

Date of issue: Wednesday, 8 March 2017

<b>MEETING</b>	<b>BERKSHIRE LOCAL TRANSPORT BODY</b>	
	<b>Member</b>	<b>Authority</b>
	Councillor Bicknell	RBWM
	Councillor Brunel-Walker	Bracknell Forest Council
	Councillor Clifford	West Berkshire Council
	Councillor Matloob	Slough Borough Council
	Councillor Page	Reading Borough Council
	Councillor Richards	Wokingham Borough Council
	Stuart Atkinson	Thames Valley Berkshire LEP
	Charles Eales	Thames Valley Berkshire LEP
	Ingrid Fernandes	Thames Valley Berkshire LEP
	Peter Howe	Thames Valley Berkshire LEP
	Graeme Steer	Thames Valley Berkshire LEP
	Matthew Taylor	Thames Valley Berkshire LEP
<b>DATE AND TIME:</b>	<b>THURSDAY, 16TH MARCH, 2017 AT 4.00 PM</b>	
<b>VENUE:</b>	<b>THE CURVE - WILLIAM STREET, SLOUGH, BERKSHIRE, SL1 1XY</b>	
<b>DEMOCRATIC SERVICES OFFICER:</b> <b>(for all enquiries)</b>	<b>NICHOLAS PONTONE</b> <b>01753 875120</b>	

NOTICE OF MEETING

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



**ROGER PARKIN**  
Chief Executive – Support to the Board

## AGENDA

### PART 1

<u>AGENDA ITEM</u>	<u>REPORT TITLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
	Apologies for absence.	
1.	Declarations of Interest	
2.	Minutes of the Meeting held on 17th November 2016	1 - 4
3.	Membership Update	-
	<i>To note the appointment of Stuart Atkinson to the BLTB as a representative of Thames Valley Berkshire LEP.</i>	
4.	Sub-National Transport Body - Proposal to join Transport for the South East	5 - 8
5.	Thames Valley Berkshire Local Growth Deal 2015-16 to 2020-21	9 - 110
6.	Airport National Policy Statement - Consultation Response	111 - 120
7.	2.04 Wokingham Distributor Roads Programme	121 - 126
8.	Assurance Framework - Review	127 - 144
9.	BLTB Forward Plan	145 - 146
10.	Date of Next Meeting	

Thursday 20<sup>th</sup> July 2017 at 4.00pm at The Curve, William Street, Slough, SL1 1XY

### Press and Public

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

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



**Berkshire Local Transport Body – Meeting held on Thursday, 17th November, 2016.**

<b>Present:-</b>	Councillor Page (in the Chair) Councillor Bicknell	Reading Borough Council The Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead
	Councillor Brunel-Walker	Bracknell Forest Council (from 4.07pm)
	Councillor Clifford	West Berkshire Council (from 4.11pm)
	Charles Eales Ingrid Fernandes Ian Frost	Thames Valley Berkshire LEP Thames Valley Berkshire LEP Thames Valley Berkshire LEP (from 4.17pm)
	Peter Howe Councillor Matloob Councillor Richards Graeme Steer	Thames Valley Berkshire LEP Slough Borough Council Wokingham Borough Council Thames Valley Berkshire LEP

**Also present:-** Councillor Sleight (deputy member for Wokingham Borough Council)

**Apologies for Absence:-** None received.

**PART 1**

**12. Declarations of Interest**

No interests were declared.

**13. Minutes of the meeting held on 21st July 2016**

**Resolved –** That the minutes of the Berkshire Local Transport Body (BLTB) held on 21<sup>st</sup> July 2016 be approved as a correct record.

**14. Financial Approval 2.15 Bracknell: Martins Heron**

A report was considered that sought conditional financial approval for scheme 2.15 Bracknell Martins Heron. The scheme was part of a wider programme to improve access between the M3 and M4 via the A322, A329 and A329(M). The project focused on the Martins Heron roundabout and minor alterations to the London Road corridor to improve congestion and journey times.

The reasons for seeking conditional approval were explained and it was noted that further work needed to be completed before the independent assessors were satisfied that the a fully compliant business case was in place. It was agreed that the scheme was sound and would complement other local schemes recently carried out. BLTB therefore agreed to give conditional financial approval, subject to the conditions specified.

**Resolved –**

- (a) That scheme 2.15 Bracknell Martins Heron be given conditional financial approval in the sum of £2,000,000 in 2017/18 and £900,000 in 2018/19 on the terms of the funding agreement set out at paragraph 13 step 5 of the report.
- (b) The condition that would have to be met in order to gain full financial approval was that the independent assessor be satisfied that the following elements of a fully compliant Full Business Case had either been supplied, or a properly documented reason for their absence, had been supplied:
  - a. Options Assessment Report;
  - b. Detailed cost breakdown;
  - c. The BMMTM local model and demand model validation reports;
  - d. Network plots of the area showing the rerouting of traffic;
  - e. Justification for the choice of forecast years;
  - f. Low and High Growth scenarios for BCR;
  - g. A 30-year assessment of BCR;
  - h. Environmental assessments;
  - i. Public Accounts (PA), Transport Economic Efficiency (TEE) and Analysis of Monetised Costs and Benefits (AMCB) tables;
  - j. Cobalt accident analysis.

**15. Financial Approval 2.21 Slough: Langley Station Improvements**

A report was considered that sought financial approval for scheme 2.21 Slough Langley Station Improvements. The scheme would improve station facilities, signage and enhance access from the surrounding area through better pedestrian, cycling, bus and parking provision. The activity would prepare the station for the arrival of Crossrail services.

Clarification was sought that the scheme would be completed prior to the start of Crossrail services and it was confirmed that work would be completed by March 2018 with Crossrail services scheduled to begin in December 2019. After due consideration, BLTB agreed to give the scheme full financial approval on the terms set out in the report.

**Resolved –** That scheme 2.21 Slough Langley Station Improvements be given full financial approval in the sum of £1,500,000 in 2017/18 on the terms of the funding agreement set out at paragraph 14 step 5 of the report.

*(Councillor Brunel-Walker joined the meeting)*

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

The BLTB considered a progress report on the Thames Valley Berkshire Local Growth Deal and in particular the schemes included in the transport packages of the Strategic Economic Plan.

Tables 4 and 5 of the report showed the risk rating of schemes starting in 2015/16 and 2016/17 respectively and all were currently rated as 'green'. An update was requested on the latest position regarding 2.08 Slough: Rapid Transit and it was responded that work on the eastern section, between Junction 5 of the M4 and the town centre, would be completed by the end of January 2017 with the central and western sections due to be finished by the end of June. Several businesses had already signed up to the scheme. Members were also updated regarding the changes to 2.09.1 Sustainable Transport: NCN 422 and noted that work had started on site for 2.01 Newbury: Kings Road Link Road.

*(Councillor Clifford joined the meeting)*

BLTB considered Table 6 which showed the risk rating of scheme with later starts and the progress of schemes with an 'Amber' or 'Red' rating was reviewed. Updates were provided on the four 'Amber' schemes – 2.04.2 Wokingham Distributor Roads, 2.05 Newbury: Sandleford Park, 2.13 Wokingham: Thames Valley Park & Ride and 2.14 Reading: East Reading Mass Rapid Transport – and BLTB was satisfied that progress was being made and the risks were being managed.

*(Ian Frost joined the meeting)*

Scheme 2.16 Maidenhead: Station Access had a 'Red' status due to difficulties in assembling the site and preparing a workable scheme. RBWM representatives updated on the current position and provided reassurance that positive progress was being made to develop a scheme on a key site, however, members were concerned about the potential impact of further slippage on the programme more widely. RBWM stated that it was anticipated that a business case would be ready in July 2017. BLTB reaffirmed its commitment to the scheme in principle and agreed that if a business case wasn't in place by July 2017 than the LTB contribution would need to be reviewed.

The BLTB then reviewed and noted the progress reports on the remaining schemes in the programme as set out in Appendix 1 to the report.

**Resolved –** That the progress made on the schemes previously given programme entry system, as set out in Appendix 1 to the report, be noted.

**17. BLTB Forward Plan**

The forward plan was considered which set out the pipeline of schemes anticipated to come to the LTB for funding approval in 2017/18.

**Resolved** – That the BLTB Forward Plan be noted.

**18. Date of the Next Meeting**

**Resolved** – That the next meeting of the BLTB be held on Thursday 16<sup>th</sup> March 2017 at 4.00pm at The Curve, William Street, Slough.

Chair

(Note: The Meeting opened at 4.00 pm and closed at 4.25 pm)

## BERKSHIRE LOCAL TRANSPORT BODY (BLTB)

**REPORT TO:** BLTB

**DATE:** 16 March 2017

**CONTACT OFFICER:** Roger Parkin, Interim Chief Executive Slough Borough Council, lead Chief Executive to the BLTB

### PART I

#### **Item 4: Sub-national Transport Body Proposal – Transport for the South East**

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

1. This report introduces details of a proposed sub-national transport body, working title 'Transport for the South East' and recommends that BLTB join on behalf of the six Berkshire Unitaries.
2. To receive a presentation from Mark Valleley of East Sussex County Council who is managing the development of the Transport Strategy for the shadow sub-national transport body.

##### ***Recommendation***

3. You are recommended to
  - 3.1. Participate in the shadow arrangements for a sub-national transport body for the south east
  - 3.2. Nominate Cllr Page to represent BLTB at the shadow board meetings
  - 3.3. Ask for further reports on the details of the governance and proposed strategy for the sub-national transport body in due course

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

##### ***Financial***

4. The operating costs of the proposed sub-national transport body will be shared between the participating members. The detail of the proposed budget and its allocated shares is one of the details that will be discussed at shadow board meetings. Once the extent of the contribution expected from BLTB is known, there will have to be a further determination of how the six unitary authorities and the LEP will apportion the costs.

##### ***Risk Management***

5. In November 2015, the DfT published [proposals as part of its devolution agenda](https://www.gov.uk/government/news/regions-to-be-offered-legal-powers-to-transform-transport-agenda)<sup>1</sup> to establish sub-national transport bodies on a statutory basis. It gave [Transport for the North](http://www.transportforthenorth.com/)<sup>2</sup> and [Midlands Connect](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/482247/midlands-engine-for-growth.pdf)<sup>3</sup> as examples.

<sup>1</sup> [https://www.gov.uk/government/news/regions-to-be-offered-legal-powers-to-transform-transport](https://www.gov.uk/government/news/regions-to-be-offered-legal-powers-to-transform-transport-agenda)

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.transportforthenorth.com/>

<sup>3</sup> [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/482247/midlands-engine-for-growth.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/482247/midlands-engine-for-growth.pdf)

6. The risk for the Thames Valley Berkshire area is that by not engaging with the government's policy to promote sub-national transport bodies, it will be harder to fund infrastructure proposals that are significant at the sub-national scale.
7. The risk associated with participating in these arrangements is that time, resources and energy will be devoted to the new arrangements which fail to deliver any tangible benefits.
8. The recommendation to join the BLTB into the new arrangements, as opposed to the six individual unitary authorities, is a response to these risks. The logic of the proposal is that the six unitary councils have a shared interest at the sub-national scale, and that our participation can be safely streamlined to a joint participation.

### Human Rights Act and Other Legal Implications

9. [Section 21\(1\) of the Cities and Local Government Devolution Act 2016](#)<sup>4</sup> amended Part 5 of the Local Transport Act 2008 as follows,  
*“The Secretary of State may by regulations establish a sub-national transport body for any area in England outside Greater London.”*  
The Act goes on to describe further the regulations for a sub-national transport body should be made.
10. Slough Borough Council will provide legal support for the BLTB should any questions arise on the application of this enabling legislation to the arrangements for the proposed Transport for the South East.

### **Supporting Information**

1. We have invited Mark Valleley of East Sussex County Council, who is leading on the development of the Transport Strategy for the shadow sub-national transport body to attend the meeting to make a presentation and answer questions about the current state of the proposals.
2. Richard Tyndall has attended a meeting of the shadow senior officers' group, and he has accompanied Cllr Page to a briefing with Cllr Glazier (Leader of East Sussex County Council) and Rupert Clubb (Director of Communities, Economy and Transport, ESCC).
3. The current timetable is working towards a 'go-live' date of 1 April 2019. The first meeting of the member-level shadow board is planned for 26 June 2017 following the forthcoming county council elections.
4. The geographical coverage of the proposed Transport for the South East is:  
  
Upper Tier Local Authorities
  - Kent

---

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2016/1/section/21/enacted>



- Medway
- East Sussex
- West Sussex
- Brighton and Hove
- Surrey
- Hampshire
- Portsmouth
- Southampton
- Isle of Wight
- Berkshire Local Transport Body on behalf of Bracknell Forest, Reading, Slough, West Berkshire, Windsor and Maidenhead and Wokingham.

#### Local Enterprise Partnerships

- South East (part)
  - Coast to Capital (part)
  - Solent
  - Enterprise M3
  - Thames Valley Berkshire
5. The arrangements will also allow for the involvement of the following key stakeholders (detail to be discussed):
- DfT
  - Highways England
  - Network Rail
  - Ports
  - Airports
  - Bus Operators
  - Train Operators
  - TfL

#### **Conclusion**

6. Proposals to develop 'Transport for the South East' are progressing well. This report authorises participation in the shadow board discussions. Any formal decision to join will be the subject of further detailed reports.

#### **Background Papers**

7. Correspondence between LEPs and briefing notes supplied by the TfSE shadow project team.

This page is intentionally left blank

**BERKSHIRE LOCAL TRANSPORT BODY (BLTB)****REPORT TO:** BLTB**DATE:** 16 March 2017**CONTACT OFFICER:** Roger Parkin, Interim Chief Executive Slough Borough Council, lead Chief Executive to the BLTB**PART I****Item 5: THAMES VALLEY BERKSHIRE LOCAL GROWTH DEAL 2015/16 to 2020/21*****Purpose of Report***

1. To report on the progress of the [Thames Valley Berkshire Local Growth Deal<sup>i</sup>](#), as amended by Growth Deal 2 ([£10.2 million further support to Thames Valley Berkshire<sup>ii</sup>](#)) with particular reference to the schemes included in the Transport Packages of the [Strategic Economic Plan<sup>iii</sup>](#).
2. Since your last meeting, the government has announced [Growth Deal 3<sup>iv</sup>](#), including six new transport schemes for Thames Valley Berkshire worth a total of £33.826m, taking the headline figure for transport scheme grants to £135.926m. This report introduces the six new schemes approved in GD3, and provides progress reports on the other previously approved schemes.
3. A seventh scheme has also been approved under Growth Deal 3, called “Smart Reading, Bracknell and West Berkshire”. This report also introduces this scheme.
4. £14.742m was spent on transport schemes in 2015/16 and we are projecting a spend of £16.546m in 2016/17. The remainder has an indicative approval over four future years 2017/18 to 2020/21.

***Recommendations***

5. That you give programme entry status to
  - 2.23 Reading: South Reading MRT Phases 3-4
  - 2.24 Newbury: Railway Station Improvements
  - 2.25 Reading: East Reading MRT Phase 2
  - 2.26 Wokingham: Winnersh Relief Road Phase 2
  - 2.27 Maidenhead Town Centre: Missing Links
  - 2.28 Bracknell: A3095 Corridor Improvements
6. That you note the approval given to the ‘Smart Reading, Bracknell and West Berkshire’ project
7. That you note the progress made on the schemes previously given programme entry status, as set out in Appendix 6

## Other Implications

### Financial

8. Thames Valley Berkshire LEP has been granted freedoms and flexibilities in managing the Growth Deal Capital Programme. This means that we will receive an annual allocation of capital within which it will be our responsibility to manage the allocation to individual schemes. This is a positive development for TVB LEP and recognises the confidence that government has in our governance arrangements.
9. The government has confirmed the allocation of funding for 2016/17 and there is a provisional profile for payments in the financial years 2017/18 - 2020/21.

Table 1: Available Finance for Transport Schemes in TVB Growth Deal

£m		2015/16 – 2020/21
LTB previously approved		14.5
Growth Deal 1	56.1	
Less Unallocated	0.7	
		55.4
Growth Deal 1 “DfT Major Schemes”		24.0
Growth Deal 2		7.5
Growth Deal 3 new approval	33.8	
Plus unallocated	0.7	
		34.5
<b>Total</b>		<b>135.9</b>

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

Table 2: Growth Deal Financial Allocation for 2015/16

£m	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
Combined Growth Deal 1 and 2 and LTB Allocation <b>approved</b>	<b>14.7</b>	<b>16.5</b>	-	-	-	-	<b>31.2</b>
Growth Deal 1 (DfT Major Schemes) <i>indicative</i>	-	-	24.0				24.0
Combined Growth Deal 1, 2 and 3 LTB Allocation <i>indicative profile</i>	-	-	18.7	31.0	20.6	10.4	80.7
Total	<b>14.7</b>	<b>16.5</b>	104.7				135.9

11. Table 3 sets out the final allocation of scheme finance for 2015/16 and 2016/17 and the provisional allocation for future financial years, which are subject to alteration following the government’s confirmation of the Growth Deal funding profile.

Table 3 – Growth Deal 1, 2 and 3 Scheme Funding Profiles

<a href="#">SEP Ref</a>	Scheme Name		Status	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	£m
2.01	Newbury: King's Rd Link Road	GD 1	On site	-	<b>1.335</b>	1.000	-	-	-	2.335
2.02	Bracknell: Warfield Link Road	GD 1	On site	<b>3.500</b>	-	-	-	-	-	3.500
2.03	Newbury: London Rd Industrial Estate	GD 1	On site	<b>0.500</b>	<b>1.400</b>	-	-	-	-	1.900
2.04	Wokingham: Distributor Roads	DfT major	Programme entry	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.05	Newbury: Sandleford Park	GD 2	Full approval	-	-	1.000	1.400	0.500	-	2.900
2.06	Reading: Green Park Railway Station	GD 1	Full approval	-	-	4.575	4.575	-	-	9.150
2.07	Bracknell: Coral Reef Roundabout	GD 1	Complete	<b>2.100</b>	-	-	-	-	-	2.100
2.08	Slough: Rapid Transit Phase 1	GD 1	On site	<b>3.100</b>	<b>2.500</b>	-	-	-	-	5.600
2.09.1	Sustainable Transport: NCN 422	GD 1	On site	-	<b>2.100</b>	1.500	0.600	-	-	4.200
2.09.2	Sustainable Transport: A4 Cycle	GD 1	On site	-	<b>0.483</b>	-	-	-	-	0.483
2.10	Slough: A332 improvements	GD 1	On site	<b>1.267</b>	<b>1.433</b>	-	-	-	-	2.700
2.11	Reading: South Reading MRT Ph 1	GD 1	On site	-	<b>2.970</b>	1.530	-	-	-	4.500
2.12	Reading: South Reading MRT Ph 2			-						
2.13	Wokingham: Thames Valley Park and Ride formerly Reading: Eastern Reading Park and Ride	GD 1	Programme entry	-	-	2.000	0.900	-	-	2.900
2.14	Reading: East Reading MRT Ph1	GD 1	Programme entry	-	-	-	5.400	10.200	3.467	19.067
2.25	Reading: East Reading MRT Ph2	GD 3	Awaiting programme entry	-	-	-	5.400	10.200	3.467	19.067
2.15	Bracknell: Martins Heron Roundabout	GD 1	On site	-	<b>0.200</b>	1.800	0.900	-	-	2.900
2.16	Maidenhead: Station Access	GD 1	Programme entry	-	-	1.750	5.000	-	-	6.750
2.17	Slough: A355 route	GD 1	Complete	<b>2.275</b>	<b>2.125</b>	-	-	-	-	4.400
2.18	not used	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.19	Bracknell: Town Centre Regeneration Infrastructure	GD 2	On site	<b>2.000</b>	-	-	-	-	-	2.000
2.20	not used	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.21	Slough: Langley Station Access Improvements	GD 2	Full approval	-	-	1.500	-	-	-	1.500

<a href="#">SEP Ref</a>	Scheme Name		Status	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	£m
2.22	Slough: Burnham Station Access Improvements	GD 2	On site	-	<b>2.000</b>	-	-	-	-	2.000
2.23	Reading: South Reading MRT Phases 3-4	GD 3	Awaiting programme entry	-	-	1.748	5.300	3.100	-	10.148
2.24	Newbury: Railway Station Improvements	GD 3	Awaiting programme entry	-	-	-	3.630	2.421	-	6.051
2.26	Wokingham: Winnersh Relief Road Phase 2	GD 3	Awaiting programme entry	-	-	-	2.848	2.022	1.390	6.260
2.27	Maidenhead Town Centre: Missing Links	GD 3	Awaiting programme entry	-	-	0.313	0.409	0.326	2.000	3.048
2.28	Bracknell: A3095 Corridor Improvements	GD 3	Awaiting programme entry	-	-	-	-	2.000	3.519	5.519
	<b>Grand Total</b>			<b>14.742</b>	<b>16.546</b>	<b>18.716</b>	<b>30.962</b>	<b>20.569</b>	<b>10.376</b>	<b>111.911</b>

### Risk Management

12. The delegation of programme management responsibilities to the LEP/BLTB brings risks. The well-established scrutiny given by both BST(O)F and BLTB meetings is designed to mitigate that risk.

13. There will be an element of risk for scheme promoters who invest in developing their schemes to full business case stage in accordance with the approved [Assurance Framework](#)<sup>v</sup>. However, there is also risk involved in not developing the schemes; that risk is that any reluctance to bring the schemes forward will result in any final approval being delayed or refused.

### Human Rights Act and Other Legal Implications

14. The [Assurance Framework](#)<sup>3</sup> referred to above identifies the steps that scheme promoters should take in order to secure financial approval from the LTB. There are, in effect, two layers of scheme approval. The first, and primary layer rests with the scheme promoter (all the schemes referred to in this report are being promoted by Local Authorities). In order to implement the schemes in question, each promoter will need to satisfy themselves that all the legal implications have been considered and appropriately resolved. The secondary layer of approval, given by the LTB, is concerned with the release of funds against the detailed business case. The arrangements for publication of plans via the LEP and promoters' websites, the arrangements for independent assessment and the consideration of detailed scheme reports are appropriate steps to ensure that any significant Human Rights Act or other legal implications are properly identified and considered.

## **Supporting Information**

### Growth Deal 3 – New schemes

15. TVB has been successful in securing financial approval from Government for four further transport schemes which were recently announced as part of the Growth Deal 3 package. They are
  - 2.23 Reading: South Reading MRT Phases 3-4 (see Appendix 1)
  - 2.24 Newbury: Railway Station Improvements (see Appendix 2)
  - 2.25 Reading: East Reading MRT Phase 2 (see joint pro-forma with phase 1 at Appendix 7)
  - 2.26 Wokingham: Winnersh Relief Road Phase 2 (see Appendix 3)
  - 2.27 Maidenhead Town Centre: Missing Links (see Appendix 4)
  - 2.28 Bracknell: A3095 Corridor Improvements (see Appendix 5)
  - 2.xx Smart Reading, Bracknell and West Berkshire
  
16. **2.23 Reading: South Reading MRT Phases 3-4.** This scheme extends South Reading MRT Phases 1 and 2 (currently on site and funded in GD1) further towards Reading Town Centre. A further two Phases 5 and 6 will be required to connect the segregated Bus Lane to Reading Station.
  
17. **2.24 Newbury: Railway Station Improvements.** This scheme coordinates improvements to the station being funded by Network Rail and Great Western Railway with the Market Street redevelopment and funds improvements to the station forecourt area.
  
18. **2.25 Reading: East Reading MRT Phase 2.** This scheme extends 2.14 East Reading MRT Phase 1 along Napier Road to Vastern Road Roundabout. Phases 1 and 2 of this scheme will now be merged and managed as a single scheme.
  
19. **2.26 Wokingham: Winnersh Relief Road Phase 2.** This scheme will complete the Winnersh Relief Road, phase 1 of which is developer funded and currently on site.
  
20. **2.27 Maidenhead Town Centre: Missing Links.** This scheme will provide improved pedestrian and cycling facilities in and around Maidenhead Town Centre.
  
21. **2.28 Bracknell A3095 Corridor Improvements.** This scheme supports the large housing developments along the A3095 to the south of Bracknell including bus and pedestrian facilities as well as junction improvements.
  
22. **2.xx Smart Reading, Bracknell and West Berkshire.** This is a project with a strong transport component, but as it is about the application of new technology in order to improve transport outcomes it is not appropriate for the LTB assurance framework. There will be an oral presentation.

