

MEETING OF THE BERKSHIRE LOCAL TRANSPORT BODY (BLTB) – THURSDAY 15 JULY 2020

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

Item 11 – Financial Approval for 2.40 Windsor Town Centre Package

Purpose of Report

1. To consider giving financial approval to scheme 2.40 Windsor Town Centre Package.
2. The proposed scheme sets out the case for investment in public realm enhancements within proximity of Windsor Castle and wider, small-scale, wayfinding interventions, both of which aim to increase visitor expenditure within the town. The public realm enhancements will be on Castle Hill and St. Alban's Street, directly outside the visitor entrance to Windsor Castle.
3. It seeks to improve the visitor experience as well as increase visitor expenditure, and so generate economic growth, by taking advantage of the opportunity presented by the high number of visitors to Windsor Castle. This shall be achieved by enhancing the public realm adjacent to the entrance to Windsor Castle, making the area more pleasant, and expanding the pedestrian area for visitors. This will support local businesses to improve their offer (e.g. through increased use of street cafes), as well as enhancing the look and feel of the area and improve the overall visitor experience.

Recommendation

4. You are recommended to give scheme 2.40 Windsor Town centre package full financial approval in the sum of £1,562,500 Local Growth Funds in 2020/21. This is on the terms of the funding agreement set out at paragraph 11 step 5 below.

Other Implications

Financial

5. In [January 2019](#) a re-prioritisation exercise was undertaken in advance of previously allocated Growth Deal Funds and returned to the Growth Deal "pot" for re-allocation. Scheme 2.40 Windsor Town Centre package is funded from this reallocation. See Appendix 1.
6. This report recommends that the RBWM be authorised to draw down the capital sum £1,562,500 from the Local Transport Body funding for this scheme.
7. 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

8. 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 2](#)) on the full business cases for the schemes
- 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 by the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.

11. The full details of the scheme are available from the [RBWM Council website](#)².

A summary of the key points is given below:

Task	Timescale
Preliminary designs	July - Oct 2020
Detailed designs	August – December 2020
Construction	Start October 2020
Completion	April 2021

Activity	Funder	Cost (approx)
Scheme development	RBWM	£500,907
Major scheme funding	Berkshire Local Transport Body	£1,562,500
Section 106 agreements		£350,000
Total		£2,413,407

12. 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	2.40 RBWM: Windsor Town Centre Package
	This scheme sets out the case for investment in public realm

Assurance Framework Check list	2.40 RBWM: Windsor Town Centre Package			
	<p>enhancements within proximity of Windsor Castle and wider, small-scale, wayfinding interventions, both of which aim to increase visitor expenditure within the town. The public realm enhancements will be on Castle Hill and St. Alban’s Street, directly outside the visitor entrance to Windsor Castle.</p> <p>This scheme was submitted and was given 21.5 points and ranked ninth out of sixteen schemes submitted. See Appendix 1.</p>			
	Factor	Raw score	Weighting	Weighted score
	SEP	3	1.5	4.5
	Deliverability	2	2.0	4.0
	Economic Impact	2	4.0	8.0
	TVB area coverage	3	1.0	3.0
	Natural Capital	1	1.0	1.0
	Social Value	2	0.5	1.0
	Total			21.5
<p>Step 2: Programme Entry: evolution of the scheme from outline proposal to full business case, external view on the business case, and independent assessment (See paragraphs 15 and 16)</p>	<p>Programme Entry status was given to Windsor Town Centre package by the BLTB on 31 January 2019 (minute 34b refers).</p> <p>The RBWM Council website⁴ 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 RBWM have been fully considered during the development of the scheme.</p> <p>The reports of the Independent Assessor are attached at Appendix 2. 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 			

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

²² https://www3.rbwm.gov.uk/info/200133/strategies_plans_and_policies/229/strategic_economic_plan

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

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

Assurance Framework Check list	2.40 RBWM: Windsor Town Centre Package
	<p>Case submission, when judged against the prevailing 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 for this addendum that Full Financial Approval is appropriate.
<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 Independent Assessor has identified that the Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) of the component scheme enhancements are both within the High Value category:</p> <p>Windsor Town Centre Package: 2.3: 1.</p> <p>DfT has set thresholds of 2.00 (High VfM) and 4.00 (Very High VfM) and schemes with BCRs above these thresholds can be described as having High or Very High Value for Money.</p>
<p>Step 5: Formal Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • roles • responsibilities • implementation • reporting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Roles</u>: TVB LEP is a part funder of the scheme. RBWM is the scheme promoter and is the relevant highway and planning authority. • <u>Responsibilities</u>: TVB LEP is responsible for allocating the capital finance in accordance with its Assurance Framework. RBWM 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

Assurance Framework Check list	2.40 RBWM: Windsor Town Centre Package
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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>from the scheme.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Implementation</u>: In addition to any reporting requirements within RBWM, the scheme promoter will use the proforma supplied by TVB LEP to make reports on progress of the implementation of the capital scheme to each meeting of the BLTB until the build is complete. In particular, RBWM 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. • <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. • <u>Auditing</u>: RBWM 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, RBWM will co-operate fully. • <u>Timing and Triggers for payments</u>: See the Claim Proforma – available on request. • <u>Contributions from Other Funders</u>: RBWM will contribute £500,907 capital and £350,000 S106 in regard to Windsor Town Centre package in 2020/21. In the event that the scheme experiences or it is anticipated that the scheme will experience a shortfall in these contributions, RBWM 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. • <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), RBWM 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) RBWM will be required to seek permission from TVB LEP to reschedule any

Assurance Framework Check list	2.40 RBWM: Windsor Town Centre Package
	<p>payments that are due or may be delayed in falling due because of the delay to the overall Business Case programme.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Consequences of Change to the Design or Specification of the Scheme</u>: In the event that RBWM 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, RBWM will be required to seek prior written consent from TVB LEP. Failing this permission, no further monies will be paid to RBWM after the change becomes apparent to TVB LEP. In addition, consideration will be given to recovering any monies paid to RBWM in respect of this scheme. • <u>Consequences of Failure</u>: As soon as it becomes apparent to RBWM that it will not be possible to deliver the by the end of April 2021, written notice shall be given to the accountable body for TVB LEP. No further monies will be paid to RBWM after this point. In addition, consideration will be given to recovering any monies paid to RBWM in respect of this scheme. • <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. • <u>Evaluation One and Five Years On</u>: RBWM will produce scheme evaluations One and Five years after practical completion that comply with DfT guidance. • <u>Other Conditions of Local Growth Funds</u>: RBWM will acknowledge the financial contribution made to this scheme through Local Growth Funds and follow the 'Growth Deal Identity Guidelines' – see link here: http://www.thamesvalleyberkshire.co.uk/getfile/Public%20Documents/Strategic%20Economic%20Plan/Logos%20for%20branding/GROWTH%20DEAL%20IDENTITY%20GUIDELINES%20280219.pdf?inline-view=true <p>It will also give due regard to the Equality Act 2010 - Public Sector and with the Public Services (Social Value Act) 2012, particularly through the employment of apprentices across the scheme supply</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">Assurance Framework Check list</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">2.40 RBWM: Windsor Town Centre Package</p>
	<p>chain.</p>

Conclusion

13. It is the conclusion of the Independent Assessor that the overall case for investment in the Windsor Town Centre Package scheme is strong, albeit the delivery of the project will need to be carefully managed, including the development of the final scheme costs, the required consultation and engagement processes, and overall risk management. On this basis, Hatch Regeneris recommend the scheme for approval.

Background Papers

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

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	M 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	Slough: SMaRT Phase 3 A4 West Park and Ride	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

Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership

Independent Assessment Summary Report:

Windsor Visitor Economy

July 2020

www.hatchregeneris.co.uk

Contents Page

Executive Summary	i
Scheme Summary	i
Review Findings	ii
1. Introduction	1
Submitted Information	1
Report Structure	1
2. Option Assessment	2
Overview	2
Review 3	
3. Appraisal Specification	4
Overview	4
Review 4	
4. Full Business Case	5
Overview	5
Key Input Assumption and Parameters	6
Strategic Case	7
Economic Case	8
Financial Case	10
Commercial Case	10
Management Case	11
Summary and Conclusions	13

Executive Summary

- i. This technical note provides an independent assessment of the Windsor Visitor Economy (WVE) 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 public realm enhancements within proximity of Windsor Castle and wider, small-scale, wayfinding interventions, both of which aim to increase visitor expenditure within the town.
- iii. The public realm enhancements will be on Castle Hill and St. Alban's Street, directly outside the visitor entrance to Windsor Castle, encompassing the area outlined below:
- iv. The wider wayfinding interventions are presented on the diagram below:

- 1.1 The overall funding request from the LEP is for £1.563 million (65%) of a forecast total scheme cost of £2.413 million.

Review Findings

Conclusions

- v. The strategic case demonstrates alignment with strategic priorities and provides clear underlying evidence of the need to delivery urban realm and wayfinding to support the local visitor economy.
- vi. The approach to assessing the economic benefits is generally robust and demonstrates the scheme should deliver high value for money, including positive environmental and social impacts.
- vii. The financial case appears reasonably sound but could be subject to variation post preliminary and detailed design. There is considered to be a reasonable level of contingency to support a robust case for investment. The RBWM funding is included within their Capital Programme for 2020/21 and RBWM have committed to managing any potential cost overruns.
- viii. The commercial and management cases are generally robust, but some information is limited in nature. The main areas for concern relate to the need for statutory consultation, as well as the management of risk to project and programme delivery.

Recommendations

- ix. It is our conclusion that overall case for investment in the scheme appears strong, albeit the delivery of the project will need to be carefully managed, including the development of the final scheme costs, the required consultation and engagement processes, and overall risk management.
- x. On this basis, we recommend the scheme for approval.

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 public realm enhancements within proximity of Windsor Castle and wider, small-scale, wayfinding interventions.
- 1.2 This report considers the evidence presented by RBWM and whether the package of measures 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 Windsor Visitor Economy (WVE) submission has been conducted on the following set of documentation submitted by RBWM and their consultant team (Project Centre):
 - Full Business Case Report (6th July 2020)
- 1.5 Whilst no formal Appraisal Specification Report or Option Appraisal Report was submitted by the Applicant, and the overall approach to be adopted and how the options have been developed, has been discussed at a series of meetings with RBWM and Project Centre between February 2019 and June 2020.

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 structure as follows:
 - Section 2: Option Assessment – provides a high-level review of the process undertaken to develop the scheme options and its acceptability.
 - Section 3: Appraisal Specification– 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 a summary of scheme elements included 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

Overview

- 2.1 No formal Option Appraisal Report was submitted for this scheme; however, the scheme options have been developed as part of wider masterplanning work for Windsor Town Centre. As part of these proposals, a new dedicated coach park is to be developed at Alma Road. This requires the temporary relocation of the current coach park to King Edward VII car park, with a shuttle bus service to be run between the relocated coach park and Thames Street. This will change the dynamic of visitor movements across the town and provides the opportunity to influence behaviour.
- 2.2 In support of the wider masterplanning work, a series of scheme options have been considered for enhancing core areas of public realm in Windsor Town Centre. These options were developed in liaison with key stakeholders, including Windsor Castle. During the stakeholder consultation and scheme development, the following key priorities, issues and constraints were identified:

Priorities:

- Space that enhances the Town Centre and setting of Windsor Castle;
- Improve visitor experience;
- Economically advantageous to businesses;
- Security requirements' and
- Requirements of Windsor Castle as major stakeholder .

Issues and constraints:

- Access arrangements to the Castle;
- Visitor queuing arrangements and how they should be protected;
- Coach drop-off arrangements;
- The setting of Queen Victoria's statue;
- Access and dropping off for taxis and private hire area and access;
- New entrance layout for visitors;
- Existing private parking;
- Space allocation and delineation; and
- Quality, look, and feel of the Castle and Town.

- 2.3 Four scheme options were developed in response to these requirements, with the spatial scope of the scheme being the primary variable. The public realm works within each core area were all proposed to include paving and surface material enhancements and new street furniture:

- OPTION 1: Closure of Castle Hill and part of St. Alban's Street to the visitor centre. Bollards and gates to create modal filters and enclose the area
 - OPTION 2: Same as Option 1, with the St. Alban's Street pedestrian extent extended to the junction with St. Alban's Close
 - OPTION 3: Same as Option 2, with the Castle Hill footway widened on the south side to narrow the carriageway road width to 6m
 - OPTION 4: This option presents a wider enhancement area, extending Option 3 to include Thames Street between Park Street and Jubilee Arch. Carriageway width to be reduced
- 2.4 Based upon the further discussions with stakeholders, Option 3 was identified as the preferred option to be taken forward, which includes a low height kerb to be built out on the southern footway to delineate the carriageway area to support the requirements for ceremonial events at the castle.
- 2.5 The wider wayfinding elements of the scheme have been developed by assessing visitor footfall on key routes across the town and understanding how that might alter with the new temporary coach car park location. The key routes have been overlaid with an assessment with current provision to identify where new wayfinding measures are required.

