recovery. It was also noted that the funding could not now be redeployed elsewhere and the scheme and wider station improvements would still meet the strategic priorities. BLTB was therefore asked to note the changes to the scheme whilst recognising that it still delivered high value for money.

Representatives from West Berkshire Council and GWR commented on the current position. GWR stated that the wider scheme was progressing well but that a combination of Covid-19 impacts and rising material costs had contributed to the deliverability of the second storey of the business units. Members asked a number of questions about the recipient of the commercial rental income from the units and the calculation of the increased number of jobs from the project. It was responded that GWR would manage lettings for the units and they were in discussion with Network Rail about the revenue split, which would also be required for ongoing maintenance. The methodology for calculating the number of jobs created was based on the Webtag assessment formula.

At the conclusion of the discussion the BLTB noted the changes to the original specification and recognised that the overall scheme still delivered high value for money.

Resolved – That the changes to the original specification of the scheme be noted, whilst recognising that the overall scheme still delivered high value for money.

52. Further update to BLTB on One Year scheme evaluations

Further to the update to BLTB in November 2020, an update was provided that set out the current position regarding the one year scheme evaluations that had been delayed due to Covid-19.

Evaluations at one and five years after schemes opening was an important part of the BLTB Assurance Framework. The schemes due for evaluation were:

- 2.21 – Slough: Langley Station Access
- 2.10 – Slough: A332 Improvements
- 2.11 and 2.12 – Reading: Phases 1 & 2 South Reading MRT
- 2.15 – Bracknell: Martin's Heron roundabout

The continuing impact of Covid-19 had meant that gathering robust data for scheme assessments and evaluations was difficult and members were asked to agree to defer the reports that were due until meaningful evaluation could be conducted. It was hoped some or all reports could be presented in July

Berkshire Local Transport Body - 11.03.21

2021. BLTB noted the update and agreed to receive the evaluation reports as soon as they were available.

Resolved – That the update be noted and that BLTB receive the evaluation reports due at a future meeting.

53. BLTB Forward Plan

The BLTB Forward Plan which set out the matters to be considered at future meetings was considered and noted.

Resolved – That the BLTB Forward Plan be noted.

54. Date of Next Meeting - 15th July 2021

Chair

(Note: The Meeting opened at 4.02 pm and closed at 4.43 pm)

This page is intentionally left blank

Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership (TVB LEP) and the Berkshire Local Transport Body (BLTB) – investing in strategic infrastructure

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 4.0) March 2019**]
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. [**AF 4.0 para 4.2.3**]. 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 BLTB has been designated as the competent body to prioritise, invest in and oversee transport capital schemes on behalf of the LEP. DfT retains responsibility for the approval process of schemes in excess of £20m LGF. The LEP will accept any BLTB recommendation or refer them back but will not substitute its own recommendations.” [**AF 4.0, para 5.9**]
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

MEETING OF THE BERKSHIRE LOCAL TRANSPORT BODY (BLTB) – THURSDAY 15 JULY 2021**CONTACT OFFICER: Josie Wragg, Chief Executive, Slough Borough Council, lead officer to the BLTB****Item 6: Thames Valley Berkshire Local Growth Deal 2015/16 to 2020/21*****Purpose of Report***

1. To report on the progress of the [Thames Valley Berkshire Local Growth Deal](#)ⁱ, as amended by Growth Deal 2 ([£10.2 million further support to Thames Valley Berkshire](#)ⁱⁱ) and Growth Deal 3 ([Factsheet GD3](#)ⁱⁱⁱ) with particular reference to the schemes included in the Transport Packages of the [Strategic Economic Plan](#)^{iv}; and on the progress of schemes funded by the Business Rates Retention Pilots (BRRP) of 2018/19 and 2019/20. This report also reports on the transport element of the [Getting Building Fund](#) (GBF) released in September 2020.
2. The headline figure for transport scheme grants under the three Local Growth Deals is £135.926m. This includes £24m of “DfT retained” allocation relating to the Wokingham Distributor Roads. This report provides progress reports on all programme entry schemes and the TVB Smart City Cluster scheme. A further £25m has been released through BRRP1 2018/19 and £11m from BRRP2 2019/20. Thames Valley Berkshire has received £7.5m through the GBF, of which £2,093,000 has been allocated to two transport projects.
3. £14.742m LGF was spent on transport schemes in 2015/16, £16.546m in 2016/17, £15.055m in 2017/18, £8.810m in 2018/19 and £12.441m 2019/20; £44.366m in 2020/21. In addition, £22.947m was spent from BRRP and £0.593 from the GBF.

Recommendations

4. That you note the progress made on the schemes previously given programme entry status, as set out in the accompanying summary report.

Other Implications***Risk Management***

5. The delegation of programme management responsibilities to the LEP/BLTB brings risks. The well-established scrutiny given by both BST(O)F and BLTB meetings is designed to mitigate that risk.
6. There will be an element of risk for scheme promoters who invest in developing their schemes to full business case stage in accordance with the approved [Assurance Framework](#)^v. However, there is also risk involved in not developing the schemes; that risk is that any reluctance to bring the schemes forward will result in any final approval being delayed or refused.
7. The risks associated with each scheme are monitored locally. Table 4 has been adapted to show the current risk rating of each of the schemes. Completed schemes are shown in blue.

Financial

8. Thames Valley Berkshire LEP has been granted freedoms and flexibilities in managing the Local Growth Deal Capital Programme. This means that we will receive an annual allocation of capital within which it will be our responsibility to manage the award of LGF to individual schemes. This is a positive development for TVB LEP and recognises the confidence that government has in our governance arrangements.

Table 1: Available Finance for Transport Schemes in TVB Local Growth Deal, BRRP and GBF

£m	2015/16 – 2020/21
LTB previously approved	14.5
Growth Deal 1	56.1
Growth Deal 1 “DfT Major Schemes”	24.0
Growth Deal 2	7.5
Growth Deal 3	33.8
Local Growth Deal Total	135.9
BRRP 2018/19 and 2019/20	36.0
Getting Building Fund 2020/21 and 2021/22	2.1
Grand Total	174.1

9. The profile and status of the available money in each year is as follows:

Table 2: Local Growth Deal, BRRP and GBF Financial Allocations for Transport Schemes by Financial Year

£m	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	Total
Combined Growth Deal 1, 2, 3 and LTB Allocation approved	14.7	16.5	15.1	8.8	12.4	44.4	-	111.96.1
Growth Deal 1 (DfT Major Schemes) <i>indicative</i>	-	-	-	0.9	22.1	1.0	-	24.0
Local Growth Deal Total	14.7	16.5	15.1	9.7	34.5	45.4	-	135.96
BRRP	-	-	-	11.5	10.0	14.5	-	36.0
Getting Building Fund	-	-	-	-	-	0.593	1.500	2.1
Grand Total	14.7	16.5	15.1	21.2	44.5	59.9	2.1	174.1