## Monitoring and Evaluation

23. The Monitoring and Evaluation Plan for the Thames Valley Berkshire Growth Deal has now been drafted with advice from government. In addition to the need for transport scheme promoters to collect and publish monitoring and evaluation reports that comply with DfT guidance for capital schemes, (see detailed report elsewhere on this agenda) there will be requirements to cooperate with the overall monitoring and evaluation plan for the Growth Deal.
24. The difference between the two processes is that one concentrates on the transport impacts and the other on the economic impacts. The basic information required from each scheme promoter is set out in paragraph 6 of the scheme proformas. This requirement is less onerous for schemes under £5m Growth Deal contribution, and runs to much more detail for the larger schemes.
25. For most schemes there will be little or no additional Growth Deal monitoring burden beyond that already signalled. Extra effort may be required to comply with the standard set out in the Monitoring and Evaluation plan which is “accurate, timely, verified and quality assured monitoring data”. For schemes mentioned by name in the Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (see list below) there will be a separate discussion about the duties on the scheme promoter:

- 2.01 Newbury: King’s Road Link Road
- 2.04 Wokingham: Distributor Roads Programme
- 2.06 Reading: Green Park Railway Station
- 2.08 Slough: Rapid Transit Phase 1
- 2.14 Reading: East Reading Mass Rapid Transit

## **Background Papers**

Each of the schemes referred to above has a pro-forma summarising the details of the scheme. Both the SEP and LTB prioritisation processes and scoring schemes are also available background papers. The Monitoring and Evaluation Plan for TVB Growth Deal will be finalised with government in the next few weeks.

---

<sup>i</sup>[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/327587/35\\_Thames\\_Valley\\_Berkshire\\_Growth\\_Deal.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/327587/35_Thames_Valley_Berkshire_Growth_Deal.pdf)

<sup>ii</sup> <http://thamesvalleyberkshire.co.uk/NewsDetails/163102m-expansion-of-growth-deal-boosts-local-plan-for-thames-valley-berkshire-economy-19917>

<sup>iii</sup> The TVB Strategic Economic Plan is available from [thamesvalleyberkshire.co.uk/Strategic\\_Economic\\_Plan](http://thamesvalleyberkshire.co.uk/Strategic_Economic_Plan)

<sup>iv</sup> [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/589268/170202\\_Thames\\_Valley\\_Berkshire\\_LEP\\_GD\\_factsheet.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/589268/170202_Thames_Valley_Berkshire_LEP_GD_factsheet.pdf)

<sup>v</sup> <http://thamesvalleyberkshire.co.uk/Portals/0/FileStore/StrategicInfrastructure/StrategicInfrastructure/BLTB/Assurance%20Framework%20for%20Berkshire%20Local%20Transport%20Body%2014%20November%202013.pdf>



## Appendix 1

### Berkshire Local Transport Body – 16 March 2017

#### 2.23 Reading: South Reading MRT Phases 3 and 4

Highlights of progress since November 2016
Programme entry status for the scheme will be sought from the BLTB meeting in March 2017.
The appraisal specification report for the full business case is being produced and financial approval will be sought from the BLTB meeting in July 2017.
Outline scheme design is complete and detailed designs are currently being developed.

### 1. The Scheme

- 1.1 South Reading Mass Rapid Transit (MRT) Phases 3 and 4 will provide a series of bus priority measures on the A33 between Rose Kiln Lane and Bennett Road, and connecting routes in Reading town centre. The scheme will reduce congestion and journey times, improving public transport reliability on the main corridor into Reading.

### 2. Progress with the scheme

- 2.1 Feasibility work is complete and programme entry status for the scheme will be sought from the BLTB meeting in March 2017.
- 2.2 The appraisal specification report for the full business case is being produced (to be agreed with WYG) and financial approval will be sought from the BLTB meeting in July 2017. The methodology will be in line with the approved business case for Phases 1 and 2 of the scheme, and the recently updated Reading Transport Model will be used for preparation of the business case.
- 2.3 Outline scheme design is complete and detailed designs are currently being prepared. This work is being progressed in line with the latest land-use development proposals for the A33 corridor and discussions are on-going with the developer of the Southside site.
- 2.4 A public exhibition was held in June 2016 for the full South Reading MRT scheme and statutory consultation for Phases 3 and 4 will be undertaken through a Traffic Regulation Order.
- 2.5 A phased construction programme for the full scheme has been developed, including measures to reduce disruption to the flow of traffic while the construction works take place, for instance by limiting any necessary lane closures to off peak hours only.
- 2.6 The potential for cost savings for the scheme continues to be reviewed, both to the overall scheme costs and the level of LGF funding required.

### 3. Funding

- 3.1. The following table sets out the funding for the scheme on the basis of the indicative funding profile.

Source of funding	2015 /16	2016 /17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020 /21	Total
Amount from LEP Local Growth Deal	-	-	£1,748,000	£5,300,000	£3,100,000	-	£10,148,000
Local contributions from:							
- Section 106 / CIL agreements	-	-	-	£1,268,000	£1,268,000	-	£2,536,000
- Council Capital Programme	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
- Other sources	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total Scheme Cost</b>			<b>£1,748,000</b>	<b>£6,568,000</b>	<b>£4,368,000</b>		<b>£12,684,000</b>

#### 4. Risks

- 4.1. The key risks on delivering this Programme Entry scheme and how they will be managed are set out in the table below:

Risk	Management of risk
Objections through the TRO process.	Scheme is within highway or safeguarded land. The principle of MRT on this corridor has been consulted upon through preparation of policy documents including the LTP3.
Utility diversions and surface water drainage alterations.	Detailed designs for the scheme are being prepared with all the relevant information from utility searches and in line with surface water drainage requirements.
Securing the required third party land where this falls outside of highway land.	The MRT route has been safeguarded for this purpose and negotiations with land owners are being undertaken.

#### 5. Programme

Task	Original Timescale	March 2017 Timescale (where changed)
Feasibility work	May 2016	
Programme Entry Status	March 2017	
Independent Assessment of FBC	May 2017	
Financial Approval from LTB	July 2017	
Acquisition of statutory powers	September 2017	
Detailed design	September 2017	
Procurement	January 2018	
Start of construction	March 2018	
Completion of construction	March 2020	
One year on evaluation	March 2021	
Five years on evaluation	March 2025	

#### 6. Growth Deal Reporting Framework

- 6.1. The following table is an extract from the Growth Deal reporting matrix. The entries made here will be reported on a project by project basis.

Growth Deal Schemes:	Transport scheme	
Thames Valley Berkshire LEP	2.23 Reading: South Reading MRT phases 3 and 4	March 2017
<b>1. Core Metrics</b>	<b>Planning Numbers</b>	<b>Actual to date</b>
<b>Inputs</b>		
Expenditure	£12,684,000	
Funding breakdown		
Local Growth Deal	£10,148,000	
s.106 and similar contributions	£2,536,000	
Council Capital Programme	-	
Other	-	
In-kind resources provided	£300,000	
<b>Outcomes</b>		
Planned Jobs connected to the intervention	[tbc]	
Commercial floor space constructed (square metres)	[tbc]	
Housing unit starts	[tbc]	

Housing units completed	[tbc]	
<b>2. PROJECT SPECIFIC OUTPUTS AND OUTCOMES - to be collected where relevant to the intervention</b>		
<b>Transport</b>		
<b>Outputs</b>		
Total length of resurfaced roads	N/A	
Total length of newly built roads	[tbc]	
Total length of new cycle ways	N/A	
Type of infrastructure	Bus Priority Lanes	
Type of service improvement	Reduced & consistent journey times	
<b>Outcomes</b>		
Follow on investment at site	N/A	
Commercial floor space occupied	N/A	
Commercial rental values	N/A	

## 7. Further Information for Summary Reports

The South Reading MRT, when complete, will provide segregated bus lanes from MereOak Park and Ride south of Junction 11 of the M4 to Reading Station. Phases 3 and 4 extend from Rose Kiln Lane and Bennett Road. Programme Entry due March 2017. Start on site due March 2018 and due to complete March 2020. First Growth Fund payment due March 2018.

This page is intentionally left blank

### Berkshire Local Transport Body – 16 March 2017

#### 2.24 Newbury – Railway Station Improvements

##### 1. The Scheme

- 1.1 This scheme plans to enhance and improve multi-modal transport interchange at Newbury Railway station including upgrade and improvement of station buildings. This will work alongside, and help to deliver, the Market Street housing-led development and also help to deliver the Sandleford Park strategic housing site, through enhanced connectivity for bus passengers, rail passengers, cyclists and pedestrians. The scheme will allow Newbury Railway Station to cope with anticipated increases in passengers with corresponding increases in demand for travel and car parking.
- 1.2 The scheme is promoted jointly by West Berkshire Council and Great Western Railway. It seeks to deliver 4 to 5 start-up incubator business units within rail land to the south of Newbury Railway Station and 2 new retail outlets on the station (north and south) with an additional 8 to 10 jobs created within these retail outlets. New and enhanced cycle facilities, ticket hall and waiting areas will be created.
- 1.3 The scheme will deliver a new multi-modal interchange with rail to the south of Newbury Railway Station along with a new multi-storey car park, station forecourt, and pedestrian/cycle link to the town centre to the north of Newbury Railway Station as part of the Market Street redevelopment.
- 1.4 A new public pedestrian footbridge between Station Road in the South and the Market Street development in the north will reduce severance for existing residents of deprived areas to the south of the station and also provide connectivity for residents of the Market Street redevelopment and town centre uses to the multi-modal interchange to the south of the station.
- 1.5 The proposal will complement the investment being made in delivering electrification of the Berks and Hants line from Newbury to Reading as part of the wider Great Western electrification project.

##### 2. Progress with the scheme

- 2.1. A feasibility study was conducted by WSP / Parsons Brinckerhoff which was completed in October 2015. It examined the opportunities to provide an improved interchange at Newbury Railway Station and considered various options recommending the one that provides the most effective benefits.
- 2.2. A Project Team has been set up which consists of representatives from West Berkshire Council and Great Western Railway (both as scheme promoters) and also involves Network Rail. Other organisations will be involved in the Project Team as required and as the project progresses.
- 2.3. Flooding in and around Newbury Railway Station is a significant problem. The Project Team needs to be confident that there are plans in place to reduce or solve this problem before work is commissioned to improve the Station as part of this scheme. As a result the Project Team has linked with a newly set up group which is looking to address the flooding issues and come up with short, medium and long term proposals that will significantly improve the situation. This group is Chaired by Thames Water and involved GWR, NR and WBC.
- 2.4. An Options Assessment Report has been prepared and sent to WYG as the first stage of the Full Business Case assessment.
- 2.5. The Market Street housing development with which this scheme closely links was approved by the Council's Planning Committee in November 2016 and the S106 agreement is being finalised.
- 2.6. The scheme is awaiting Programme Entry status following the announcement on Growth Deal 3 and pending a decision from the Berkshire Local Transport Body.

### 3. Funding

3.1. The following table sets out the funding for the scheme on the basis of provisional funding allocations. The profile is yet to be confirmed for expenditure for this scheme.

Source of funding	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/2021	Total
Amount from LEP Local Growth Deal			3,630,000*	2,421,000*		6,051,000
<b>Local contributions from:</b>						
GWR (SCPF)			1,890,000			1,890,000
GWR(NSIP)			125,000	125,000		250,000
Network Rail		2,500,000				2,500,000
Section 106 Agreements / CIL			225,000	225,000		450,000
Market Street Development (Grainger)			2,610,000	1,400,000		4,010,000
- Other sources (ATOC)		26,000				26,000
<b>Total Scheme Cost</b>		<b>2,826,000</b>	<b>8,480,000</b>	<b>4,171,000</b>		<b>15,177,000</b>

\*Provisional profile, awaiting confirmation

### 4. Risks

4.1. The key risks on delivering this Programme Entry scheme and how they will be managed are set out in the table below:

Risk	Management of risk
Delay / inability to secure Network Rail maintenance depot relocation.	Network Rail has provided a letter of support for the proposal including provision of its professional services to secure the scheme. The maintenance depot area is proposed for car parking, subject to relocation of the access to this area and acceptance of reduced parking, it would be possible to implement the remainder of the scheme without this area. Network Rail is already progressing a maintenance depot rationalisation investigation for this area.
Difficulty in achieving foot bridge connectivity with proposed Market Street multi-storey and station footbridge.	Grainger (the developer for the Market Street development) has provided a letter of support. The initial WSP designs currently drawn-up consider the currently designed position of the multi-storey and permitted position of the new station foot bridge. These relate well, and clearance to Network Rail infrastructure has been shown to be greater than that required by Network Rail for operational and maintenance purposes. All levels, clearances, tolerances, structural ability for connection etc. will be checked throughout the detailed design process and kept as an ongoing item on the Risk Register.
Changes to funding for bus services may reduce the number of buses likely to use the interchange.	The current design drawn up by WSP closely aligns to the current demand for bus services with relatively little spare capacity. Any reduction in bus services would simply provide more tolerance for changes in bus timings, alternative services etc.
Timing of Market Street development: The timing of the Market Street development to the north of the station will determine: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the need for the interchange with buses (when the current bus station moves to the Wharf);</li> <li>the time at which the proposed footbridge</li> </ul>	A planning application for the proposed bus interchange at The Wharf has been approved and it is proposed to begin construction by Autumn 2017. The Market Street scheme has been approved by the planning committee and the S106 is being negotiated. Grainger's draft programme of works includes construction of the multi-storey car park as an early

<p>can be connected to the new multi-storey;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the timing of funding from Market Street CIL or S106 contributions.</li> </ul>	<p>development operation, giving confidence that this will be complete by the time the footbridge is ready for construction.</p> <p>Grainger holds regular meetings with West Berkshire Council, Network Rail and Great Western Railway.</p>
<p>Withdrawal of Vodafone buses to another location.</p>	<p>Vodafone have Travel Plan commitments to operate their bus services and links to Newbury Station form a key part of ensuring that staff travel by sustainable modes, avoiding breaching planning conditions in relation to car parking on their site.</p> <p>Vodafone are currently re-committing to this bus service through Reading Buses for the next few years.</p> <p>In the very unlikely event that Vodafone buses were routed elsewhere, the stops anticipated for Vodafone buses could be re-used for College shuttle, taxis, parking, drop-off/pick-up on another relevant purpose for the interchange at low cost.</p>
<p>Cost escalation</p>	<p>Investigation works will continue in-house at West Berkshire Council and in conjunction with the Market Street developers (Grainger), Network Rail and Great Western Railway to ensure that as many factors as possible can be considered to reduce the likelihood and severity of cost escalation. This will include: consideration of utilities; consideration of GWR building fabric; obtaining as much detail as possible about Network Rail's proposed new footbridge and Grainger's proposed multi-storey car park; liaison will stakeholders including WBC asset management, WBC car parking, taxi-operators, bus operators etc.</p> <p>One initial element will be a detailed feasibility of the public access bridge over the railway as this is the part of the scheme which is likely to be vulnerable to escalating costs due to the complexity of design and delivery.</p>
<p>Buried services / utilities</p>	<p>A full search of utilities across the whole scheme area will be undertaken prior to detailed design work being undertaken to ensure that the design can mitigate against the need to divert or relocate services.</p> <p>Some initial utilities searches have already been undertaken by West Berkshire Council. These indicate that there are no significant utilities issues which are likely to prevent the project from proceeding as planned or which cannot be accommodated in the design.</p>
<p>GWR/NR building fabric and asbestos</p>	<p>The re-working, demolition and replacement of buildings and structures on the station owned and managed by GWR/NR may detect the presence of asbestos. Accordingly, all building fabric will be examined prior to undertaking works and suitable certified contractors will be used to undertake the works and remove asbestos appropriately should it be discovered.</p>
<p>Surface water drainage</p>	<p>Whilst it is accepted that Newbury station is low-lying and has flooded in the past, much of the existing area for the scheme is already hard-surfaced. Any new areas for surfacing will require SUDS principles to be applied. Any re-working of existing hard-surfaced areas may give the opportunity to introduce SUDS or other drainage improvement measures to provide an overall betterment over the existing situation. The Project Team are will also work closely with a group set up to address the flooding issues at the station.</p>
<p>Timing of Sandleford development will affect the demand for Sandleford bus services and the timing of CIL/S106 contributions.</p>	<p>The timing of bus services for Sandleford will have negligible impact on the proposed interchange design.</p> <p>The timing of contributions could require West Berkshire Council to bridge the timing of contributions to ensure that the scheme can be delivered in the required time frame. The Project Team is well linked to the Council's Officers working on the Sandleford Housing Site so will be aware of the challenges of timing.</p>

## 5. Programme

Task	January 2017 Timescale	March 2017 Timescale (where different)
Programme Entry Status	March 2017	
Independent Assessment of FBC	September / October 2017 (provisional)	
Financial Approval from LTB	November 2017 (provisional)	
Feasibility work	Second Phase Feb –May 2017	
Acquisition of statutory powers	Tbc	
Detailed design	Tbc	
Procurement	Tbc	
Start of construction	Tbc	
Completion of construction	Tbc	
One year on evaluation	Tbc	
Five years on evaluation	Tbc	

## 6. Growth Deal Reporting Framework

6.1. The following table is an extract from the Growth Deal reporting matrix. The entries made here will be reported on a project by project basis. *To be completed*

Growth Deal Schemes:	Transport scheme	
<b>Thames Valley Berkshire LEP</b>	<b>2.24 Newbury – Railway Station Improvement</b>	<b>March 2017</b>
<b>1. Core Metrics</b>	<b>Planning Numbers</b>	<b>Actual to date</b>
<b>Inputs</b>		
Expenditure		
Funding breakdown		
Local Growth Deal		
s.106 and similar contributions		
Council Capital Programme		
Other		
In-kind resources provided		
<b>Outcomes</b>		
Planned Jobs connected to the intervention		
Commercial floor space constructed (square metres)		
Housing unit starts		
Housing units completed		
<b>2. PROJECT SPECIFIC OUTPUTS AND OUTCOMES - to be collected where relevant to the intervention</b>		
<b>Transport</b>		
<b>Outputs</b>		
Total length of resurfaced roads		
Total length of newly built roads		
Total length of new cycle ways		
Total length of new footways		
Type of service improvement		



<b>Outcomes</b>		
Follow on investment at site		
Commercial floor space occupied		
Commercial rental values		

<b>3. ADDITIONAL MONITORING - for specific schemes</b>		
Transport - to be collected for all projects/programmes <b>involving more than £5m public funding</b> and where these metrics and the collection points are relevant to the intervention		
Average daily traffic and by peak/non-peak periods		
Average AM and PM peak journey time per mile on key routes (journey time measurement)		
Average AM and PM peak journey time on key routes (journey time measurement)		
Day-to-day travel time variability		
Average annual CO2 emissions		
Accident rate		
Casualty rate		
Nitrogen Oxide and particulate emissions		
Traffic noise levels at receptor locations		
Annual average daily and peak hour passenger boardings		
Bus/light rail travel time by peak period		
Mode share (%)		
Pedestrians counts on new/existing routes (#)		
Cycle journeys on new/existing routes (#)		
Households with access to specific sites by mode within threshold times (#)		

## 7. Further Information for Summary Reports

The Newbury Station Improvements will enhance and improve multi-modal transport interchange at Newbury Railway station including upgrade and improvement of station buildings. Programme Entry due March 2017. Start on site due Summer 2018 and due to complete March 2020. First Growth Fund payment due March 2019.

This page is intentionally left blank

Berkshire Local Transport Body – 16 March 2017

2.26 Wokingham: Winnersh Relief Road (Phase 2)

Highlights of progress
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preliminary designs have been completed to assess the feasibility of the scheme</li> <li>• More detail design work is being prepared, including access, construction methodologies and ground conditions etc.</li> <li>• Planning process to completed during 2017</li> <li>• More information regarding design work will be available in coming reports</li> </ul>

**1. The Scheme**

- 1.1. The full project will deliver a new relief road to the west of Winnersh, avoiding the current Winnersh Crossroads junction.
- 1.2. The work will be delivered in two phases. The first phase is currently under construction and being delivered by a Bovis / Persimmon.
- 1.3. The second phase will be delivered by Wokingham Borough Council and will provide a new junction on the A329 Reading Road and will dual the section of Lower Earley Way (B3270).

**Figure 1:** Location of Winnersh Relief Road (All Phases) and Lower Earley Way Widening,



- 1.4. The route requires funding to deliver new infrastructure that is essential to facilitate planned housing and economic growth locally.
- 1.5. The full scheme when joined with the Wokingham Northern Distributor Road will offer an alternative route around the centre of Wokingham and avoiding Winnersh Crossroads.

## 2. Progress with the scheme

- 2.1. The BCR for the FULL Winnersh Relief Road scheme is 2.2 (including the funding provide by the developer Bovis). Considering only the elements to be funded from the LEP the BCR rises to 3.3
- 2.2. The route alignment has been agreed and features in a number Wokingham Borough Councils plans such as the Core Strategy and LTP
- 2.3. Planning permission has been granted for Phase 1 of the scheme, this includes the Lower Earley Way junction portion of the scheme as well as the section to be delivered by Bovis Persimmon (including the phase 1 junction on Kings Street Lane)
- 2.4. Lawful Development approval has been granted for phase 2a (dualling of Lower Earley Way) but full planning permission for phase 2b (King Street Lane to Reading Road) will be sort in due course, although all the land needed to deliver phase 2b is already in control of Wokingham Borough Council, this reduces the risks associated with planning applications.
- 2.5. Wokingham Borough Council do not require any further partnership working to complete the scheme and will tendering the scheme in due course to seek maximum value.

## 3. Funding

- 3.1. The following table sets out the funding for the full scheme (includes Phase 1 & Phase 2) on the basis of our unapproved funding profile.

Source of funding	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
Amount from LEP Local Growth Deal			£2,848,000	£2,022,000	£1,390,000	£6,260,000
Private sector contributions(Developer delivery of Phase 1)		£6,500,000				£6,500,000
- Other sources	£438,000	-		-	-	£438,000
<b>Total Scheme Cost</b>	<b>£438,000</b>	<b>£6,825,000</b>	<b>£2,848,000</b>	<b>£2,022,000</b>	<b>£1,390,418</b>	<b>£13,198,000</b>

## 4. Risks

- 4.1. The key risks on delivering this Programme Entry scheme and how they will be managed are set out in the table below:

Risk	Management of risk
Design & Delivery	Project will be managed and designed by Wokingham Borough Council and this will reduce the risk of delivering the junctions as issues can be internalised.
Developer fails to finish Phase 1 to time and satisfaction	Developer's progress is being over seen by Wokingham Borough Council including the delivery against agreed plans.
Flooding	The land on which the relief road is being constructed, floods, but that has been mitigated by using flood analysis data and the associated construction techniques.
Political support	There is strong political support for the scheme as its seen as part of wider package of measures to support the growth of Wokingham Borough
Land ownership	Land constraints identified, elements of land within local authority ownership.

## 5. Programme

- 5.1. Design work for phase 2 has been undertaken to preliminary stage.
- 5.2. Public consultation will also take place during 2017 leading to the submission of a planning application for phase 2b

- 5.3. Planning will be secured in late 2017 to ensure that the risks to scheme delivery are minimised
- 5.4. Planning will require a number of studies such as Environmental Impact Assessment and review of the flood model.
- 5.5. Detailed design will be completed in 2018 with essential programme elements such as procurement and construction methodologies being finalised during 2018 in preparation for onsite works to commence.
- 5.6. Scheme should be open to the public in 2020.

Task	Original Timescale	March 2017 Timescale (where changed)
Programme Entry Status	March 2017	
Independent Assessment of FBC	Spring 2018	
Financial Approval from LTB	July 2018	
Feasibility work	Complete. (2015-2016)	
Acquisition of statutory powers	November 2017	
Detailed design	May 2018	
Procurement	November 2018	
Start of construction	January 2019	
Completion of construction	August 2020	
One year on evaluation	2021	
Five years on evaluation	2025	

## 6. Growth Deal Reporting Framework

- 6.1. The following table is an extract from the Growth Deal reporting matrix. The entries made here will be reported on a project by project basis.

Growth Deal Schemes:	Transport scheme	
	2.26 Wokingham: Winnersh Relief Road	March 2017
Thames Valley Berkshire LEP	Planning Numbers	Actual to date
<b>1. Core Metrics</b>		
<b>Inputs</b>		
Expenditure		
Funding breakdown		
Local Growth Deal		
s.106 and similar contributions	-	
Council Capital Programmes		
Other	-	
In-kind resources provided	Estimate required	
<b>Outcomes</b>		
Planned Jobs connected to the intervention	-	
Commercial floor space constructed (square metres)	-	
Housing unit starts	-	
Housing units completed	-	

<b>2. PROJECT SPECIFIC OUTPUTS AND OUTCOMES - to be collected where relevant to the intervention</b>		
<b>Transport</b>		
<b>Outputs</b>		
Total length of resurfaced roads	Estimate required	
Total length of newly built roads	Estimate required	
Total length of new cycle ways	Estimate required	
Type of infrastructure	Estimate required	
Type of service improvement	Estimate required	
<b>Outcomes</b>		
Follow on investment at site	Estimate required	
Commercial floor space occupied	Estimate required	
Commercial rental values	Estimate required	

<b>3. ADDITIONAL MONITORING - for specific schemes</b>		
Transport - to be collected for all projects/programmes <b>involving more than £5m public funding</b> and where these metrics and the collection points are relevant to the intervention		
Average daily traffic and by peak/non peak periods		
Average AM and PM peak journey time per mile on key routes (journey time measurement)		
Average AM and PM peak journey time on key routes (journey time measurement)		
Day-to-day travel time variability		
Average annual CO2 emissions		
Accident rate		
Casualty rate		
Nitrogen Oxide and particulate emissions		
Traffic noise levels at receptor locations		
Annual average daily and peak hour passenger boardings		
Bus/light rail travel time by peak period		
Mode share (%)		
Pedestrians counts on new/existing routes (#)		
Cycle journeys on new/existing routes (#)		
Households with access to specific sites by mode within threshold times (#)		

## 7. Further Information for Summary Reports

A new relief road to the west of Winnersh, avoiding the current Winnersh Crossroads junction and completing the developer-funded Phase 1. Programme Entry due March 2017. The scheme is due on site in January 2019 with completion in August 2020. The first Growth Fund payment is due in March 2019.