Review

- 2.6 Whilst a formal option appraisal is not presented, it is clear that the identification of the preferred scheme option for the urban realm improvement has been through a rigorous process, including extensive consultation. It also fits in with wider development aspirations for the town.
- 2.7 A range of alternative design options have been considered, with the preferred options selected to best meet the requirements of local stakeholders.
- 2.8 The approach to identifying the wayfinding measures is also considered robust, with a detailed understanding of current and future visitor footfall and the need for additional provision at key locations.

3. Appraisal Specification

Overview

- 3.1 Whilst no formal Appraisal Specification Report was submitted by the Applicant, the overall approach to be adopted has been discussed during a variety of meeting with RBWM and Project Centre, from February 2019 through to June 2020.
- 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 the local visitor economy and key routes around the town for visitors;
- An overview of the current town centre provision for visitors; and
- The proposed appraisal methodology, with a specific focus upon the approach to the Economic Case.

Review

- 3.3 The primary purpose of the discussions were to agree how the proposed enhancements will impact upon visitors to Windsor, and specifically the Castle, and how it may influence their behaviour in terms of the routes they use, the amount of time they dwell in specific areas, and the amount they spend within the local visitor economy.
- 3.4 Based upon initial evidence presented, it was agreed that current levels of spend amongst visitors to Windsor is relatively low, and that key reason for this is that routes through the town, and the local urban realm, do not encourage visitors towards key shopping locations and to spend time dwelling within these area.
- 3.5 It was agreed that assessing the potential impact of the scheme on increasing the level of average spend amongst visitor was a key benefit. This could be captured through case study evidence assessing the impact of other urban realm scheme upon local retail turnover and increased retail employment.
- 3.6 In addition, it is agreed that the urban realm improvements, by themselves, will deliver direct benefits to all visitors who use and dwell within them. It was agreed that the Transport for London (TfL) Valuing Urban Realm Toolkit (VURT) was an appropriate tool for assessing this impact.

4. Full Business Case

Overview

- 4.1 The full business case submission sets out the case for investment in public realm enhancements within proximity of Windsor Castle and wider, small scale wayfinding interventions, both of which aim to increase visitor expenditure within the town.
- xi. The public realm enhancements will be on Castle Hill and St. Alban's Street, directly outside the visitor entrance to Windsor Castle, encompassing the area outlined below:
- 4.2 The wider wayfinding interventions are presented on the diagram below:

Key Input Assumption and Parameters

- 4.3 The overarching business case is based upon a range of key assumptions and data sources that underpin the appraisal process:
- All scheme elements will be completed and operational by April 2021
 - The temporary relocation of the current coach park to King Edward VII car park, with a shuttle bus service to be run between the relocated coach park and Thames Street
 - Current average day visitor spend within local shops = £6.93
 - The scheme will result in a 20% increase in visitor spend within local shops resulting in an increase of average day visitor spend of £1.39
 - 40% of Windsor Castle visitors will increase their spend
 - 2018 ONS Annual Business Survey data for retail economy turnover, GVA and jobs
 - HCA Additionality Guide (2014) regional multiplier of 1.38
 - 25% displacement of employment impacts
 - The scheme will result in 60% of visitors dwelling for a minimum of 20 minutes
 - 15-year appraisal period
 - Costs and benefits discounted to 2020 prices
 - 20% Optimism Bias

Independent Assessor Comment

- 4.4 Whilst the level of certainty around the wider masterplanning exercise is unclear, it is understood that the proposals to relocate the coach parking are well developed. In the event it were not taken forward this is unlikely to affect the benefits generated by the core urban realm scheme but may require reconsideration of wayfinding elements.
- 4.5 The data on average spend is considered robust. Clear case study evidence is presented showing the impact of urban realm upon retail spend. The assumptions applied within the analysis apply a relatively conservative approach based upon the findings.
- 4.6 The logic around 40% of Windsor visitors increasing their spend and 60% increasing dwell time is clearly presented. It is noted that sensitivity tests are undertaken to examine the implication of lower values.
- 4.7 The application of ONS data and HCA multipliers is appropriate. The 25% displacement allowance is considered acceptable.
- 4.8 The appraisal of urban realm welfare benefits is considered appropriate over a 15-year period. Whilst for the analysis of the impact of increased visitor spend might typically be assessed over a 10-year period, this is not directly specified within HM treasury Green Book, rather an appropriate appraisal period for the life-time of the asset should be applied. RBWM reference studies that

indicate there is evidence that these schemes do have positive economic impacts beyond a 12-year period and so, on that basis, we consider the 15-year appraisal period to be broadly acceptable. This will be considered further under the sensitivity testing section within the review of the Economic Case

4.9 The 20% optimism bias is considered appropriate.

Strategic Case

- 4.10 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 the urban realm investment to support the local visitor economy.
- 4.11 An overview of the study area context is presented in relation to economic growth and exiting travel patterns, as well as key destination locations. The levels of current footfall on key routes through the town are also presented and how this is forecast to change with wider masterplanning proposals, including the relocation of coach parking.
- 4.12 A set of existing issues are identified, including the relatively low level of spend among visitors, despite high satisfaction levels with the shops themselves. Key opportunities are identified as:
- Increasing footfall on the high street;
 - Increasing expenditure within the shops;
 - Supporting economic growth and prosperity within the town; and,
 - Increasing employment opportunities.
- 4.13 The contribution of the scheme to national, regional and local strategic priorities is set out, specifically highlighting the focus upon revitalising high streets, as well as the role of Windsor Castle as a global brand for Berkshire.
- 4.14 The primary scheme objective is defined as to generate economic growth within Windsor by capitalising on the opportunity presented by the high number of visitors to Windsor Castle. This will be achieved through enhancing the public realm and encouraging visitors to dwell and enjoy the area.
- 4.15 A series of measures of success are set out, including pedestrian footfall, visitor expenditure, and pedestrian dwell times around Windsor Castle.
- 4.16 A set of case study evidence is set out that demonstrates the impact of previous urban realm scheme upon local retail economies and concludes that improvements can generate between 20% and 40% increased retail spend.
- 4.17 The main constraints in delivering the schemes are stated to relate to managing construction with the level of footfall within the town centre, ensuring impacts on local businesses and Windsor Castle are minimal, along with security implications of the locality.

- 4.18 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.
- 4.19 The option development process is summarised, including the identification of the preferred option.

Independent Assessor Comment

- 4.20 The Strategic Case is considered to present a good overview of the issues, objectives and preferred urban realm enhancement to support the local visitor economy within Windsor town Centre.
- 4.21 The local context, issues and opportunities provide a good understanding the challenges facing local retailers despite the high footfall of visitors to the Castle. The wider masterplanning proposals clearly provide an initiative to enhance conditions.
- 4.22 The policy context is well established, with a clear understanding of the priorities of national, regional and local bodies, including the Berkshire Local Industrial Strategy and Strategic Economic Plan.
- 4.23 The established scheme objective, and sub-objectives, are clear and logical, and the identified measures of success align well with the objectives.
- 4.24 The case study evidence presented is insightful and provide useful contextual data. The conclusions drawn from the case studies are considered robust, including the assumption that visitor spend will increase by 20% from the urban realm improvements.
- 4.25 The discussion on constraints rightly focus upon the context in which the scheme will need to be delivered, noting the high footfall and importance of minimising the impact upon existing retail and leisure activities, as well as the security requirements of the Castle. The Construction Management Plan proposed will be an important document in identifying how all of these potential constraints can be effectively managed. It is understood that the only outstanding approvals will be internal detailed design approvals. The detailed design will be subject to a Traffic Management order and so will require statutory consultation, with the potential risk objections.
- 4.26 The section on inter-dependencies focuses upon the risks associated with the delivery of the scheme. No specific dependencies upon internal and external factors are identified; however, the wider masterplanning exercise and the operation of the Castle are likely to be factors that need consideration.
- 4.27 In the discussion of stakeholders, whilst there is no indication of the level of engagement to-date, it is understood that there is support amongst key stakeholders and, specifically, Windsor Castle. On-going engagement with the Castle and local retailers will be important to successful delivery.
- 4.28 The options assessment section demonstrates that due consideration has been given to the optimum scheme designs for the urban realm and wayfinding measures (see Section 2 of this report for more details).
- 4.29 Overall, the Strategic Case is considered to provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate a clear need for the urban realm and wayfinding improvements to support the local visitor economy.

Economic Case

- 4.30 The Economic Case sets out the appraisal rationale and the approach undertaken to assess the potential scheme benefits and the case for public sector investment.
- 4.31 It is highlighted that, whilst the scheme impacts upon highway provision, a conventional approach to transport appraisal is not appropriate as the traffic flows at the scheme location (Castle Hill) are very low. The alternative approach to assessing the scheme benefits in terms of increased visitor spend and urban realm welfare benefits is set out.
- 4.32 The visitor spend analysis concludes that the increased level of spend (retail turnover) will be sufficient to generate up to seven retail jobs with a Gross Value Added (GVA) to the economy equivalent to just under £220,000 per annum (in 2020 prices)
- 4.33 The urban realm welfare analysis concludes the scheme will generate annual benefits of £339,846 in 2020 prices through the welfare value visitor will place on the higher standard of urban realm.
- 4.34 The underlying assumptions within the cost benefits analysis are set out and the Present Value of Cost (including 20% optimism bias) and Benefits presented. Overall, a Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) of 2.32 is forecast.
- 4.35 The outcomes of two sensitivity test are presented. These consider the implication of the proportion of visitors spending more in the local area reducing from the central case forecast of 40% to 30% or 20%. The predicted BCR falls to 2.07 under the 30% scenario and 1.81 under the 20% scenario.
- 4.36 An overview of environmental and social impacts is presented, highlighting a range of potential benefits and limited risks of negative impacts.
- 4.37 A short Value for Money Statement concludes the Economic Case, summarising the BCRs.

Independent Assessor Comment

- 4.38 The overarching approach adopted within the Economic Case is considered robust.
- 4.39 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.
- 4.40 It is agreed that a traditional approach to assessing a highway-based scheme would not have been appropriate for this scheme, given that Castle Hill currently has no through traffic and is, effectively, restricted to local access requirements.
- 4.41 The approach adopted to assessing increased visitor spend applies robust case study evidence and local retail data, as well as ONS and HCA metrics. The assessment is considered consistent with HM Treasury Green Book and MHCLG appraisal requirements.
- 4.42 The assessment of welfare impacts of the urban realm improvements utilises the industry standard TfL VURT approach, including the Pedestrian Environmental Review System (PERS) tool. Whilst the tool was calibrated and validated for a London context, the location of this scheme directly outside an internationally renowned visitor attraction in South East England means it is considered equally applicable for this scheme.

- 4.43 The overall cost benefit analysis is considered to be generally robust. The application of a 20% optimism bias is considered appropriate. It was noted within the earlier section of this report on 'Key Input Parameters and Assumptions' that the appraisal period of 15 years, whilst entirely appropriate for the welfare impacts, may be considered non-typical for the visitor retail spend impacts. However, we accept the evidence presented by RBWM that these benefits will extend beyond a 12-year period and so the 15-year appraisal is considered broadly acceptable.
- 4.44 The assessment of potential environmental and social impacts, whilst high level and qualitative in nature, highlights that the scheme should generate a range of positive benefits in terms of reducing noise, air quality and emissions, as well as positive impacts on townscape and enhancing heritage assets. The scheme should also encourage physical activity, improve pedestrian journey quality, and enhance accessibility/reduce pedestrian severance. Whilst road traffic access will be reduced along Castle Hill during certain periods of the day, the volumes of traffic affected are minimal.
- 4.45 There is no overall Appraisal Summary Table presented for the scheme but the overall quantified assessment of value for money appears to demonstrate that the scheme should deliver high value for money from investment.
- 4.46 The sensitivity tests for cost benefit analysis demonstrates that the scheme would still deliver a BCR of over 2 to 1 if only 30%, instead of 40%, of visitors increase their spend. Whilst the BCR would fall to 1.81 to 1 under the 20% sensitivity test, this would still represent good value for money from investment.
- 4.47 In relation to the period over which the visitor spend impacts have been appraised, it can be seen that even if this was reduced to 12 years, the BCR would still be estimated to be 1.96 to 1 (within the margin for error for 'high' value for money).

Financial Case

- 4.48 The Financial Case provides an overview of scheme capital costs, cost profiles and funding sources.
- 4.49 The overall scheme capital costs are detailed for the urban realm and wayfinding elements and are based upon RBWM term contract unit rates, with an uplift to account for additional costs from experience of delivering similar schemes, and are based on outline designs. The level of contingency applied is 20% of the base capital costs. Standard allowances for design and preliminaries, totalling 35% of base scheme costs, are included.
- 4.50 The profile of costs indicates all expenditure will be within 2020/21 and, likewise, the profile of funding. A total of £1.563 million (65%) of funding is requested from the LEP, with £350,000 in S106 contributions and £500,907 from RBWM capital programme.

Independent Assessor Comment

- 4.51 A breakdown in scheme costs is not directly presented and so cannot be fully verified. It is understood the preliminary design has yet to be completed and so there is potential for cost variation to emerge through both preliminary and detailed design.
- 4.52 The level of contingency applied (20%) is considered a reasonably robust amount, given the stage of design, but no details of how this was derived is presented.