10. The breakdown of types of projects with allocated LGF, BRRP and GBF monies is shown below:

Table 3: Breakdown of schemes by type by funding allocated

£m	LGF	BRRP	GBF	Total
MRT / P&R projects	23.5	21.1	-	44.6
Railway projects	30.7	-	-	30.7
Highway improvements	24.6	-	2.1	26.7
Unlocking direct housing	21.6	12.3	-	33.9
Other	11.4	2.6	-	14.1
DfT retained	24.0	-	-	24.0
Unallocated funds	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Total funding	135.96	36.0	2.1	174

11. The LGF programme closed on 31 March 2021. Where a project did not complete by this date and there was still outstanding expenditure, the LEP was allowed to use freedoms and flexibilities to temporarily allocate the funding to an alternative capital project that took place within the local authority during 2020/21. Once the original projects completes, the LGF will be reallocated back to the original project. This process is known as a capital swap and is an accounting process to ensure that capital grants are defrayed within the correct financial period. Delivery partners confirmed that by the end of March 2021, expenditure was at roughly £79m, against the £112m paid over the LGF period. Roughly £33m was reallocated as a capital swap. The following table shows the amount of capital swap that was required by each local authority:

Table 4: LGF Capital Swap by Local Authority

Local Authority	Amount
West Berkshire Council	£10.8m
Slough Borough Council	£7m
Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead	£6.2m
Wokingham Borough Council	£5.2m
Reading Borough Council	£3m
Bracknell Forest Council	£1m
Total	£33.2m

12. Table 5 has been amended to present all project data previously shown across several tables. It shows the final award of scheme finance for 2015/16, 2016/17, 2017/18, 2018/19, 2019/20 and 2020/21. The provisional allocation for 2021/22 is shown for the BRRP and GBF. It also shows Red Amber Green (RAG) risk rating and completed projects in blue, the data that LTB approval was granted or sought and any notes including when future evaluations are due.

ⁱhttps://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/327587/35_Thames_Valley_Berkshire_Growth_Deal.pdf

ⁱⁱhttps://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/399438/Thames_Valley_Berkshire_Factsheet.pdf

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

^{iv} <http://www.thamesvalleyberkshire.co.uk/documents?page=1&folder=192&view=files>

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

Table 5 – Local Growth Deal, BRRP and GBF Scheme Funding Profiles

Ref.	Scheme Name	Growth Deal	RAG	Notes	LTB Funding Approval	Start on Site	Completion date	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
LOCAL GROWTH FUND														
2.01	Newbury: King's Road Link Road	GD1	AG	Delays due to planning	Mar-15	Oct-16	Due Dec 21	0.000	1.335	1.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	2.335
2.02	Bracknell: Warfield Link Road	GD1	C	1-yr impact report published Mar 20	Jan-15	Feb-15	Apr 17; open Oct 18	3.500	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	3.500
2.03	Newbury: London Road Industrial Estate	GD1	C	1-yr impact report published Jul 18 Delays to linked housing	Mar-15	Feb-16	Mar-17	0.500	1.400	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.900
2.04	Wokingham Arborfield Relief Rd	DfT major	C	1-yr impact report due Nov 21	Jul & Aug 19 via DfT	Aug 19 enabling	Nov-20	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.874	22.126	1.000	24.000
2.05	Newbury: Sandleford Park	GD2	G	Western Access funds returned	Jul-16	Aug-18	Due Dec 21	0.000	0.000	0.000	2.000	0.000	0.000	2.000
2.06	Reading Green Park Railway Station	GD1	A	Open to public Jan 22	Nov 14 & Jul 19	Mar-18	Due Oct 21	0.000	0.000	4.575	0.000	4.575	0.550	9.700
2.07	Bracknell: Coral Reef Roundabout	GD1	C	1-yr impact report published Nov 17	Jan-15	Apr-15	Apr-16	2.100	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	2.100
2.08	Slough Rapid Transit Phase 1	GD1	C	1-yr impact report published Mar 20	Jul-14	Dec-15	Dec 17; buses Mar 19	3.100	2.500	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	5.600
2.09.01	Sustainable Transport: NCN 422	GD1	C	1-yr impact report due - date TBC	Nov-15	Jan-17	Dec-20	0.000	2.100	1.500	0.200	0.400	0.000	4.200
2.09.02	Sustainable Transport: A4 Cycle (with Bucks)	GD1	C	1-yr impact report published Jul 20	Nov-15	Feb-17	Sep-18	0.000	0.483	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.483
2.10	Slough A332 Improvements	GD1	C	1-yr impact report due - date TBC	Nov-14	Dec-15	Sep-19	1.267	1.433	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	2.700
2.11	South Reading Mass Rapid Transit Phase 1	GD1	C	1-yr impact report due - date TBC	Nov-15	Aug-16	Jul-19	0.000	2.970	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	2.970
2.12	South Reading Mass Rapid							0.000	0.000	1.530	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.530

	Transit Phase 2													
2.13	Wokingham Thames Valley Park and Ride	GD1	C	Bus service tender is on hold	Jul-17	Feb-18	Nov-20	0.000	0.000	0.000	2.000	0.900	0.000	2.900
2.14	East Reading MRT Phase 1	GD1	Project withdrawn											
2.25	East Reading MRT Phase 2	GD3												
2.15	Bracknell: Martins Heron	GD1	C	1-yr impact report due - date TBC	Apr-17	Apr-17	Apr-19	0.000	0.200	2.700	0.000	0.000	0.000	2.900
2.16	Maidenhead: Station Access	GD 1	G		Nov-17	Jan-19	Due Aug 21	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.690	1.666	1.394	3.750
2.17	Slough: A355 route	GD 1	C	1-yr impact report published Jul 18	Nov-14	Dec-15	Feb-17	2.275	2.125	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	4.400
2.18	Not used													
2.19	Bracknell: Town Centre Regeneration Infrastructure	GD 2	C	1-yr impact report published Mar 19	Nov-15	Apr-15	Sep-17	2.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	2.000
2.20	Not used													
2.21	Slough: Langley Station Access	GD 2	C	1-yr impact report due - date TBC	Nov-16	Mar-18	Feb-20	0.000	0.000	1.500	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.500
2.22	Slough: Burnham Station Access	GD 2	C	1-yr impact report published Jul 20	Mar-16	Jan-17	Apr-19	0.000	2.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	2.000
2.23	Reading: South Reading MRT Ph 3-4	GD 3	G	See BRRP below.	Nov-17	Mar-18	Due Oct 21	0.000	0.000	2.250	0.090	0.000	0.000	2.340
2.24	Newbury: Railway Station	GD 3	AR	Completion beyond March 22	Cond. Jul 18, lifted Feb 19	Jan-19	Due Aug 22	0.000	0.000	0.000	3.630	0.000	3.061	6.691
2.25	East Reading MRT Phase 2 - See 2.14 above													
2.26	Wokingham: Winnersh Relief Road Phase 2 - See BRRP below													
2.27	Maidenhead Town Centre: Missing Links	GD 3	G		Cond. Nov 18, lifted Sep 19	Nov-20	Due Oct 21	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	2.242	2.242
2.28	Bracknell: A3095 Corridor	GD 3	C	1-yr impact report due - date TBC	Jul-18	Oct 18 enabling	Jun-21	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.200	1.800	3.519	5.519