Berkshire Local Transport Body – 16 March 2017

2.27 Maidenhead Town Centre: Missing Links

Highlights of progress
The selection process for appointing joint venture partners for the town centre development areas is underway.
Suppliers have been invited to provide costed proposals for an upgraded pedestrian / cycle bridge link to Town Moor.

**1. The Scheme**

- 1.1 The purpose of this scheme is to complete the ‘missing links’ between planned major development areas in and around Maidenhead and to improve their connectivity to the town centre and surrounding residential areas and local facilities.
- 1.2 A new ‘inner-ring’ is proposed for pedestrians and cyclists, which will be tied into new / enhanced crossings over the A4, including a pedestrian / cycle bridge. The routes will tie into the infill public realm areas in the town, which will in turn trigger a review of the core town centre road network.

**2. Progress with the scheme**

- 2.1. The project directly supports and strengthens the regeneration plans for Maidenhead. The Maidenhead Town Centre Area Action Plan sets a clear vision for economic growth, designating six ‘opportunity areas’ for regeneration, including: Maidenhead Station; Broadway; West Street; Chapel Arches; York Road; and Stafferton Way. Since then, a further two major development sites have been identified, namely St Clouds Way to the north of the A4 and Reform Road to the east of the town centre.
- 2.2. Cumulatively, this regeneration will result in:
  - Up to 4,870 new dwellings
  - Over 65,000 m<sup>2</sup> of new office space
  - An enhanced retail offer
  - An improved leisure offer, with new cafes and restaurants
  - Public realm enhancements
- 2.3. These will be in addition to the recent developments at Boulter’s Meadow and Kidwells Park to the north of the town centre. It is important to ensure that all new development is integrated with the wider town centre and the surrounding urban area, with continuity in public realm and high quality walking and cycling networks.
- 2.4. The Maidenhead Waterways project is integral to the regeneration of the town centre – restoring and enlarging the waterways that run through the town centre. When complete, this will allow continuous navigation by small boats. It will also enhance the setting of the Chapel Arches development. In addition, the towpaths will provide a valuable recreation resource, and will improve access to the town centre for pedestrians and cyclists. In order to be effective these towpaths will need to be linked to wider walking and cycling networks.
- 2.5. Aspirations for continuous and cohesive walking and cycling networks and public realm cannot be delivered by these developments alone. If walking and cycling access is left solely to the developers of each Opportunity Area, then financial and land constraints will lead to disjointed and incomplete networks serving individual developments rather than the wider town centre and North Maidenhead area.
- 2.6. The Maidenhead Town Centre Area Action Plan identifies the need to enhance entrance points into the town centre with high quality public realm. It also includes an objective to improve the quality of existing public spaces, with a specific focus on the train station, High Street, King Street and Queen Street. Some sections will be delivered as part of the regeneration of the Opportunity Sites, but gaps will remain.
- 2.7. The Royal Borough has also developed a draft Cycling Strategy, which identifies an ‘inner ring’ route, which will connect the major development sites and link them to employment and

retail opportunities in Maidenhead town centre and Maidenhead Station. The ring will also improve links to surrounding residential areas and the Waterway towpaths. This will help to increase the proportion of local trips made on foot and by bike, delivering congestion and air quality benefits.

- 2.8. Some sections of the 'inner ring' will be provided as part of the regeneration of the Opportunity Areas and as part of the Station Interchange Scheme. These include: remodelling of the King Street / Queen Street / A308 junction to improve pedestrian / cycle crossings; and provision of a new link through the St Clouds Way site. Additional works are required to join up these disparate links, including a new bridge link across the A4 between West Street and Kidwells Park and replacing the existing footbridge over Strand Water with a new shared use facility.
- 2.9. The regeneration activity will also impact on traffic flows around the town centre, prompting a review of the of the existing road network, including directional flow, changes in terms of one / two way operation and changes to the pedestrianised areas / public open space.
- 2.10. The project steering group has been established with the project inception meeting taking place on 13 January 2017.
- 2.11. The council has invited potential joint venture partners to submit proposals for the regeneration of four major development sites, including: West Street; St Cloud Way; York Road; and Reform Road. Shortlisted developers were subsequently invited to present their proposals for the West Street and St Cloud Way sites over two dates at the end of January. The proposals included improvements to pedestrian and cycle access to and through the sites, including a new bridge link over the A4 between West Street and Kidwells Park. The proposals are currently being assessed and will go to Cabinet Regeneration Sub-Committee for noting on 16 March and to Council for approval on 30 March. Frameworks will then be developed over the following couple of months.
- 2.12. Suppliers have been invited to provide costed proposals for an upgraded bridge link between Holmanleaze and Town Moor. The existing pedestrian bridge will be replaced with a shared use pedestrian / cycle bridge, which will improve cycle access to the town centre and the proposed St Cloud Way development site from North Maidenhead.

### 3. Funding

- 3.1. The following table sets out the funding for the scheme on the basis of our unapproved funding profile. The Royal Borough may wish to take the opportunity to review the profile to ensure that it is realistic given the delay in confirming the Growth Deal Settlement.

Source of funding	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
Amount from LEP Local Growth Deal	-	£313,000	£409,000	£326,000	£2,000,000	£3,048,000
Local contributions from .....						
•Section 106 agreements	-	-	£250,000	£250,000	£500,000	£1,000,000
•Council Capital Programme	-	-	£100,000	£200,000	£405,000	£705,000
•Other sources	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total Scheme Cost</b>						<b>£4,753,000</b>

### 4. Risks

- 4.1. The key risks on delivering this Programme Entry scheme and how they will be managed are set out in the table below:

Risk	Management of risk
Construction Cost Increase	Scheme design and material specs will need to be amended to reduce project costs or the Council will need to provide additional funding
Planning Consent	If the A4 bridge scheme were to not receive planning consent then a key



	section of the scheme would be missing. Subject to the reasons for refusal there may be scope to resubmit a revised scheme, which will add delay and cost. Seeking consent earlier than required would limit the risk or highlight issues at a much earlier stage to allow time for mitigation.
Cost of Utilities Protection/Diversion	Early engagement with the utility companies and knowledge of their requirements and locations is key to seeking to reduce this risk
Land Ownership	Although the majority of the scheme is within public highway land or RBWM property, there is always a risk that small sections of private land may impact on the buildability of the scheme. The Council will seek records and legal deeds during design stage and clarify their impact on the scheme and redesign accordingly to limit any need for 3rd party land.
Ecological	Where the 'Inner Ring' crosses the waterways, park or moorland, the ecology of these areas may be impacted by the scheme and suitable measures may be needed to mitigate the impact. Early investigation is key to removing the need for mitigation or seeking cost effective measures to address any issues.

## 5. Programme

Task	Original Timescale	March 2017 Timescale (where changed)
Programme Entry Status	January 2017	-
Feasibility / outline design	April 2017	-
Detailed design	July 2017	-
Preparation of FBC	September 2017	-
Independent Assessment of FBC	October 2017	-
Financial Approval from LTB	November 2017	-
Procurement	December 2017	-
Start of construction	January 2018	-
Completion of construction	March 2021	-
One year on evaluation	March 2022	-
Five years on evaluation	March 2026	-

## 6. Growth Deal Reporting Framework

6.1. The following table is an extract from the Growth Deal reporting matrix. The entries made here will be reported on a project by project basis.

Growth Deal Schemes:	Transport scheme	
<b>Thames Valley Berkshire LEP</b>	<b>2.27 Maidenhead Town Centre: Missing Links</b>	<b>March 2017</b>
<b>1. Core Metrics</b>	<b>Planning Numbers</b>	<b>Actual to date</b>
<b>Inputs</b>		
Expenditure	£4,753,342	£0
Funding breakdown		
Local Growth Deal	£3,048,342	£0
s.106 and similar contributions	£1,000,000	£0
Council Capital Programme	£705,000	£0
Other	-	-
In-kind resources provided	£150,000	£2,000
<b>Outcomes</b>		
Planned Jobs connected to the intervention	8,000	0
Commercial floor Space constructed (square metres)	65,404	0
Housing unit starts	1,986	0
Housing units completed	2,884	0
<b>2. PROJECT SPECIFIC OUTPUTS AND OUTCOMES - to be collected where relevant to</b>		

<b>the intervention</b>		
<b>Transport</b>		
<b>Outputs</b>		
Total length of resurfaced roads	0.33	0
Total length of newly built roads	0	0
Total length of new cycle ways	0.8	0
Type of infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New pedestrian / cycle bridge across the A4</li> <li>• Replacement pedestrian / cycle bridge to Town Moor</li> </ul>	
Type of service improvement		
<b>Outcomes</b>		
Follow on investment at site	tbc*	-
Commercial floor space occupied	3,637	-
Commercial rental values	tbc*	-

\* Numbers will be determined as part of feasibility work

## 7. Further Information for Summary Reports

A central Maidenhead 'inner-ring' is proposed for pedestrians and cyclists, which will be tied into enhanced crossings over the A4, including a pedestrian and cycle bridge. Programme Entry due March 2017. The scheme is due on site in January 2018 with completion in March 2021. The first Growth Fund payment is due in March 2018.

**Berkshire Local Transport Body – 16 March 2017**

**2.28 Bracknell – A3095 Corridor Improvements**

<b>Highlights of progress since November 2016</b>
Concept scheme developed and economic assessment carried out in early 2016. Combined BCR for all improvements along the corridor is 4.0.

**1. The Scheme**

1.1. This project delivers significant improvements to one of the key highway corridors in the Thames Valley Berkshire. The project will significantly help in terms of accommodating movements and reducing congestion between the M4 (J8/9/10) and M3 (J4) and between Maidenhead, Reading, Wokingham, Bracknell, and Camberley/Blackwater Valley and beyond. This work would also assist in unlocking housing delivery at TRL and Broadmoor that will provide 1415 new houses and enhance urban connectivity.

**2. Progress with the scheme**

- 2.1. Options appraised and final designs set and assessed on economic impacts
- 2.2. Modelling shows improved journey times and a positive BCR of 4.0
- 2.3. The project will be supported by local contributions from nearby developments including TRL

**3. Funding**

3.1. The following table sets out the funding for the scheme

<b>Source of funding</b>	<b>2015/16</b>	<b>2016/17</b>	<b>2017/18</b>	<b>2018/19</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>Total</b>
Amount from LEP Local Growth Deal	-	-	-	-	£2,000,000	£3,518,800	£5,518,800
Local contributions from .....							
- Section 106 agreements	-	-	-	-	-	£2,500,000	£2,500,000
- Council Capital Programme	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
- Other sources	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total Scheme Cost</b>					<b>£2,000,000</b>	<b>£6,018,800</b>	<b>£8,018,800</b>

**4. Risks**

4.1. The key risks on delivering this Programme Entry scheme and how they will be managed are set out in the table below

<b>Risk</b>	<b>Management of risk</b>
That the overall cost of the Coral Reef Junction exceeds the funding available	Detailed Bill of Quantities with effective site and contract management
Statutory undertakers C4 cost estimates significantly exceed C3 cost estimates	Early liaison with statutory undertakers and early commission of C4 estimates (underway)
Highway Works in neighbouring area during construction leading to traffic congestion and possible impact on programme and costs	Liaison with neighbouring authorities and agreement re. programme
Unexpected need for additional Temporary Traffic Management increasing costs	Liaison with Traffic Management Section and early quantification of TM requirements and costs (underway)

## 5. Programme

Task	Original Timescale	March 2017 timescale (where changed)
Programme Entry Status	January 2017	
Independent Assessment of FBC	April 2017	
Financial Approval from LTB	July 2017	
Feasibility work	April 2016	
Acquisition of statutory powers	None required	
Detailed design		
Procurement	Term contractor	
Start of construction	April 2019	
Completion of construction	November 2021	
One year on evaluation	November 2022	
Five years on evaluation	November 2026	

## 6. Growth Deal Reporting Framework

6.1. The following table is an extract from the Growth Deal reporting matrix. The entries made here will be reported on a project by project basis.

Growth Deal Schemes:	Transport scheme	
Thames Valley Berkshire LEP	2.28 Bracknell A3095 Corridor improvements	March 2017
<b>1. Core Metrics</b>	<b>Planning Numbers</b>	<b>Actual to date</b>
<b>Inputs</b>		
Expenditure	£8,018,800	
Funding breakdown		
Local Growth Deal	£5,518,800	
s.106 and similar contributions	£2,500,000	
Council Capital Programme		
Other	-	
In-kind resources provided		£15,000
<b>Outcomes</b>		
Planned Jobs connected to the intervention	0	
Commercial floorspace constructed (square metres)	0	
Housing unit starts	1000	
Housing units completed	1000	
<b>2. PROJECT SPECIFIC OUTPUTS AND OUTCOMES - to be collected where relevant to the intervention</b>		
<b>Transport</b>		
<b>Outputs</b>		
Total length of resurfaced roads	Approximately 2500 m of resurfacing	
Total length of newly built roads	Approximately 5700m following removal of the roundabout and realignment of the carriageway.	
Total length of new cycle ways	Existing cycleway network runs adjacent to the	

	junction and is unaffected by the works	
Type of infrastructure	Replacement of existing roundabout with new signalised junction	
Type of service improvement	Improvement to journey times following removal of an existing pinch point on the network.	Assessment to be carried out at least 12 months after completion in accordance with DfT guidance.
<b>Outcomes</b>		
Follow on investment at site	0	
Commercial floorspace occupied	0	
Commercial rental values	0	
<b>3. ADDITIONAL MONITORING - for specific schemes</b>		
Transport - to be collected for all projects/programmes <b>involving more than £5m public funding</b> and where these metrics and the collection points are relevant to the intervention		
Average daily traffic and by peak/non-peak periods		
Average AM and PM peak journey time per mile on key routes (journey time measurement)		
Average AM and PM peak journey time on key routes (journey time measurement)		
Day-to-day travel time variability		
Average annual CO <sub>2</sub> emissions		
Accident rate		
Casualty rate		
Nitrogen Oxide and particulate emissions		
Traffic noise levels at receptor locations		
Annual average daily and peak hour passenger boardings		
Bus/light rail travel time by peak period		
Mode share (%)		
Pedestrians counts on new/existing routes (#)		
Cycle journeys on new/existing routes (#)		
Households with access to specific sites by mode within threshold times (#)		

## 7. Further Information for Summary Reports

The scheme enhances through-routes and helps unlock housing delivery at TRL and Broadmoor that will provide 1415 new houses. Programme Entry due March 2017. The scheme is due on site in April 2019 with completion in November 2021. The first Growth Fund payment is due in March 2020.

This page is intentionally left blank

Berkshire Local Transport Body – 16 March 2017

2.01 Newbury: Kings Road Link Road

Highlights of progress since November 2016
Demolition and preparation works are progressing well on site. Network Rail bridge replacement programme is complete and the new bridge is open to traffic.

**1. The Scheme**

1.1. The scheme is the delivery of the Kings Road Link Road in Newbury. It is a new direct link between the Hambridge Road industrial area and the A339 to support housing delivery and significantly improve access to a key employment area.

**2. Progress with the scheme**

- 2.1. The Western Area Planning Committee recommended approval for the scheme on 18th March 2015 and referred it to the District Planning Committee (DPC) for final decision. The DPC considered the planning application on 25th March 2015 and granted approval.
- 2.2. Work on site started on 24<sup>th</sup> October 2016. The delay in starting on site has been partly due to the time taken to satisfy the planning pre-commencement conditions and some difficulties in gathering sufficient survey information relating to buildings that were, in part, hazardous to access.
- 2.3. Network Rail has completed the work to replace the rail bridge adjacent to the redevelopment site. The new bridge was open to traffic at the end of January 2017 following the 12-month replacement programme. Initially there is a traffic light controlled single lane system operating until the redevelopment of the industrial estate is complete and the northern approach to the bridge has been widened. Then the bridge will operate with two lanes and the traffic lights will be removed. This will have a great benefit to the transport network in this area.

**3. Funding**

3.1. The table below sets out the proposed funding profile for the scheme.

Source of funding	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
Amount from LEP Local Growth Deal	-	1,340,000	1,000,000	-	-	-	2,340,000
Local contributions from .....							
- Section 106 agreements	230,000	270,000	-	-	-	-	500,000
- Council Capital Programme	140,000	180,000	60,000	-	-	-	380,000
- Other sources	1,010,000	600,000	-	-	-	-	1,610,000
<b>Total Scheme Cost</b>	<b>1,380,000</b>	<b>2,390,000</b>	<b>1,060,000</b>				<b>4,830,000</b>

**4. Risks**

4.1. The key risks on delivering this Programme Entry scheme and how they will be managed are set out in the table below

Risk	Management of risk
Delivery of scheme being delayed and not fitting with BLTB funding.	A legal agreement will secure the delivery of the scheme within the required timescales. Ongoing discussions with the developer and regular project meeting updates.

Escalating costs	Ongoing assessment of costs as further details of the scheme are developed. Opportunities being explored for any additional funding sources. Legal agreement sets out a maximum sum available to the Developer for the delivery of the road.
------------------	--

## 5. Programme

Task	November 2014 Timescale	March 2017 Timescale (where changed)
Programme Entry Status	14 July 2013	
Independent Assessment of FBC	October 2014	
Financial Approval from LTB	Due November 2014	approval granted 9 March
Acquisition of statutory powers	Planning Permission due November 2014	Planning approval granted March 2015
Detailed design	Complete by February 2016	
Procurement	March / April 2016	
Start of construction	May 2016	October 2016
Completion of construction	November 2017	March 2019
One year on evaluation	November 2018	March 2020
Five years on evaluation	November 2022	March 2024

## 6. Growth Deal Reporting Framework

- 6.1. The following table is an extract from the Growth Deal reporting matrix. The entries made here will be reported on a project by project basis.

Growth Deal Schemes:	Transport scheme	
Thames Valley Berkshire LEP	2.01 Newbury Kings Road Link Road	March 2017
1. Core Metrics	Planning Numbers	Actual to date
<b>Inputs</b>		
Expenditure	£4,830,000	
Funding breakdown		
Local Growth Deal	£2,340,000	
s.106 and similar contributions	£2,110,000	£67,000
Council Capital Programme	£380,000	6,000
Other	-	
In-kind resources provided	£20,000	£10,000
<b>Outcomes</b>		
Planned Jobs connected to the intervention	150	
Commercial floor space constructed (square metres)	-	
Housing unit starts	177	
Housing units completed	177	
<b>2. PROJECT SPECIFIC OUTPUTS AND OUTCOMES - to be collected where relevant to the intervention</b>		



<b>Transport</b>		
<b>Outputs</b>		
Total length of resurfaced roads	n/a	
Total length of newly built roads	230 metres	
Total length of new cycle ways	n/a	
Type of infrastructure	Highway	
Type of service improvement	New road link in key town centre location	
<b>Outcomes</b>		
Follow on investment at site	n/a	
Commercial floor space occupied	n/a	
Commercial rental values	n/a	

## 7. Further Information for Summary Reports

The road will support housing delivery and significantly improve access to a key employment area. The scheme went on site in October 2016 and the demolition and preparation works are progressing well. The first Growth Deal payment is due in March 2017.

Berkshire Local Transport Body – 16 March 2017

2.02 Bracknell – Warfield Link Road

Highlights of progress since November 2016
The construction of the road began in Feb 15 and is on programme
303 housing starts to date, with 69 of those completed

1. The Scheme

1.1. The project involves building a road to unlock a Strategic Development Location in Bracknell Forest (for 2,200 new dwellings, schools, neighbourhood centre, open space, SANGs and other infrastructure and facilities). The link road crosses the middle of the site and will serve as access for many of the development parcels. One of the developers for approximately 1/3<sup>rd</sup> of the development for the benefit of the whole development intends to build the road. However, the development is currently experiencing viability problems as a result. The construction of the link road is essential to achieve an early start on-site because it provides access benefits to housing parcels for the developer and other 3<sup>rd</sup> party sites within the wider Warfield development; and access to a new primary school which has to be also built early to allow the development to proceed.

2. Progress with the scheme

- 2.1. Following independent assessment approval the scheme has started on site and progressing well
- 2.2. The scheme is being delivered in partnership with the developer, who are a majority land owner. The scheme remains on programme
- 2.3. In Sept 2016 the first part of the road was opened up to allow access to the new school which serves the development site and surrounding area.

3. Funding

3.1. The following table sets out the funding for the scheme

Source of funding	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
Amount from LEP Local Growth Deal	3,500,000	-	-	-	-	-	3,500,000
Local contributions from .....							
- Section 106 agreements	-	1,700,000	-	-	-	-	1,700,000
- Council Capital Programme	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
- Other sources	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total Scheme Cost</b>	<b>3,500,000</b>	<b>1,700,000</b>					<b>5,200,000</b>

4. Risks

4.1. The key risks on delivering this Programme Entry scheme and how they will be managed are set out in the table below

Risk	Management of risk
1 That the overall cost of the link road exceeds the funding available	Detailed BOQ with Effective Site and contract management
2 Statutory undertakers C4 cost estimates significantly exceed C3 cost estimates	Liaise with statutory undertakers and early commission of C4 estimates
3 A delay on the development impacting on the need for the road and delaying the programme	Liaison with developers and review agreement re programme

4 Unexpected need for additional Temporary Traffic Management increasing costs	Liaison with Traffic Management section and early quantification of TM cost
5 Slower construction of the road due to physical constraints	Early engagement and partnership working with key interested parties such as the environment agency.

## 5. Programme

Task	November 2014 Timescale	March 2017 Timescale (where changed)
Programme Entry Status	24 July 2014	
Independent Assessment of FBC	Due October 2014	
Financial Approval from LTB	Due November 2014	Jan 2015
Feasibility work	complete	
Acquisition of statutory powers	Not needed	
Detailed design	March 2015	Jan 2015
Procurement	Developer s278 agreement	
Start of construction	April 2015	Feb 2015
Completion of construction	March 2017	
One year on evaluation	March 2018	
Five years on evaluation	March 2022	

## 6. Growth Deal Reporting Framework

- 6.1. The following table is an extract from the Growth Deal reporting matrix. The entries made here will be reported on a project by project basis.

Growth Deal Schemes:	Transport scheme	
Thames Valley Berkshire LEP	2.02 Bracknell – Warfield Link Road	March 2017
1. Core Metrics	Planning Numbers	Actual to date
<b>Inputs</b>		
Expenditure	£5,200,000	
Funding breakdown		
Local Growth Deal	£3,500,000	£3,500,000
s.106 and similar contributions	£1,700,000	
Council Capital Programme	-	
Other	-	
In-kind resources provided		£30,000
<b>Outcomes</b>		
Planned Jobs connected to the intervention	0	
Commercial floor space constructed (square metres)	0	
Housing unit starts	750	303
Housing units completed	2200	69
<b>2. PROJECT SPECIFIC OUTPUTS AND OUTCOMES - to be collected where relevant to the intervention</b>		
<b>Transport</b>		
<b>Outputs</b>		

Total length of resurfaced roads	Approximately 100m of resurfaced road	Underway
Total length of newly built roads	Approximately 750-1000m of newly built road.	650m
Total length of new cycle ways	Approximately 750-1000m of new cycleways adjacent to proposed link road.	650m
Type of infrastructure	New link road to allow for access to new development	Underway
Type of service improvement	Unlocking proposed development.	
<b>Outcomes</b>		
Follow on investment at site	Not applicable	
Commercial floor space occupied	Not applicable	
Commercial rental values	Not applicable	

## 7. Further Information for Summary Reports

This road unlocks 2,200 new dwellings, schools, neighbourhood centre, etc. Started on site in February 2015, 303 housing starts, 69 completions so far. Completion due March 2017. All Growth Fund payments made.

**Berkshire Local Transport Body – 16 March 2017**

**2.03 Newbury - London Road Industrial Estate**

<b>Highlights of progress since November 2016</b>
Phase 1 of the scheme (A339 widening) is complete. Phase 2 is progressing well and is on track.