- 4.53 There is no specific indication of whether construction inflation has been taken into account within the cost profiling.
- 4.54 There is no reference to maintenance costs requirements. Typically, the maintenance of higher quality urban realm materials are higher than standard highway materials.
- 4.55 The source of match-funding is presented, and it is understood that it is included within RBWM's capital programme for 2020/21. Whilst the risk of higher costs is partly covered by the contingency, RBWM have stated that they will be responsible for managing any further cost overruns and ensure these are minimised, where possible.

Commercial Case

- 4.56 The Commercial Case outlines the procurement strategy for the schemes and provides information on payment mechanisms, risk allocation, contract length and contract management.
- 4.57 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. The key deliverables are stated in relation to an output-based specification.
- 4.58 The procurement strategy outlines two 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 they provide best value for money.
- 4.59 RBWM conclude that, as the scheme includes standard highway civis and public realm improvements that fit the scope of projects delivered through the framework, 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 in the local area.
- 4.60 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.
- 4.61 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.
- 4.62 The current construction framework contract is stated to run till 2021 but can be extended for job specific projects.
- 4.63 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.
- 4.64 The contracts will be managed through as combination of workshops, reviews, meetings, and day-to-day operation.

Independent Assessor Comment

- 4.65 Overall the commercial case establishes that the scheme can be delivered through existing framework contracts that offer high value for money and an effective and efficient procurement process.
- 4.66 The outputs-based specification details what is to be achieved through the procurement process, as opposed to the specific detail of what the overall contract will need to deliver.
- 4.67 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 works fit within the core the specification of the framework.
- 4.68 The payment terms, including potential penalty clauses, are well set out for the main construction framework contract.
- 4.69 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.
- 4.70 Consideration is also given to contract lengths, human resource issues, and contract management, which provides useful additional understanding of the commercial case.
- 4.71 Overall it is concluded that use of the framework contracts represents an appropriate commercial approach.

Management Case

- 4.72 The Management Case presents information on how the proposal will be successfully delivered and managed.
- 4.73 Several examples of previous projects are presented that are considered similar or relevant to the urban realm and wayfinding scheme being delivered through this project. This is accompanied by evidence of the proposed delivery partners involvement similar types of projects.
- 4.74 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 to visitors and business operations around Windsor, most notably the Castle.
- 4.75 A detailed account of roles and job titles in RBWM management and governance arrangements is included. This includes the use of Microsoft Teams software to manage the project and to provide visibility of the status of the work.
- 4.76 A project plan/programme is referred to within an appendix. A summary of key milestones is set out.
- 4.77 An assurance and approval plan is set out that includes sign-off procedures by the Project Board. An overarching communications and stakeholder management plan is outlined. This identifies key stakeholder who will be kept aware of the schemes progress and will be provided with the opportunities to provide feedback. A series of mechanisms for promoting the scheme are identified.

- 4.78 Responsibilities for programme and project reporting are set out, including the Project Manager and Project Sponsor. In addition, the key workstreams for implementing the project are summarised.
- 4.79 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 any required revisions to scheme costs at detailed design stage, a reduction in Windsor visitor numbers reducing the benefits of the scheme; stakeholder objections to the scheme; unforeseen construction delays; and archaeological finds.
- 4.80 A section on benefits realisation sets out a three-stage monitoring and evaluation strategy with key performance indicators specified, with targets, and data collection requirements, as well as specifying an evaluation process.

Independent Assessor Comment

- 4.81 The management case, in general, provides a comprehensive range of information that provides assurance around the delivery arrangements in place for the project.
- 4.82 The evidence of delivering previous projects showcases some schemes that are directly similar in nature to the urban realm works in this project, although others are less directly relevant. The examples provided in relation to delivery partners is also useful and, overall provides sufficient evidence that the project team has sufficient experience to successfully deliver this project.
- 4.83 The project dependencies focus upon ensuring local support for the project and that it can be successful delivered without significant disruption to visitor and business activities in the area. This engagement process will need to be managed carefully to ensure it does not affect the overall programme for delivery.
- 4.84 The section of governance is considered detailed, although it generally describes generic positions without reference to who will fill these positions and their individual experience.
- 4.85 A project programme is attached within the appendices and provides a detailed assessment of the individual elements involved in the preliminary design, detailed design, procurement and construction. There is no specific reference to any engagement or statutory consultation requirements and how these may impact upon the programme. It is understood that statutory consultation will be required for the Traffic Management Orders, but RBWM consider the risk of objections to be minimal, due to wider stakeholder support. Overall, the programme appears challenging with limited scope for any delays.
- 4.86 The assurance and approval plan provides an acceptable overview of processes.
- 4.87 The communication and stakeholder management plan identifies a wide range of stakeholders and indicates how they will all be engaged. The type of consultation and any implications of objections to scheme elements is not directly stated, but it is understood this will be in the form of statutory consultation related to the Traffic Management Orders and this will take place during the detailed design phase. RBWM consider the risk of objections to be low but this cannot be confirmed at this stage.

- 4.88 The programme/project reporting and the implementation sections provide useful insight into proposed processes.
- 4.89 The detailed risk register is attached within the appendices, dated 5th June 2020. This identifies three risk with potential for 'major' consequences, including: stakeholder objections; maintain the entrance to Windsor Castle for residents and deliveries; and traffic network impacts during construction. These appear different to the main risk identified within the Management Case text. Whilst mitigation actions are identified, they tend to relate to early consultation and engagement, as opposed to direct mitigation in the event that a risk comes to fruition. 'Moderate' risks identified also include: RBWM funding, Windsor visitor numbers, contractor fees exceeding budget, archaeological finds and utilities.
- 4.90 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 and a process for evaluation, although the reference case against which the scheme will be assessed is not clear.

Summary and Conclusions

Summary

- 4.91 The review of the five cases has identified a series of key summary points:
- The strategic case demonstrates clear evidence that the visitor economy is underperforming in terms of average retail spend within Windsor and there is a clear opportunity to maximise the benefits of the significant volumes of visitors to the Castle. The scheme will also complement wider masterplanning aspirations for the town.
 - Strong case study evidence is presented around the potential impacts of improved urban realm provision upon retail spend. The specific dynamics of the layout of the town are also presented and the accompanying wayfinding improvements should help encourage more footfall along the High Street.
 - It is clear that there is still a requirement to work closely with local stakeholders to ensure that the scheme maximises the benefit for local businesses and does not cause undue disruption during its construction.
 - The overall economic case assessment has been conducted in an appropriate manner. There is strong case study evidence that the scheme will encourage higher levels of retail spend that will support the local retail economy. In addition, the urban realm improvements will deliver direct welfare benefits to those visiting the Castle and are able to dwell in the pedestrianised area.
 - High level information indicates that the scheme should deliver positive environmental and social benefits in terms of encouraging walking and cycling and enhancing the local environment. Overall the scheme is forecast to deliver high value for money from investment.
 - The overall financial case for the scheme is considered to be relatively robust, at an overarching level, with a reasonable contingency allowance included. However, it should be recognised that the scheme has yet to progress to preliminary design stage and so there will remain some uncertainties

until preliminary, and then detailed design, have been completed. The RBWM funding is committed within their Capital Programme for 2020/21 and RBWM have stated they will take responsibility for managing any potential cost overruns would be covered.

- 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.
- The management case provides a comprehensive range of information around management and delivery protocols. Whilst a detail project programme is provided, there is limited specific information on the required statutory consultation process required in relation to the Traffic Management Orders and the level of risk of objections. More generally, the risk register identifies a number of potentially 'major' and 'moderate' risks that could affect funding and delivery and it is unclear if comprehensive contingency and mitigation plans are in place.

Conclusions

- 4.92 The strategic case demonstrates alignment with strategic priorities and provides clear underlying evidence of the need to delivery urban realm and wayfinding to support the local visitor economy.
- 4.93 The approach to assessing the economic benefits is generally robust and demonstrates the scheme should deliver high value for money, including positive environmental and social impacts.
- 4.94 The financial case appears reasonably sound but could be subject to variation post preliminary and detailed design. There is considered to be a reasonable level of contingency to support a robust case for investment. The RBWM funding is included within their Capital Programme for 2020/21 and RBWM have committed to managing any potential cost overruns.
- 4.95 The commercial and management cases are generally robust, but some information is limited in nature. The main areas for concern relate to the need for statutory consultation, as well as the management of risk to project and programme delivery.
- 4.96 It is our conclusion that overall case for investment in the scheme appears strong, albeit the delivery of the project will need to be carefully managed, including the development of the final scheme costs, the required consultation and engagement processes, and overall risk management.
- 4.97 On this basis, we recommend the scheme for approval.

Appendix 3

Windsor Visitor Economy

Windsor Town Centre Package

Business Case

**Client Name: Royal Borough of Windsor and
Maidenhead**

Date: May 2020

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report sets out the business case for the 'Windsor Visitor Economy' to secure Local Growth Deal funding for the scheme.

The scheme comprises of two elements: public realm enhancements within proximity of Windsor Castle and wider, small scale wayfinding interventions. Both of which aim to increase visitor expenditure within the town. The business case is structured in accordance with the Green Book five-case model, comprising of the following cases: strategic, economic, financial, commercial and management.

Strategic Case

Windsor is becoming a victim of its own success, as overall visitor numbers continue to grow, the town is becoming overcrowded to the detriment of the visitor experience. The town has a medieval road layout that was not designed to cope with the numbers of people that it accommodates today. As a result, roads and footways around the town centre are heavily congested in the peak summer season.

More needs to be done to address the existing issues and capture the economic opportunities presented by the high number of visitors.

Following a review of visitor survey data, it was identified that despite the high visitor satisfaction for the shops, there is low and declining spend, particularly from day visitors. Surveys in 2017 identified that visitors spent an average of £6.93 on shopping.

Acknowledging this, the proposed scheme seeks to increase visitor expenditure, and generate economic growth, by taking advantage of the opportunity presented by the high number of visitors to Windsor Castle. This shall be achieved by enhancing the public realm adjacent to the entrance to Windsor Castle, making the area more pleasant, and expanding the pedestrian area for visitors. This will support local businesses to improve their offer (e.g. through increased use of street cafes), as well as enhancing the look and feel of the area and improve the overall visitor experience.

Economic Case

The case study review provides a robust evidence base to support the proposed public realm interventions, identifying a clear relationship between public realm enhancements and increased spend and economic growth. The economic analysis identifies that by taking advantage of the high number of visitors to Windsor Castle, the benefits generated from the scheme significantly outweigh the costs, providing a Benefit/ Cost ratio of 2.32. Therefore, presenting High value for money.

Financial Case

The Windsor Visitor Economy proposal is a strong fit with local, regional, and national policies and priorities relating to transportation investment and economic growth. The total cost of the

preferred option is £2,413,407, which includes a 20% allowance for preliminaries, 15% for design and legal fees, and a 20% contingency.

Funding is available through the Local Growth Fund (LGF), which has been provisionally allocated to this project subject to RBWM demonstrating a satisfactory business case. Total LGF funding of £1,562,500, with a S106 contribution of £350,000, and capital funding of £500,907 from RBWM.

Commercial Case

RBWM is able to draw on existing long-term framework contracts for delivery of aspects of the project including:

- I Volker Highways for delivery of highways construction services, traffic signs and road markings;
- I Project Centre for professional engineering services, including structures, highway planning and design services; and
- I AA Lighting / Zeta for the design and delivery of street lighting solutions.

The existing contract for construction currently runs to 2021. However, this would be extended for job specific projects under construction for the duration of the scheme.

The contract follows a traditional NEC 3 format, ensuring that the contractual / commercial arrangement will be well defined. This form of contract is well understood throughout the supply chain and relies on a pre-defined risk register to allocate and manage anticipated risk.

Management Case

RBWM, its consultants, and contractors all have extensive experience of delivering projects of similar cost, scale, and complexity. The scheme is not dependent upon other projects. However, works will also need to be coordinated with other major transport schemes, which are due to take place over a similar timescale.

The Council has developed sound project management and governance arrangements. This includes regular scrutiny by elected members, as well as oversight by a Project Board consisting of senior officers. A project manager will be appointed who will be responsible for delivering the project on behalf of the Project Board and for managing the Project Team.

Key project milestones include:

- I Business case approval: July 2020
- I Preliminary design: July – October 2020
- I Detailed design: August – December 2020
- I Construction commencement: October 2020

I Construction completion: April 2021

The scheme monitoring and evaluation plan will consist of three distinct stages:

I Stage 1 - Pre-Construction Study;

I Stage 2 – One Year Post Opening Process Evaluation, Q2 2022; and,

I Stage 3 - Five Year Post Opening Impact Evaluation Study, Q2 2026.

A process evaluation will be undertaken as the construction nears completion. The aim will be to: identify factors influencing the extent to which objectives have been achieved; identify and investigate unintended outcomes; and identify lessons learned. After completion of the monitoring and impact evaluation, an economic evaluation will be undertaken to assess the accountability of the scheme investment.