2.29	Wokingham: Winnersh Triangle Park & Ride	GD 3 resrv.	AG	Additional funding approved June and July 2020	Cond. Mar 19, lifted May 19	Apr-21	Due Jan 22	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	4.240	4.240
2.30	TVB Smart City Cluster – See below													
2.31	Slough: Stoke Road Area Regeneration	GD 3 resrv.	AG	Completing beyond March 21	Jul-19	Aug 19 enabling	Due Mar 22	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.000	6.650	7.650
2.32	M Maidenhead: Housing Sites Enabling Work Ph. 1	GD 3 resrv.	G	See BRRP below	Cond. Jan 19, lifted Jul 20	Nov-20	Due Nov 21	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	4.254	4.254
2.33	GWR: Maidenhead to Marlow Branch Line Upgrade	GD 3 resrv.	Project withdrawn											
2.34	Slough MRT Phase 2 – see BRRP below													
2.35	Reading: Reading West Station Upgrade	GD 3 resrv.	A	Completing beyond March 22	Nov-19	Feb-21	Due Jul 22	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	3.100	3.100
2.36	Wokingham: Coppid Beech Park and Ride	GD 3 resrv.	G		Mar-20	Feb-21	Due Nov 21	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	2.400	2.400
2.37	Bracknell: A322 A329 Corridor Improvements	GD 3 resrv.	G		Nov-19, amends Jun 20	Nov-20	Due Sep 21	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.400	0.400
2.38	Theale Station Upgrade	GD 3 resrv.	A	Completing beyond March 22	Cond. June 20, lifted Dec 20	Mar-21	Due Oct 22	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	4.000	4.000
2.39	Wokingham: Coppid Beech northbound on-slip widening	GD 3 resrv.	Project withdrawn											
2.40	Windsor: Town Centre Package	GD 3 resrv.	G	Completing beyond March 21	Jul-20	Mar-21	Due Dec 21	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.563	1.563
2.41	Not used													
2.42	South Wokingham Distributor Road – Eastern Gateway – see BRRP below													

2.43	Wokingham: Barkham Bridge	GD 3 resrv.	C	1-yr impact report due - date TBC	Nov-19	Nov-19	Feb-21	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	2.100	2.136	4.236
2.44	Reading Buses: Completing the Connection	GD 3 resrv.	C	1-yr impact report due - date TBC	Cond. July 20 lifted Nov 20	Nov-20	Mar-21	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.541	1.541
2.45	Slough Langley High Street phase 1	GD 3 resrv.	G		Cond. June 20 lifted Oct 20	Feb-21	Due Nov 21	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.324	1.324
2.46	Slough Langley High Street phase 2	GD 3 resrv.	G		Cond. Jul 20 lifted Oct 20	Feb-21	Due Nov 21	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.033	1.033
2.47	Bracknell Town Centre The Deck	GD 3 resrv.	G		Cond. Nov 20, lifted Dec 20	Feb-21	Due Jul 21	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.956	0.956
N/a	Independent assessment costs	GD 3 resrv.	N/a					0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.004	0.004
Predicted Spend								14.742	16.546	15.055	9.684	34.567	45.367	135.961
2.30	TVB Smart City Cluster	LGF	AG	Part funding moved to BRRP; procurement delays to extension	Nov 17 by LEP Board	Jan-18	Due Aug 21	0.000	0.000	0.083	0.255	0.802	0.300	1.440

BUSINESS RATES RETENTION PILOT

Ref.	Scheme Name	Growth Deal	RAG	Notes	LTB Funding Approval	Start on Site	Completi on date			2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	Total
Capital Projects														
2.23	Reading: South Reading MRT Ph 3-4	BRRP	G		Nov-17	Mar-18	Due Oct 21			7.808	0.000	0.000	0.000	7.808

2.26	Wokingham: Winnersh Relief Road Phase 2	BRRP	C	Ph. 1 private funds Moved from LGF. 1-yr impact report due - date TBC	Cond. Nov 18, lifted Feb 19	Jan-19	May-21			3.000	3.260	0.000	0.000	6.260
2.32	Maidenhead: Housing Sites Enabling Work Ph. 1	BRRP	G	See LGF above	Cond. Jan 19, lifted Jul 20	Nov-20	Due Nov 21			0.000	0.000	0.000	1.027	1.027
2.34	Slough MRT Phase 2	BRRP	AR	Project split in 2: MRT complete Oct 21; P&R Dec 22 but start TBC	Jan-19	Aug-19	Due Dec 22			0.000	1.000	3.000	9.300	13.300
2.42	South Wokingham Distributor Road – Eastern Gateway	BRRP	G		Nov-19	Oct-19	Due Mar 22			0.000	5.000	0.000	0.000	5.000
2.30	TVB Smart City Cluster	BRRP	AG	Additional BRRP awarded	Mar-20	Jan-18	Due Aug 21			0.000	0.293	0.284	0.000	0.577
Page 1 2.0	Superfast Berkshire	BRRP	G	Moved from LGF (digital)	Mar-20	Jul-15	Due Mar 22			0.000	0.436	0.111	0.000	0.547
Capital Projects Funds Total										10.808	9.989	3.395	10.327	34.519

Revenue Projects

N/a	BLIS development	BRRP	N/a	Work completed						0.044	0.046	0.000	0.000	0.090
N/a	Business Case Preparation	BRRP	N/a	6 proposals approved						0.600	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.600
N/a	Forward Plans Team	BRRP	N/a	Proposals being developed	Mar-20	Oct-20	Mar-21			0.000	0.000	0.065	0.685	0.750
N/a	Independent assessment of 1 & 5 year evaluations	BRRP	N/a	Transferred from LGF by adjusting LGF / GBF proportions for project 2.32	Due Jul 21	Due Nov 21	Due Mar 27			0.000	0.000	0.000	0.041	0.041
Revenue Projects Funds Total										0.644	0.046	0.065	0.726	1.481
Predicted BRRP Spend										11.452	10.035	3.460	11.053	36.000

GETTING BUILDING FUND

GBF1	Slough Langley High Street phase 3	GBF	A	Awaiting start on site	Cond. Nov 20;	Due Nov 21	Due Mar 22					0.593	1.050	1.643
												2020/21	2021/22	Total

				lifted May 21										
GBF15	Bracknell A322 A329 Corridor Improvements	GBF	A	Programme entry awarded March 21		Due Jul 21	Due Dec 21					0.000	0.450	0.450
					Capital Projects Funds Total						0.593	1.500	2.093	

13. In addition to these capital schemes, there is a further Local Growth Deal funded project called 2.30 TVB Smart City Cluster. The project delivers three key deliverables:
- a. Smart city platform: consisting of an Internet of Things (IoT) or Lora Wan communication platform across all six Berkshire Local Authorities and a cross-authority open data platform. This is enabling infrastructure for the delivery of a wide range of IoT technologies including traffic signal communications which will provide the revenue savings to maintain and operate the system.
 - b. Challenge funded IoT solutions: grant funded IoT solutions to real Local Authority challenges which the private sector has responded to. These grants were awarded through competition and on the basis of co-funding.
 - c. Cross authority / cross sector smart city group: This includes a Steering Group to oversee the project delivery and act as a catalyst for wider smart city debate, project development and funding.