**1. The Scheme and Background**

- 1.1. This scheme is a new junction on the A339 in Newbury and associated widening to provide access to the London Road Industrial Estate (LRIE) which will unlock its potential for redevelopment. The scheme will open up a 10-hectare edge of town centre site for redevelopment and employment intensification. The proposal will unlock the potential for additional housing delivery and encourage an extension to the vibrant town centre.
- 1.2. The scheme and the redevelopment of the industrial estate that it will unlock is a long-standing objective within Newbury Vision 2025. This vision document is seen very much as a community project and annual conferences in relation to its delivery are very well attended by all sectors of the Newbury community.
- 1.3. The redevelopment of the industrial estate and the highways scheme are both included in Council plans and documents the latest of which (Housing Site Allocations DPD) has recently completed a consultation and Examination period. Both political parties wish to see the redevelopment of this area which this scheme will enable.
- 1.4. The Council has appointed a development partner (St. Modwen) for the redevelopment project. This is an indication of the commitment of the Council to the wider project and has the full support of the Executive.

**2. Progress with the scheme**

- 2.1. Planning permission was granted for the scheme on 4<sup>th</sup> February 2015.
- 2.2. Financial approval was given for the scheme by the BLTB following confirmation from White Young Green in relation to the supporting Business Case (letter 9<sup>th</sup> March 2015).
- 2.3. Although much of the scheme is within highway land and the LRIE is a Council asset, a parcel of land (within the LRIE) needed for the delivery of the scheme is on a long lease. The Council has successfully acquired this land through negotiation and has avoided the need for a CPO.
- 2.4. Phase 1 which is the widening of the A339 is complete. Phase 2 is progressing well and is on track.
- 2.5. The Council was awarded Challenge Fund money for the A339 and has been able to enhance this scheme as a result and deliver the Challenge Fund objectives at the same time using the same contractor. This means economies of scale can be made in some areas, disruption to the transport network has been concentrated and kept to a minimum by combing the works and more will be delivered as a result. The additional elements as a result of the two schemes being managed together are:
  - Additional resurfacing works
  - Refurbishment of the A339 canal bridge
  - Refurbishment of two culverts under the A339

**3. Funding**

- 3.1. The following table sets out the funding for the road access scheme on the basis of a provisional funding profile. It has been updated to include the amounts spent on the Challenge Fund works which are being managed alongside this project (see 2.5 above).

Source of funding	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
Amount from LEP Local Growth Deal	£500,000	£1,400,000	-	-	-	-	£1,900,000
Local contributions from .....							
- Section 106 agreements	£90,000	-	-	-	-	-	£90,000
- Council Capital Programme	£255,000	£945,000	-	-	-	-	£1,200,000
- Challenge Fund	-	£1,310,000	-	-	-	-	£1,310,000
<b>Total Scheme Cost</b>	<b>£845,000</b>	<b>£3,655,000</b>					<b>£4,500,000</b>

#### 4. Risks

- 4.1. The key risks on delivering this Programme Entry scheme and how they will be managed are set out in the table below

Risk	Management of risk
Escalating costs	Ongoing assessment of costs as further details of the scheme are developed. Opportunities being explored for any additional funding sources. Scheme has been combined with the delivery of a linked scheme using Challenge Fund money so that some economies of scale can be achieved.

#### 5. Programme

Task	November 2014 Timescale	March 2017 Timescale (where changed)
Programme Entry Status	24 July 2014	
Independent Assessment of FBC	October 2014	
Financial Approval from LTB	Due November 2014	Full approval 9 March 2015
Feasibility work	Complete	
Acquisition of statutory powers	Planning due February 2015 CPO as back up to negotiation with lease holder	Planning permission granted 4 February 2015. Authority to proceed with CPO gained July 2015 (now not needed).
Detailed design	trial pits and other investigation underway	Complete
Procurement	Aug 2014 – March 2015	Dec 2014 – September 2015
Start of construction	August 2015	February 2016
Completion of construction	May 2016	March 2017
One year on evaluation	May 2017	March 2018
Five years on evaluation	May 2021	March 2022

#### 6. Growth Deal Reporting Framework

- 6.1. The following table is an extract from the Growth Deal reporting matrix. The entries made here will be reported on a project by project basis.

Growth Deal Schemes:	Transport scheme	
Thames Valley Berkshire LEP	2.03 Newbury - London Road Industrial Estate	March 2017
1. Core Metrics	Planning Numbers	Actual to date
Inputs		
Expenditure	£4,500,000	£3,700,000
Funding breakdown		

Local Growth Deal	£1,900,000	£1,900,000
s.106 and similar contributions	£90,000	£90,000
Council Capital Programme	£1,100,000	£900,000
Other (Challenge Fund)	£1,310,000	£720,000
In-kind resources provided	£100,000	£90,000
<b>Outcomes</b>		
Planned Jobs connected to the intervention	1,000	
Commercial floor space constructed (square metres)	14,000	
Housing unit starts	300	
Housing units completed	300	
<b>2. PROJECT SPECIFIC OUTPUTS AND OUTCOMES - to be collected where relevant to the intervention</b>		
<b>Transport</b>		
<b>Outputs</b>		
Total length of resurfaced roads	400 metres (one lane)	400 metres
Total length of newly built roads	400 metres (one lane) plus 70 metres (2 lanes)	400 metres
Total length of new cycle ways	390 metres	390 metres
Total length of new footways	390 metres	390 metres
Type of service improvement	New access link and associated highway improvements in central town location.	
<b>Outcomes</b>		
Follow on investment at site	Exact amount not yet known but development partner, St Modwen will be investing significantly	
Commercial floor space occupied	14,000 m2	
Commercial rental values	Not yet known	

## 7. Further Information for Summary Reports

This scheme will unlock a 10-hectare town centre industrial estate for redevelopment and employment intensification. The scheme went on site in February 2016 and the widening element is complete. The scheme has attracted additional grant funds and will complete in March 2017. The first Growth Deal payment was made in March 2016.

Berkshire Local Transport Body – 16 March 2017

2.04.2 Wokingham – North Wokingham Distributor Road

Highlights of progress since November 2016
Currently pursuing the option of concentrating the DfT funding, which is currently shared across three schemes, in just one scheme, i.e. Arborfield Cross Relief Road. The consequence is that the developer funding will be concentrated on this scheme, and South Wokingham Relief Road.
The LEP have indicated support for this change, which will have the benefit of producing one full business case for Arborfield, instead of one for each road.
WBC is therefore looking at their current funding contributions to determine if this is possible as it would make the financial approval process much more streamlined. WBC will need to formally agree any change to the funding approach at BLTB before discussing further with the DfT.

**1. The Scheme**

1.1. A new road that will provide access to 1,500 new homes, community facilities and commercial development and form a link around the north of Wokingham town. The development cannot come forward without the road. The road is being delivered in multiply stages :

- (1) Kentwood Farm West (currently on site)
- (2) Kentwood Farm East
- (3) 94 Toutley Road to Twyford Road aka Matthewsgreen Farm (under construction, work started January 2016)
- (4) Keephatch Beech
- (5) Bell Foundry Lane
- (6) Toutley Road section
- (7) A329 Reading Road to Toutley Road

**2. Progress with the scheme**

- 2.1. Feasibility work has been undertaken on a number of route options; the options have all been out to full public consultation and the responses have been analysed.
- 2.2. A consultation report has been considered by the Council Executive which details the public's preferred route. The council has agreed to fund further work as identified in the consultation to undertake further analysis of suggested 'tweaks' to the preferred route.
- 2.3. Work at Kentwood Farm continues which includes the construction of part of the distributor road that passes through the site. The site is expected to be built out (274 houses) by 2018.
- 2.4. Discussions with developers on other sites in North Wokingham continue
- 2.5. Work on the refinement of the North Wokingham Distributor Road Option B has been completed. The preferred route for the road was discussed and a decision made at Council on the 24 September 2015.
- 2.6. The programme for delivery is phased as it is dependent upon development coming forward. Early delivery of the road would encourage developers to bring sites forward and funding for the scheme could potentially then be repaid from s106 / CIL contributions.

**3. Funding**

3.1. The following table sets out the funding for the scheme on the basis of our unapproved funding profile.

Source of funding	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
Amount from LEP Local Growth Deal	-	-	-	-	£3,000,000	£3,100,000	£6,100,000
Local contributions		£1,041,705	£2,919,418	£10,733,803	£463,223	£6,258,113	£23,840,000*



from .....							
- Section 106 agreements	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
- Council Capital Programme	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
- Other sources	£500,000	£4,100,000	£6,323,000	£2,927,000	-	-	£13,850,000
<b>Total Scheme Cost</b>	<b>£500,000</b>	<b>£5,141,705</b>	<b>£9,242,418</b>	<b>£13,660,803</b>	<b>£3,463,223</b>	<b>£9,358,113</b>	<b>£41,366,262**</b>

\*Additional costs post 2020/21- Local Contributions - £2,423,738

\*\*Total Scheme costs estimated at £43,790,000

#### 4. Risks

4.1. The key risks on delivering this Programme Entry scheme and how they will be managed are set out in the table below

Risk	Management of risk
Proposed route is not agreed.	Comprehensive consultation has been completed. The consultation results along with an officer recommendation for the optimal route have been presented to the Council's executive. Further work to refine the route alignment has been started.
Planning permission not being granted for the scheme.	Officers will have detailed pre-application discussions to address any issues of concern early on as part of the detailed design process.
Developments in North Wokingham SDL not progressing as planned	The programme for delivery is phased as it is dependent upon development coming forward. Early delivery of the road would encourage developers to bring sites forward and funding for the scheme could potentially then be repaid from s106 / CIL contributions.

#### 5. Programme

Task	November 2014 Timescale	March 2017 Timescale (where changed)
Programme Entry Status	14 July 2013	
Independent Assessment of FBC	Autumn 2015 at the earliest	Oct 2019
Financial Approval from DfT	Due Late 2015	Late 2019
Feasibility work	Complete – awaiting final approval	
Acquisition of statutory powers	Planning permission required: application due 2015	Sept 2018
Detailed design	Alignment to be approved in June 2015; detailed design to be completed 2016	Dec 2018
Procurement	To follow	Jul 2019
Start of construction	2016	Dec 2019
Completion of construction	2020	Jun 2021
One year on evaluation	2021	2022
Five years on evaluation	2025	2026

#### 6. Growth Deal Reporting Framework

6.1. The following table is an extract from the Growth Deal reporting matrix. The entries made here will be reported on a project by project basis.

<b>Growth Deal Schemes:</b>	<b>Transport scheme</b>	
<b>Thames Valley Berkshire LEP</b>	<b>2.04.2 Wokingham – North Wokingham Distributor Road</b>	<b>March 2017</b>
<b>1. Core Metrics</b>	<b>Planning Numbers</b>	<b>Actual to date</b>
<b>Inputs</b>		
Expenditure	tbc	-
Funding breakdown		
Local Growth Deal	£6,100,000	0
s.106 and similar contributions	tbc	-
Council Capital Programme	tbc	-
Other	-	
In-kind resources provided	Estimate required	
<b>Outcomes</b>		
Planned Jobs connected to the intervention	0	-
Commercial floor space constructed (square metres)	A share of 25,000	-
Housing unit starts	A share of 4,000	-
Housing units completed	A share of 4,000	-
<b>2. PROJECT SPECIFIC OUTPUTS AND OUTCOMES - to be collected where relevant to the intervention</b>		
<b>Transport</b>		
<b>Outputs</b>		
Total length of resurfaced roads	Estimate required	-
Total length of newly built roads	Estimate required	-
Total length of new cycle ways	Estimate required	-
Type of infrastructure	New road	
Type of service improvement	Enabling housing development	
<b>Outcomes</b>		
Follow on investment at site	Estimate required	-
Commercial floor space occupied	Estimate required	-
Commercial rental values	Estimate required	-
<b>3. ADDITIONAL MONITORING - for specific schemes</b>		
Transport - to be collected for all projects/programmes <b>involving more than £5m public funding</b> and where these metrics and the collection points are relevant to the intervention		
Average daily traffic and by peak/non-peak periods	Estimate required	
Average AM and PM peak journey time per mile on key routes (journey time measurement)	Estimate required	
Average AM and PM peak journey time on key routes (journey time measurement)	Estimate required	
Day-to-day travel time variability	Estimate required	
Average annual CO2 emissions	Estimate required	

Accident rate	Estimate required	
Casualty rate	Estimate required	
Nitrogen Oxide and particulate emissions	Estimate required	
Traffic noise levels at receptor locations	Estimate required	
Annual average daily and peak hour passenger boardings	n/a	
Bus/light rail travel time by peak period	n/a	
Mode share (%)	n/a	
Pedestrians counts on new/existing routes (#)	n/a	
Cycle journeys on new/existing routes (#)	n/a	
Households with access to specific sites by mode within threshold times (#)	n/a	

## 7. Further Information for Summary Reports

This road is one of 4 new roads supporting the development of up to 10,000 new dwellings, schools, neighbourhood centre, etc. This is a retained scheme, and assurance framework matters are being managed by the DfT. Due on site in December 2019.

## Berkshire Local Transport Body – 16 March 2017

### 2.04.3 Wokingham – South Wokingham Distributor Road

Highlights of progress since November 2016
Currently pursuing the option of concentrating the DfT funding, which is currently shared across three schemes, in just one scheme, i.e. Arborfield Cross Relief Road. The consequence is that the developer funding will be concentrated on this scheme, and North Wokingham Relief Road.
The LEP have indicated support for this change, which will have the benefit of producing one full business case for Arborfield, instead of one for each road.
WBC is therefore looking at their current funding contributions to determine if this is possible as it would make the financial approval process much more streamlined. WBC will need to formally agree any change to the funding approach at BLTB before discussing further with the DfT.

#### 1. The Scheme

- 1.1. The completed road will provide access to 2,500 new homes, a primary school, community facilities and retail development and form a new link around the south of Wokingham town. The development cannot come forward without the road. The road will be brought forward in 4 stages:
  - (1) Montague Park (on site, being provided by the developer)
  - (2) Eastern Gateway (WBC working with Network Rail, Planning application work has commenced)
  - (3) Spine Road & Western Gateway Phase 1
  - (4) Western Gateway Phase 2

#### 2. Progress with the scheme

- 2.1. Feasibility work has been completed on a number of different route options for the South Wokingham Distributor Road. The first section of the route is already being built through Montague Park (formally Buckhurst Park). The new junction on to the existing A329 is complete and in operation.
- 2.2. A public consultation exercise where the results the feasibility work were presented was undertaken during the summer that ran from the end of June to the end of August.
- 2.3. Discussions are ongoing with developers for the remainder of the development sites in South Wokingham.
- 2.4. Work at Montague Park is continuing. The site is expected to be built out by 2020.
- 2.5. Discussions with developers on other sites in South Wokingham continue.
- 2.6. The results of the feasibility study consultation along with an officer recommendation for the optimal route was presented to the Council's executive in November 2014 and subsequently agreed.
- 2.7. The programme for delivery is phased as it is dependent upon development coming forward. Early delivery of the road would encourage developers to bring sites forward and funding for the scheme could potentially then be repaid from s106 / CIL contributions.
- 2.8. Design work with Network Rail for the provision of a new road bridge over the Waterloo Main line has commenced. This will enable to the delivery of the section of the Distribution Road known as the Eastern Gateway.

#### 3. Funding

- 3.1. The following table sets out the funding for the scheme on the basis of our unapproved funding profile.

Source of funding	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
Amount from LEP Local Growth Deal	-	-	-	-	£4,300,000	-	£4,300,000
Local contributions from .....	£144,209	£1,557,555	£1,693,896	£7,123,012	£7,960,948	£9,737,617	£28,217,237
- Section 106 agreements	-	-	-	-	-	-	
- Council Capital Programme	-	-	-	-	-	-	
- Other sources	£1,957,000		-	-	-	-	£1,957,000-
<b>Total Scheme Cost</b>	<b>£2,101,209</b>	<b>£1,557,555</b>	<b>£1,693,896</b>	<b>£7,123,012</b>	<b>£12,260,948</b>	<b>£9,737,617</b>	<b>£34,474,237**</b>

\*Additional costs post 2020/21- Local Contributions - £127,763

\*\*Total Scheme costs estimated at £36,602,000 (includes £2,000,000 pre. 2-15/16)

#### 4. Risks

4.1. The key risks on delivering this Programme Entry scheme and how they will be managed are set out in the table below

Risk	Management of risk
Proposed route is not agreed.	Comprehensive consultation completed. The consultation along with an officer recommendation for the optimal route will have been presented to the Council's executive and agreed. Risk has been mitigated.
Planning permission not being granted for the scheme.	Officers will have detailed pre-application discussions to address any issues of concern early on as part of the detailed design process.
Developments in South Wokingham SDL not progressing as planned	The programme for delivery is phased as it is dependent upon development coming forward. Early delivery of the road would encourage developers to bring sites forward and funding for the scheme could potentially then be repaid from s106 / CIL contributions.
Developers failing to reach an agreement with Network Rail on the delivery of a new bridge over the railway.	Officers are meeting with the development consortium to maintain momentum and to be aware of issues arising.

#### 5. Programme

Task	November 2014 Timescale	March 2017 Timescale (where changed)
Programme Entry Status	14 July 2013	
Independent Assessment of FBC	due March 2016 at the earliest and not before 2.04.2 North Wokingham DR	TBC.
Financial Approval from LTB	due July 2016	TBC.
Feasibility work	recommendation to Council Executive on route options Autumn 2014	Completed
Acquisition of statutory powers	not before 2.04.2 North Wokingham DR	TBC.
Detailed design	not before 2.04.2 North Wokingham DR	TBC.

Procurement	To follow	TBC.
Start of construction	2018	
Completion of construction	2021	
One year on evaluation	2022	
Five years on evaluation	2026	

## 6. Growth Deal Reporting Framework

6.1. The following table is an extract from the Growth Deal reporting matrix. The entries made here will be reported on a project by project basis.

<b>Growth Deal Schemes:</b>	<b>Transport scheme</b>	
<b>Thames Valley Berkshire LEP</b>	<b>2.04.3 Wokingham – South Wokingham Distributor Road</b>	<b>March 2017</b>
<b>1. Core Metrics</b>	<b>Planning Numbers</b>	<b>Actual to date</b>
<b>Inputs</b>		
Expenditure	£4,300,000	0
Funding breakdown		
Local Growth Deal	Tbc	-
s.106 and similar contributions	Tbc	-
Council Capital Programme	Tbc	-
Other	-	
In-kind resources provided	Estimate required	-
<b>Outcomes</b>		
Planned Jobs connected to the intervention	0	-
Commercial floor space constructed (square metres)	A share of 25,000	-
Housing unit starts	A share of 4,000	-
Housing units completed	A share of 4,000	-
<b>2. PROJECT SPECIFIC OUTPUTS AND OUTCOMES - to be collected where relevant to the intervention</b>		
<b>Transport</b>		
<b>Outputs</b>		
Total length of resurfaced roads	Estimate required	-
Total length of newly built roads	Estimate required	-
Total length of new cycle ways	Estimate required	-
Type of infrastructure	New road	
Type of service improvement	Enabling housing development	
<b>Outcomes</b>		
Follow on investment at site	Estimate required	-
Commercial floor space occupied	Estimate required	-
Commercial rental values	Estimate required	-
<b>3. ADDITIONAL MONITORING - for specific schemes</b>		
Transport - to be collected for all projects/programmes <b>involving more than £5m public funding</b> and where these metrics and the collection points are relevant to the intervention		
Average daily traffic and by peak/non-peak periods	Estimate required	-

Average AM and PM peak journey time per mile on key routes (journey time measurement)	Estimate required	-
Average AM and PM peak journey time on key routes (journey time measurement)	Estimate required	-
Day-to-day travel time variability	Estimate required	-
Average annual CO2 emissions	Estimate required	-
Accident rate	Estimate required	-
Casualty rate	Estimate required	-
Nitrogen Oxide and particulate emissions	Estimate required	-
Traffic noise levels at receptor locations	Estimate required	-
Annual average daily and peak hour passenger boardings	n/a	
Bus/light rail travel time by peak period	n/a	
Mode share (%)	n/a	
Pedestrians counts on new/existing routes (#)	n/a	
Cycle journeys on new/existing routes (#)	n/a	
Households with access to specific sites by mode within threshold times (#)	n/a	

## 7. Further Information for Summary Reports

This road is one of 4 new roads supporting the development of up to 10,000 new dwellings, schools, neighbourhood centre, etc. This is a retained scheme, and assurance framework matters are being managed by the DfT. Due on site in 2018.

## Berkshire Local Transport Body – 16 March 2017

### 2.04.4 Wokingham – Arborfield Relief Road

Highlights of progress since November 2016
Currently pursuing the option of concentrating the DfT funding, which is currently shared across three schemes, in just one scheme, i.e. Arborfield Cross Relief Road. The consequence is that the developer funding will be concentrated on South and North Wokingham Relief Roads.
The LEP have indicated support for this change, which will have the benefit of producing one full business case for Arborfield, instead of one for each road.
WBC is therefore looking at their current funding contributions to determine if this is possible as it would make the financial approval process much more streamlined. WBC will need to formally agree any change to the funding approach at BLTB before discussing further with the DfT.

#### 1. The Scheme

- 1.1. The Arborfield distributor road will provide relief to the existing A327 through the Village of Arborfield and also Arborfield Cross Gyratory to accommodate and reduce the traffic impacts of strategic development at Arborfield Garrison and South of the M4 (Shinfield and Spencer's Wood). The Arborfield SDL calls for 3,500 new homes.

#### 2. Progress with the scheme

- 2.1. This is the fourth part of the Distributor Roads programme, and while preliminary works have been completed to justify the need for the scheme, detailed work on the alignment of the road is programmed to follow on from the development of parts 1, 2 and 3.
- 2.2. Discussions with developers at Arborfield continue.
- 2.3. Work is progressing on the refinement of the Arborfield Relief Road alignment options to gain greater confidence in scheme delivery ahead of a later Executive decision to proceed with a Preferred Scheme for detailed design. This will lead to a business case for submission to DfT in 2015

#### 3. Funding

- 3.1. The following table sets out the funding for the scheme on the basis of our unapproved funding profile.

Source of funding	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
Amount from LEP Local Growth Deal	-	-	-	-	£8,600,000	£5,000,000	£13,600,000
Local contributions from .....		£665,599	£939,259	£3,102,137	£7,244,381	£687,839	£12,667,00*
- Section 106 agreements	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
- Council Capital Programme	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
- Other sources	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total Scheme Cost</b>		<b>£665,599</b>	<b>£939,259</b>	<b>£3,102,137</b>	<b>£15,844,381</b>	<b>£5,687,839</b>	<b>£26,267,000**</b>

\*Additional costs post 2020/21- Local Contributions - £1,803,000

\*\*Total Scheme costs estimated at £28,070,000

#### 4. Risks



- 4.1. The key risks on delivering this Programme Entry scheme and how they will be managed are set out in the table below

<b>Risk</b>	<b>Management of risk</b>
Proposed route is not agreed.	Comprehensive consultation will be undertaken in due course. The consultation along with an officer recommendation for the optimal route will be presented to the Council's executive.
Planning permission not being granted for the scheme.	Officers will have detailed pre-application discussions to address any issues of concern early on as part of the detailed design process.
Developments in Arborfield SDL not progressing as planned	The programme for delivery is phased as it is dependent upon development coming forward. Early delivery of the road would encourage developers to bring sites forward and funding for the scheme could potentially then be repaid from s106 / CIL contributions.

## 5. Programme

<b>Task</b>	<b>November 2014 Timescale</b>	<b>March 2017 Timescale (where changed)</b>
Programme Entry Status	24 July 2014	
Independent Assessment of FBC	Autumn 2015 at the earliest	Oct 2018
Financial Approval from LTB	Early 2016 at the earliest	Early 2019
Feasibility work	Complete	
Acquisition of statutory powers	Planning permission required	Sept 2017
Detailed design	Underway in preparation for a planning application	Nov 2017
Procurement	To follow	Jul 2018
Start of construction	2016	Nov 2018
Completion of construction	2019	Jun 2020
One year on evaluation	2020	2021
Five years on evaluation	2024	2025

## 6. Growth Deal Reporting Framework

- 6.1. The following table is an extract from the Growth Deal reporting matrix. The entries made here will be reported on a project by project basis.