CONTENTS PAGE	PAGE NO.
1. INTRODUCTION	3
1.2 Background	3
1.3 Structure of the report	3
2. STRATEGIC CASE	5
2.1 Area description and strategic context	5
2.2 Existing situation and issues	13
2.3 Contribution to National, Regional, and Local strategic priorities	15
2.4 Scheme objectives and success criteria	17
2.5 Measures of success	18
2.6 Case study evidence base	18
2.7 Constraints	22
2.8 Inter-dependencies	22
2.9 Stakeholders	23
2.10 Options and scheme development	23
3. ECONOMIC CASE	30
3.1 Introduction	30
3.2 Appraisal rationale	30
3.3 Scheme benefit quantification	31
3.4 Cost Benefit Analysis	33
3.5 Sensitivity analysis	34
3.6 Environmental and social impact summary	34
3.7 Value for Money statement	35
4. FINANCIAL CASE	36
4.1 Overview of affordability assessment	36
4.2 Project costs	36

4.3	Cost profile	37
5.	COMMERCIAL CASE	38
5.1	Output based specification	38
5.2	Procurement strategy and sourcing options	38
5.3	Payment/ charging mechanisms and framework	39
5.4	Risk allocation and transfer	39
5.5	Contract length	40
5.6	Human resource issues	40
5.7	Contract management	40
6.	MANAGEMENT CASE	41
6.1	Introduction	41
6.2	Evidence of similar projects	41
6.3	Programme/ project dependencies	43
6.4	Governance, organisational structure & roles	44
6.5	Programme/ project plan	46
6.6	Assurance and approval plan	47
6.7	Communications and stakeholder management	47
6.8	Programme/ project reporting	48
6.9	Implementation	49
6.10	Risk management	49
6.11	Benefits realisation	49
7.	CONCLUSIONS	53

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1.1 This report sets out the business case for the 'Windsor Visitor Economy' scheme to secure Growth Deal funding from Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP). Concept designs for the scheme have been completed following stakeholder input and a review of options. The scheme is now in the position to progress to preliminary and detailed design, with the scheme to be constructed and completed by April 2021, subject to the approval of this business case.

1.2 Background

1.2.1 Following a review of visitor survey data, it was identified that despite Windsor attracting a high number of visitors, current spend within the town is low. Acknowledging this, the proposed scheme seeks to increase visitor expenditure and generate economic growth by taking advantage of the opportunity presents by the high number of visitors to Windsor Castle.

1.2.2 The proposed scheme comprises of two elements: public realm enhancements in proximity of Windsor Castle and wider, small scale wayfinding measures. Both of which aim to increase visitor expenditure within the town. The public realm works make up the main element of the scheme. By enhancing the area, the enhancements aim to encourage visitors to dwell and attract them toward the High Street. The wider, small scale interventions have been informed by a review of visitor routes between key destinations, the proposed measures aim to increase attract visitors and increase their exposure to the retail areas within the town.

1.2.3 The cost of the works is estimated at £2.413 million. The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead (RBWM) is seeking £1.563 million of Local Growth funding, with the balance coming from developer funding (£350,000), and the council's capital programme (£500,907).

1.3 Structure of the report

1.3.1 This report has been prepared in accordance with the Department for Transport (DfT)'s Transport Appraisal Guidance (TAG), and HM Treasury five-case model, structured as follows:

- I Section 2 – Strategic Case: describes why the scheme is needed, defines the scope, outcomes to be delivered, and demonstrates how the project aligns with national, regional, and local policies and plans.
- I Section 3 – Economic Case: presents an appraisal of the likely impacts of a range of options and the resulting value for money of the final scheme.
- I Section 4 – Financial Case: demonstrates that the scheme is affordable, providing details of the cost and funding arrangements.
- I Section 5 – Commercial Case: provides evidence of the commercial viability of the scheme and describes the procurement strategy.

- I Section 6 – Management Case: sets out how the delivery of the scheme will be managed, including programme and risk, as well as arrangements for monitoring and post-implementation evaluation.
- I Section 7 – Conclusions: presents a summary and conclusions of the business case.

2. STRATEGIC CASE

2.1 Area description and strategic context

2.1.1 Windsor is located in The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead, approximately 20 miles to the west of London and 10 miles to the west of Heathrow Airport.

2.1.2 Home to the oldest and largest inhabited castle in the world, and official residence of Her Majesty the Queen, Windsor attracts a high number of both domestic and overseas visitors. Forming one of the main towns within the Royal Borough, Windsor is also of local importance, providing an employment centre with a high street accommodating an array of shops, restaurants, cafés, and public houses, attracting local shopping and leisure trips.

Figure 2.1 – Windsor Location Plan (Google, 2020)

2.1.3 A study into the economic impact of tourism within Windsor and Maidenhead, undertaken in 2017, identified that the total value of tourism activity within the borough was estimated to have been approximately £566.5 million: supporting around 6,483 Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) jobs. These jobs were spread across a wide range of service sectors, from catering and retail to public services (Tourism South East, 2017). According to the Office of National Statistics, there are 84,000 employee jobs across Windsor and Maidenhead (Office of National Statistics, 2018). Based on the survey estimates, tourism related expenditure supports 10.5% of these jobs.

Figure 2.2 – Proportion of tourism visits and spend within Berkshire (Tourism South East, 2017)

2.1.4 Although specific tourism expenditure and employment data for Windsor is not available, as a consequence of Windsor being home to the main tourist attraction within the Royal Borough — with 2 million visitors entering the castle annually (RBWM, 2020) — Windsor generates a significant proportion of tourism visits and spend within Berkshire: 23% and 28% respectively (Tourism South East, 2017). Therefore, it is likely that the economic impact of tourism within Windsor is significantly higher than the borough as a whole, with a greater reliance on tourism for job and economic value creation. As a result, the attractiveness of the area and well-being of visitors is paramount for the economic prosperity of the town.

2.1.5 To understand the origin, profile, and behaviour of visitors within Windsor, visitor surveys comprising face-to-face interviews with a random sample of adults were undertaken between August and September 2017 (Tourism South East, 2017). The surveys identified that London is the main origin of visitor journeys, with 55% of day visitors from holiday bases outside of Windsor, 34% from home and 11% staying overnight. Of the visitors on holiday, 93% were staying in London accommodation.

2.1.6 Windsor is well served by public transport, with two train stations: Central, providing links to London Paddington via Slough; and Riverside, proving links to London Waterloo. In addition to local services, there are also several bus routes serving Windsor between London Victoria and Heathrow Airport, providing routes to key local destinations including Bracknell and Slough. Several private coach tours also operate, particularly from London. These are served by Windsor Coach Park, which is currently located on Alma Road, adjacent to Alexandra Park to the north-west of the town centre. Figure 2.3 below, provides an illustration of the key transport node locations within the town.

Figure 2.3 – Windsor key destinations overview

2.1.7 Despite the array of travel options available, the visitor survey identified that the private car is the dominant mode of transport for visitors to the town, with 43% of visitors travelling by car, 37% by train and 13% by coach. Of the private vehicles, 36% used the park and ride with 51% using town centre car parks and 13% parking on-street or at their accommodation. A survey of local businesses undertaken in February this year raised current parking stress as a significant concern for businesses within Windsor.

2.1.8 The visitor survey also identified that 93% of visitors were visiting for leisure/ holiday, with 90% of all visitors stating that Windsor Castle had been the main reason for their visit, and that they intended to visit inside the castle. As a consequence, the pedestrian routes and desire lines through the town are ultimately dictated by the links between Windsor Castle and the transport nodes. Figure 2.4 below provides a heat map of the visitor routes between the key destinations and Windsor Castle, with dark brown denoting high footfall, and green denoting low footfall.

Figure 2.4 – Windsor existing visitor route

2.1.9 There are future aspirations to redevelop the coach park, which is currently located on Alma Road. As part of this, it is proposed that the coach park be temporarily relocated to King Edward VII car park, which shall be incorporated into the development masterplan. A new dedicated coach park will be provided by the developer as part of redevelopment. It is also proposed that a shuttle bus service will run between the relocated coach park and Thames Street. As a consequence, future visitor routes are likely to change. The pedestrian route heat map has been updated to **reflect this**

change to understand how this will influence visitor routes within Windsor. This is illustrated in Figure 2.5 below.

Figure 2.5 - Windsor future visitor routes

2.1.10 The relocation of the coach park is likely to result in increased footfall on Thames Street and decrease footfall on Alma Road. To understand how these routes correspond with the retail areas, a review of the existing retail types within Windsor has been undertaken, this is illustrated in Figure 2.6 below. As demonstrated, the relocation of the coach park will increase visitor exposure to retail on Thames Street. However, the current and future routes do not expose visitors to the retail areas on the High Street to the south, towards Park Street.

Figure 2.6 - Windsor retail locations and types

2.2 Existing situation and issues

2.2.1 Windsor is becoming a victim of its own success, as overall visitor numbers continue to grow, the town is becoming overcrowded to the detriment of the visitor experience. The town has a medieval road layout that was not designed to cope with the numbers of people that it accommodates today. As a result, roads and footways around the town centre are heavily congested in the peak summer season.

2.2.2 More needs to be done to address the existing issues and capture the economic opportunities presented by the high number of visitors.

2.2.3 The visitor surveys identified that Windsor attracts an affluent profile of visitors. However, despite the high visitor satisfaction for the shops, there is low spend, particularly from day visitors, who spent an average of £6.93 on shopping, presenting a £4.19 reduction from the previous year. A decrease in spend on shopping was also experienced from staying visitors, who spent an average of £4.34 less than the previous year.

2.2.4 Although it is acknowledged that the decrease in day visitor spend was offset by increases in spend in other areas – entertainment in particular – this was not the case for staying visitors, who spent on average £11.90 less during their visit than the previous year. Therefore, it is evident that there is an existing issue, and opportunity for improvement.

2.2.5 With visitors highly satisfied with the shops, it is clear the low and declining spend on shopping is a consequence of a low proportion of visitors visiting the shops, with an average of only 27% of visitors visiting the shops.

2.2.6 To address the low and declining spend on shopping, more needs to be done to attract and expose visitors to the shops. By doing this there are several opportunities and benefits which are presented, including:

- | Increased footfall on the high street;
- | Increased expenditure within the shops;
- | Economic growth and prosperity within the town; and,
- | Increased employment opportunities.

Figure 2.7 – Scheme location plan

2.2.7 The proposed scheme location is outlined in orange in Figure 2.7 above. As illustrated in the pedestrian routes plan in Figure 2.4, since most visitors to Windsor visit Windsor Castle, almost all visitors to the town will be within the proposed scheme extents at some point during their visit. With the pedestrian desire lines through the town determined by the relationship between Windsor Castle and the transport nodes.

2.2.8 The current public realm on Castle Hill segregates Windsor Castle from its visitors and the rest of the town. As a result, there is poor pedestrian permeability between Windsor Castle and the High Street. This is a key factor contributing to the low proportion of visitors visiting the shops.

2.2.9 Interventions on Castle Hill present an immediate opportunity to address these issues. Castle Hill is the location where visitors queue to enter the castle. Under the current situation, visitors' queue from the entrance at the Advance Gate, down the northern footway along Castle Hill towards Thames Street. The footways are extremely overcrowded as a consequence of this arrangement. Therefore, there is a clear need to rethink the road layout around Windsor Castle to address the overcrowding, improve pedestrian movements and connectivity and attract visitors onto the High Street.

2.3 Contribution to National, Regional, and Local strategic priorities

Contribution to National Priorities:

2.3.1 The Government published its Industrial Strategy White Paper, 'Building a Britain fit for the future' in November 2017. This set out the Governments approach to delivering and shaping a stronger, fairer economy through greater collaboration with businesses.

2.3.2 The strategy is underpinned by five foundations: ideas, people, infrastructure, business environment, and places. Capitalising on current and future opportunities is a key theme throughout. Acknowledging that many places are not realising their full potential, one of the main

policies of the places foundation is to build on local strengths and deliver economic opportunities. This is particularly prevalent in the context of high streets, with national policy acknowledging current decline and need for intervention.

2.3.3 High streets perform a fundamental place function within local communities and are crucial for local economic growth and prosperity. This was highlighted in the Government's High Streets Report. The report identified the issues which high streets are currently facing, with declining footfall and increasing vacant shops due to changes in shopping behaviours.

2.3.4 The report led to the launch of Our Plan for the High Street announced within the 2018 Budget. This set out a series of measures to address the issues facing the high street, taking on board the recommendations outlined within the report. Making town centres and high streets places where people want to be, through replanning space and strengthening community assets and historic buildings, was identified as a key measure to achieve this.

2.3.5 By capitalising on the opportunity presented by the high number of visitors to Windsor Castle, the Royal Borough seeks to leverage the strengths of the community assets, to boost the performance, productivity, and prosperity of the town. Therefore, achieving the aspirations of the Industrial Strategy; and, acting on the recommendations set out within the High Streets Report.

Contribution to Regional Priorities:

2.3.6 In response to the Government's Industrial Strategy, outlined above, the Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) have developed a Local Industrial Strategy (LIS) which sets out how the LEP shall conform with and deliver the objectives of the Industrial Strategy. Founded on an evidence base, the LIS sets out the current situation, opportunities, and measures on how the region shall deliver on the Industrial Strategy.

2.3.7 The LIS recognises the importance in capturing the full economic potential presented by existing and future assets. The intrinsic nature of Berkshire as a place is identified as a significant factor contributing to Berkshire's strong economy. This is a consequence of it being home to some of the nation's major historic and cultural assets, primarily Windsor Castle. Recognising this, the LIS highlights Windsor Castle as a global "brand" for Berkshire, which presents great opportunities in raising the profile of the region.