Human Rights Act and Other Legal Implications

14. The [Assurance Framework](#)^{vi} referred to above identifies the steps that scheme promoters should take in order to secure financial approval from the LTB. There are, in effect, two layers of scheme approval. The first, and primary layer rests with the scheme promoter (all the schemes referred to in this report are being promoted by Local Authorities). In order to implement the schemes in question, each promoter will need to satisfy themselves that all the legal implications have been considered and appropriately resolved. The secondary layer of approval, given by the LTB, is concerned with the release of funds against the detailed business case. The arrangements for publication of plans via the LEP and promoters' websites, the arrangements for independent assessment and the consideration of detailed scheme reports are appropriate steps to ensure that any significant Human Rights Act or other legal implications are properly identified and considered.

Supporting Information

15. The Thames Valley Berkshire LEP website has published summary information about all its Growth Deal-funded projects, including all transport projects. Please go to Thames Valley Berkshire [Local Growth Fund](#)^{vii} and [Business Rates Retention Pilot](#)^{viii} e-Books.
16. There is a detailed progress report on each of the schemes in the accompanying composite report.

Monitoring and Evaluation

17. The Monitoring and Evaluation Plan for the Thames Valley Berkshire Growth Deal has now been agreed with government. In addition to the need for transport scheme promoters to collect and publish monitoring and evaluation reports that comply with DfT guidance for capital schemes, there will be requirements to cooperate with the overall monitoring and evaluation plan for the Growth Deal.

18. The difference between the two processes is that one concentrates on the transport impacts and the other on the economic impacts. The basic information required from each scheme promoter is set out in the scheme proformas. This requirement is less onerous for schemes under £5m Growth Deal contribution and runs to much more detail for the larger schemes.

19. For most schemes there will be little or no additional Growth Deal monitoring burden beyond that already signalled. Extra effort may be required to comply with the standard set out in the Monitoring and Evaluation plan which is “accurate, timely, verified and quality assured monitoring data”. For schemes mentioned by name in the Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (see list below) there will be a separate discussion about the duties on the scheme promoter:

2.01 Newbury: King’s Road Link Road

2.04 Wokingham: Distributor Roads Programme

2.06 Reading: Green Park Railway Station

2.08 Slough: Rapid Transit Phase 1

Background Papers

Each of the schemes referred to above has a proforma summarising its details. Both the LEP and LTB prioritisation processes and scoring schemes are also available background papers. The Monitoring and Evaluation Plan for TVB Growth Deal is also available.

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

^{vii} <https://spark.adobe.com/page/IUJLI858NStY0/>

^{viii} <https://spark.adobe.com/page/6LOjEtuDgacVm/>

BERKSHIRE LOCAL TRANSPORT BODY (BLTB)**REPORT TO:** BLTB**DATE:** 15 July 2021**CONTACT OFFICER:** Josie Wragg, Chief Executive, Slough Borough Council, lead officer to BLTB**Item 7: Financial Approval 2.37 Bracknell A322 A329 Corridor Improvements (Birch Hill Junction Upgrade Extension)*****Purpose of Report***

1. To consider giving financial approval for additional funding to scheme 2.37 Bracknell: A322 A329 Corridor Improvements for Birch Hill Junction Upgrade.
2. This project delivers upgrades to signalling equipment at the Birch Hill Junction, situated along the A322 and A329 corridor.
3. The scheme represents a relatively small-scale investment in the replacement of obsolete, and failing, signalling technology at the junction, to ensure greater resilience to the strategically important A322/A329 corridor, as well as provide day-to-day operational benefits.
4. This proposes an increment to an already approved Local Growth Fund (LGF) Bracknell project, scheme 2.37: Bracknell A322 A329 Corridor Improvements. The project will significantly help in terms of accommodating movements and reducing congestion between the M4 and M3 and between Reading, Wokingham, Bracknell, Bagshot and beyond, as well as improving North-South links between the M3 and M4.

Recommendation

5. You are recommended to give scheme 2.37 Bracknell: A322/A329 Corridor Improvements, full financial approval for an additional sum of £450,000 in 2021/22 for the Birch Hill Junction Upgrade on the terms of the funding agreement set out at paragraph 11 step 5 below. This brings the total funding for this project to £850,000.

Other Implications**Financial**

6. A re-prioritisation exercise was undertaken in advance of previously allocated Getting Building Fund (GBF) monies returned to the "pot" for re-allocation. At the March 2021 BLTB meeting an additional £450,000 of GBF was allocated to Scheme 2.37 Bracknell: A322/A329 Corridor Improvement for the Birch Hill Junction Upgrade.

7. This report recommends that Bracknell Forest Council be authorised to draw down the capital sum £450,000 from the Getting Building Fund for this scheme.
8. The funding agreement set out at paragraph 11 step 5 sets out the roles and responsibilities, reporting and auditing arrangements, timing and triggers for payments, contributions from other funders, consequences of delay, consequences of failure, claw back, and evaluation requirements at one and five years on.

Risk Management

9. The risk management arrangements already put in place by the Local Transport Body are as follows:
 - The [Assurance Framework](#)¹ 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

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

Supporting Information

11. The scheme will be carried out for Bracknell Forest Council.
12. The full details of the scheme are available from the [Bracknell Forest website](#)². A summary of the key points is given below:

Task	Timescale
Procurement	Via the Council's Term Contractor
Contractor appointed	As above
Construction	January 2022
Open to public	March 2022

Activity	Funder	Cost
Scheme development (original)	Bracknell Forest Council	£ 117,658
Major scheme funding (original)	Berkshire Local Transport Body	£400,000

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

²<https://www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/strategic-economic-plan/background>

Scheme development (extension)	Bracknell Forest Council	£50,000
Major scheme funding (extension)	Berkshire Local Transport Body	£450,000
Scheme development total	Bracknell Forest Council	£167,658
Major scheme funding total	Berkshire Local Transport Body	£850,000

13. The table below sets out the details of this scheme's compliance with steps 1-5 of paragraph 14 of [Assurance Framework](#)³.