<b>Growth Deal Schemes:</b>	<b>Transport scheme</b>	
<b>Thames Valley Berkshire LEP</b>	<b>2.04.4 Wokingham – Arborfield Relief Road</b>	<b>March 2017</b>
<b>1. Core Metrics</b>	<b>Planning Numbers</b>	<b>Actual to date</b>
<b>Inputs</b>		
Expenditure	tbc	-
Funding breakdown		
Local Growth Deal	£13,700,000	0
s.106 and similar contributions	tbc	-
Council Capital Programme	tbc	-
Other	-	
In-kind resources provided	Estimate required	-
<b>Outcomes</b>		
Planned Jobs connected to the intervention	0	-
Commercial floor space constructed (square metres)	A share of 25,000	-
Housing unit starts	A share of 4,000	-
Housing units completed	A share of 4,000	-

<b>2. PROJECT SPECIFIC OUTPUTS AND OUTCOMES - to be collected where relevant to the intervention</b>		
<b>Transport</b>		
<b>Outputs</b>		
Total length of resurfaced roads	Estimate required	-
Total length of newly built roads	Estimate required	-
Total length of new cycle ways	Estimate required	-
Type of infrastructure	New road	
Type of service improvement	Enabling housing development	
<b>Outcomes</b>		
Follow on investment at site	Estimate required	-
Commercial floor space occupied	Estimate required	-
Commercial rental values	Estimate required	-

<b>3. ADDITIONAL MONITORING - for specific schemes</b>		
Transport - to be collected for all projects/programmes <b>involving more than £5m public funding</b> and where these metrics and the collection points are relevant to the intervention		
Average daily traffic and by peak/non-peak periods	Estimate required	-
Average AM and PM peak journey time per mile on key routes (journey time measurement)	Estimate required	-
Average AM and PM peak journey time on key routes (journey time measurement)	Estimate required	-
Day-to-day travel time variability	Estimate required	-
Average annual CO2 emissions	Estimate required	-
Accident rate	Estimate required	-
Casualty rate	Estimate required	-
Nitrogen Oxide and particulate emissions	Estimate required	-
Traffic noise levels at receptor locations	Estimate required	-
Annual average daily and peak hour passenger boardings	n/a	
Bus/light rail travel time by peak period	n/a	
Mode share (%)	n/a	
Pedestrians counts on new/existing routes (#)	n/a	
Cycle journeys on new/existing routes (#)	n/a	
Households with access to specific sites by mode within threshold times (#)	n/a	

## 7. Further Information for Summary Reports

This road is one of 4 new roads supporting the development of up to 10,000 new dwellings, schools, neighbourhood centre, etc. This is a retained scheme, and assurance framework matters are being managed by the DfT. Due on site November 2018.

Berkshire Local Transport Body – 16 March 2017

2.05 Newbury – Sandleford Park

Highlights of progress since November 2016
The negotiations with Newbury College over the land required for the delivery of the scheme have progressed to a successful conclusion.
The planning application for the A339 access road has been submitted to the Planning Authority. This is included alongside the application for the new primary school.
The planning application for the housing development is still being considered by West Berkshire Council Planning Authority.
There has been a change in approach to delivery from the developer of the main part of the housing site and a new application has been submitted. The Council is considering its response to this change in approach which is likely to involve further detailed negotiations with the two developers.

**1. The Scheme**

- 1.1. The purpose of this scheme is to deliver additional accesses to Sandleford Park, a strategic development site that will deliver up to 2,000 dwellings. This will ensure permeability through the site and better manage the impact on the highway network. There are two main elements: i) a new access from the A339, and ii) new junction arrangements on the A343 and the upgrading of a route to provide a suitable access. The scheme will also unlock land for a new primary school and for new enterprises seeking to build better links between business and education.
- 1.2. The parties involved in the scheme are: the Council, the developers and their agents, Newbury College.

**2. Progress with the scheme**

- 2.1. The scheme received full financial approval from the Berkshire Local Transport Body at its meeting in July 2016.
- 2.2. West Berkshire Council is assessing a planning application for the Sandleford Park development. The main developer of the site (Bloor Homes) has changed approach and has submitted a further planning application seeking permission for housing on just the land controlled by them (rather than the whole site). The Council is in discussion with Bloor Homes and is considering its response to this change in approach. Further detailed discussions will be needed with both developers.
- 2.3. A planning application has been submitted by West Berkshire Council's Education Service for Highwood Copse primary school. This planning application includes the full extent of the A339 access and road between the A339 and the Sandleford Park development area within its 'red line' and therefore seeks detailed permission for the A339 access.
- 2.4. The detailed negotiations with Newbury College over land and contributions have reached a successful conclusion following decisions made by the Newbury College Corporation Board. The matter is now with legal teams to formalise.
- 2.5. Regular project meetings are held in relation to the overall strategic residential scheme – these include discussions on the access scheme and interaction with educational land uses associated with both the A343 Andover Road access and A339 Newtown Road access.

**3. Funding**

- 3.1. The following table sets out the funding for the scheme on the basis of a provisional funding profile.

Source of funding	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	Total
Amount from LEP Local Growth Deal			1,000,000	1,400,000	500,000	2,900,000
Local contributions from .....						
- Section 106 Agreements & Private investment (Newbury College)			1,060,000	5,100,000	1,500,000	7,660,000
- Council Capital Programme			400,000			400,000
- Other sources						
<b>Total Scheme Cost</b>			<b>2,460,000</b>	<b>6,500,000</b>	<b>2,000,000</b>	<b>10,960,000</b>

#### 4. Risks

4.1. The key risks on delivering this Programme Entry scheme and how they will be managed are set out in the table below

Risk	Management of risk
Timing of planning applications for housing and education development and road delivery not working together.	There is close liaison with the Developers and their agents and frequent meetings discussing the wide range of topics associated with the overall development. These channels of communication will be used to coordinate timing of accesses and how this links with planning applications and phases of development.
Escalating costs	The costs have been reviewed after more detailed work and additional funding secured from all parties as a result. The project team will continue to monitor costs closely as the project progresses.

#### 5. Programme

Task	February 2015 Timescale	March 2017 Timescale (where changed)
Programme Entry Status	19 March 2015	
Independent Assessment of FBC	January 2016 ( <i>provisional</i> )	June 2016
Financial Approval from LTB	March 2016 ( <i>provisional</i> )	July 2016
Feasibility work	Spring / Summer 2015 ( <i>provisional</i> )	
Acquisition of statutory powers	Winter 2015/16 ( <i>provisional</i> )	Autumn / Winter 2016
Detailed design	Summer 2015 ( <i>provisional</i> )	Autumn 2016
Procurement	Autumn / Winter 2015/16 ( <i>provisional</i> )	Summer 2017
Start of construction	April 2017 ( <i>provisional</i> )	Autumn 2017
Completion of construction	March 2020 ( <i>provisional</i> )	
One year on evaluation	March 2021 ( <i>provisional</i> )	
Five years on evaluation	March 2025 ( <i>provisional</i> )	

## 6. Growth Deal Reporting Framework

6.1. The following table is an extract from the Growth Deal reporting matrix. The entries made here will be reported on a project by project basis.

<b>Growth Deal Schemes:</b>	<b>Transport scheme</b>	
<b>Thames Valley Berkshire LEP</b>	<b>2.05 Newbury – Sandleford Park</b>	<b>March 2017</b>
<b>1. Core Metrics</b>	<b>Planning Numbers</b>	<b>Actual to date</b>
<b>Inputs</b>		
Expenditure	£10,960,000	
Funding breakdown		
Local Growth Deal	£2,900,000	
s.106 and similar contributions	£7,660,000	
Council Capital Programme	400,000	£20,000
Other		
In-kind resources provided	£100,000	20,000
<b>Outcomes</b>		
Planned Jobs connected to the intervention	420	
Commercial floor space constructed (square metres)	35,500	
Housing unit starts	2,000	
Housing units completed	2,000	
<b>2. PROJECT SPECIFIC OUTPUTS AND OUTCOMES - to be collected where relevant to the intervention</b>		
<b>Transport</b>		
<b>Outputs</b>		
Total length of resurfaced roads	400m	
Total length of newly built roads	450m	
Total length of new cycle ways	750m	
Total length of new footways	850m	
Type of service improvement	New highway access routes	
<b>Outcomes</b>		
Follow on investment at site	Not yet known	
Commercial floor space occupied	Not yet known	
Commercial rental values	Not yet known	

## 7. Further Information for Summary Reports

These access roads unlock up to 2,000 new dwellings, schools, neighbourhood centre, etc. Developer negotiations not yet complete. Due on site in Autumn 2017, completion due March 2020. First Growth Fund payment due March 2018.

**Berkshire Local Transport Body – 16 March 2017**

**2.06 Reading Green Park Railway Station**

<b>Highlights of progress since November 2016</b>
Design work is being progressed in partnership with Network Rail and GWR. An updated programme has been agreed between all parties for the scheme to be delivered by December 2018.
Planning conditions relating to site clearance are currently being discharged with both Reading and West Berks planning authorities.
A proposal to the New Stations Fund 2 was submitted in December, with an announcement on funding anticipated in the spring.

**1. The Scheme**

- 1.1. Reading Green Park Station is a proposed new railway station on the Reading to Basingstoke line in south Reading. This scheme, which includes the station, multi-modal interchange and access road, would significantly improve accessibility and connectivity of the existing Green Park business park and surrounding area, and would help to enable delivery of the Green Park Village mixed use development.

**2. Progress with the scheme**

- 2.1. The full business case has been completed and reviewed by DfT Rail and the BLTB independent assessors, confirming the scheme represents good value for money in both a low and high forecast patronage scenario. Financial approval for the scheme was granted by the BLTB in November 2014.
- 2.2. Planning permission for the station, multi-modal interchange, car park and access road was granted by Reading Borough Council in April 2015 and West Berkshire Council in May 2015. Planning conditions relating to site clearance are currently being discharged with both planning authorities.
- 2.3. Design work for the scheme is being undertaken in partnership with Network Rail and FGW to ensure compliance with the latest railway standards. An updated scheme programme has been agreed between all parties for the scheme to be delivered by December 2018.
- 2.4. A proposal to the New Stations Fund 2 was submitted in December, with an announcement on funding anticipated in the spring.
- 2.5. Electrification of the line from Southcote Junction to Basingstoke was delayed from December 2018 to an unspecified date between 2019 – 2024 as part of the Hendy Review, however the DfT has confirmed that a third diesel unit for the line between Reading and Basingstoke will be funded from December 2018 to enable the new station to be served.
- 2.6. Discussions are on-going to identify any opportunities to align implementation of the station with other major upgrade works on the railway.
- 2.7. Liaison with nearby landowners is on-going to ensure coordination with the wider development plans for the area, including the mixed-use Green Park Village development.
- 2.8. Scheme development is being undertaken in line with Network Rail's GRIP process and to take account of the latest developments from related projects such as Reading Station Redevelopment, Great Western Mainline Electrification, Electric Spine, East-West Rail and Western Rail Access to Heathrow (WRATH).
- 2.9. Engagement with Green Park and Madejski Stadium has been initiated and operational discussions will follow at the appropriate time to ensure maximum accessibility for the station and connectivity with other public transport services.

**3. Funding**

- 3.1. The following table sets out the funding for the scheme:

Source of funding	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
Amount from LEP Local Growth Deal	-	-	£4,575,000	£4,575,000	-	-	£9,150,000
Local contributions from:							
- Section 106 agreements	-	-	£4,600,000	-	-	-	£4,600,000
- Council Capital Programme	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
- Other sources	-	-	-	-	-	-	£1,000,000
<b>Total Scheme Cost</b>			<b>£9,175,000</b>	<b>£4,575,000</b>			<b>£14,750,000</b>

#### 4. Risks

4.1. The key risks on delivering this Programme Entry scheme and how they will be managed are set out in the table below:

Risk	Management of risk
Network Rail's revised electrification plan for the Reading-Basingstoke Branch creates delays	Current lobbying exercise led by RBC Cllrs; need to explore either delay or revive the plan for a diesel service if construction is not delayed
Business case does not meet DfT requirements for new stations.	Business case has been developed in partnership with Network Rail, FGW, and the DfT Rail Executive. The business case has been approved by the BLTB.
Planning permission is not granted.	Historic planning application has been updated to reflect the latest situation. Planning permission has been granted by both Reading and West Berkshire Councils.
It is not feasible to stop trains at the new station within the existing timetable.	Timetable capability assessment has been undertaken with Network Rail which confirms service options for the station which have been included in the scheme business case.
TOC does not agree to stop trains at the new station.	Scheme development is being undertaken in partnership with FGW, including preparation of the business case and design of the station.
Scheme costs significantly increase.	Costs are being reviewed and cost savings sought, contingency has been built into the overall scheme cost.

#### 5. Programme

Task	November 2014 Timescale	March 2017 Timescale (where changed)
Programme Entry Status	July 2013	
Feasibility work	March 2014	
Independent Assessment of FBC	October 2014	
Financial Approval from LTB	November 2014	
Acquisition of statutory powers	January 2015	May 2015
Detailed design	April 2015	May 2017
Procurement	September 2015	December 2017
Start of construction	October 2015	January 2018
Completion of construction	September 2016	November 2018
Open to public	December 2016	December 2018
One year on evaluation	September 2017	December 2019
Five years on evaluation	September 2021	December 2023

## 6. Growth Deal Reporting Framework

6.1. The following table is an extract from the Growth Deal reporting matrix. The entries made here will be reported on a project by project basis.

<b>Growth Deal Schemes:</b>	<b>Transport scheme</b>	
<b>Thames Valley Berkshire LEP</b>	<b>2.06 Reading Green Park Railway Station</b>	<b>March 2017</b>
<b>1. Core Metrics</b>	<b>Planning Numbers</b>	<b>Actual to date</b>
<b>Inputs</b>		
Expenditure	£14,750,000	
Funding breakdown		
Local Growth Deal	£9,150,000	
s.106 and similar contributions	£4,600,000	
Council Capital Programme	-	
Other (PRUPIM)	£1,000,000	
In-kind resources provided	£500,000	
<b>Outcomes</b>		
Planned Jobs connected to the intervention	3,580	
Commercial floor space constructed (square metres)	68,000	
Housing unit starts	735	
Housing units completed	735	
<b>2. PROJECT SPECIFIC OUTPUTS AND OUTCOMES - to be collected where relevant to the intervention</b>		
<b>Transport</b>		
<b>Outputs</b>		
Total length of resurfaced roads	230m	
Total length of newly built roads	250m	
Total length of new cycle ways	310m	
Type of infrastructure	Rail/public transport Interchange	
Type of service improvement	Decongestion Benefits, Journey Time Savings Reliability Journey Ambience	
<b>Outcomes</b>		
Follow on investment at site	Development of GPV & GP Business Park	
Commercial floor space occupied	N/A	
Commercial rental values	N/A	
<b>3. ADDITIONAL MONITORING - for specific schemes</b>		
Transport - to be collected for all projects/programmes involving more than £5m public funding and where these metrics and the collection points are relevant to the intervention		
Average daily traffic and by peak/non peak	n/a	



periods		
Average AM and PM peak journey time per mile on key routes (journey time measurement)		n/a
Average AM and PM peak journey time on key routes (journey time measurement)		n/a
Day-to-day travel time variability		n/a
Average annual CO2 emissions		n/a
Accident rate		n/a
Casualty rate		n/a
Nitrogen Oxide and particulate emissions		n/a
Traffic noise levels at receptor locations		n/a
Annual average daily and peak hour passenger boardings	4,109 High Growth 2,143 Low Growth 668 AM Peak 596 PM Peak	
Bus/light rail travel time by peak period		n/a
Mode share (%)		8% for rail
Pedestrians counts on new/existing routes (#)	New access – no existing count	
Cycle journeys on new/existing routes (#)	New access – no existing count	
Households with access to specific sites by mode within threshold times (#)		n/a

## 7. Further Information for Summary Reports

The scheme will develop a new category C railway station on the Reading – Basingstoke line. Due on site in January 2018, completion due November 2018. First Growth Fund payment due March 2018.

## Berkshire Local Transport Body – 16 March 2017

## 2.07 Bracknell – Coral Reef Roundabout

## Highlights of progress since November 2016

The scheme is complete and working well.  
Assessment of scheme to be carried out at least 12 months after completion in accordance with DfT guidance.

## 1. The Scheme

- 1.1. The Coral Reef roundabout is the first junction encountered as you enter Bracknell on the A322 heading from M3 J3 towards the A329, the A329(M) and the M4. Proposals are to convert the existing roundabout to a fully signalised crossroads that reduces delay on all arms and improves journey times along the route. These measures will improve access to existing employment areas and new developments, unlocking their economic potential and also assist in reducing carbon emissions. Benefits would also be felt by neighbouring LEP areas and assist in the overall control and coordination of the strategic corridor network within the Borough

## 2. Progress with the scheme

- 2.1. Works started on site 7<sup>th</sup> April 2015  
2.2. The Coral Reef project is being delivered through a Principal Contractor (the Council's Highways Term Contract) which significantly streamlines the procurements process.  
2.3. The project has progressed well and with good weather is expected to be complete in spring of 2016.

## 3. Funding

- 3.1. The following table sets out the funding for the scheme

Source of funding	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
Amount from LEP Local Growth Deal	£2,100,000	-	-	-	-	-	£2,100,000
Local contributions from .....							
- Section 106 agreements	-	£270,000	-	-	-	-	£270,000
- Council Capital Programme	-	£640,000	-	-	-	-	£640,000
- Other sources	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total Scheme Cost</b>	<b>£2,100,00</b>	<b>£910,000</b>					<b>£3,010,000</b>

## 4. Risks

- 4.1. The key risks on delivering this Programme Entry scheme and how they will be managed are set out in the table below

Risk	Management of risk
That the overall cost of the Coral Reef Junction exceeds the funding available	Detailed Bill of Quantities with effective site and contract management
Statutory undertakers C4 cost estimates significantly exceed C3 cost estimates	Early liaison with statutory undertakers and early commission of C4 estimates (underway)
Highway Works in neighbouring local authority area during construction leading to traffic congestion and possible impact on programme and costs	Liaison with neighbouring authorities and agreement re. programme
Unexpected need for additional Temporary Traffic Management increasing costs	Liaison with Traffic Management Section and early quantification of TM requirements and costs (underway)

## 5. Programme

Task	November 2014 Timescale	March 2017 timescale (where changed)
Programme Entry Status	14 July 2013	
Independent Assessment of FBC	June 2014	Complete
Financial Approval from LTB	July 2014	Complete January 2015
Feasibility work		complete
Acquisition of statutory powers	None required	
Detailed design	October 2014	Complete Feb 2015
Procurement	Term contractor	complete
Start of construction	June 2015	April 2015
Completion of construction	November 2016	April 2016
One year on evaluation	November 2017	April 2017
Five years on evaluation	November 2021	April 2021

## 6. Growth Deal Reporting Framework

6.1. The following table is an extract from the Growth Deal reporting matrix. The entries made here will be reported on a project by project basis.

Growth Deal Schemes:	Transport scheme	
Thames Valley Berkshire LEP	2.07 Bracknell – Coral Reef Roundabout	March 2017
<b>1. Core Metrics</b>	<b>Planning Numbers</b>	<b>Actual to date</b>
<b>Inputs</b>		
Expenditure	£3,010,000	£3,010,000
Funding breakdown		
Local Growth Deal	£2,100,000	£2,100,000
s.106 and similar contributions	£270,000	£270,000
Council Capital Programme	£640,000	£640,000
Other	-	
In-kind resources provided		£100,000
<b>Outcomes</b>		
Planned Jobs connected to the intervention	0	
Commercial floor space constructed (square metres)	0	
Housing unit starts	0	
Housing units completed	0	
<b>2. PROJECT SPECIFIC OUTPUTS AND OUTCOMES - to be collected where relevant to the intervention</b>		
<b>Transport</b>		
<b>Outputs</b>		
Total length of resurfaced roads	Approximately 2000m of resurfacing following implementation of the new traffic signals	Complete
Total length of newly built roads	Approximately 100m following removal of the roundabout and realignment of the carriageway.	Complete

Total length of new cycle ways	Existing cycleway network runs adjacent to the junction and is unaffected by the works	N/A
Type of infrastructure	Replacement of existing roundabout with new signalised junction	Complete
Type of service improvement	Improvement to journey times following removal of an existing pinch point on the network.	Assessment to be carried out at least 12 months after completion in accordance with DfT guidance.
<b>Outcomes</b>		
Follow on investment at site	0	
Commercial floor space occupied	0	
Commercial rental values	0	

## 7. Further Information for Summary Reports

The Coral Reef junction has been successfully converted from roundabout to signal controls. It finished ahead of time and on budget in April 2016. One-year-on monitoring report due autumn 2017. First and only Growth Fund payment made March 2016.

Berkshire Local Transport Body – 16 March 2017

2.08 Slough: Rapid Transit Phase 1

Highlights of progress since November 2016
Eastern segment near complete and work started and progressing on western section.

**1. The Scheme**

- 1.1. The A4 forms the spine of a 12km strategic public transport corridor that links Maidenhead, Slough and Heathrow and plays an important role in providing surface access to the airport. The western section of the Slough Mass Rapid Transit (SMaRT) project will provide for buses to operate along the service roads fronting Slough Trading Estate. Bus lanes and other priority measures will be provided in the central section between the estate, Slough town centre and eastwards to Junction 5 of the M4.
- 1.2. The scheme was given full financial approval by the BLTB at the 24th July 2014 meeting.

**2. Progress with the scheme**

- 2.1. A comprehensive report was put to the 15th September 2014 meeting of the Council's Cabinet. The Cabinet agreed to progress the scheme and gave permission to use CPO powers if necessary to assemble land.
- 2.2. Public consultation has been carried out and was presented to the Cabinet on 19<sup>th</sup> January 2015. The consultation highlighted some concerns about the design of the scheme and revisions have been made in discussion with stakeholders. Planning permission due imminently for elements of the scheme outside highway boundaries.
- 2.3. Procurement has proceeded in parallel with schemes 2.10 Slough: A332 Improvements and 2.17 Slough: A355 Route. Tenders have been sought, a contractor has been selected and the construction programme is under review to meet the LEP and Local Authority spend profile.
- 2.4. The advanced utility diversion work is underway and is scheduled to be completed in July followed by the start of civil works programme.
- 2.5. Civil works is underway and is being co-ordinated with the A355/A332 schemes in order to meet the programme schedule.
- 2.6. Widening works between Upton Court Road and High Street, Langley underway. Works near trading estate to start in mid-October 2016.
- 2.7. Eastern segment near complete and work started and progressing on western section.

**3. Funding**

3.1. The following table sets out the funding for the scheme.

Source of funding	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
Amount from LEP Local Growth Deal	£3,100,000	£2,500,000	-	-	-	-	£5,600,000
Local contributions from:							
- Section 106 agreements	£600,000	£300,000	-	-	-	-	£900,000
- Council Capital Programme	£1,800,000	£800,000	-	-	-	-	£2,600,000
- Other sources	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total Scheme Cost</b>	<b>£5,500,000</b>	<b>£3,600,000</b>					<b>£9,100,000</b>

**4. Risks**

- 4.1. The key risks on delivering this Programme Entry scheme and how they will be managed are set out in the table below

Risk	Management of risk	Status
Unfavourable response to wider public consultation.	Programme allows for detailed design to be modified where necessary to address specific objections.	Green
Planning permission not being granted for elements that are not Permitted Development.	Public consultation and close working with Ward Members, NAGs, Parish Councils and partners, bearing in mind that the affected land lies within the approved Bath Road Widening Line. On-going dialogue with planning officers to address likely concerns.	Green
Delay in acquiring frontage land near Three Tuns/ land transfer negotiations and legal process longer than expected.	Programme allows time for CPO process to be carried out and time for land transfer. (Minor issue remaining)	Amber
Higher than expected costs arising post-business case approval.	Manage scheme costs and benchmark against similar schemes.	Green
Delays in procurement process.	Programme allows adequate time for procurement.	Green
Delays in achieving local contribution towards costs.	Ensure SBC funding in place and on-going dialogue with partners.	Green
Unexpected land compensation claims.	Address any claims in accordance with current legislation.	Green
Unexpected lead in time and duration for Statutory Authority Works.	Discuss and place orders early on and allow adequate lead in time in Project Plan.	Green
Utilities alterations greater than expected.	Early consultations with Statutory Authorities.	Green
Changes to design after commencing construction.	Fully complete design prior to commencing construction/ allow for contingency provision.	Red

## 5. Programme

Task	November 2014 Timescale	March 2017 Timescale (where changed)
Programme Entry Status	14 July 2013	
Independent Assessment of FBC	June 2014	Complete
Financial Approval from LTB	July 2014	Complete
Feasibility work		Complete
Acquisition of statutory powers	Planning permission and CP Orders required	Complete
Detailed design	Council Cabinet 15 <sup>th</sup> September 2014 agreed subject to outcome of public consultation	Complete
Procurement	Due May 2015	Complete
Start of construction	June 2015	December 2015
Completion of construction	June 2016	December 2017
One year on evaluation	June 2017	December 2018
Five years on evaluation	June 2021	December 2022

## 6. Growth Deal Reporting Framework

6.1. The following table is an extract from the Growth Deal reporting matrix. The entries made here will be reported on a project by project basis.