2.3.8 The Thames Valley Berkshire Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) similarly recognises the 'internationalisation' of the region. However, identifies the attractiveness of the region as a threat to future growth potential. To address this, the SEP sets out the need for investment in places, to generate jobs, increase profits, and ensure the regions towns are attractive.

2.3.9 With Windsor Castle representing a global "brand" for the region, the proposed scheme presents an opportunity to enhance the regions profile. By enhancing the public realm and capitalising on the opportunities presented by the global landmark, the Royal Borough is seeking to increase spend on the High Street. Therefore, increasing profits, generating jobs, and making the

area more attractive. In hand, contributing to the objectives and aspirations set out within both the LEP's LIS and SEP.

Contribution to Local Priorities:

2.3.10 The Windsor and Maidenhead Tourism Action Plan (TAP) sets out the Royal Borough's comprehensive tourism strategy, with an underlying aim of delivering expenditure growth. The TAP aims to achieve this by focusing on five quality themes: travel and transport, product development, marketing, information, and people.

2.3.11 Whilst acknowledging the success to date, and the wealth of assets to offer and attract visitors — particularly Windsor Castle — the TAP identifies a series of challenges and opportunities. Maximisation of the benefits of tourism for the local community, is identified as a key objective; with increased visitor expenditure a fundamental means of achieving this.

2.3.12 The marketing of Windsor is a key theme throughout the TAP, with the Royal Borough seeking to attract visitors through potential re-branding to suit visitor demand. The image of Windsor Castle is a key marketing mechanism, this is particularly important during events with global media coverage.

2.3.13 By improving the public realm outside Windsor Castle, the proposed scheme shall enhance the image of Windsor, contributing to the marketing of the town and attracting visitors. The scheme shall also contribute to the objectives of the TAP, by drawing visitors towards the High Street, increasing expenditure; therefore, maximise the benefits of tourism for the benefits of the community.

2.4 Scheme objectives and success criteria

2.4.1 The primary aim of the scheme is to generate economic growth within Windsor by capitalising on the opportunity presented by the high number of visitors to Windsor Castle.

2.4.2 This shall be achieved by enhancing the public realm in proximity of Windsor Castle, making the area more pleasant. This will greatly improve capacity for visitors in this congested area and will support local businesses to improve their offer (e.g. through increased use of street cafes), as well as enhancing the look and feel of the area and improving the overall visitor experience.

2.4.3 Encouraging visitors to dwell and enjoy the area, the scheme shall attract visitors towards the High Street and local shops. The resulting increased footfall within the retail and commercial area of the town will generate economic growth through increased visitor expenditure.

2.4.4 Achievement of these objectives will be measured in terms of increased footfall on the High Street, increased visitor expenditure on shopping, and increased visitor dwell time in the proximity of Windsor Castle.

2.5 Measures of success

2.5.1 Successful delivery against the scheme objectives will be monitored as part of the post construction scheme evaluation, details of which are discussed in Section 6 (Management Case) of this report.

2.5.2 A programme of monitoring will be put in place prior to construction, then again at one-year and five-year post construction. It is envisaged that the monitoring will include 'before and after' conditions in relation to:

- I Pedestrian counts on the High Street;
- I Visitor expenditure in shops; and
- I Pedestrian dwell time within proximity of Windsor Castle.

2.6 Case study evidence base

The Pedestrian Pound (Living Streets, 2018):

2.6.1 Pedestrian Pound, a research report into the economic contribution of pedestrians and public realm improvements on the economic vitality of high streets (undertaken by Living Streets) found that public realm investments deliver significant, cost-effective benefits to consumers and businesses.

2.6.2 Highlighting footfall as a common measure for business activity and economic vitality, the research identified many benefits from increasing footfall on the high street. It was found that well-planned improvements to public spaces within town centres can boost commercial trading by up to 40% and catalyse private sector investment. In Wanstead High Street, London, footfall increases of 98% were experienced as a result of enhancements to pedestrian routes between key local destinations: two train stations, bus terminus, school, library, and high street. Although the impacts of the scheme were not measured, the benefits to businesses and the local economy were likely to be substantial.

2.6.3 The report also identified that small-scale improvements to the public realm and pedestrian environment result in local spend increases. Referencing a case study in Shoreditch, London (comprising of a temporary 'parklet' replacing two car parking spaces with seating and cycle parking spaces) it was found that such interventions resulted in 20% additional spend in local shops. Therefore, demonstrating the direct economic benefits generated from dwell time increases in proximity of shops.

2.6.4 Although the report provided significant evidence to demonstrate the economic benefits of public realm improvements, the majority of this evidence remains anecdotal. From the research, the report found quantitative assessments remain very rare, which is believed to be due to the absence of post-build evaluations. The majority of the case study findings were focussed on the town centre footfall increases induced by public realm improvements.

2.6.5 However, the proposed Windsor Pedestrianisation scheme is somewhat simpler, since there are already a high number of pedestrians attracted to the town. Therefore, it is not a case of attracting additional visitors to the town, it is a case of attracting visitors to the areas of the town where economic benefits can be captured i.e. the high street, where the commercial and retail premises are located.

Creating Better Streets: Inclusive and accessible places (CIHT, 2018):

2.6.6 A review into the contribution public realm makes to society, undertaken by the Chartered Institute of Highways and Transportation (CIHT), identified that such projects present an array of benefits to the environment, economy, health and safety, and quality of places. From undertaking a series of case studies, the review concluded that of the projects with available information, economic benefits were experienced as a consequence of public realm improvements. The main economic benefits accrued from increased footfall and available seating areas for restaurants and cafés etc. Although the case studies varied in context, useful conclusions can be drawn from one case study in particular: Elwick Square, Ashford.

2.6.7 Forming part of a wider economic regeneration scheme, Elwick Square in Ashford successfully delivered economic benefits to the town centre through public realm improvements. Before the scheme, the town centre had been constrained by the local roads, which provided poor connectivity and separated the town centre from the train station: the two key destinations within the town.

2.6.8 One of the main aims of the scheme was to create a more well-connected area, providing better pedestrian experiences. This was achieved by redesigning the roads, replacing the existing conventional carriageway layout and signalised junction with a shared-spaces area, enabling improved pedestrian connectivity towards the town centre. Figures 2.8 and 2.9 below illustrate Elwick Square before and after the public realm improvements.

Figure 2.8 – Elwick Square, Ashford – Before (2007) (CIHT, 2018)

Figure 2.9 – Elwick Square, Ashford (2014) (Google, 2014)

2.6.9 Elwick Square is located outside County Square shopping centre, the main hub for business and retail activities in Ashford. Despite the absence of quantitative data, anecdotal evidence identified that the town centre had experienced economic benefits as a consequence of the scheme. The evaluation of the case study identified that Elwick Square had become part of the town centre, as opposed to the local highway network; and, had created a ‘pull factor’ attracting visitors to the town into County Square shopping centre. Resulting in economic benefits as a result of increased footfall.

2.6.10 The Windsor scheme under consideration aims to attract visitors from Windsor Castle towards the high street, to increase spend and in hand generate economic growth. Similar to the

case study, the scheme aims to achieve this by incorporating the highway adjoining Windsor Castle into the fabric of the town centre. Therefore, making the area more attractive by improving pedestrian connectivity between the two key destinations. The case study demonstrates that public realm improvements do induce increased pedestrian movements and create a 'pull factor' towards and between key destinations.

Walking and cycling: the economic benefits (Transport for London, 2018):

2.6.11 A study into the economic benefits of walking and cycling within London, identified an array of benefits generated from such projects including: increased spend; increased rental and land value; and, improved productivity and wellbeing. Resonating the findings from the two reports above, it was found that public realm improvements can increase retail sales by up to 30%. It was also identified that such schemes resulted in a 216% increase in people stopping, sitting, or socialising.

2.6.12 Again, the findings from this research support the aims of the Windsor scheme under consideration. By undertaking public realm improvements, the scheme aims to increase pedestrian dwell time attracting visitors from Windsor Castle towards the high street. TfL's research supports the proposals, demonstrating that public realm enhancements do result in increased dwell time.

Case study findings summary:

2.6.13 Although the majority of evidence from the case studies is based on qualitative, anecdotal evidence, the findings demonstrate that there is a robust economic justification for public realm improvements. Pedestrian Pound identified that public realm improvements increased commercial trading by 40%, and temporary localised improvements result in 20% additional spend; similarly, Walking and Cycling: the economic benefits found that public realm improvements increase retail spend by 30%. Therefore, identifying that public realm improvements generate between 20% and 40% increased retail spend.

2.6.14 In addition to the economic benefits presented, public realm improvements generate welfare, health, safety, and environmental benefits. The key findings outlined above identify that economic benefits are accrued from increasing footfall on high streets; and, increasing dwell time, attracting visitors to spend in local shops. It was found that this is achieved through improving pedestrian connectivity between key destinations and embedding main attractions into the fabric of the town. With the purpose of the scheme to embed Windsor Castle into the fabric of the town, and encourage movements towards the High Street, the case study findings identify that there is a robust case for change and clear justification for the scheme.

2.7 Constraints

2.7.1 Potential constraints exist for the scheme and these have been considered within the risk register in Appendix A, which also describes proposed mitigation measures. Key potential constraints to consider include:

- | Town centre location, high pedestrian footfall;
- | Local businesses and Windsor Castle operational requirements; and
- | Location sensitivity, security requirements.

2.7.2 The preliminary design for the project shall be developed taking the constraints into consideration. The project team shall make every effort to prevent and address any technical, technological, or buildability issues with the proposed scheme. The project programme has been developed to ensure the scheme is progressed without unduly impacting on visitors, businesses, and Windsor Castle. This is provided within Appendix B.

2.7.3 In addition, a Construction Management Plan will be produced at detailed design in liaison with planners and key stakeholders, to coordinate works with third party schemes or events. This will ensure that critical path elements are fully understood and properly managed.

2.8 Inter-dependencies

2.8.1 High-level key inter-dependencies have been considered within the risk register in Appendix A. The delivery of the scheme to the stated programme shall be dependent on these risks either not arising or being sufficiently mitigated so that scheme delivery remains unaffected. For the purpose of this section of the business case it is sufficient to summarise the key areas of risk/ inter-dependency – these include:

- | Budget costs are inadequate to deliver the scheme;
- | Unidentified statutory undertaker apparatus found during construction;
- | Stakeholders object to proposals; ND
- | Archaeological finds discovered, resulting in increased costs and delays to construction programme.

2.8.2 The project team will continue to monitor these risks/ inter-dependencies to ensure the smooth delivery against the project programme.

2.9 Stakeholders

2.9.1 Stakeholders to be consulted as part of the scheme's development include:

- | Windsor Castle;
- | Affected businesses;
- | Affected residents (including relevant residents' associations);
- | Developers;

- | Affected transport providers (taxis, buses, coaches etc.);
- | Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership; and
- | RBWM elected members, and officers.

2.10 Options and scheme development

2.10.1 The proposed scheme comprises a core area of public realm enhancements in the proximity of Windsor Castle, and wider, smaller interventions throughout the town.

Wider interventions

2.10.2 The aim of the wider interventions is to influence pedestrian movements throughout the town so visitors to Windsor Castle are exposed to the retail areas and are encouraged to dwell. Therefore, resulting in increased expenditure. The proposed interventions have been established by reviewing the future pedestrian routes and retail areas plans, outlined in Figure 2.4 and 2.5 respectively, to identify opportunities for wayfinding, seating, and crossing improvements. As illustrated in Figure 2.10 below.

Figure 2.10 – Proposed wider interventions

Core public realm enhancements

2.10.3 Various options for the core area of public realm enhancements have been considered, which have been developed in liaison with stakeholders. Given the characteristics of the scheme, it is difficult to differentiate the economic benefits accrued from each of the options. Therefore, the effectiveness of the options has been assessed in relation to how they achieve the scheme objectives, deliverability, and alignment with stakeholder concerns.

2.10.4 During stakeholder consultation and scheme development, the following key priorities, issues, and constraints were identified:

2.10.5 Priorities:

- | Space that enhances the Town Centre and setting of Windsor Castle;
- | Improve visitor experience;
- | Economically advantageous to businesses;
- | Security requirements' and
- | Requirements of Windsor Castle as major stakeholder.

2.10.6 Issues and constraints:

- | Access arrangements to the Castle;
- | Visitor queuing arrangements and how they should be protected;
- | Coach drop-off arrangements;
- | The setting of Queen Victoria's statue;
- | Access and dropping off for taxis and private hire area and access;
- | New entrance layout for visitors;
- | Existing private parking;
- | Space allocation and delineation; and
- | Quality, look, and feel of the Castle and Town.

2.10.7 From these, four options have been developed. All options are proposed to operate on a 9:30am to 4pm Mon-Sun closure to accommodate operational and entry requirements for Windsor Castle. The proposed scheme options are illustrated and described in Table 2.1 below.

Table 2.1 – Proposed core scheme options

CORE AREA PLAN	DESCRIPTION
----------------	-------------

OPTION 1

Closure of Castle Hill and part of St. Alban's Street to the visitor centre. Bollards and gates to create modal filters and enclose the area.

OPTION 2

Same as Option 1, with the St. Alban's Street pedestrian extent extended to the junction with St. Alban's Close.