Assurance Framework Check list	2.37 Bracknell A322/A329 Corridor Improvements (Birch Hill Junction Upgrade extension)			
	<p>The project was originally devised to deliver significant improvements to one of the key highway corridors in Thames Valley Berkshire. This specific addition to the existing scheme represents a relatively small-scale investment in the replacement of obsolete, and failing, signalling technology at the junction, to ensure greater resilience to the strategically important A322/A329 corridor, as well as provide day-to-day operational benefits. Overall, the project will significantly help in terms of accommodating movements and reducing congestion between the M4 and M3 and between Reading, Wokingham, Bracknell, Bagshot and beyond, as well as improving North-South links between the M3 and M4. The updated BLIS assessment process was used and the scheme was given 23.5 points and ranked 6th of 17 schemes submitted.</p>			
	Factor	Raw score	Weighting	Weighted score
	Strategy	3	1.5	4.5
	Deliverability	3	2.0	6.0
	Economic Impact	2	4.0	8.0
	TVB area coverage	2	1.5	3.0
	Environment	1	0.5	0.5
	Social	3	0.5	1.5
			Total	23.5
<p>Step 2: Programme Entry: evolution of the scheme from outline proposal to full business case, external view on the business case, and independent assessment (See paragraphs 15 and 16)</p>	<p>Programme Entry status for the additional funding was given by the BLTB on 11 March 2021⁴.</p> <p>The Bracknell Forest website⁵ holds the latest details of the full business case, including the VfM statement certified by the senior responsible officer.</p> <p>Any comments or observations on the scheme received by either TVB LEP or Bracknell Forest Borough Council have been fully considered during the development of the scheme.</p> <p>The report of the Independent Assessor is attached at Appendix 1. The Independent Assessor was asked to report as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completeness – has the promoter prepared a complete Full Business Case submission, when judged against the prevailing 			

³<http://www.thamesvalleyberkshire.co.uk/berkshire-strategic-transport-forum>

⁴<http://www.slough.gov.uk/moderngov/documents/s54539/Report%20and%20Appendices.pdf>

⁵<https://www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/strategic-economic-plan/background>

Assurance Framework Check list	2.37 Bracknell A322/A329 Corridor Improvements (Birch Hill Junction Upgrade extension)
	<p>advice from the DfT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.
Step 3: Conditional Approval	The Independent Assessor has recommended that in this case Full Financial Approval is appropriate.
Step 4: Recommendation of Financial Approval - High Value for Money - Support of the Independent assessor	<p>The scheme has a Benefit- Cost Ratio (BCR) of 2.33</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>
Step 5: Formal Agreement - roles - responsibilities - implementation - reporting - auditing - timing and triggers for payments, - contributions from other funders, - consequences of delay, - consequences of failure, - claw back, - evaluation one and five years on	<p>The capital grant of £850,000 is a maximum figure which cannot be increased but may be reduced if savings are achieved during implementation. In the event that Bracknell Forest Council wishes to alter the profile of the grant payments, it must seek prior written permission from TVB LEP, having first raised the matter with the BLTB. The grant is made subject to the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Roles</u>: TVB LEP is a part funder of the scheme. Bracknell Forest Council is the scheme promoter and is the relevant highway and planning authority. 2. <u>Responsibilities</u>: TVB LEP is responsible for allocating the capital finance in accordance with its Assurance Framework. Bracknell Forest Council is responsible for all aspects of the design, risk management, insurance, procurement, construction and implementation of the scheme, including its responsibilities as highway and planning authority, any other statutory duties, and any financial or other liabilities arising from the scheme. 3. <u>Implementation</u>: In addition to any reporting requirements within Bracknell Forest Council, the scheme promoter will use the proforma supplied by TVB LEP to make reports on progress of the

Assurance Framework Check list	2.37 Bracknell A322/A329 Corridor Improvements (Birch Hill Junction Upgrade extension)
	<p>implementation of the capital scheme to each meeting of the BLTB until the build is complete. In particular, Bracknell Forest Council will report on any 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>4. <u>Reporting</u>: The scheme promoter must provide accurate, timely, verified and quality assured quarterly monitoring and forecast data, which relate to defined output and outcome indicators agreed between TVB LEP and government as a condition of the Growth Deal. This scheme will not be required to participate in an evaluation as set out in the Growth Deal Monitoring and Evaluation Plan.</p> <p>5. <u>Auditing</u>: Bracknell Forest Council will keep financial records such that the expenditure on the scheme is readily identifiable, and if and when BEIS, DfT or other government department or the Accountable Body for TVB LEP requests access to financial or other records for the purposes of an audit of the accounts, Bracknell Forest Council will co-operate fully.</p> <p>6. <u>Timing and Triggers for payments</u>: See the Claim Proforma at Appendix 1 of the Capital Grant Letter – available on request.</p> <p>7. <u>Contributions from Other Funders</u>: Bracknell Forest Council capital programme contributed 117,658 in 2020/21 and will contribute £50,000 in 2021/22. In the event that the scheme experiences or it is anticipated that the scheme will experience a shortfall in these contributions, Bracknell Forest Council will be required to notify TVB LEP of these developments. The provisions of clauses 8, Consequences of Delay; 9, Consequences of Change to the Design or Specification of the Scheme; or 10, Consequences of Failure will then be applied.</p> <p>8. <u>Consequences of Delay</u>: In the event that the scheme experiences minor delays to its overall Business Case programme (no more than 10 weeks), Bracknell Forest Council will report these delays and the reasons for them, and the proposed remedial action to the next available meeting of the BLTB. In the event that the scheme experiences major delays to its overall Business Case programme (11 weeks or longer) Bracknell Forest Council will be required to seek permission from TVB LEP to reschedule any payments that are due, or may be delayed in falling due because of the delay to the overall Business Case programme.</p> <p>9. <u>Consequences of Change to the Design or Specification of the Scheme</u>: In the event that Bracknell Forest Council wishes to change the design or specification of the scheme such the scheme delivered will vary in any material aspect from the description given in the overall business case, Bracknell Forest Council will be required to</p>

Assurance Framework Check list	2.37 Bracknell A322/A329 Corridor Improvements (Birch Hill Junction Upgrade extension)
	<p>seek prior written consent from TVB LEP. Failing this permission, no further monies will be paid to Bracknell Forest Council after the change becomes apparent to TVB LEP. In addition, consideration will be given to recovering any monies paid to Bracknell Forest Council in respect of this scheme.</p> <p>10. <u>Consequences of Failure</u>: As soon as it becomes apparent to Bracknell Forest Council that it will not be possible to deliver the scheme by the end of March 2022, written notice shall be given to the Accountable Body for TVB LEP. No further monies will be paid to Bracknell Forest Council after this point. In addition, consideration will be given to recovering any monies paid to Bracknell Forest Council in respect of this scheme.</p> <p>11. <u>Claw back</u>: If the overall scheme achieves savings against budget, these savings will be shared by TVB LEP and the other funders noted above in proportion to the amounts set out in the Financial Profile. The Accountable Body for TVB LEP reserves the right to claw back any amounts of grant that have been spent on purposes other than the scheme as approved and any repayments due as a consequence of changes to the design or specification of the scheme or scheme failure.</p> <p>12. <u>Evaluation One and Five Years On</u>: Bracknell Forest Council will produce scheme evaluations One and Five years after practical completion that comply with DfT guidance.</p> <p><u>Other Conditions of Local Growth and Getting Building Funds</u>: Bracknell Forest Council will acknowledge the financial contribution made to this scheme through Local Growth Funds and follow the "Growth Deal Identity Guidelines"⁶ It will also give due regard to the Public Services (Social Value) Act⁷, particularly through the employment of apprentices across the scheme supply chain.</p>

Conclusion

14. It is the conclusion of the Independent Assessor that there is sufficient evidence presented to support the overall case for investment in the scheme. It meets wider strategic policy aims and should deliver 'high' value for money. The overall value for money for the scheme is high. On this basis, we recommend the scheme for approval.