Growth Deal Schemes:	Transport scheme	
Thames Valley Berkshire LEP	2.08 Slough: Rapid Transit Phase 1	March 2017
1. Core Metrics	Planning Numbers	Actual to date
Inputs		

Expenditure		£9,100,000	£5,500,000
Funding breakdown			
Local Growth Deal		£5,600,000	£3,100,000
s.106 and similar contributions		£900,000	£600,000
Council Capital Programme		£2,600,000	£1,800,000
Other		-	
In-kind resources provided		£110,000	-
<b>Outcomes</b>			
Planned Jobs connected to the intervention		2,460	0
Commercial floor space constructed (square metres)		108,700	0
Housing unit starts		3,120	0
Housing units completed		3,120	0
<b>2. PROJECT SPECIFIC OUTPUTS AND OUTCOMES - to be collected where relevant to the intervention</b>			
<b>Transport</b>			
<b>Outputs</b>			
Total length of resurfaced roads	Partial resurfacing of 2000m for bus lane provision		1200
Total length of newly built roads	150m		90
Total length of new cycle ways	2850m (bus lane)		1710
Type of infrastructure	Junction improvements, traffic signal enhancement, road widening, bus lanes		
Type of service improvement	Enhanced bus services: greater frequency and reliability, reduced journey times		
<b>Outcomes</b>			
Follow on investment at site	To be determined		-
Commercial floor space occupied	To be determined		-
Commercial rental values	To be determined		-

<b>3. ADDITIONAL MONITORING - for specific schemes</b>		
Transport - to be collected for all projects/programmes <b>involving more than £5m public funding</b> and where these metrics and the collection points are relevant to the intervention		
Average daily traffic and by peak/non-peak periods	Data for 3 sections of A4: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bath Rd</li> <li>• Wellington Rd</li> <li>• London Rd</li> </ul>	0
Average AM and PM peak journey time per mile on key routes (journey time measurement)	n/a	-
Average AM and PM peak journey time on key routes (journey time measurement)	Data for A4 Bath Rd between Burnham and town centre and for A4 London Rd between town centre and M4 J5	0

Day-to-day travel time variability	Data for bus travel time variations from timetabled services on A4 Bath Rd and A4 London Rd	0
Average annual CO2 emissions	Data for Slough-wide emissions from traffic on 'A' roads	0
Accident rate	Data for rates along A4	0
Casualty rate	Data for KSI and slights along A4	0
Nitrogen Oxide and particulate emissions	Data for Slough AQMAs 3 & 4	0
Traffic noise levels at receptor locations	n/a	-
Annual average daily and peak hour passenger boardings	Data for <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 'Series 7' Heathrow bus services;</li> <li>• Boardings in A4 Bath Rd and A4 London Rd</li> </ul>	0
Bus/light rail travel time by peak period	Data for end-to-end and intermediate bus travel times for A4 Bath Rd services	0
Mode share (%)	n/a	-
Pedestrians counts on new/existing routes (#)	n/a	-
Cycle journeys on new/existing routes (#)	Data for journeys along A4 Bath Rd	0
Households with access to specific sites by mode within threshold times (#)	Data for households within 45 mins bus journey time of Heathrow	0

## 7. Further Information for Summary Reports

The Mass Rapid Transit scheme will provide a segregated bus link from M4 Junction 7 to Heathrow Airport. Phase 1 covers a section from the Trading Estate via the station and town centre to M4 Junction 5. Started on site in December 2015, completion due December 2017. First Growth Fund payment made March 2016.



### Berkshire Local Transport Body – 16 March 2017

#### 2.09.1 Sustainable Transport NCN 422

##### Highlights of progress since November 2016

- Budget has been reprofiled for 2017. The bulk of the funding will be drawn down in February 2017
- Wokingham Borough will start on the last phase of the western section of NCN422 leaving one phase for 2018
- Bracknell Forest have started delivering part of the NCN through the redeveloped Town Centre completing the route towards Ascot
- Reading Borough has 2 phases of the route designed in detail and is due on site in February 2017.
- Steering group meeting has been held to discuss publicity, monitoring and signing.

#### 1. The Scheme

- 1.1. In 2013 Sustrans were commissioned by Wokingham Borough Council (with the support of Reading Borough Council, Bracknell Forest Borough Council and the Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead) to investigate a potential National Cycle Route linking all four Boroughs.
- 1.2. The route has since been developed so that it originates in West Berkshire (Newbury) and goes through to LEGOLAND from where there are existing connections to Windsor.
- 1.3. Although the through connection to LEGOLAND Windsor is no longer politically supported by RBWM, the route can be delivered in a less formal way.
- 1.4. There still exists a route via Ascot and Windsor Great Park. Although the route through the park is closed at night, the Park Ranger has agreed that cyclist can use it. (This is real progress)

#### 2. Progress with the scheme

- 2.1. A full business case for the route has been approved for funding.
- 2.2. Bracknell Forest have come up with alternative solution which involves improving crossing facilities across 3 major junctions and includes adjustments to the ped/cycleway network to improve safety along the section between Martins Heron roundabout and the borough boundary with Royal Borough Windsor and Maidenhead. This allows the route to be achieved with destinations as described in the business case development, but with an alternative, less direct and less satisfactory route.
- 2.3. Reading Borough Council are well progressed in developing the schemes. The first phase is due on site with the next phases being consulted upon and designed up.
- 2.4. Wokingham Borough have a clear design process established, in which a scheme will be delivered, starting on site in February 2017 costing around £1.4m.
- 2.5. The next phase of the scheme in Wokingham will make the most of the links through Coppid Beach roundabout, linking up to the David Wilson Homes development which is currently on site at Amen Corner.
- 2.6. West Berks are reconsidering their design as some sections are proving problematic where there is not enough space in the carriageway and vehicle speeds are very high. West Berks are going to look for the use of any s.106 along the route that might help with the values engineering exercise.

#### 3. Funding

- 3.1. The following table sets out the funding for the scheme on the basis of our approved funding profile.
- 3.2. Funding for the Bracknell Forest portion of the route has been pulled forward to 2016/17 to coincide with other projects, Town Centre Redevelopment.

	West Berks	Reading	Wokingham	Bracknell	RBWM	Totals
2016/17	0	450,000	800,000	850,000	0	2,100,000
2017/18	500,000	750,000	250,000	0	0	1,500,000
2018/19	600,000	0	0	0	0	600,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,100,000</b>	<b>1,200,000</b>	<b>1,050,000</b>	<b>850,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>£4,200,000</b>

#### LEP funding table with contribution

Source of funding	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
Amount from LEP Local Growth Deal	-	£2,100,000	£1,500,000	£600,000	-	-	£4,200,000
- Wokingham Council Capital Programme	£600,000	£600,000	£TBA	-	-	-	£1,200,000*
- Reading Council Capital Programme		£50,000*	£50,000	-	-	-	£100,000*
- West Berkshire Capital Programme	-		£50,000	£50,000	-	-	£100,000*
- Bracknell Forest Capital Programme	-	£50,000-	£50,000		-	-	£100,000*
- Other sources	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total Scheme Cost</b>	<b>£600,000</b>	<b>£2,800,000</b>	<b>£1,650,000</b>	<b>£650,000</b>			<b>£5,700,000*</b>

#### 4. Risks

- 4.1. The key risks on delivering this Programme Entry scheme and how they will be managed are set out in the table below:

Risk	Management of risk
Design	If the whole project was delivered as one, which design standards should the project conform to? Each authority has its own take on specification and style. It is recommended that the latest DfT guidance on cycle design is used to give the project continuity
Design feasibility & costing	Parts of the project have not yet been designed and there is a risk that it may not be possible to design and implement the project within allocated budget. Capital programme allocation within each Council should be used to supplement delivery where possible.
Funding	As with any multi-faceted project there are risks of securing all the funding needed for completion of the whole NCN. This project has proven to be flexibly delivered and is bring the large section of the project forward.
Political support	Political support withdrawn for the project by RBWM members, which results in no sustainable new infrastructure being delivered. The plan will rely on new connecting facilities being constructed in Bracknell to deliver access to an existing route in RBWM.

#### 5. Programme

- 5.1. The programme will be delivered as per the funding programme above in 3.1.
- 5.2. Adjustments have been made to ensure the route to the east of Bracknell can be delivered and will link up to existing route in Windsor and Maidenhead
- 5.3. Reading and Wokingham will have the spine of the route delivered in 2017/18
- 5.4. The steering group will develop publicity regarding route promotion and links to work and central areas, such as Newbury, Reading, Wokingham and Redeveloped Bracknell Town centre.

- 5.5. If we are all successful with the DfT's Access Fund, West Berks, Reading Wokingham and Bracknell will use the fund to further promote the link and embed into a 3 year long programme of publicity.
- 5.6. A monitoring programme will also be developed in 2017 to ensure data of the number of cyclists using the route is captured.

Task	November 2014 Timescale	March 2017 Timescale (where changed)
Programme Entry Status	24 July 2014	
Independent Assessment of FBC	Not before March 2015	Autumn 2015
Financial Approval from LTB	Due July 2015	November 2015
Feasibility work	Sustrans work complete	COMPLETE
Acquisition of statutory powers	Unlikely to be needed	N/A
Detailed design	RBC & WBC Complete for 2016	COMPLETE
Procurement	Term Contractors undertaking works	
Start of construction	November 2016	January 2017
Completion of construction	2019	
One year on evaluation	2020	
Five years on evaluation	2024	

## 6. Growth Deal Reporting Framework

- 6.1. The following table is an extract from the Growth Deal reporting matrix. The entries made here will be reported on a project by project basis.

Growth Deal Schemes:	Transport scheme	
Thames Valley Berkshire LEP	2.09.1 Sustainable Transport NCN 422	March 2017
1. Core Metrics	Planning Numbers	Actual to date
<b>Inputs</b>		
Expenditure	£5,700,000	
Funding breakdown		
Local Growth Deal	£4,200,000	
s.106 and similar contributions	-	
Council Capital Programmes	£1,500,000	
Other	-	
In-kind resources provided	Estimate required	
<b>Outcomes</b>		
Planned Jobs connected to the intervention	-	
Commercial floor space constructed (square metres)	-	
Housing unit starts	-	
Housing units completed	-	
<b>2. PROJECT SPECIFIC OUTPUTS AND OUTCOMES - to be collected where relevant to the intervention</b>		
<b>Transport</b>		
<b>Outputs</b>		

Total length of resurfaced roads	1.1km	
Total length of newly built roads	Estimate required	
Total length of new cycle ways	3.5 km (or 7km)	
Type of infrastructure	Share facility and on carriageway	
Type of service improvement	Estimate required	
<b>Outcomes</b>		
Follow on investment at site	Estimate required	
Commercial floor space occupied	Estimate required	
Commercial rental values	Estimate required	

## 7. Further Information for Summary Reports

NCN 422 will form part of the National Cycle Network. The route runs from Theale in West Berkshire through Reading, Wokingham and Bracknell to Ascot. Started on site in January 2017, completion due in 2019. First Growth Fund payment due March 2017.

**Berkshire Local Transport Body – 16 March 2017**

**2.09.2 Sustainable Transport A4 Cycle Route with Bucks**

<b>Highlights of progress since November 2016</b>
Further design changes required along the A4 in Slough due to pinch points not being addressed in initial design.

**1. The Scheme**

1.1. This scheme will provide a safe and convenient cycle route between Slough and South Buckinghamshire. It will follow the A4 corridor and will link with a scheme being promoted by Thames Valley Buckinghamshire LEP, which is progressing along similar time-scales. The scheme will connect the two urban areas of Slough and Maidenhead and will give access to: the Bishops Centre Retail Park; Slough Trading Estate; Burnham and Taplow stations; and adjacent residential areas. It will cater for commuting and other utility cycling trips, as well as leisure trips, connecting to National Cycle Network Route 61 via the Jubilee River, and to Cliveden and Burnham Beeches.

**2. Progress with the scheme**

2.1. Progress with scheme is as follows:

- RBWM has decided not to take up this scheme and has returned the funds allocated for the Maidenhead section of the scheme.
- Bucks: Thames Bridge to Slough Borough boundary – feasibility study completed and design underway – designs are being revised in response to stakeholder feedback.
- Slough: Borough boundary east to Burnham station and Slough Trading Estate – design work completed. The scheme will be coordinated with the delivery of the LSTF-funded cycle link between Slough Trading Estate and Slough town centre. SBC has designed traffic signals for the Huntercombe Lane / A4 junction - toucan crossings are proposed for both arms of the junction to tie in with the A4 Cycle scheme. The Local Access Forum has been consulted and no objections have been received. Consulted with all frontagers in February. Slough is ready to proceed with construction of their element of the scheme.
- Traffic signal design work of Huntercombe Lane/A4 has been varied, however has been recently completed. Work is planned to begin in October.

2.2. There have been regular project meetings between SBC and Bucks County Council (BCC) to coordinate the scheme design and to explore opportunities for joint working.

2.3. Further design changes required along the A4 in Slough due to pinch points not being addressed in initial design.

2.4. Some costs to be agreed with civil contractor. Main work scheduled to start in February alongside Burnham Improvements.

**3. Funding**

3.1. The following table sets out the funding for the scheme on the basis of our unapproved funding profile. There will be an upward adjustment to the approved LEP finance figure when the final costings have been received; this will be met from the “unapproved allocation”.

<b>Source of funding</b>	<b>2015/16</b>	<b>2016/17</b>	<b>2017/18</b>	<b>2018/19</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>Total</b>
Amount from LEP Local Growth Deal	-	£483,000	-	-	-	-	£483,000
Local contributions from ....							
- Section 106 agreements	-	£50,000	-	-	-	-	£50,000
- Council Capital Programme	-	£397,000	-	-	-	-	£397,000
- Other sources	-	£1,728,600	-	-	-	-	£1,728,600
<b>Total Scheme Cost</b>		<b>£2,658,600</b>					<b>£2,658,600</b>

**Notes:**

- Other sources of funding include £1,542,700 from Thames Valley Bucks LEP and £185,900 from Bucks S106.

**4. Risks**

- The key risks on delivering this Programme Entry scheme and how they will be managed are set out in the table below

Risk	Management of risk
Delay in coordinating cross-boundary elements.	Public consultation and close working between three authorities.
Higher than expected costs arising post-business case approval.	Manage scheme costs and benchmark against similar schemes.
Delays in procurement process.	Programme will allow adequate time for procurement.
Delays in achieving local contribution towards costs.	Submit internal funding bids in good time.
Unexpected lead in time and duration for Statutory Authority Works.	Discuss and place orders early on and allow adequate lead in time in Project Plan.
Utilities alterations greater than expected.	Early consultations with Statutory Authorities.

**5. Programme**

Task	Original Timescale	March 2017 Timescale (where changed)
Programme Entry Status	24 July 2014	
Data Collection	April 2015	June 2015
Independent Assessment of FBC	Due May 2015	October 2015
Financial Approval from LTB	Due July 2015	November 2015
Feasibility work	complete	
Acquisition of statutory powers	Unlikely to be needed	
Detailed design	Spring/summer 2015	January 2016
Public Consultation	-	February – June 2016
Procurement	Complete by December 2015	September 2016
Start of construction	Spring 2016	February 2017
Completion of construction	December 2016	June 2017
One year on evaluation	December 2017	June 2018
Five years on evaluation	December 2021	June 2022

**6. Growth Deal Reporting Framework**

- The following table is an extract from the Growth Deal reporting matrix. The entries made here will be reported on a project by project basis.

Growth Deal Schemes:	Transport scheme	
Thames Valley Berkshire LEP	2.09.2 Sustainable Transport A4 Cycle with Bucks	March 2017
1. Core Metrics	Planning Numbers	Actual to date
Inputs		
Expenditure	£2,970,000	£0
Funding breakdown		
Local Growth Deal	£550,000	£0
s.106 and similar contributions	£90,000	£0
Council Capital Programmes	£630,000	£0
Other	£1,700,000	£0

In-kind resources provided	£50,000	£50,000
<b>Outcomes</b>		
Planned jobs connected to the intervention	0	-
Commercial floor space constructed (square metres)	0	-
Housing unit starts	0	-
Housing units completed	0	-
<b>2. PROJECT SPECIFIC OUTPUTS AND OUTCOMES - to be collected where relevant to the intervention</b>		
<b>Transport</b>		
<b>Outputs</b>		
Total length of resurfaced roads	0	-
Total length of newly built roads	0	-
Total length of new cycle ways	2.4 km*	0
Type of infrastructure	Shared use footway / cycleway and on-carriageway cycle lanes	
Type of service improvement	New cycle route	
<b>Outcomes</b>		
Follow on investment at site	0	-
Commercial floor space occupied	0	-
Commercial rental values	0	-

\* excludes section within Buckinghamshire

## 7. Further Information for Summary Reports

The A4 Cycle scheme is coordinated with works in South Bucks and the arrival of Crossrail services at Taplow (Bucks) and Burnham (Slough) stations. Due on site in February 2017, completion due June 2017. First Growth Fund payment due March 2017.

## Appendix 6

### Berkshire Local Transport Body – 16 March 2017

#### 2.10 Slough: A332 Improvements

##### Highlights of progress since November 2016

Utility diversions underway with BT delays are likely due to extent of works

#### 1. The Scheme

1.1. This project includes a programme of junction improvements, road widening and other works along the A332 on the approach to Slough town centre with the aim of improving conditions for general traffic as well as buses along this strategic route, making journeys quicker and more reliable.

#### 2. Progress with the scheme

2.1. The business case for this scheme was assessed by WYG in October 2014. Financial Approval was given by the BLTB on 20<sup>th</sup> November 2014.

2.2. Detailed design and public consultation have been completed. Approval was granted by the Cabinet on the 15<sup>th</sup> December 2014 to proceed to tender and implementation. The Council has worked with other owners of land on the eastern frontage to agree a regeneration scheme involving the demolition of properties to allow road widening and provision of a comprehensive residential development<sup>1</sup>. Agreement has now been reached without the need to use CPO powers.

2.3. Procurement has proceeded in parallel with schemes 2.08 Slough: Rapid Transit Phase 1 and 2.17 Slough: A355 Route. Tenders have been sought, a contractor has been selected and the construction programme is under review to meet both the LEP and L's funding profile.

2.4. Utility works to commenced December 2015 and main civil works to start January 2017 with completion due September 2017.

2.5. Some civil works have been started early in order to utilise downtime at other sites the contractor is working on (Slough Rapid Transit/A355 Improvements).

2.6. Utility diversions underway with BT, delays are likely due to extent of works.

#### 3. Funding

3.1. The following table sets out the funding for the scheme.

Source of funding	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
Amount from LEP Local Growth Deal	£1,266,667	£1,433,333	-	-	-	-	£2,700,000
Local contributions from ....							
- Section 106 agreements	£250,000		-	-	-	-	£250,000
- Council Capital Programme	£2,050,000		-	-	-	-	£2,050,000
- Other sources	-		-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total Scheme Cost</b>	<b>£3,566,667</b>	<b>£1,433,333</b>					<b>£5,000,000</b>

#### 4. Risks

4.1. The key risks on delivering this Programme Entry scheme and how they will be managed are set out in the table below.

<sup>1</sup> This has been supported by the 27<sup>th</sup> November 2014 Planning Committee's decision to designate the area as a 'Selected Key Location' for regeneration in line with Core Policy 1 of the Slough Local Plan.



Risk	Management of risk	Status
Unfavourable response to wider public consultation.	Address any issues arising during public consultation. Close working with Ward Members, NAGs, Parish Councils and partners, bearing in mind that the affected land lies within the approved Berkshire Road Widening Line. (Planning application submitted: no issues anticipated in relation to LGF scheme).	Green
Planning permission not being granted for associated housing and commercial developments.		Green
Delay in acquiring frontage land / land transfer negotiations and legal process longer than expected.	Land located within Berkshire Road Widening Line approved by Berks in 1996. Programme allows times for CPO process to be carried out if necessary and time for land transfer.	Green
Higher than expected costs arising post-business case approval.	Manage scheme costs and benchmark against similar schemes. Scheme to be tendered with other SMaRT and A355 major projects.	Green
Delays in procurement process.	Programme allows adequate time for procurement.	Green
Delays in achieving local contribution towards costs.	Ensure SBC funding in place and on-going dialogue with partners.	Green
Unexpected land compensation claims.	Address any claims in accordance with current legislation.	Green
Unexpected lead in time and duration for Statutory Authority Works.	Discuss and place orders early on and allow adequate lead in time in Project Plan.	Green
Utilities alterations greater than expected.	Early consultations with Statutory Authorities.	Amber
Changes to design after commencing construction.	Fully complete design prior to commencing construction/ allow for contingency provision.	Green

## 5. Programme

Task	Original Timescale	March 2017 Timescale (where changed)
Programme Entry Status	24 July 2014	
Independent Assessment of FBC	October 2014	
Financial Approval from LTB	20 November 2014	
Feasibility work	Completed	
Acquisition of statutory powers	planning permission and CP Orders required	September 2014
Cabinet approve scheme		Dec 2014
Detailed design	March 2015	Jan 2015
Procurement	May 2015	September 2015
Start of construction	June 2015	December 2015
Completion of construction	June 2016	September 2017
One year on evaluation	June 2017	September 2018
Five years on evaluation	June 2021	September 2022

## 6. Growth Deal Reporting Framework

6.1. The following table is an extract from the Growth Deal reporting matrix. The entries made here will be reported on a project by project basis.

Growth Deal Schemes:	Transport scheme	
Thames Valley Berkshire LEP	2.10 Slough: A332 Improvements	March 2017
1. Core Metrics	Planning Numbers	Actual to date
Inputs		
Expenditure	£5,000,000	£3,566,667

Funding breakdown		
Local Growth Deal	£2,700,000	£1,266,667
s.106 and similar contributions	£250,000	£250,000
Council Capital Programme	£2,050,000	£2,050,000
Other	-	
In-kind resources provided	£90,000	-
<b>Outcomes</b>		
Planned Jobs connected to the intervention	2,150	0
Commercial floor space constructed (square metres)	79,150	0
Housing unit starts	2,995	0
Housing units completed	2,995	0
<b>2. PROJECT SPECIFIC OUTPUTS AND OUTCOMES - to be collected where relevant to the intervention</b>		
<b>Transport</b>		
<b>Outputs</b>		
Total length of resurfaced roads	500m	0
Total length of newly built roads	500m of additional traffic lane	0
Total length of new cycle ways	350m	0
Type of infrastructure	Junction improvements, road widening, bus lanes	
Type of service improvement	Relieve congestion, reduce journey times, increase journey reliability	
<b>Outcomes</b>		
Follow on investment at site	Redevelopment for 125 housing units	0
Commercial floor space occupied	To be determined	-
Commercial rental values	To be determined	-

## 7. Further Information for Summary Reports

- 7.1. The scheme includes junction improvements, road widening and other works along the A332 on the approach to Slough town centre with the aim of improving conditions for general traffic as well as buses along this strategic route, making journeys quicker and more reliable. Start on site was December 2015 and it is due to finish in September 2017. The first Growth Fund payment was made in March 2016.

**Berkshire Local Transport Body – 16 March 2017**

**2.11 Reading: South Reading MRT phase 1**

**2.12 Reading: South Reading MRT phase 2**

<b>Highlights of progress since November 2016</b>
Construction of phase 1 of the scheme commenced in August with work on the new sections of outbound bus lane between Imperial Way and Basingstoke Road, and Basingstoke Road and M4 junction 11, completed in December.
Procurement for the remainder of the construction works is on-going with a contractor scheduled to be appointed in late January and works due to commence in March.
A revised design for phase 2 of the scheme has been prepared due to uncertainties regarding the Southside development site, with an outbound bus lane parallel to the existing carriageway to be constructed as part of the phase 2 works.

**1. The Scheme**

- 1.1 South Reading Mass Rapid Transit (MRT) Phases 1 and 2 will provide a series of bus priority measures on the A33 between M4 junction 11 and the A33 junction with Longwater Avenue (Green Park) (Phase 1) and Island Road (Phase 2). The scheme will reduce congestion and journey times, improving public transport reliability on the main corridor into Reading.

**2. Progress with the scheme**

- 2.1 Outline design and preliminary business case development is complete. The scheme was granted programme entry status by the BLTB in July 2014.
- 2.2 The business case has been completed and full financial approval for the scheme was granted by the BLTB in November 2015. The business case incorporates comments received previously from WYG regarding the need to update elements of the Reading Transport Model, therefore an updated model of the A33 corridor was used to prepare the business case.
- 2.3 The economic appraisal for the scheme gives a BCR of 3.55, showing the scheme represents high value for money. Sensitivity tests undertaken with increased scheme costs and high and low patronage forecasts still show a positive BCR of between 2.4 to 4.2.
- 2.4 Statutory consultation for the scheme has been completed with no objections received to the Traffic Regulation Orders. In addition a public exhibition was held in June 2016 to provide information about this element of the MRT scheme and proposals for future phases.
- 2.5 Construction of phase 1 of the scheme commenced in August with work on the new sections of outbound bus lane between Imperial Way and Basingstoke Road, and Basingstoke Road and M4 junction 11, completed in December.
- 2.6 Procurement for the remainder of the construction works is on-going with a contractor scheduled to be appointed in late January and works due to commence in March. It is anticipated that the construction period will run for the majority of the calendar year with completion scheduled for November 2017.
- 2.7 A revised design for phase 2 of the scheme has been prepared due to uncertainties regarding the Southside development site, with an outbound bus lane parallel to the existing carriageway to be constructed as part of the phase 2 works. In addition an inbound bus lane alongside the development site has been included within the GD3 bid for phases 3 and 4 of the scheme.
- 2.8 A phased construction programme for the overall MRT scheme has been developed, including measures to reduce disruption to the flow of traffic while the construction works take place, for instance by limiting any necessary lane closures to off peak hours only.
- 2.9 The potential for cost savings for the scheme continues to be reviewed, both to the overall scheme costs and the level of LGF funding required.