OPTION 3

Same as Option 2, with the Castle Hill footway widened on the south side to narrow the carriageway road width to 6m.

OPTION 4

This option presents a wider enhancement area, extending Option 3 to include Thames Street between Park Street and Jubilee Arch. Carriageway width to be reduced.

2.10.8 The spatial scope of the scheme is the primary variable. As illustrated within the photomontages in Figure 7 and 8 below, the public realm works within the core area shall include paving and surface material enhancements and new street furniture.

2.10.9 Option 4 presents a wider, future aspiration which is beyond the scope and budget of the current scheme. However, it presents a potential next phase which shall be informed by the current outcomes.

Figure 2.11 – Castle Hill proposed photomontage

Figure 2.12 – St Alban’s Street proposed photomontage

2.10.10 Option 1 provides a reduced extent along St. Alban’s Street. The purpose of the reduced extent is to accommodate private on-street parking provision. However, following consultation with Windsor Castle, it has been confirmed that this parking can be accommodated elsewhere. Therefore, enabling the scheme extents to be extended, connecting to Church Lane. Providing an improved pedestrian environment and encouraging movement.

2.10.11 Having shortlisted the scheme extents, further consultation was undertaken with Windsor Castle to understand their access and operational requirements. Building-out of the existing footway on the southern site of Castle Hill was proposed to provide an improved space for pedestrians and encourage movements towards the retail areas. However, it was identified that a delineated carriageway area would be required for procession carriages during ceremonial events. This arrangement has been accommodated within Option 3, with the southern footway to be built-out with a low height kerb delineating the carriageway area.

2.10.12 Option 3 has therefore been selected as the preferred option, accommodating the key priorities, issues, and constraints identified. The analysis within the Economic Case is therefore based on this option.

3. ECONOMIC CASE

3.1 Introduction

3.1.1 The Economic Case forms one of the Department for Transport (DfT)’s five-case business case models. The purpose of the Economic Case is to demonstrate that the proposed scheme provides Value for Money (VfM).

3.1.2 This is established by identifying and assessing all the impacts of the scheme, in the form of costs and benefits, to determine its overall VfM. It considers the costs of developing and building the scheme and a full range of impacts. These include those impacts which can be monetised. The Economic Case considers the extent to which the scheme’s benefits will outweigh its costs.

Providing a Benefits to Cost Ratio (BCR), with a value greater than 1 demonstrating that the benefits outweigh the costs.

3.2 Appraisal rationale

3.2.1 The proposed scheme comprises of public realm improvements, which seek to attract visitors to Windsor Castle towards the high street and retail areas. Therefore, increasing footfall and spend within the town.

3.2.2 As outlined within the Strategic Case, current visitor spend within the town is low, this is primarily due to Castle Hill (the area under consideration) separating Windsor Castle from the rest of the town. By enhancing the area, the scheme seeks to increase visitor dwell time and improve pedestrian permeability.

3.2.3 Castle Hill provides access to Windsor Castle and local businesses. Therefore, it is subject to low traffic flows with no through traffic. Access to Windsor Castle and local businesses can be gained outside the hours of operation of the pedestrianised area. As a result, the proposed pedestrianisation of Castle Hill will not generate any significant transport user benefits or costs.

3.2.4 In addition, although the pedestrianisation will present safety benefits, by reducing conflict between the high number of pedestrians and vehicles, there are a low number of collisions recorded within the area. With no collisions recorded on Castle Hill. This is likely to be due to the low number, and speeds of vehicles.

3.2.5 Since the scheme is unlikely to generate any net costs or benefits associated with both transport users and accidents, traditional TUBA and COBALT economic modelling has not been undertaken. In addition, the maintenance requirements are not anticipated to differ from the existing requirements. Therefore, only the capital construction costs have been considered for the economic appraisal.

3.3 Scheme benefit quantification

3.3.1 The scheme benefits comprise of two elements: increased visitor spend and urban realm welfare benefits. Both of which have been calculated based on the Windsor Castle visitor numbers. The benefits generated from increased visitor spend have been informed by the case study findings and ONS data; and, the urban realm welfare benefits have been calculated using Transport for London (TfL) Valuing Urban Realm Toolkit (VURT), which has been informed by a Pedestrian Environment Review System (PERS) Audit undertaken as part of the design process.

Increased spend benefits:

3.3.2 From the case studies outlined within the Strategic Case, it was identified that public realm interventions result in between 20% and 40% increase in visitor spend. With the proposed interventions targeted at visitors to Windsor Castle, visitor data was obtained, which identified that there were a total of 1,597,276 visitors to Windsor Castle during 2018.

3.3.3 As established within the Strategic Case, the average day visitor spend within shops is low, on average £6.93. The following analysis has been undertaken on the basis that the scheme will result in a 20% increase in visitor spend within shops, representing the worst-case scenario at the lower end of the range identified from the case studies. This will result in an increase of average day visitor spend of £1.39.

3.3.4 Similarly, acknowledging the localised scope of the scheme, not covering the wider area proposed as part of the second project phase, it is estimated that the scheme will not influence all visitors to Windsor Castle. Therefore, to account for the worst-case scenario, it has been assumed that the scheme will result in only 40% of Windsor Castle visitors increasing spend. Therefore, generating an annual increase spend and turnover of £888,095.

3.3.5 The 2018 ONS Annual Business Survey data has been used to derive the GVA increase based on the above spending increases. The survey identifies that the UK retail business economy generates the following annual outputs:

I Turnover: 420,000 million;

I GVA: £89,557 million; and

I Jobs: £3,193 thousand.

3.3.6 Identifying that 1 job generated for every £131,752 turnover (turnover/jobs).

3.3.7 On this basis, the scheme is estimated to generate seven additional jobs. The above data identifies that 1 job is likely to generate approximately £28,048 GVA. However, this figure is based on a national average. The GVA output per head is estimated to be approximately 8% higher than the national average. The GVA has therefore, been adjusted accordingly.

3.3.8 In addition, the GVA will only account for the direct, immediate economic benefits generate to local businesses, and does not consider the benefits generated from the supply chain. The HCA Additionality Guide (2014) suggests that a regional multiplier of 1.38 can be applied as a supplier chain multiplier. However, an allowance should be applied to accommodate displacement. A 25% displacement allowance has been agreed with Hatch.

3.3.9 The scheme is estimated to generate an annual GVA increase of £219,466. (Jobs x GVA x Multiplier x Displacement), (7 x £30,292 x 1.38 x 0.75).

Urban realm welfare benefits:

3.3.10 The proposed area of public realm enhancements provides an attractive external viewpoint of Windsor Castle. However, the current arrangements make poor use of the space, with narrow footways preventing visitors from enjoying the area, with the space primarily used for queuing. As a result, under the current situation it can be reasonably assumed that 20% of visitors to Windsor Castle dwell for approximately 10 minutes within the proposed area of public realm enhancements. This has therefore been taken as the baseline within the VURT analysis.

3.3.11 As demonstrated by the case study, and visitor spend analysis above, the proposed enhancements are estimated to result in 40% of visitors increasing spend within shops. Although not all visitors will increase spend, many will spend time within proximity of Windsor Castle as a consequence of the scheme providing an active public space and increasing pedestrian capacity, enabling visitors to dwell and enjoy the area. It is therefore estimated that the scheme will result in 60% of visitors dwelling for a minimum of 20 minutes. On this basis, these figures have therefore been taken as the future scenario within the VURT analysis.

3.3.12 A PERS audit was undertaken to inform the VURT analysis. The PERS audit provides an assessment of the pedestrian environment improvements generated from the scheme, accounting for a number of factors including movement, activity, comfort, and safety. The PERS audit was undertaken with conservative scoring to account for the worst-case scenario. The outputs of which were input into VURT, which estimated that the scheme will generate annual benefits of £339,846 in 2020 prices.

3.3.13 The VURT outputs are provided within Appendix C.

3.3.14 Therefore, the scheme is estimated to generate total annual benefits of £559,312 (increased visitor spend + urban realm welfare improvements).

3.4 Cost Benefit Analysis

Appraisal parameter assumptions:

3.4.1 A study undertaken by CABI into the value of street design, paved with gold: the real value of good street design (2007), identified that significant economic benefits are accrued from public realm improvements several years into the future. Although based on qualitative data, a review of a project 12 years after opening, identified that significant economic benefits were still being experienced, with the study recommending that longer appraisal periods should be applied for street improvement schemes. A 15-year appraisal period has therefore been used for the scheme.

3.4.2 In addition, a 20% optimism bias has been applied, which is considered proportionate given the project status and benefit and costs calculation allowances. This has been accommodated by applying a 20% uplift on the estimated scheme costs of £2,413,407, providing a final cost of £2,896,088.

3.4.3 Table 3.1 below provides a summary of the cost-benefit analysis. Based on a 3.5% Social Time Preference Rate (STPR), in accordance with the HM Treasury Green Book.

Table 3.1 – Cost Benefit Analysis summary

YEAR	COST (FV)	COSTS(PV)	BENEFITS(FV)	BENEFITS (PV)
0	£2,896,088	£2,896,088	£279,656	£279,656

1	£0	£0	£559,312	£540,398
2	£0	£0	£559,312	£522,123
3	£0	£0	£559,312	£504,467
4	£0	£0	£559,312	£487,408
5	£0	£0	£559,312	£470,925
6	£0	£0	£559,312	£455,000
7	£0	£0	£559,312	£439,614
8	£0	£0	£559,312	£424,748
9	£0	£0	£559,312	£410,384
10	£0	£0	£559,312	£396,506
11	£0	£0	£559,312	£383,098
12	£0	£0	£559,312	£370,143
13	£0	£0	£559,312	£357,626
14	£0	£0	£559,312	£345,532
15	£0	£0	£559,312	£333,848
TOTAL PV		£2,896,088		£6,721,482

3.4.4 As demonstrated, the scheme would generate, £2,896,088 in costs; and, £6,721,482 in benefits. Which equates to a Net Present Value (NPV) of £3,825,394 and BCR of 2.32. Therefore, presenting High VfM.

3.5 Sensitivity analysis

3.5.1 To establish the sensitivity of the expected scheme outcomes, cost benefit analysis was undertaken for reduced proportions of Windsor Castle visitors increasing spend: 30% and 20%, as opposed to 40%.

3.5.2 With only 30% proportion of Windsor Castle visitors increasing spend, the scheme would generate five jobs, translating into £5,999,031 in total benefits. Equating to a NPV of £3,102,943 and BCR of 2.07. Still presenting High VfM.

3.5.3 With only 20% proportion of Windsor Castle visitors increasing spend, the scheme would generate three jobs, translating into £5,233,017 in benefits. Equating to a NPV of £2,336,929 and BCR of 1.81. Reducing the VfM from High to Medium.

3.6 Environmental and social impact summary

Environmental impact:

3.6.1 The proposed scheme comprises of public realm enhancements, reallocating existing carriageway to footway use to improve the environment in proximity of Windsor Castle. The removal of vehicular traffic will generate noise, air quality, and greenhouse gas improvements. In addition, the public realm enhancements will provide townscape benefits, improving the environment, better utilising the space, and complementing the historic environment.

3.6.2 The proposed scheme is located within an urban area and is not within proximity of any water courses. Therefore, it is not anticipated to generate any biodiversity of water environment impacts.

Social impact:

3.6.3 Although the proposal seeks to restrict and prevent vehicle movements on Castle Hill, the road does not form part of a commuter route, being primarily utilised by access and circulating traffic. Therefore, the proposed scheme is unlikely to generate any commuting journey impacts.

3.6.4 Since the scheme proposes to reallocate road space to pedestrian use, it will provide physical activity benefits, encouraging movement and walking. In addition, the scheme will provide journey quality improvements for pedestrians. By removing vehicular traffic, the scheme will reduce the risk of conflict between pedestrians and vehicles, therefore, reducing the risk of accidents.

3.6.5 By encouraging pedestrian movements and permeability within the town the scheme will also result in improved access to a number of services.

3.6.6 As outlined within the Strategic Case, the current carriageway severs the public realm, restricting pedestrian movements. By creating pedestrian and public realm improvements and removing vehicular traffic, the scheme will provide severance benefits.

3.7 Value for Money statement

3.7.1 The expected Benefit to Cost Ratio (BCR) of the scheme is 2.32 therefore, presenting High Value for Money. The sensitivity analysis identified that the benefits and value of the scheme are robust, with the scheme still presenting High VfM with only 30% of Windsor Castle visitors increasing spend as a consequence of the scheme; and presenting Medium but positive VfM if the proportion is further reduced to 20%.

3.7.2 In addition, the cost benefit analysis is considered conservative, accounting for the worst-case scenario with only 20% increased visitor spend, only 40% proportion of Windsor Castle visitors increasing spend. Therefore, the actual benefits and VfM are likely to be greater.

4. FINANCIAL CASE

4.1 Overview of affordability assessment

4.1.1 In September 2012, the DfT set out firm proposals for the devolution of funding for local major transport schemes from 2015 from a national pot of £2bn. The Government's response further confirmed the commitment to delegate funding decisions and negotiate a Growth Deal with every Local Transport Body (LTB) to deliver local growth and infrastructure priorities.