Background Papers

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

⁶<http://www.thamesvalleyberkshire.co.uk/documents?view=files&folder=230>

⁷ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/social-value-act-information-and-resources/social-value-act-information-and-resources>

Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership

Independent Assessment Summary Report A322/A329 Corridor Improvements: Birch Hill Junction Upgrade

June 2021

www.hatch.co.uk

Contents Page

Executive Summary	i
Scheme Summary	i
Review Findings	i
<hr/>	
1. Introduction	1
Submitted Information	1
Report Structure	1
<hr/>	
2. Business Case Submission	2
Overview	2
Key Input Assumptions and Parameters	2
Strategic Case	3
Economic Case	4
Financial Case	5
Commercial Case	5
Management Case	6
Summary and Conclusions	7

Executive Summary

- i. This technical note provides an independent assessment of the A322/A329 Corridor Improvements: Birch Hill Junction Upgrade Business Case submission to the Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership (TVB LEP).

Scheme Summary

- 1.1 The business case submission sets out the case for investment in upgrades to signalling equipment at the Birch Hill Junction, situated along the A322 and A329 corridor.
- ii. The scheme represents a relatively small-scale investment in the replacement of obsolete, and failing, signalling technology at the junction, to ensure greater resilience to the strategically important A322/A329 corridor, as well as provide day-to-day operational benefits.
- iii. The overall scheme cost is estimated to be £0.5 million, with £0.45 million sought from the Getting Building Fund (GBF).

Review Findings

Conclusions

- iv. Given its locations along the A322/A329 there is considered to be a strong case for investment in upgrades to traffic signalling technology at the Birch Hill Junction. The age of the current systems represents a significant risk to on-going, and future, network resilience, and the replacement will improve the efficiency of movements across the corridor.
- v. Whilst challenging to quantify, there is sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the scheme will deliver 'high' value for money, based upon reducing the frequency of traffic signal failures, as well as the wider benefits the upgraded signal technology will deliver for normal network management.
- vi. The underlying scheme costings are considered reasonably robust, albeit subject to further development, particularly in relation to the requirement for any utilities work. The inclusion of a contingency provides confidence that the project can be delivered within the overall budget.
- vii. The delivery of the scheme, through the BFC Term Maintenance Contract, is considered appropriate, and the management processes in place should ensure risks are minimised.
- viii. It is acknowledged that there is a relatively short period of time to deliver the scheme and that, whilst feasible, it will be important to ensure there are no delays to the commencement of work and that all risks have been suitable mitigated, including the requirement for utilities work.

Recommendations

- ix. There is considered to be sufficient evidence presented to support the overall case for investment in the scheme. It meets wider strategic policy aims and should deliver 'high' value for money. The main risk will be for BFC to ensure delivery within the designated three month time period from January 2022 to March 2022.

- x. On this basis, the Birch Hill Junction Upgrade is recommended for investment.

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This report provides an independent assessment of the Full Business Case (FBC) submitted by Bracknell Forest Council (BFC) for the delivery of the A322/A329 Corridor Improvements: Birch Hill Junction Upgrade.
- 1.2 The scheme represents a relatively small-scale investment in the replacement of obsolete, and failing, signalling technology at the junction. This will ensure greater network resilience along the strategically important A322/A329 corridor, as well as provide day-to-day operational benefits.
- 1.3 This report considers the evidence presented within the FBC and whether it represents a robust case for the investment of Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership (TVB LEP) Getting Building Funds (GBFs).
- 1.4 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) Transport Appraisal Guidance (TAG).

Submitted Information

- 1.5 The independent assessment process for the Birch Hill Junction submission has been conducted on the following set of documentation submitted by BFC:
 - Full Business Case Submission (15th June 2021)
- 1.6 In addition to these formal documents, Hatch has engaged with BFC between April and June 2021 to discuss the requirements of the business case submission and comment upon the acceptability of the proposed appraisal approach, as well as input assumptions and parameters.
- 1.7 Given the relatively small-scale nature of the scheme, no formal Appraisal Specification Report or Option Appraisal Report has been required of this project. The specification has been discussed and agreed between BFC and TVB LEP.

Report Structure

- 1.8 This Independent Assessors Report responds to the formal submission of documentation, as well as the informal engagement process with BFC, 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.
- 1.9 This report provides an initial summary of scheme elements included within business case submission, alongside the details presented within each of the five 'cases' (Strategic, Economic, Financial, Commercial, Management).
- 1.10 It also sets out the recommendations to the LEP Local Transport Body relating to the suitability of the scheme for funding.

2. Business Case Submission

Overview

- 2.1 The full business case submission sets out the case for investment in signalling upgrades at the Birch Hill Junction. The core scheme deliverables are:
- Upgrade of traffic signals to incorporate MOVA technology
 - Utilisation of PLUS + technology to reduce the number of new duct-runs required and, therefore, minimise the civils cost element of the project. The system includes dedicated failsafe signal heads, as well as new smart loop modules to make sure that the overall system is tolerant of individual component and cable damage.
- 2.2 The scheme is designed primarily to resolve current, and projected future, failure rates of the existing signally technology at the junction, which can cause significant delays along the strategically important A322/A329 corridor.
- 2.3 In addition, the upgraded signalling technology will permit enhanced day-to-day management of the local network and improve performance.

Key Input Assumptions and Parameters

Summary of Content

- 2.4 The overarching business case is considered particularly reliant upon the following key assumptions:
- Scheme opening year = 2022
 - 20-year benefits appraisal period
 - Costs and benefits discounted to 2010 prices @3.5% per annum
 - Values of Time applied from TAG Databook
 - 10% 'optimism bias' applied as an uplift in the Financial Case

Independent Assessor Comment

- 2.5 The assessment has applied a range of standard **assumptions and parameters**, including discount rates and values of time, all of which are considered appropriate.
- 2.6 The 20-year **appraisal period** is generally considered appropriate for a technology-based investment of this type, albeit this is at the upper end of the expected life-cycle.
- 2.7 The '**optimism bias**' that has been applied within the financial case is considered to be more reflective of a financial contingency or risk allowance. As such, there should, technically, be a further level of 'optimism bias' applied within the economic assessment. The implications are examined further within the Economic Case section of the report, below.

Strategic Case

Summary of Content

- 2.8 The Strategic Case sets out the wider context in which the Birch Hill Junction needs to be considered. The junction's location on the A322/A329 corridor is highlighted and how this corridor provides a key link between the M3 and M4 and is recognised by the DfT for its strategic importance to the region as highlighted in its M25 South West Quadrant report.
- 2.9 It is demonstrated that a range of improvements have already been made across the corridor to improve network resilience and Birch Hill Junction remains a location still in need of improvement.
- 2.10 The current challenges experienced at the junction are set out, including the age of the signalling technology and the lack of real-time adaptability that hinders the management of the network in that area. Whilst the junction operates relatively effectively during periods of normal activity, when incidents occur (including signal failures) the impact upon the local network is significant.
- 2.11 Data is reported that demonstrates the signalling technology has failed, on average, over 10 times a year for the last five years. Furthermore, these incidences of failure are anticipated to increase over the forthcoming years as the technology ages further.
- 2.12 Traffic modelling outputs are presented that demonstrate the implications of signal failures upon the wider network and provides data on the extent of the delays that can occur.
- 2.13 The measures of success are outlined as: reduced queue lengths; reduced delays; and improved journey times across the A322/A329 corridor.