### 3. Funding

3.1. The following table sets out the funding for the scheme on the basis of the indicative funding profile:

Source of funding	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
Amount from LEP Local Growth Deal	-	£2,970,000	£1,530,000	-	-	-	£4,500,000
Local contributions from:							
- Section 106 agreements	-	-	£1,120,000	-	-	-	£1,120,000
- Council Capital Programme	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
- Other sources	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total Scheme Cost</b>		<b>£2,970,000</b>	<b>£2,650,000</b>				<b>£5,620,000</b>

### 4. Risks

4.1. The key risks on delivering this Programme Entry scheme and how they will be managed are set out in the table below:

Risk	Management of risk
Objections through the TRO process.	Scheme is within highway or safeguarded land. The principle of MRT on this corridor has been consulted upon through preparation of policy documents including the LTP3.
Utility diversions and surface water drainage alterations.	Detailed designs for the scheme are being prepared with all the relevant information from utility searches and in line with surface water drainage requirements.
Securing the required third party land where this falls outside highway land.	The MRT route has been safeguarded for this purpose and negotiations with land owners are being undertaken.

### 5. Programme

Task	Original Timescale	March 2017 Timescale (where changed)
Feasibility work	March 2014	
Programme Entry Status	July 2014	
Independent Assessment of FBC	September 2015	
Financial Approval from LTB	November 2015	
Acquisition of statutory powers	March 2016	June 2016
Detailed design	June 2015	Phase 1 - April 2016 Phase 2 - November 2016
Procurement	June 2016	Phase 1 - July 2016 Phase 2 - January 2017
Start of construction	August 2016	
Completion of construction	November 2017	
One year on evaluation	November 2018	
Five years on evaluation	November 2022	

### 6. Growth Deal Reporting Framework

6.1. The following table is an extract from the Growth Deal reporting matrix. The entries made here will be reported on a project by project basis.

<b>Growth Deal Schemes:</b>	<b>Transport scheme</b>	
<b>Thames Valley Berkshire LEP</b>	<b>2.11 Reading: South Reading MRT phase 1 2.12 Reading: South Reading MRT phase 2</b>	<b>March 2017</b>
<b>1. Core Metrics</b>	<b>Planning Numbers</b>	<b>Actual to date</b>
<b>Inputs</b>		
Expenditure	£5,620,000	
Funding breakdown		
Local Growth Deal	£4,500,000	
s.106 and similar contributions	£1,120,000	
Council Capital Programme	-	
Other	-	
In-kind resources provided	£350,000	
<b>Outcomes</b>		
Planned Jobs connected to the intervention	2,424	
Commercial floor space constructed (square metres)	44,016	
Housing unit starts	527	
Housing units completed	527	
<b>2. PROJECT SPECIFIC OUTPUTS AND OUTCOMES - to be collected where relevant to the intervention</b>		
<b>Transport</b>		
<b>Outputs</b>		
Total length of resurfaced roads	N/A	
Total length of newly built roads	1,900m (Phase 1) 1,360m (Phase 2)	
Total length of new cycle ways	200m (Phase 2)	
Type of infrastructure	Bus Priority Lanes	
Type of service improvement	Reduced & consistent journey times	
<b>Outcomes</b>		
Follow on investment at site	N/A	
Commercial floor space occupied	N/A	
Commercial rental values	N/A	

## 7. Further Information for Summary Reports

The South Reading MRT, when complete, will provide segregated bus lanes from Mere oak Park and Ride south of Junction 11 of the M4 to Reading Station. Phases 1 and 2 extend from J11 to Island Road. Started on site July 2016 and due to complete November 2017. First Growth Fund payment due March 2017.

**Berkshire Local Transport Body – 16 March 2017**

**2.13 Wokingham: Thames Valley Park and Ride**  
 previously called 2.13 Reading: Eastern Park and Ride

<b>Highlights of progress since November 2016</b>
Discussions ongoing between Oracle and Wokingham Borough Council relating to transfer of land ownership. Once complete SGN Gas Main survey will be able to commence and detailed design completed.
Discussions have commenced with TVP regarding a proposed Heads of Terms for use of the TVP Shuttle Bus Service. TVP Directors support in principle the proposed Heads of Terms
The Planning Application was given conditional planning approval on 9 November 2016.
The Business Case is in advanced state of preparation and is due to be submitted ahead of July 2017 Meeting,

**1. The Scheme**

- 1.1 Thames Valley Park and Ride (P&R) is a proposed P&R facility off the A3290 in the east of the Reading urban area. The scheme will improve access to Reading town centre and major employment sites by providing congestion relief on the road network in east Reading.
- 1.2 The scheme is being jointly promoted by Reading Borough Council (RBC) and Wokingham Borough Council (WBC).
- 1.3 The scheme was originally called 2.13 Reading: Eastern Park and Ride, but has since been re-named 2.13 Wokingham: Thames Valley Park and Ride

**2. Progress with the scheme**

- 2.1 Outline design and preliminary business case development (including baseline surveys and modelling) is complete. The scheme was granted programme entry status by the BLTB in July 2014.
- 2.2 Scheme development, including preparation of the full business case for the scheme has been completed in line with the requirements of the BLTB independent assessment.
- 2.3 Wokingham BC secured LSTF revenue funding for 2015/16 to progress the scheme to submission of a planning application. Progression of a public consultation, planning application (including an Environmental Statements), has been undertaken in line with the scheme programme.
- 2.4 Meetings took place between Reading BC and Wokingham BC to ascertain the extent of work already undertaken.
- 2.5 Progress on scheme development has been reported to the Thames Valley Park Board and regular updates will be reported to this forum as a key delivery partner for the project.
- 2.6 The potential for cost savings for the scheme continues to be reviewed, both to the overall scheme costs and the level of LGF funding required.
- 2.7 The scheme is being developed to ensure compatibility with other schemes contained within the TVB Strategic Economic Plan (SEP), particularly East Reading Mass Rapid Transit.

**3. Funding**

- 3.1. The following table sets out the funding for the scheme on the basis of the indicative funding profile.

<b>Source of funding</b>	<b>2015/16</b>	<b>2016/17</b>	<b>2017/18</b>	<b>2018/19</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>Total</b>
Amount from LEP Local Growth Deal	-			£2,000,000	£900,000	-	£2,900,000
Local contributions	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

from .....							
- Section 106 agreements	-	-	£250,000	£450,000	-	-	£700,000
- Council Capital Programme	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
- Other sources	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total Scheme Cost</b>			<b>£250,000</b>	<b>£2,450,000</b>	<b>£900,000</b>		<b>£3,600,000</b>

#### 4. Risks

4.1. The key risks on delivering this Programme Entry scheme and how they will be managed are set out in the table below

<b>Risk</b>	<b>Management of risk</b>
Planning permission is not granted.	Robust scheme development and planning application documentation has been prepared.
Land availability	Land constraints have been identified, elements of land within local authority ownership. WBC engaged in negotiations on leases.
Crossrail safeguarded land	Initial discussions with Crossrail confirmed they are only likely to require access across the land to a storage area by the river.
Objections through the planning process	Robust scheme development and planning application documentation is being prepared.
Environmental consents / mitigation	Subject to planning and consultation process. Initial key survey work has been undertaken and scheme subject to a rigorous site option assessment process. Ecology surveys now complete and discussions have commenced with WBC Development Management.
Securing operationally viable bus service	Liaison with possible providers including TVP underway, operational principles established. Heads of Terms agreed in principle.
Requirement for Utility Diversion	Ongoing discussions with SGN and SSE.

#### 5. Programme

<b>Task</b>	<b>Original Timescale</b>	<b>March 2017 Timescale (where changed)</b>
Programme Entry Status	24 July 2014	
Independent Assessment of FBC	September 2015	October 2016 (submit first draft FBC)
Financial Approval from LTB	November 2015	July 2017
Feasibility work	March 2014	
Acquisition of statutory powers	September 2015	November 2016
Detailed design	September 2015	Autumn 2017
Procurement	March 2016	Spring 2018
Start of construction	April 2016	Autumn 2018
Completion of construction	September 2017	2019
One year on evaluation	September 2018	2020
Five years on evaluation	September 2022	2024

#### 6. Growth Deal Reporting Framework

6.1. The following table is an extract from the Growth Deal reporting matrix. The entries made here will be reported on a project by project basis.

<b>Growth Deal Schemes:</b>	<b>Transport scheme</b>	
<b>Thames Valley Berkshire LEP</b>	<b>2.13 Wokingham: Thames Valley Park and Ride previously 2.13 Reading: Eastern Park and Ride</b>	<b>March 2017</b>
<b>1. Core Metrics</b>	<b>Planning Numbers</b>	<b>Actual to date</b>
<b>Inputs</b>		
Expenditure	£3,600,000	0
Funding breakdown		
Local Growth Deal	£2,900,000	0
s.106 and similar contributions	£700,000	0
Council Capital Programme	-	-
Other	-	-
In-kind resources provided		
<b>Outcomes</b>		
Planned Jobs connected to the intervention	n/a	-
Commercial floor space constructed (square metres)	n/a	-
Housing unit starts	n/a	-
Housing units completed	n/a	-
<b>2. PROJECT SPECIFIC OUTPUTS AND OUTCOMES - to be collected where relevant to the intervention</b>		
<b>Transport</b>		
<b>Outputs</b>		
Total length of resurfaced roads	[TBC]	-
Total length of newly built roads	[TBC]	-
Total length of new cycle ways	[TBC]	-
Type of infrastructure	[TBC]	-
Type of service improvement	[TBC]	-
<b>Outcomes</b>		
Follow on investment at site	[TBC]	-
Commercial floor space occupied	[TBC]	-
Commercial rental values	[TBC]	-

## 7. Further Information for Summary Reports

This Park and Ride site will serve Thames Valley Park and the A329(M). It will complement the planned East Reading MRT scheme. Awaiting full business case approval in July 2017, then due on site in 2018 and completion in 2019. First Growth Fund payment due March 2019.



**Berkshire Local Transport Body – 16 March 2017**

**2.14 Reading: East Reading Mass Rapid Transit (MRT) Phase 1**

**2.25 Reading: East Reading Mass Rapid Transit (MRT) Phase 2**

<b>Highlights of progress since November 2016</b>
The full business case for the scheme (phases 1 and 2) has been produced using the updated Reading Transport Model. WYG have undertaken a preliminary review and requested some further information, therefore it is anticipated that full financial approval will be sought from the BLTB meeting in June.
The planning application is being prepared and pre-application discussions are on-going with Reading BC, Wokingham BC and all statutory consultees including the Environment Agency.
An Early Contractor Involvement (ECI) feasibility report has been completed highlighting potential areas of added value to be investigated through the detailed design of the scheme.
In anticipation of the Minister's announcement, we have included Phase 2 as a GD3 scheme

**1. The Scheme**

- 1.1 East Reading Mass Rapid Transit (MRT) Phases 1 and 2 is a new public transport link between central Reading and the proposed Thames Valley Park P&R site to the east of the Reading urban area, running parallel to the Great Western mainline.
- 1.2 The scheme is being promoted by Reading Borough Council (RBC) in partnership with Wokingham Borough Council (WBC).

**2. Progress with the scheme**

- 2.1 Feasibility work and outline design is complete. The scheme was granted programme entry status by the BLTB in July 2014.
- 2.2 The full business case for the scheme (phases 1 and 2) has been produced using the updated Reading Transport Model. WYG have undertaken a preliminary review and requested some further information, therefore it is anticipated that full financial approval will be sought from the BLTB meeting in June.
- 2.3 The planning application is being prepared and pre-application discussions are on-going with Reading BC, Wokingham BC and all statutory consultees including the Environment Agency. The EIA scoping opinion has been agreed with both planning authorities and significant work is being undertaken in order to mitigate the environmental, flooding, landscaping and visual impact aspects of the scheme.
- 2.4 Informal consultation including a public exhibition was undertaken during July 2016 which has informed development of the scheme. Statutory consultation will be undertaken through the planning process.
- 2.5 An Early Contractor Involvement (ECI) feasibility report has been completed highlighting potential areas of added value to be investigated through the detailed design of the scheme.
- 2.6 Negotiations are on-going with third party landowners in order to acquire the land needed for the scheme.
- 2.7 The programme has been updated to reflect implications resulting from the significant delay associated with the requirement to update the Reading Transport Model prior to preparation of the full business case for the scheme.
- 2.8 Progress on scheme development has been reported to the Thames Valley Park Board and regular updates will be reported to this forum as a key delivery partner for the project.
- 2.9 The scheme is being developed to ensure compatibility with other schemes contained within the TVB Strategic Economic Plan (SEP), particularly the Thames Valley Park P&R scheme.
- 2.10 The potential for cost savings for the scheme continues to be reviewed, both to the overall scheme costs and the level of LGF funding required.

### 3. Funding

3.1. The following table sets out the funding for the scheme on the basis of the indicative funding profile.

Source of funding	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
Amount from LEP Local Growth Deal	-	-	-	£5,400,000	£10,200,000	£3,467,000	£19,067,000
Local contributions from ...							
- Section 106 agreements	-	-	-	-	£3,900,000	£900,000	£4,800,000
- Council Capital Programme	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
- Other sources	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total Scheme Cost</b>				<b>£5,400,000</b>	<b>£14,100,000</b>	<b>£4,367,000</b>	<b>£23,867,000</b>

### 4. Risks

4.1. The key risks on delivering this Programme Entry scheme and how they will be managed are set out in the table below

Risk	Management of risk
Environmental consents / mitigation	Subject to planning and consultation process. Initial key survey work has been undertaken and scheme subject to a rigorous site option assessment process.
Planning permission is not granted / objections through the planning process	Robust scheme development and planning application documentation is being prepared.
A Public Inquiry is called by the Planning Inspectorate.	Robust scheme development and planning application documentation is being prepared.
Land availability	Land constraints have been identified, elements of land within local authority ownership, and negotiations on-going with third party landowners.
Scheme costs significantly increase.	Costs are being reviewed and cost savings sought, a phased approach to delivery has been identified.

### 5. Programme

Task	Original Timescale	March 2017 Timescale (where changed)
Programme Entry Status	July 2013	
Feasibility work	March 2014	
Independent Assessment of FBC	September 2015	April 2017
Financial Approval from LTB	November 2015	July 2017
Acquisition of statutory powers: Planning submission	September 2015	May 2017
Detailed design	September 2015	September 2017
Procurement	March 2016	March 2018
Start of construction	April 2016	April 2018
Completion of construction	September 2017	September 2020
One year on evaluation	September 2018	September 2021
Five years on evaluation	September 2022	September 2025

## 6. Growth Deal Reporting Framework

6.1. The following table is an extract from the Growth Deal reporting matrix. The entries made here will be reported on a project by project basis.

<b>Growth Deal Schemes:</b>	<b>Transport scheme</b>	
<b>Thames Valley Berkshire LEP</b>	<b>2.14 and 2.25 Reading: East Reading Mass Rapid Transit Phases 1&amp;2</b>	<b>March 2017</b>
<b>1. Core Metrics</b>	<b>Planning Numbers</b>	<b>Actual to date</b>
<b>Inputs</b>		
Expenditure	£23,867,000	
Funding breakdown		
Local Growth Deal	£19,067,000	
s.106 and similar contributions	£4,800,000	
Council Capital Programme	-	
Other	-	
In-kind resources provided	£500,000	
<b>Outcomes</b>		
Planned Jobs connected to the intervention	1,236	
Commercial floor space constructed (square metres)	29,600	
Housing unit starts	356	
Housing units completed	356	
<b>2. PROJECT SPECIFIC OUTPUTS AND OUTCOMES - to be collected where relevant to the intervention</b>		
<b>Transport</b>		
<b>Outputs</b>		
Total length of resurfaced roads	N/A	
Total length of newly built roads	1,870m	
Total length of new cycle ways	1,870m	
Type of infrastructure	Dedicated public transport link	
Type of service improvement	Decongestion Benefits; Journey Time Savings; Reliability; Journey Ambience	
<b>Outcomes</b>		
Follow on investment at site	N/A	
Commercial floor space occupied	N/A	
Commercial rental values	N/A	
<b>3. ADDITIONAL MONITORING - for specific schemes</b>		
Transport - to be collected for all projects/programmes involving more than £5m public funding and where these metrics and the collection points are relevant to the intervention		
Average daily traffic and by peak/non-peak periods		
Average AM and PM peak journey time per mile on key routes (journey time measurement)		

Average AM and PM peak journey time on key routes (journey time measurement)		
Day-to-day travel time variability		
Average annual CO2 emissions		
Accident rate		
Casualty rate		
Nitrogen Oxide and particulate emissions		
Traffic noise levels at receptor locations		
Annual average daily and peak hour passenger boardings	745,000 per annum; Circa 2,050 per day; 423 AM Peak; 281 Inter-peak	
Bus/light rail travel time by peak period	Time saving of 4 minutes	
Mode share (%)		
Pedestrians counts on new/existing routes (#)		
Cycle journeys on new/existing routes (#)		
Households with access to specific sites by mode within threshold times (#)		

## 7. Further Information for Summary Reports

When complete, the East Reading MRT scheme will create segregated bus lanes between Reading Station and Thames Valley Park and the proposed Park and Ride site. The full business case will be presented in July 2017, and it is due on site in April 2018, with completion in September 2020. The first Growth Fund payment is due in March 2019.

## Appendix 6

### Berkshire Local Transport Body – 16 March 2017

#### 2.15 Bracknell: Martins Heron Roundabout

Highlights of progress since November 2016
Enhancements made to the original scheme to deliver strategic benefits over and above the original expectations.
Scheme has unconditional approval from 13 January 2017
A start on site has been made in March with utilities diversions and other preliminary works

#### 1. The Scheme

- 1.1. This is part of a wider programme to improve access between the M3 and M4 via the A322, A329 and A329(M). This route runs through the middle of Bracknell and forms part of the original inner ring road. The main capacity constraint is the junctions where radial and orbital routes intersect. This scheme focuses on the Martins Heron roundabout on the east of Bracknell and includes associated junction improvements and minor alteration to the London Road corridor to improve congestion and journey times. The original intention had been to fund a major part of the improvements from developer contributions arising from Bracknell Town Centre redevelopment but this is no longer possible on viability grounds.

#### 2. Progress with the scheme

- 2.1. Following the decision of BLTB in July, a start on site has been made in March 2017 with some utilities diversions and other preliminary works..
- 2.2. We plan to deliver the Martins Heron/London road corridor improvements project through a Principal Contractor (the Council's Highways Term Contract) which significantly streamlines the procurements process, and will be seeking the necessary internal approvals for this course of action.

#### 3. Funding

- 3.1. The following table sets out the funding for the scheme on the basis of our unapproved funding profile.

Source of funding	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
Amount from LEP Local Growth Deal	-	£200,000	£1,800,000	£900,000	-	-	£2,900,000
Local contributions from .....							
- Section 106 agreements	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
- Council Capital Programme	-	-	£450,000-	£450,000	-	-	£900,000
- Other sources	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total Scheme Cost</b>		<b>£200,000</b>	<b>£2,250,000</b>	<b>£1,350,000</b>			<b>£3,800,000</b>

#### 4. Risks

Risk	Management of risk
That the overall cost of the Martins Heron Junction exceeds the funding available	Detailed Bill of Quantities with effective site and contract management
Statutory undertakers C4 cost estimates significantly exceed C3 cost estimates	Early liaison with statutory undertakers and early commission of C4 estimates (underway)
Highway Works in neighbouring local authority area during construction leading to traffic congestion and possible impact on programme and costs	Liaison with neighbouring authorities and agreement re. programme

Unexpected need for additional Temporary Traffic Management increasing costs	Liaison with Traffic Management Section and early quantification of TM requirements and costs (underway)
--	--

## 5. Programme

Task	Original Timescale	March 2017 Timescale (where changed)
Programme Entry Status	24 July 2014	
Independent Assessment of FBC	April 2016	Nov 2016(conditional)
Financial Approval from LTB	November 2016	January 2017 Unconditional approval
Feasibility work		April 2016
Acquisition of statutory powers	Not needed	
Detailed design	October 2016	
Procurement	Term contractor	
Start of construction	June 2017	March 2017
Completion of construction	November 2018	
One year on evaluation	November 2019	
Five years on evaluation	November 2023	

## 6. Growth Deal Reporting Framework

6.1. The following table is an extract from the Growth Deal reporting matrix. The entries made here will be reported on a project by project basis.

Growth Deal Schemes:	Transport scheme	
Thames Valley Berkshire LEP	2.15 Bracknell: Martins Heron Roundabout	March 2017
1. Core Metrics	Planning Numbers	Actual to date
<b>Inputs</b>		
Expenditure	£3,800,000	
Funding breakdown		
Local Growth Deal	£2,900,000	
s.106 and similar contributions	£450,000	
Council Capital Programme	£450,000	
Other	-	
In-kind resources provided	Surveys – Topographical and turning counts	£10000
<b>Outcomes</b>		
Planned Jobs connected to the intervention	0	
Commercial floor space constructed (square metres)	0	
Housing unit starts	0	
Housing units completed	0	
<b>2. PROJECT SPECIFIC OUTPUTS AND OUTCOMES - to be collected where relevant to the intervention</b>		
<b>Transport</b>		
<b>Outputs</b>		
Total length of resurfaced roads	Approximately 750m – 1000m	
Total length of newly built roads	Approximately 100m where	

	the existing roundabout is to be removed.	
Total length of new cycle ways	Shared facilities already run along London Rd. Junction works will provide safer controlled crossing points for peds/cyclists.	
Type of infrastructure	Replacement of existing roundabout with signalised junction	
Type of service improvement	Improvement to journey times following removal of an existing pinch point on the network.	
<b>Outcomes</b>		
Follow on investment at site	Not applicable	
Commercial floor space occupied	Not applicable	
Commercial rental values	Not applicable	

## 7. Further Information for Summary Reports

The Martins Heron Junction is due to be converted from roundabout to signal controls. The start on site is due in March 2017 and completion in November 2018. The first Growth Fund payment due in March 2017.

Berkshire Local Transport Body – 16 March 2017

2.16 Maidenhead: Station Access

Highlights of progress since November 2016
High level business cases have been developed for various options using webTAG principles, but all have failed to produce the necessary benefit cost ratio. Key issues are the additional congestion caused by the upgraded crossing and the additional walking distance caused by relocating car parking from the station forecourt to Stafferton Way.
RBWM has consulted WSP Parsons Brinckerhoff who advised that additional benefits could be included to boost the business case.
WSP Parsons Brinckerhoff is also updating the borough's traffic model to prepare a 2033 forecast year scenario to inform the Borough Local Plan. This will be used to assess the impacts of the pedestrian / cycle crossing on the wider town centre road network.

**1. The Scheme**

1.1. The scheme has three elements:

- i) Construction of a multi-modal transport interchange at Maidenhead Station to improve connections between journeys made on foot, bicycle, bus, train, taxi and car.
- ii) Improved linkages between the rail station and the town centre, with environmental enhancements for the station forecourt that will transform the area and create a proper gateway to the town centre.
- iii) Construction of replacement and increased parking for rail commuters, shoppers, visitors and employees.

**2. Progress with the scheme**

- 2.1. Maidenhead Railway Station is a major gateway into the town centre with over 4.5 million people passing through it each year, putting it in the top 50 UK stations outside London, and significantly higher if interchanges are taken into account.
- 2.2. With the planned upgrades to the Great Western Main Line, including electrification, new rolling stock and implementation of the Elizabeth Line (Crossrail), passenger footfall and the importance of Maidenhead station will increase.
- 2.3. Maidenhead Town Centre Area Action Plan (AAP) has identified the station and surrounding area as an Opportunity Site for development. Discussions have taken place with Network Rail and other landowners.
- 2.4. Access to the station by non-car modes is currently poor. Buses call at a number of different stops scattered over a wide area. In a recent passenger survey, access by bus was the second most identified area for improvement.
- 2.5. The station forecourt is congested with parked cars, taxis and vehicles involved in dropping off / picking up passengers, while walking and cycling routes to the station are narrow and congested, with cycle parking facilities operating above capacity.
- 2.6. In 2013, a provisional scheme was developed jointly with Crossrail incorporating a transport interchange at Maidenhead Station to improve connections between rail and other forms of transport. Vehicles would largely be removed from the station forecourt to enable creation of interchange facilities and a high quality public space commensurate with its importance as a gateway to the town centre and western terminus to the Elizabeth Line. Unfortunately, the scheme was ultimately found to be unviable, but it provided a useful starting point.
- 2.7. There are nearly 400 parking spaces in the station car parks, with 87 in the station forecourt. These facilities operate at or close to capacity on most days. Removal of the parked cars from the station forecourt means that parking will need to be re-provided elsewhere. A passenger survey showed that only half of interviewed passengers who arrived by car currently use the station car parks, with a quarter parking on street. This suggests that there is suppressed demand for parking at the station. The additional trips associated with the Elizabeth Line and other planned improvements, are likely to significantly increase the demand for parking in the vicinity of the rail station.