4.1.2 As identified within the Strategic Case, the Windsor Visitor Economy proposal is a strong fit with national, regional, and local policies and priorities relating to investment and economic growth. Funding is available through the Local Growth Fund (LGF) and has been provisionally allocated to this project subject to RBWM demonstrating a satisfactory BCR.

4.2 Project costs

4.2.1 The LEP provisionally agreed a £1.563 million contribution to this project, with £350,000 of S106 contributions and £500,907 from the RBWM capital programme. Equating to a grand total of £2.413 million. All funding sources will be utilised in the 2020/21 financial year.

4.2.2 The costs for the scheme are set out in Table 4.1. A contingency (risk) budget of £350,134 is included within the cost estimates based on 20% of the construction costs.

4.2.3 The proposed scheme comprises of footway repaving and raising the existing carriageway to footway level. Therefore, will reduce existing loading – from vehicular to pedestrian – and, will not require lowering of the existing surface. As a result, the proposal is unlikely to affect statutory undertakers. However, to allow for any unforeseen works, a utility allowance of £50,000 has been accommodated within the costs.

4.2.4 An estimate of design fees and charges has been included at 15% of construction costs. An estimate of preliminaries, legal fees and charges has been included at 20% of construction costs. This includes surveys, and any permanent and temporary Traffic Orders.

4.2.5 The construction costs have been estimated using RBWM's term contract rates with an uplift to account for additional costs from experience of delivering similar schemes. The prelims, design, stats, and contingency costs are based on knowledge, understanding and experience of the quantum of costs required to deliver the proposed scheme. Based on concept designs and shall be refined for preliminary and detailed design.

Table 4.1 – Proposed scheme costs

Scheme costs £000			
	Public realm	Wayfinding	Total
Design	227	36	263
Prelims	218	40	258
Construction	1292	200	1,492
Stats	50	0	50
Contingency	302	48	350
TOTAL COST	2,089	324	2,413

4.3 Cost profile

4.3.1 Table 4.2 presents the scheme costs profiled by financial year for the duration of the funding period.

4.3.2 Preliminary design will take place until October 2020, with detailed design completed by January 2021. The construction works shall commence in November 2020 and will be fully delivered by April 2021. Subject to approval of this business case.

Table 4.2 – Cost profile

	2020/21	Total	
Expenditure (estimated costs)		£000	£000
Design		263	263
Prelims		258	258
Construction		1,492	1,492
Stats		50	50
Contingency		350	350
TOTAL COST		2,413	2,413

5. COMMERCIAL CASE

5.1 Output based specification

5.1.1 The Commercial Case details the procurement strategy for the project and is informed by the following strategic outcome objectives:

- I Achieve cost certainty, or certainty that the scheme can be delivered within the available funding constraints;
- I Obtain contractor experience and input to the construction programme to ensure the implementation programme is robust and achievable;
- I Minimise further preparation costs with respect to scheme design by ensuring best value, and appropriate quality; and
- I Obtain contractor input to risk management and appraisals, including mitigation measures, to capitalise at an early stage on opportunities to reduce construction risk and improve out-turn certainty thereby reducing risks to a level that is 'as low as reasonably practicable' (HSE Risk Management).

5.1.2 Key deliverables for the scheme include public realm enhancements within proximity of Windsor Castle, primarily on Castle Hill.

5.2 Procurement strategy and sourcing options

5.2.1 RBWM is able to draw on existing long-term framework contracts for delivery of the project including: Volker Highways for delivery of highway construction services, traffic signs and road markings; and, Project Centre for professional engineering services, including public realm, traffic and highway engineering design services.

5.2.2 These contracts were let in 2017 using a rigorous competitive tender approach to ensure best value for money across a range of highway projects, taking advantage of economies of scale associated with delivering large volumes of work as part of RBWM capital programme.

5.2.3 The Windsor Visitor Economy scheme consists of highway civils and public realm improvements, which is similar in scope to projects already being delivered as part of the framework. Therefore, it is considered sensible to use the existing frameworks to take advantage of their preferential rates and RBWM is content that this approach presents value for money.

5.2.4 The construction, paving and associated furniture etc. will be procured directly through Volker Highways, who will also be in a position to deliver early contractor involvement in the design and development of the scheme.

5.2.5 The timescales for delivery of the works are relatively tight and going out to competitive tender would incur significant additional delay that could prejudice delivery within the funding time constraints. Utilising the existing frameworks will minimise procurement timescales.

5.2.6 Also, involvement of the council's existing term contractor allows them to better coordinate the Windsor Visitor Economy works with other planned works in the area. Therefore, minimising the risk of incurring delays associated with other schemes over-running.

5.2.7 Project Centre has been involved in the concept design and preparation of the Windsor Visitor Economy Business Case. As such, they have a sound understanding of the scheme, its estimated costs, and associated risks. Their continued involvement in the project through the delivery phase will help to minimise risks and any associated costs.

5.3 Payment/ charging mechanisms and framework

5.3.1 The existing term contracts are based on an NEC 3 contract model Option B, which allows for penalty clauses, specifically relating to over-running.

5.3.2 Payments to the contractors will be made monthly in arrears to the value for 80% of the project, subject to the project engineering checking and agreeing the submission made by the contractor as the build progresses. The final 20% will be paid once the project is complete and has been signed off.

5.3.3 Payments made to the contractor will be subject to cross-checking against the programme to ensure that the absolute minimum overrun occurs. If any penalty is due to be applied, the council will work with the contractor to rectify/ remedy this.

5.4 Risk allocation and transfer

5.4.1 Resources are available to manage risks across the scheme. Risks shall be allocated and managed in a cost-effective manner by the most appropriate party to do this and at the appropriate level.

5.4.2 The Project Board, as defined in Section 6, shall be primarily concerned with managing strategic level risks relating to interfaces between the scheme and the wider project environment.

5.4.3 The Project Manager will have overall responsibility for ensuring that the risk management process is implemented and managed in accordance with best practice. They will ensure that risks are actively managed in a consistent and appropriate manner across all work streams. All severe risks will be reported to the Project Board. In addition, all risks which relate to the overall direction, organisation and control of the scheme shall be reported to the Project Board. The Project Manager will:

- I Ensure that an appropriate procedural framework is adopted;
- I Report to the Project Director in review and management of performance;
- I Agree the required level of risk management support to be provided for risk identification, analysis, review, and reporting;

- I Facilitate risk workshops/meetings as appropriate; and
- I Be the custodian of the risk register.

5.4.4 The risk owner will be responsible for the day-to-day management of the risk(s) that they own. The selection and appointment (by the Project Manager) of a risk owner will be on a “best person for the task” approach and, once appointed, the risk owner will monitor and update the risk register informing the Project Manager of changes.

5.5 Contract length

5.5.1 The design and build elements of the scheme will be procured separately. Project Centre are identified to undertake preliminary and detailed design, which will be undertaken in line with the programme provided in Appendix B. A review of the programme will be undertaken at each stage and incorporated into the delivery plan.

5.5.2 The existing Volker Highways contract for construction currently runs to 2021. However, this would be extended for job specific projects currently under construction for the duration of that scheme.

5.6 Human resource issues

5.6.1 The ability for the contractor to resource the project effectively will be scrutinised at procurement stage via the procurement specifications. Design resource is readily available via Project Centre, who hold a long-term, sole-source framework with RBWM.

5.7 Contract management

5.7.1 The contract follows a traditional NEC 3 format, ensuring that the contractual / commercial arrangement will be well defined. This form of contract is well understood throughout the supply chain and relies on a pre-defined risk register to allocate and manage anticipated risk.

5.7.2 During contract negotiations, risk will be allocated to the party best able to manage it in the most cost-effective way.

5.7.3 The contracts will be managed through a combination of workshops, reviews, meetings, and day-to-day operation to enable all actions to be discussed and agreed.

6. MANAGEMENT CASE

6.1 Introduction

6.1.1 The purpose of the Management Case is to demonstrate that there are robust arrangements in place for the delivery, monitoring and evaluation of the scheme. Within this Management Case, these aspects are covered and demonstrated under the following sections:

- I Evidence of similar projects;

- | Programme and project dependencies;
- | Governance, resourcing, and responsibilities;
- | Managing project risks;
- | Stakeholder management; and
- | Benefits realisation.

6.1.2 The management approach has been developed following the methodology set out below:

- | Set the appropriate governance structure to ensure outcomes and objectives are met;
- | Identify and plan for the key approval milestones ensuring information is provided in good time so as to not delay the programme; and
- | Assess how the delivery process will be managed to achieve optimum financial performance and impact.

6.2 Evidence of similar projects

6.2.1 This section presents evidence to demonstrate that RBWM, and its consultants/ contractors are experienced at delivering similar infrastructure projects to those proposed for the scheme.

6.2.2 RBWM has extensive experience of delivering similar schemes as part of its annual capital programme and also as part of major schemes. Similar schemes that have been implemented recently include:

- | Maidenhead Station Forecourt – enhancement of the station to cater for the Elizabeth Line and achieve a more sustainable transport mode split for travel to and from Maidenhead town centre. The scheme includes the removal of long-stay parking from the forecourt, the doubling of cycle parking capacity, the creation of a pedestrian area, widened footways and a gateway to the town centre.
- | Stafferton Way Link, Maidenhead – construction of a new £6 million link road to the south of Maidenhead town centre, including a new bridge over the flood reliver channel with shared-use footway/ cycleways, toucan crossing, new road junctions, lighting and noise barriers and a roundabout at the A4/ B3028 junction.
- | Peascod Street, Windsor – conversion of carriageway to ‘at-grade’ shared space, creating a pedestrian friendly area, with additional space accommodating outdoor seating for cafes. Scheme included street clutter clearance and replacement of cobbles and granite paving. Opening up the vista towards Windsor Castle.
- | Clarence Road Roundabout, Windsor – construction of a complex signal-controlled roundabout at the junction of A332 Royal Windsor Way, A308 Goslar Way, B3173 Imperial

Road, B3024 Clarence Road. The scheme was constructed in a phased manner to minimise the impact on traffic and the completed scheme has succeeded in significantly improving congestion, helping to achieve air quality objectives within the Windsor Air Quality Management Area.

6.2.3 For the Stafferton Link Road, the client and project management team were responsible for commissioning a professional services team, and procurement of a contractor, Balfour Beatty, who successfully delivered the project.

6.2.4 Although utilising a different procurement strategy, the management structure and practices proposed for the Windsor Visitor Economy scheme shall be the same as those applied for the delivery of the Stafferton Link Road project, which are outlined below.

6.2.5 Project and programme management services were led by RBWM, who undertook all associated programme and risk management activities, and coordinated the professional services team.

6.2.6 Scheme delivery was managed through a design and build contract, which was specified and procured by the RBWM team.

6.2.7 The Stafferton Way Link Road scheme delivered all elements of the scheme to the required standard and has been successful in delivering the missing section of the town centre ring-road. Resultantly, unlocking investment in the vicinity of Stafferton Way, with a new supermarket and housing development being constructed since the scheme opened.

6.2.8 Although the scheme did experience a significant overspend, this was due to changes in project scope - which included additional items requested by members - engineering complexity and unforeseen utility costs. The council allocated additional funds to the project to ensure it was delivered in full.

6.2.9 A detailed review of the project was undertaken, which highlighted several key learning points. These included the need for timely reporting of financial information; understanding trade-offs between scope and cost; and, the need for full involvement of elected members, officers, and consultants in the decision-making process throughout the lifetime of the project.

6.2.10 The council has since put in place a comprehensive, scalable, and mandated project management methodology. Which is to be adopted for all major projects, which is described in full later in this document.

6.2.11 RBWM's professional services consultant, Project Centre, have extensive experience in developing business cases for major LEP schemes and assisting local authorities to design and deliver those schemes. It is expected that they will be leading on the design of the scheme.

6.2.12 An example of a project which Project Centre has assisted with and successfully delivered is Commercial Road Park, Strood. Working with Medway Council, Project Centre assisted in securing £11m LEP funding for a transportation and public realm improvement scheme.

6.2.13 In addition, Project Centre provided preliminary design, consultation, and detailed design services. This included traffic modelling, street and architectural lighting design, public and stakeholder consultation, public real and street art design, and detailed design for construction.

6.2.14 Commercial Road Park, Strood, is now complete having been successfully delivered within programme and budget constraints.

6.2.15 Project Centre also provided services for Waltham Forest mini-Holland scheme, which included traffic engineering and public realm design for 5km of cycle/ bus/ walking routes of strategic highway. Lea Bridge Road was the focus of the study and a flagship for the Transport for London (TfL) mini-Holland programme, for which Waltham Forest Council received £30m in funding. Project Centre delivered preliminary design, consultation, and detailed design services for the project.

6.2.16 The scheme incorporated junction designs, removal of bus lanes, the introduction of cycle lanes, and facilities for pedestrians.

6.3 Programme/ project dependencies

6.3.1 The scheme programme is dependent on the following:

- I Political backing;
- I Stakeholder support, including Windsor Castle;
- I Funding from the identified funding streams; and
- I Successful liaison with the local community and businesses, ensuring they are included in regular updates through the scheme development.

6.3.2 The scheme is not dependent upon other projects. However, the works will need to be coordinated with key stakeholders, primarily Winsor Castle, to avoid unacceptable disruption to visitors and business operations.