Independent Assessor Comment

- 2.14 BFC has previously demonstrated the **strategic importance** of the A322/A329 corridor for both the local area, as well as wider connectivity across the region. Whilst this full body of evidence is not repeated within this business case, it remains clear that the Birch Hill Junction Upgrade would support these wider policy aspirations to provide resilience and improve the performance of the corridor.
 - 2.15 The extend of the **issues and opportunities** for enhancement are well presented, with good supporting evidence that demonstrates the extent to which the failures of the current signalling system create significant wider network disruption.
 - 2.16 Whilst not stated within the FBC document, it is understood that the scheme has **inter-relationships** with other highway works in the area, as well as the requirement to protect network capacity in the lead up to Christmas, and so works at Birch Hill Junction cannot commence until January 2022.
-

Economic Case

Summary of Content

- 2.17 The Economic Case presents a case study review of previous junction improvement schemes along the A322/A329 that demonstrates they have all been forecast to delivery high, or very high, value for money.
- 2.18 The benefits stream for Birch Hill Junction Upgrade has been assessed on the basis of reducing the number of incidents of traffic signal failures at the junction. This is recorded in terms of the total network journey time that can be saved every time a signal failure is prevented. This utilises the current data on signal failure rates, but also assumes a further deterioration in the performance of the technology, with a predicted 10% increase in failure rate per annum. The present value of benefits associated with the network journey time saved is estimated at £0.823 million in 2010 prices.
- 2.19 The present value of costs for the scheme have been estimated, applying the costs within financial case, and are estimated £0.353 million in 2010 market prices. Optimism bias has been applied within the financial case, but not additionally within the economic case.
- 2.20 The overall estimated benefit cost ratio for the scheme is 2.33 to 1. This does not include any quantitative assessment of the improvements to normal operation of the junction, nor any potential savings with on-going maintenance requirements of the current signals.

Independent Assessor Comment

- 2.21 It is acknowledged that there are a number of challenges in assessing the economic impact of the signalling upgrade scheme, since the majority of the **quantified benefits** are derived from the prevention of traffic signal failures, as opposed to direct enhancement of normal junction forward.
- 2.22 Whilst there are some limitations to the approach adopted, given the scale of the investment, we consider it to be appropriate in this instance. The underlying assumptions made within the analysis are considered acceptable and the overall outcomes demonstrate that the scheme should deliver 'high' value for money.
- 2.23 It is accepted that there may be a **range of other benefits** that the scheme will deliver that can't easily be quantified, including network efficiency improvements, from the use of MOVA technology, and reduced requirements for annual maintenance of the current signalling equipment.
- 2.24 As set out in paragraph 2.7, there may be a case under DfT TAG protocols for applying an additional level of 'optimism bias' within the economic case analysis. The addition of a further 15% **optimism bias** would still result in a 'high' benefit cost ratio, and so we remain confident that the scheme will offer value for money from investment, even in the event of higher final scheme costs.

Financial Case

Summary of Content

- 2.25 Scheme costs have been estimated by BFC through concept designs and application of BFC Term Contractor schedule of rates. This generates a base cost estimate of £451,076, with a breakdown of all elements provided within an appendix.
- 2.26 A 10% 'financial optimism bias' has been applied to generate an overall budget requirement of £500,000.

- 2.27 The funding request of the TVB LEP is for £450,000, with a local contribution from BFC of £50,000.
- 2.28 BFC have provided a separate letter from the S151 Officer confirming the availability of the funding.

Independent Assessor Comment

- 2.29 A detailed breakdown of the **scheme cost** is provided, giving confidence that individual cost elements have been examined in detail and should represent a robust overall estimate of costs.
- 2.30 The additional 10% added within the financial case is considered to represent a **cost contingency**, as opposed to optimism bias, but does ensure that an allowance for unforeseen cost is included.
- 2.31 There would appear to be some minor uncertainty around the potential need for any utilities works (trial holes will be undertaken), and the extent to which this could impact upon scheme costs, but BFC are confident that the nature of the scheme means these will be minimal and sufficient allowance has been included within the overall budget.
- 2.32 Whilst the **funding profile** is not stated within the FBC, BFC are fully aware that all the TVB LEP funds from the GBF need to be defrayed before the end of March 2022.
- 2.33 The S151 Officer letter provides confidence of the allocation of the BFC contribution to the project.

Commercial Case

Summary of Content

- 2.34 The FBC states that the project, being small in scale, is limited in complexity (e.g., construction tasks, site access, etc.). No third party land is required and some of the construction work can be undertaken off-line, simplifying any traffic management issues.
- 2.35 The highways work will be undertaken by Ringway Infrastructure Services, as part of the BFC Term Maintenance Contract. This will operate with "Target Costing", with any cost overruns will be shared between the contractor and the Council.
- 2.36 Risks will be managed through both joint working with the contractor at the design and programming stages and continuous monitoring of costs and progress to minimise costs overrun.
- 2.37 The contract is anticipated to be for a period of 3 months from January 2022 and will be managed within BFC by an experienced resident engineer, with regular progress meetings and risk reduction meetings. The contractor will be contractually obliged to provide monthly progress and financial updates to BFC, which will include updates to the project programme.

Independent Assessor Comment

- 2.38 Given the scale of the scheme investment, the decision of BFC to utilise their existing Term Maintenance Contact appears pragmatic and acceptable. This framework has already been subject to a full open tendering process and so BFC can demonstrate that an appropriate **procurement process** has been undertaken that will result in commercial value for money.

- 2.39 It will clearly be important for BFC to work closely with the contractor to secure the final 'target cost' within the scope of the agreed funding budget and to subsequently to carefully manage the delivery of the project.

Management Case

Summary of Content

- 2.40 The management case provides evidence of similar projects that have been completed by BFC along the A322/A329 corridor, including: the Horse and Groom Roundabout, Twin Bridges Gyratory, Jennett's Park Roundabout, Hilton Roundabout, and Coral Reef Roundabout.
- 2.41 The schemes is stated as being free from dependencies. There is the potential requirement for minor utilities diversions. Trial holes will be undertaken to establish the location of apparatus in key areas to ensure an accurate assessment of impacts and costs can be made at this stage of the project.
- 2.42 The governance, organisational structure & key roles are set out, covering overall responsibilities for the delivery of the schemes, alongside day-to-day management.
- 2.43 A provisional Project Plan is provided demonstrating the key stages and the critical path. This includes two work phases: Phase 1: Circulatory and Phase 2: Centre Area. Project assurance and approvals will be the main responsibility of the Steering Group Chair supported by the Steering Group.
- 2.44 A 'tried and tested' stakeholder engagement process is outlined ,which is used on all significant BFC projects. The approach to project reporting is also set out, including updates on general progress, project finances, issues, as well as risk and governance meetings.
- 2.45 The approach to managing risks is set out, and a risk register is provided, with the main risk identified as '*delays to programme due to non-performance of supplier or sub-contractor failure*'.
- 2.46 The approach to benefits realisation and monitoring is outlined, with 1, 3 and 5 year monitoring of success factors identified.