6.4 Governance, organisational structure & roles

6.4.1 RBWM will operate the design, construction, and monitoring stages of the scheme, utilising the governance structure described in Table 6.1.

Table 6.1 – RBWM management and governance arrangements

Responsible group or officer Responsibility

Cabinet Member group that manages council business including high value/high risk procurement and projects, including LGF projects.

Overview & Scrutiny Panel Provides on-going member oversight of the development and delivery of major transport schemes.

Project Sponsor Senior officer with overall accountability for the project. Responsible for providing regular updates to relevant Cabinet portfolio members.

For the Windsor Visitor Economy scheme, this role will be fulfilled by Chris Joyce, Head of Infrastructure, Sustainability and Economic Growth.

Project Board Provides senior officer project management oversight and support. For the Windsor Visitor Economy scheme, the Project Board includes senior representatives from:

- | Highways, Parks and Countryside;
- | Community Protection and Enforcement;
- | Property;
- | Regeneration;
- | Parking; and,
- | Finance.

The Group is responsible for the strategic management of the project and has authority to commit resources to the project in accordance with the Council's Constitution. General tasks include:

- | appointing the project manager;
- | signing off the project brief and business case;
- | approving the Project Initiation Document (PID);
- | agreeing project controls;
- | authorising project start;
- | reviewing progress against the agreed programme;
- | review of Microsoft Teams project toolkit;
- | authorising variations to expenditure;
- | managing key risks in the highlighted risk log;
- | agreeing responses to issues arising;

- | managing communications;
- | authorising project closure.

The Project Board meets on a monthly basis and an LGF update report is a standing item on the agenda.

Project Manager

Responsible for delivering the project on behalf of the Project Board. Key responsibilities include:

- | Leads and manages the Project Team – has the authority and responsibility to run the project on a day-to-day basis;
- | Delivers the agreed outputs to the required level of quality and within the specified constraints of time, cost, resources and risk;
- | Prepares project information, including the Project Initiation Document (PID) and Project Plan;
- | Identifies and evaluates risks, determines and manages actions, and maintains the risk log;
- | Manages and controls changes to the project scope, requirements, personnel etc;
- | Ensures the project is properly resourced, with sufficient, properly-skilled support;
- | Monitors and reports progress against the agreed programme, budget and other performance metrics, updating the Council’s project management system each month;
- | Identifies key issues that need to be escalated to the project board for review and decision;
- | Liaises with the Project Board and Project Sponsor, securing their approval and decisions at key project stages.

Project Team This is a working group that is responsible for the detailed running of the project.

They undertake regular reviews of progress, risks, issues, actions and spend at a detailed level.

Head of Internal Audit

Leads on providing financial governance advice. Involved in the programme from an early stage.

6.4.2 The council uses Microsoft Teams software to manage the project and provide visibility of the work status. This is updated monthly, by the Project Manager and is reviewed by the Project Sponsor and Project Board.

6.4.3 Key information entered within Microsoft Teams includes:

- | Project toolkit;
- | Delivery status;
- | Project milestones;
- | Risks log;
- | Issues log;
- | Decision / change log;
- | Costs;
- | Actions;
- | Project plan / programme;
- | Document management;
- | Project overview;
- | Scope / project initiation document;
- | Justification / approvals;
- | Project constraints;
- | Assumptions;
- | Meeting agendas / minutes;
- | Progress reports.

6.4.4 A key benefit of using Microsoft Teams is that it is cloud-based, providing a common data environment, so all project documentation can be easily shared with internal and external stakeholders. It also enables collaboration and automatic version control, so all parties are confident that they are working on the latest version of project documents.

6.4.5 A regular snapshot is taken from Microsoft Teams to provide status reports for Project Board and Project Team meetings. Which also provides a useful audit trail.

6.5 Programme/ project plan

The outline programme for development and delivery of the scheme is provided within Appendix B. The programme will be refined following full scheme approval, subject to preliminary and detailed design. The key milestones are detailed in Table 6.2 below.

Table 6.2 – Key project milestones

Stage	Date
Business case approval	Jul 2020
Preliminary design	Jul - Oct 2020
Detailed design	Nov – Jan 2021
Procurement	Sept 2020
Commence construction	Oct 2020
Completion of Construction	April 2021

6.6 Assurance and approval plan

6.6.1 The Project Board will be the mechanism for assessing scheme progress. This includes sign-off for each stage completed and approval for commencing the next stage, as set out in the Project Management Toolkit. This methodology enables:

- | Realistic and achievable targets to ensure successful delivery;
- | Deployment of relevant skills and competencies to a project;
- | Compliance with best practice;
- | Key stakeholder input and understanding;
- | Project feedback through lessons learnt;
- | A visible audit trail.

6.6.2 The key milestones for RBWM and LEP sign-off are shown below:

- | Decision by BLTB/Thames Valley Berkshire LEP Board on commitment of funding – July 2020;
- | Contract between BLTB, LEP and scheme delivery body produced and signed – August 2020;
- | Detailed design approval – August and November 2020; and
- | Construction contract agreed – November 2020 and January 2021.

6.6.3 These milestones have been built into the project programme and will be monitored by the RBWM Project Manager and reported to the Project Board.

6.7 Communications and stakeholder management

6.7.1 The key objectives of the scheme's stakeholder management are to keep stakeholders aware of the scheme's progress and give an opportunity for feedback / input to the design process. Key stakeholders include:

- | Windsor Castle;
- | Affected businesses;
- | Affected residents (including relevant residents' associations);
- | Developers;
- | Affected transport providers (taxis, buses, coaches etc.);
- | Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership;
- | RBWM elected members; and
- | RBWM officers.

6.7.2 RBWM will ensure public and stakeholder awareness of the scheme by providing consistent, clear, and regular information to those affected by the scheme. This will include information on how groups using the area might be affected by works.

6.7.3 RBWM will publicise the scheme in the public domain in advance of construction, including details of the programme, its impact on pedestrian, and vehicle movements including road closures, etc. This will include:

- | Press releases;
- | Articles on the council website;
- | Social media releases;
- | Articles in 'Around the Royal Borough';
- | Messages on variable message signs around the town centre;
- | Engagement with the Developers' Forum;
- | Engagement of local businesses through the Town Manager.

6.7.4 Direct engagement with statutory consultees will occur during the detailed design stage of the project and further during the public consultation stage. The design team and project team **will**

undertake these consultation activities in partnership with the Royal Borough's communication team.

6.8 Programme/ project reporting

6.8.1 Responsibility for accurate, timely and appropriate communications within the Project Team rests with the RBWM Project Manager, to ensure that the Project Board is kept up-to-date with programme developments.

6.8.2 The Project Manager is responsible for leading the Project Team and reporting the Project Sponsor. The Project Sponsor is responsible for keeping the lead members aware of the scheme development, and reporting progress to the Overview and Scrutiny Panel.

6.8.3 It is the responsibility of the Project Sponsor and Project Manager to ensure that the Project Board has sufficient information. The Project Board shall be involved in all decisions that affect the programme and performance of the project, achievement of the project objectives, or deviation from the agreed and delegated responsibilities. Project Team meetings will be held monthly, with the outcomes escalated to the Project Board.

6.9 Implementation

6.9.1 The key workstreams required for implementing the project are as following:

- | Approval of business case;
- | Preliminary design (Project Centre);
- | Detailed design (Project Centre);
- | Early site works (through appointed contractor for scheme);
 - o Including utility works where required;
- | Construction (through appointed contractors for scheme);
- | Site supervision (Project Centre); and
- | Monitoring and evaluation (led in-house).

6.10 Risk management

6.10.1 The risk register detailing scheme risks, implications, mitigations, and actions, is provided in Appendix A. It has been categorised into the following four areas: strategic, design, financial, and construction.

6.10.2 The key project risks will be managed throughout the planning and implementation of the scheme. The risk register includes the severity of risk. The main issues are summarised below:

- I Scheme capital costs increase due to unforeseen factors including unanticipated utility works;
- I Windsor visitor numbers reduce, reducing financial benefit;
- I Stakeholders object to the proposed interventions;
- I Delays to construction due to unforeseen events; and
- I Archaeological finds discovered, resulting in increased costs and delays to construction programme.

6.10.3 The risk register will remain a live document, which shall be continually updated throughout the life of the project, as existing risks change, new risks are identified, or where further development of the design results in mitigation of risks. This would include appropriate levels of value engineering to optimise value and reduce risk.

6.10.4 Following confirmation of scheme funding, ownership of the risks will be allocated to those parties best able to manage them.

6.11 Benefits realisation

6.11.1 This section presents the proposed monitoring and evaluation strategy for the project as well as the key decision points. The proposed reporting and approval process will also be summarised.

6.11.2 The following stages of the project programme represent key points where decisions can be undertaken to ensure that the appropriate project viability considerations are undertaken in advance of significant capital commitment:

- I Public consultation stage;
- I Local Enterprise Partnership approval; and,
- I Internal funding approval.

6.11.3 The scheme monitoring and evaluation plan will consist of three stages:

- I Stage 1 – Pre-construction study;
- I Stage 2 – One year post opening process evaluation, Q2 2022; and
- I Stage 3 – Five year post opening impact evaluation study, Q2 2026.

6.11.4 The council is seeking agreement to the following Key Performance Indicators (KPI) to monitor the delivery and success of this project:

Table 6.3 – Key Performance Indicators

Core Benefit	Indicator	Target	Additional Data Collection
Outputs:	Public realm enhancements	Scheme delivery	100% of scheme delivered on time/ to budget
	None		
	Wayfinding and pedestrian routing	Scheme delivery	100% of scheme delivered on time/ to budget
	None		
Outcomes:	Increase GVA within local economy over 5 years relative to baseline.	Increase visitor spend in shops	Increase
		Visitor survey	
	Increase number of visitors to Windsor Castle visiting shops.	Increase footfall on the high street.	Increase over 5 years relative to base line.
		Visitor survey and pedestrian counts.	
	Improved visitor welfare. over 5 years relative to baseline.	Visitor dwell time in proximity of Windsor Castle.	Increase
		Pedestrian surveys.	

6.11.5 A process evaluation will be undertaken as the construction nears completion. The aim will be to identify factors influencing the extent to which objectives have been achieved; identify and investigate unintended outcomes; and, identify lessons learned.

6.11.6 The process evaluation will involve interviews with key project officers and a process review workshop with key parties and stakeholders. This will include assessment of:

- I Programme management, success factors and key obstacles to delivering the scheme;
- I Project plan assessment, delivery at key milestones, etc.;
- I A review of evidence collated through RBWM’s project management and governance procedures;
- I Consultation with key stakeholders to garner a range of views of the operation and success of the scheme;
- I Evolution of the risk register and the effectiveness of the risk management strategy e.g. safety during construction, delays to transport users, impacts on local business during construction;
- I Contract management issues, including handling of early warnings, change controls and value engineering opportunities;
- I If and how the context and rationale behind the scheme has changed; and

I All costs involved in the management, construction and delivery of the scheme compared to the forecast costs including an assessment of risk and optimism bias in pricing.

6.11.7 This process will inform a formal project closedown and associated lessons learned report and log. These reports will be used to assist in the evaluation of the process from start to finish.

6.11.8 As part of the project closedown process, a workshop will be held with key members of the client and contractor teams to capture the items that went well and did not go well, and identify if there are additional lessons that need to be learned. This will include a review of the impact of stakeholder engagement based upon the feedback that was received during the project, and perceptions of the construction phase obtained via the residents' attitudes surveys.

6.11.9 After completion of the monitoring and impact evaluation, an economic evaluation will be undertaken to assess the accountability of the investment into the scheme through answering the following questions:

I How do the realised benefits, and therefore, VfM correspond with those estimates derived from the scheme appraisal?

I Have any unexpected benefits occurred or have other predicted benefits not materialised?

I Are on-going benefits expected to change?

6.11.10 The actual outturn costs and movement data will be used to generate a new assessment of cost benefit. This will be supplemented with an assessment of the wider economic benefits generated by the scheme.

7. CONCLUSIONS

7.1.1 The business case demonstrates that the Windsor Visitor Economy scheme presents an opportunity to generate economic growth, providing a strong fit with local, regional, national policies and priorities. The case study review provides a robust evidence base to support the proposed public realm interventions, identifying a clear relationship between public realm enhancements and increased spend and economic growth.

7.1.2 The selection of the preferred scheme option has been informed by stakeholder engagement, and provides a sensible solution given the scheme constraints and operational requirements of Windsor Castle, local residents, and local businesses. As demonstrated by the economic analysis, by taking advantage of the high number of visitors to Windsor Castle, the benefits generated from the scheme significantly outweigh the costs, providing a Benefit/ Cost ratio of 2.32. Therefore, presenting High value for money.

7.1.3 From the Financial Case, it is demonstrated that the scheme is affordable, with sufficient funds available to deliver the scheme subject to LGF and BRRP funding. RBWM also benefit from having existing frameworks agreements in place to deliver both the design and construction of the

scheme, with RBWM, the consultant and contractor all having experience of delivering schemes of similar scale and complexity.

7.1.4 The scheme is currently being progressed to preliminary design, following completion of concept design. Subject to approval of this business case, the scheme is on track to be completed by April 2021.