Independent Assessor Comment

- 2.47 The management case provide strong evidence that BFC have the **experience** and protocols in place to deliver a scheme of this nature, including **governance, assurance and approvals, engagement, and reporting**.
- 2.48 Whilst not detailed in nature, the **Project Plan** provides evidence of the different stages of delivery and when the required works will be completed. Since the project cannot be commenced until January 2021 (due to the requirement to complete other highway projects in the area and to minimise works on the network in the lead up to the Christmas period) the delivery timeframe is very constrained, and it will be imperative that all potential **risks** are managed appropriately by BFC, and their contractors, to ensure there are no delays.
- 2.49 Whilst a detailed **benefits realisation plan** is not presented, sufficient evidence is presented (both in the management case and strategic case) of how the impacts of the scheme will be **monitored**.

Summary and Conclusions

Summary

2.50 The review of the five cases has identified the following key points for consideration:

- The importance of the A322/A329 corridor, as a strategic route, is established within the **Strategic Case**, as are the issues of the current reliability of the traffic signals at Birch Hill Junction. Traffic modelling tools provide a demonstration of the scale of the impact when the traffic signals fail and how the scheme will deliver network resilience, as well enhanced network management technology.
- Whilst the approach to assessing the quantified benefits of the scheme is challenging, the **Economic Case** demonstrates sufficient evidence to provide confidence that the scheme will deliver 'high' value for money from investment. The benefits will not only include reduce network disruption from traffic signal failure, but also improvements to normal operations and potential reductions in highway maintenance requirements.
- The overall **Financial Case** demonstrates that the costings are reasonably detailed and included an allowance for contingency. There is some uncertainty as to whether any utilities work are required, but these are anticipated to be minor. It is important to recongnised the requirement for all TVB LEP GBF allocations to be defrayed by the end of March 2022, which coincides with the current scheme completion date, therefore no delays can be tolerated.
- The **Commercial Case** is succinct but reflects the relatively straightforward nature of the scheme and the existence of The BFC Term Maintenance Contract for delivering these types of projects in an effective and efficient manner.
- The **Management Case** provides sufficient evidence to determine that the project will be delivered in an effective manner, albeit it is recongnised that there is very limited scope to accommodate any delays in the project delivery programme, in order to defray TVB GBF payments by the end of March 2022.

Conclusion

- 2.51 Given its locations along the A322/A329 there is considered to be a strong case for investment in upgrades to traffic signalling technology at the Birch Hill Junction. The age of the current systems represents a significant risk to on-going, and future, network resilience, and the replacement will improve the efficiency of movements across the corridor.
- 2.52 Whilst challenging to quantify, there is sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the scheme will deliver 'high' value for money, based upon reducing the frequency of traffic signal failures, as well as the wider benefits the upgraded signal technology will deliver for normal network management.
- 2.53 The underlying scheme costings are considered reasonably robust, albeit subject to further development, particularly in relation to the requirement for any utilities work. The inclusion of a continency provides confidence that the project can be delivered within the overall budget.
- 2.54 The delivery of the scheme, through the BFC Term Maintenance Contract, is considered appropriate, and the management processes in place should ensure risks are minimised.
- 2.55 It is acknowledged that there is a relatively short period of time to deliver the scheme and that, whilst feasible, it will be important to ensure there are no delays to the

commencement of work and that all risks have been suitable mitigated, including the requirement for utilities work.

Recommendation

- 2.56 There is considered to be sufficient evidence presented to support the overall case for investment in the scheme. It meets wider strategic policy aims and should deliver 'high' value for money. The main risk will be for BFC to ensure delivery within the designated three month time period from January 2022 to March 2022.
- 2.57 On this basis, the Birch Hill Junction Upgrade is recommended for investment.

This page is intentionally left blank

MEETING OF THE BERKSHIRE LOCAL TRANSPORT BODY (BLTB) – THURSDAY 15 July 2021

CONTACT OFFICER: Josie Wragg, Chief Executive, Slough Borough Council, Lead Officer to the BLTB

Item 8: Final update to BLTB on One Year scheme evaluations

Purpose of Report

1. To update the report given to the BLTB [11 March 2021](#).
2. Per section 19 of the agreed [BLTB Assurance Framework](#) process:

“Evaluation: Evaluation post implementation. The scheme promoter will publish one- and five- year impact reports post scheme opening. These reports will be reviewed by the independent assessor and reported to the BLTB.”

3. With the expectation of a continued gradual lifting of Covid restrictions, it is anticipated that the ability for scheme promoters to gather appropriate data for scheme assessments and evaluations should now improve. Department for Transport data for the end of June would indicate that nationally motor vehicles usage is at 98% of pre pandemic levels (see link below). As such, we anticipate that relevant schemes due for evaluation will be submitted to the November 2021 BLTB meeting when a meaningful report can be presented.

4. Upcoming schemes due for evaluation are:

- **Scheme 2.04 – Wokingham: Arborfield Relief Road**
- **Scheme 2.09.1 - Sustainable Transport NCN 422**

Carry forward schemes:

- *Scheme 2.21 – Slough: Langley Station Access*
- *Scheme 2.10 - Slough: A322 Improvements*
- *Scheme 2.11 and 2.12 - Reading: Phase 1 & 2 South Reading MRT**
- *Scheme 2.15 - Bracknell: Martin’s Heron roundabout*

*(Italics – per previous report; *RBC have submitted an evaluation report, and this is under Hatch Regeneris assessment)*

Recommendation

5. You are asked to note the update and await reports from the scheme promoters which will be produced at the November 2021 BLTB meeting.

Conclusion

6. There is no further action required at this point, but all schemes will continue to be monitored against required conditions.

Background Papers:

Department of Transport Statistics showing use of transport modes: Great Britain, since 1 March 2020

<https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/transport-use-during-the-coronavirus-covid-19-pandemic>

BLTB Forward Plan 2021-2022

Meeting	Deadline for final reports:	Agenda published	Agenda items
11 November 2021	21 October	3 November	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress reports • One-year-on Impact report for 2.21 Slough: Langley Station Access • One-year-on Impact report for 2.10 Slough: A322 Improvements • One-year-on Impact report for 2.11 & 2.12 Reading: Phase 1 & 2 South Reading MRT • One-year-on Impact report for 2.15 Bracknell: Martins Heron roundabout • One-year-on Impact report for scheme 2.04 – Wokingham: Arborfield Relief Road • One-year-on Impact report for scheme 2.09.1 - Sustainable Transport NCN 422 • Transport for the South East – Annual Subscription Report Update • Forward Plan
10 March 2022	18 February	2 March	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress reports • Forward Plan
14 July 2022	24 June	6 July	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress reports • Forward Plan
10 November 2022	21 October	2 November	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress reports • Forward Plan

This page is intentionally left blank