- 2.8. An access and parking study has been carried out for the town centre, which shows that long-stay car parks near the station are already at capacity on weekdays. With growth in traffic forecast to be in the region of 2% per annum over 10 years, it is forecast that there will be an overall shortfall in weekday parking across the town centre within the next few years. A number of options have been considered to address this shortfall. Regardless of which option is pursued, additional car parking will be required to accommodate weekday demand.
- 2.9. The council adopted its Parking Strategy in October 2016, which set out the policies and principles that will govern future parking provision in the borough. A draft implementation plan has been developed and was taken to Cabinet for approval in January 2017. This included proposals to increase parking capacity in Stafferton Way.
- 2.10. A range of other stakeholders have demonstrated commitment and support for the project as part of the wider Maidenhead Town Centre Area Action Plan, including the Partnership for the Rejuvenation of Maidenhead.
- 2.11. The Council has also been working with developers to explore delivery options for improving pedestrian and cycle access between the station and the town centre, including remodelling the King Street / Queen Street / Grenfell Road junction. A planning application has been approved for The Landing development and RBWM has provisionally secured a contribution of £250,000 towards the junction improvement scheme.
- 2.12. The Council appointed consultants to progress designs for a multi-modal interchange at the station. The constrained nature of the station site means that it is not possible to provide all of the required interchange elements within the existing station forecourt and so additional land would be needed for the bus interchange.
- 2.13. The adjacent landowners declined to enter into a joint venture, which means that compulsory purchase of all or part of the area to the north of the station will be required in order to deliver the interchange scheme.
- 2.14. Consultants have appraised numerous options and sub-options, including redevelopment of all or part of the site in order to minimise any funding gaps created by the compulsory purchase of the land required for the interchange.
- 2.15. However, even the lowest cost option could not be progressed with the funding available. Also, it was found that the bus interchange would potentially limit the potential for the adjacent office buildings to be redeveloped.
- 2.16. An alternative option has been developed minus the bus interchange, featuring:
  - Improved access for pedestrians and cyclists within the station forecourt and across the King Street / Queen Street / A308 junction
  - A 300 space cycle hub in the forecourt
  - A new taxi rank with improved layout
  - A taxi feeder lane on the A308 (requires the clock tower to be relocated)
  - Additional disabled parking in the station forecourt
  - A dedicated passenger set-down / pick-up area
  - High quality paving and environmental enhancements in the forecourt
  - Additional parking in Stafferton Way to replace spaces lost from the forecourt
  - A new southbound bus stop on the A308, closer to the King Street / Queen Street / A308 junction.
- 2.17. A high level value for money (VfM) assessment was carried out for this scheme. This found that the scheme costs outweighed the benefits by a significant margin. Many of the scheme benefits cannot be quantified using traditional webTAG methodologies or have a low monetary value (e.g. the environmental enhancements and taxi feeder lane). Also, redesigning the King Street / Queen Street / A308 junction was found to have a negative impact on traffic congestion, while re-providing car parking off-site would have negative impacts in terms of increased walking distances.
- 2.18. A further VfM assessment has been carried out for a 'core scheme' without the forecourt paving, passenger set-down / pick-up area, and taxi feeder lane. These features account for a significant portion of the scheme costs, while delivering little in terms of quantifiable transport benefits. The assessment has shown that this scheme could deliver a BCR of

around 1.45, but only if traffic on Queen Street can be constrained so the junction operates below capacity in future.

- 2.19. Consultants from WSP | Parsons Brinckerhoff were invited to give a second opinion on the business case work completed to date. They advised that additional benefits could be included to boost the business case.
- 2.20. WSP | Parsons Brinckerhoff is also updating the borough's traffic model to prepare a 2033 forecast year scenario for the Borough Local Plan. This will be used to assess the impacts of the pedestrian / cycle crossing on the wider town centre road network.
- 2.21. Great Western Railway is looking to enhancing the station's southern access to extend the ticket gate line to accommodate the additional passengers that are forecast to use this entrance.
- 2.22. They also developed a proposal for decking the station car park at Shoppenhangers Road to provide at least 182 additional spaces and submitted a bid to the Station Commercial Project Facility. Unfortunately, this was unsuccessful due to the high cost of the project relative to the benefits afforded by the scheme.

### 3. Funding

- 3.1. The following table sets out the funding for the scheme on the basis of our unapproved funding profile.

Source of funding	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
Amount from LEP Local Growth Deal	-	-	£1,750,000	£5,000,000	-	-	£6,750,000
Local contributions from .....							
- Section 106 agreements	-	£600,000	£1,250,000*	-	-	-	£1,250,000*
- Council Capital Programme	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
- Other sources	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total Scheme Cost</b>			<b>£3,000,000*</b>	<b>£5,000,000</b>			<b>£8,000,000*</b>

\*provisional funding profile, not yet confirmed

### 4. Risks

- 4.1. The key risks on delivering this Programme Entry scheme and how they will be managed are set out in the table below

Risk	Management of risk
Land cannot be secured for the development	Compulsory purchase options being investigated.
Planning permission is not granted	The scheme is consistent with priorities identified within the Maidenhead Town Centre AAP. Planning is engaged in discussions.
Private sector finance is not forthcoming	The bid reflects the worst case scenario, with minimal private sector funding. Discussions are ongoing with relevant stakeholders and the Council is confident that private sector finance can be delivered in excess of the minimum levels indicated.

## 5. Programme

Task	Original Timescale	March 2017 Timescale (where changed)
Programme Entry Status	24 July 2014	
Feasibility / outline design	March 2015	November 2016
Selection of preferred option		February 2017
Detailed design	January 2016	May 2017
Preparation of FBC		May 2017
Independent Assessment of FBC	March 2016	June 2017
Financial Approval from LTB	July 2016	July 2017
Acquisition of statutory powers	March 2015	September 2017
Procurement	March 2016	November 2017
Start of construction	April 2017	January 2018
Completion of construction	March 2017	October 2019
One year on evaluation	October 2018	October 2020
Five years on evaluation	October 2022	October 2024

## 6. Growth Deal Reporting Framework

- 6.1. The following table is an extract from the Growth Deal reporting matrix. The entries made here will be reported on a project by project basis.

Growth Deal Schemes:	Transport scheme	
Thames Valley Berkshire LEP	2.16 Maidenhead: Station Access	March 2017
1. Core Metrics	Planning Numbers	Actual to date
<b>Inputs</b>		
Expenditure	£8,000,000	£0
Funding breakdown		
Local Growth Deal	£6,750,000	£0
s.106 and similar contributions	£1,250,000	£0
Council Capital Programme	-	£5,000
Other	-	£105,000
In-kind resources provided	£150,000	£45,000
<b>Outcomes</b>		
Planned Jobs connected to the intervention	875	0
Commercial floor Space constructed (square metres)	15,750	0
Housing unit starts	50	0
Housing units completed	50	0
<b>2. PROJECT SPECIFIC OUTPUTS AND OUTCOMES - to be collected where relevant to the intervention</b>		
<b>Transport</b>		
<b>Outputs</b>		
Total length of resurfaced roads	0	0
Total length of newly built roads	0	0
Total length of new cycle ways	0	0
Type of infrastructure	Multi-modal transport interchange; 1,000 space multi-storey car park	

Type of service improvement	Improved connections between journeys made on foot, bicycle, bus, train, taxi and car; Increased car park capacity serving the rail station and town centre.	
<b>Outcomes</b>		
Follow on investment at site	tbc*	-
Commercial floor space occupied	tbc*	-
Commercial rental values	tbc*	-
<b>3. ADDITIONAL MONITORING - for specific schemes</b>		
Transport - to be collected for all projects/programmes <b>involving more than £5m public funding</b> and where these metrics and the collection points are relevant to the intervention		
Average daily traffic and by peak/non-peak periods	n/a	-
Average AM and PM peak journey time per mile on key routes (journey time measurement)	n/a	-
Average AM and PM peak journey time on key routes (journey time measurement)	n/a	-
Day-to-day travel time variability	n/a	-
Average annual CO <sub>2</sub> emissions	n/a	-
Accident rate	n/a	-
Casualty rate	n/a	-
Nitrogen Oxide and particulate emissions	n/a	-
Traffic noise levels at receptor locations	n/a	-
Annual average daily and peak hour passenger boardings	tbc*	-
Bus/light rail travel time by peak period	n/a	-
Mode share (%)	tbc*	-
Pedestrians counts on new/existing routes (#)	tbc*	-
Cycle journeys on new/existing routes (#)	tbc*	-
Households with access to specific sites by mode within threshold times (#)	tbc*	-

\* Numbers will be determined as part of feasibility work

## 7. Further Information for Summary Reports

Maidenhead Station will be served by Crossrail services from December 2019, and this scheme is designed to improve the capacity of the forecourt area to cope with the anticipated increase in pedestrian traffic. The scheme is coordinated with capacity improvements inside the station. A start on site is due in January 2018 and completion in October 2019. The first Growth Fund payment due in March 2018.

Berkshire Local Transport Body – 16 March 2017

2.17 Slough: A355 Route

Highlights of progress since November 2016
Southbound carriageway works completed in September including bridge works
Northbound bridge works underway

**1. The Scheme**

- 1.1. This is a scheme to improve traffic flow on the strategic north-south A355 route that links the M4, Slough Trading Estate and the M40 and to enhance access to Slough town centre. The scheme involves the remodelling of the Copthorne roundabout, signal and junction upgrades and selected road widening.
- 1.2. The A355 Route Enhancement scheme will deliver a major contribution to reducing road congestion and increasing economic efficiency and business confidence. This project will support the delivery of the 150,000m<sup>2</sup> of office and ancillary space proposed in the Slough Trading Estate master plan and over 60,000m<sup>2</sup> of office space, 2,300 dwellings and other development to be delivered in the town centre as part of the 'Heart of Slough' project.

**2. Progress with the scheme**

- 2.1. The business case for this scheme was assessed by WYG in October 2014. Financial Approval was given by the BLTB on 20<sup>th</sup> November 2014.
- 2.2. Detailed design and public consultation have been completed. Approval was granted by the Cabinet on the 15<sup>th</sup> December 2014 to proceed to tender and implementation.
- 2.3. Procurement has proceeded in parallel with schemes 2.08 Slough: Rapid Transit Phase 1 and 2.10 Slough: A332 Improvements.
- 2.4. Civils work started mid-January 2016; the bridge repair and new parapets are on-going and about 30% complete on the east side. The formation of the cut through at the roundabout is about 40% complete. Works to the south bound carriageway are 40% complete. Switch over to commence work on the west side is July 2016 and full completion is December 2016.
- 2.5. Southbound carriageway works completed in September including bridge works, Contra-flow switched in September, Northbound bridge work underway.
- 2.6. Near complete. Copthorne roundabout opened, some minor civil works remaining on central reservation.

**3. Funding**

- 3.1. The following table sets out the funding for the scheme.

Source of funding	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
Amount from LEP Local Growth Deal	£2,275,000	£2,125,000	-	-	-	-	£4,400,000
Local contributions from ....							
- Section 106 agreements	£700,000		-	-	-	-	£700,000
- Council Capital Programme	£700,000		-	-	-	-	£700,000
- Other sources	-		-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total Scheme Cost</b>	<b>£3,675,000</b>	<b>£2,125,000</b>					<b>£5,800,000</b>

**4. Risks**

- 4.1. The key risks on delivering this Programme Entry scheme and how they will be managed are set out in the table below.

Risk	Management of risk	
Unfavourable response to wider public consultation.	Public consultation and close working with Ward Members, NAGs, Parish Councils and partners, bearing in mind that the affected land lies within the approved Bath Road Widening Line. On-going dialogue with planning officers to address likely concerns.	Green
Higher than expected costs arising post-business case approval.	Manage scheme costs and benchmark against similar schemes. Scheme to be tendered with other SMaRT and A332 major projects.	Green
Delays in procurement process.	Programme allows adequate time for procurement	Green
Delays in achieving local contribution towards costs.	Ensure SBC funding in place and on-going dialogue with partners.	Green
Unexpected land compensation claims.	Address any claims in accordance with current legislation.	Green
Unexpected lead in time and duration for Statutory Authority Works.	Discuss and place orders early on and allow adequate lead in time in Project Plan.	Green
Utilities alterations greater than expected.	Early consultations with Statutory Authorities.	Green
Changes to design after commencing construction.	Fully complete design prior to commencing construction/ allow for contingency provision.	Green

## 5. Programme

Task	November 2014 Timescale	March 2017 Timescale (where changed)
Programme Entry Status	24 July 2014	
Independent Assessment of FBC	October 2014	
Financial Approval from LTB	20 November 2014	
Feasibility work	Completed	
Acquisition of statutory powers	n/a	Completed
Detailed design	March 2015	Completed
Procurement	May 2015	Completed
Start of construction	June 2015	December 2015
Completion of construction	June 2016	Completed February 2017
One year on evaluation	June 2017	February 2018
Five years on evaluation	June 2021	February 2022

## 6. Growth Deal Reporting Framework

- 6.1. The following table is an extract from the Growth Deal reporting matrix. The entries made here will be reported on a project by project basis.

Growth Deal Schemes:	Transport scheme	
	2.17 Slough: A355 Route	March 2017
<b>Thames Valley Berkshire LEP</b>		
<b>1. Core Metrics</b>	<b>Planning Numbers</b>	<b>Actual to date</b>
<b>Inputs</b>		
Expenditure	£5,800,000	£5,675,000
Funding breakdown		
Local Growth Deal	£4,400,000	£4,275,000
s.106 and similar contributions	£700,000	£700,000
Council Capital Programme	£700,000	£700,000
Other	-	
In-kind resources provided	£90,000	
<b>Outcomes</b>		

Planned Jobs connected to the intervention	1,260	0
Commercial floor space constructed (square metres)	48,000	0
Housing unit starts	600	0
Housing units completed	600	0
<b>2. PROJECT SPECIFIC OUTPUTS AND OUTCOMES - to be collected where relevant to the intervention</b>		
<b>Transport</b>		
<b>Outputs</b>		
Total length of resurfaced roads	550m	500
Total length of newly built roads	500m of additional traffic lane	500
Total length of new cycle ways	Nil	-
Type of infrastructure	Signalised roundabout, road widening and bridge improvements	
Type of service improvement	Relieve congestion, reduce journey times, increase journey reliability	
<b>Outcomes</b>		
Follow on investment at site	To be determined	-
Commercial floor space occupied	To be determined	-
Commercial rental values	To be determined	-

## 7. Further Information for Summary Reports

The scheme will improve traffic flow on the strategic north-south A355 route that links the M4, Slough Trading Estate. The scheme involves the remodelling of the Copthorne roundabout, signal and junction upgrades and selected road widening. The start on site was in December 2015 and completion was achieved in February 2017. The first Growth Fund payment was in March 2016.

## Berkshire Local Transport Body – 16 March 2017

## 2.19 Bracknell: Town Centre Regeneration Infrastructure Improvements

Highlights of progress since November 2016
LEP funded works complete. Overall Town Centre opening now set for Sept 2017
537 housing starts recorded, of which 134 now complete

**1. The Scheme**

- 1.1. The scheme aims to bring forward transport infrastructure improvements linked to the town centre regeneration, and compliment them further with behaviour change initiatives. Crucially, leading stakeholders in the town centre regeneration, which already has planning consent, have given a strong indication that securing this funding will reduce the joint financial burden, kick-start the development and deliver at least 3,540 retail and leisure jobs for local people.
- 1.2. Schemes included within this project will benefit from other improvements secured through the Growth deal and other Government initiatives such as the Local Pinch Point Funding and Local Sustainable Transport Fund. These include a number of major junctions within Bracknell and also the securing of funds towards delivering the authority's Intelligent Transport Systems strategy. A network management approach has been adopted that looks at improving the network as a whole through the use of Urban Traffic Management & Control. It is this approach that will allow us to achieve improved journey times at key junctions at a much reduced cost, improving accessibility and providing much better value for money

**2. Progress with the scheme**

- 2.1. Scheme is well under way and on all Local Growth Deal funding elements have been completed.
- 2.2. Work continues on the overall regeneration which on programme to be complete and ready for business in 2017.

**3. Funding**

- 3.1. The following table sets out the funding for the scheme on the basis of our unapproved funding profile.

Source of funding	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total
Amount from LEP Local Growth Deal	2,000,000		-	-	-	-	2,000,000
Local contributions from .....	-	-	-	-	-	-	
- Section 106 agreements	-	-					-
- Council Capital Programme	1,000,000	3,382,000	-	-	-	-	4,382,000
- Other sources	-	-	-	-	-	-	
<b>Total Scheme Cost</b>	<b>3,000,000</b>	<b>3,382,000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>6,382,000</b>

**4. Risks**

- 4.1. The key risks on delivering this Programme Entry scheme and how they will be managed are set out in the table below



Risk	Management of risk
That the overall cost of the scheme exceeds the funding available	Detailed BOQ with Effective Site and contract management
Statutory undertakers C4 cost estimates significantly exceed C3 cost estimates	Liaise with statutory undertakers and early commission of C4 estimates
A delay on the development impacting on the need for improvements and delaying the programme	Liaison with developers and review agreement re programme
Unexpected need for additional Temporary Traffic Management increasing costs	Liaison with Traffic Management section and early quantification of TM cost
Slower construction of the road due to physical constraints	Early engagement and partnership working with key interested parties such as the environment agency.

## 5. Programme

Task	Original Timescale	March 2017 Timescale (where changed)
Programme Entry Status	March 2015	
Independent Assessment of FBC	October 2015	
Financial Approval from LTB	November 2015	
Feasibility work	November 2014	
Acquisition of statutory powers	Not needed	
Detailed design	March 2015	
Procurement	Developer s278 agreement	
Start of construction	Main TC Regen Works April 2015	
Completion of construction	April 2017	Sept 2017
One year on evaluation	April 2018	
Five years on evaluation	April 2022	

## 6. Growth Deal Reporting Framework

- 6.1. The following table is an extract from the Growth Deal reporting matrix. The entries made here will be reported on a project by project basis.

Growth Deal Schemes:	Transport scheme	
Thames Valley Berkshire LEP	2.19 Bracknell: Town Centre Regeneration Infrastructure Improvements	March 2017
<b>1. Core Metrics</b>	<b>Planning Numbers</b>	<b>Actual to date</b>
<b>Inputs</b>		
Expenditure	£6,382,000	£4,000,000
Funding breakdown		
Local Growth Deal	£2,000,000	£2,000,000
s.106 and similar contributions		
Council Capital Programme	£4,382,000	£2,500,000
Other		
In-kind resources provided		
<b>Outcomes</b>		
Planned Jobs connected to the intervention	3,540	
Commercial floor space constructed (square metres)	270,000	
Housing unit starts	1,000	537

Housing units completed	1,000	134
<b>2. PROJECT SPECIFIC OUTPUTS AND OUTCOMES - to be collected where relevant to the intervention</b>		
<b>Transport</b>		
<b>Outputs</b>		
Total length of resurfaced roads	Approximately 3000m of resurfaced road	Underway
Total length of newly built roads	Approximately 50m of newly built road.	Underway
Total length of new cycle ways	Approximately 650-700m of new cycleways adjacent to proposed link road.	500m
Type of infrastructure	Improved accessibility to new development	Underway
Type of service improvement	Unlocking proposed development.	Underway
<b>Outcomes</b>		
Follow on investment at site	Work underway to determine value	
Commercial floor space occupied	Work underway to determine figures	
Commercial rental values	Work underway to determine value	

## 7. Further Information for Summary Reports

This project has funded several necessary junction modifications and other works associated with the major redevelopment of Bracknell Town Centre. The LEP funded works are complete, but the Lexicon Centre is not due to open until September 2017. The first and only Growth Fund payment was made in March 2016.

**Berkshire Local Transport Body – 16 March 2017**

**2.21 Slough: Langley Station Access Improvements**

<b>Highlights of progress since November 2016</b>
Discussions with rail partners on coordination of scheme with other infrastructure projects in Langley area.
Preparations for a start on site in April 2017 well underway

**1. The Scheme**

- 1.1. This is a scheme to improve station facilities at Langley and enhance access to the station from the surrounding area. Activities will include new station buildings, lifts and enhancements to the station entrances and parking. Improvements will be made to pedestrian, cycling, and bus facilities. Better information and signage will be provided and measures to enhance the safety and security of the station.
- 1.2. The scheme is aimed at preparing the station for the enhanced travel opportunities that will arise when Crossrail services begin in 2019. Some short-term works are being undertaken at Langley as part of Network Rail's electrification programme and further investment has been committed by the DfT towards improving accessibility. Rail for London is planning station enhancements in connection with the Crossrail programme and First Great Western retains an interest in station infrastructure improvements as incumbent train operating company.
- 1.3. This scheme will add value to these rail industry plans by upgrading access to the station from the surrounding area.

**2. Progress with the scheme**

- 2.1. Discussions are being held between the Council and its rail partners to coordinate project planning and design work with the aim of delivering the scheme to build on and take advantage of rail investment commitments. Detailed proposals are being drawn up by both parties taking account of other rail proposals in the Langley area: the Western Rail Link to Heathrow scheme and potential relocation of the Heathrow Express depot. Public consultation will follow.
- 2.2. WYG are being consulted on business case development bearing in mind that the scheme is a 'hybrid' involving both the BLTB value for money assessment and Network Rail's own processes.
- 2.3. The scheme requirements are being finalised and the development of the business case is currently in progress and should be ready for the November BLTB.
- 2.4. Outline design complete. Business case submitted to WYG
- 2.5. Specifications and brief for detailed design under development.

**3. Funding**

- 3.1. The following table sets out the funding for the scheme with £1,500,000 coming from Growth Deal 2 announced in January 2015. The bulk of the local contribution will come from rail partners made up of the DfT (funding for accessibility); Network Rail and Rail for London (Crossrail); and First Group (train operating company). The funding for the scheme is set out on the basis of our unapproved funding profile.

<b>Source of funding</b>	<b>2015/16</b>	<b>2016/17</b>	<b>2017/18</b>	<b>2018/19</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>Total</b>
Amount from LEP Local Growth Deal	-	-	1,500,000	-	-	-	1,500,000
Local contributions from ....							
- S.106 agreements	-	-	50,000	-	-	-	50,000
- Council Cap Prog	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
- Other sources	-	-	3,500,000	-	-	-	3,500,000
<b>Total Scheme Cost</b>	-	-	<b>5,050,000</b>	-	-	-	<b>5,050,000</b>

#### 4. Risks

4.1. The key risks on delivering this Programme Entry scheme and how they will be managed are set out in the table below

Risk	Management of risk	Status
1 Unfavourable response to wider public consultation.	Public consultation and close working with Ward Members and NAGs. On-going dialogue with planning officers to address likely concerns.	Amber
2 Difficulty in coordinating the design and delivery of the scheme with the Crossrail programme.	Close working with Network Rail, Great Western Railway and Rail for London.	Amber
3 Higher than expected costs	Financial and project management.	Amber
4 Delays in procurement process	Programme allows sufficient time for process.	Amber

#### 5. Programme

Task	November 2014 Timescale	March 2017 Timescale (where changed)
Programme Entry Status	March 2015 BLTB	
Independent Assessment of FBC	October 2015	May 2016
Financial Approval from LTB	November 2015	November 2016
Feasibility work	September 2015	December 2015
Acquisition of statutory powers	n/a	
Cabinet approve scheme	January 2016	January 2017
Detailed design	Summer 2016	
Procurement	Autumn 2016	
Start of construction	January 2017	April 2017
Completion of construction	March 2018	
One year on evaluation	March 2019	
Five years on evaluation	March 2023	

#### 6. Growth Deal Reporting Framework

6.1. The following table is an extract from the Growth Deal reporting matrix. The entries made here will be reported on a project by project basis.

Growth Deal Schemes:	Transport scheme	
	2.21 Slough: Langley Station Access Improvements	March 2017
Thames Valley Berkshire LEP		
<b>1. Core Metrics</b>	<b>Planning Numbers</b>	<b>Actual to date</b>
<b>Inputs</b>		
Expenditure	£5,050,000	0
Funding breakdown		
Local Growth Deal	£1,500,000	0
s.106 and similar contributions	£50,000	0
Council Capital Programme		
Other	£3,500,000	0
In-kind resources provided	To be inserted	
<b>Outcomes</b>		
Planned Jobs connected to the intervention	-	-
Commercial floor space constructed (square metres)	-	-
Housing unit starts	500	0

Housing units completed	500	0
<b>2. PROJECT SPECIFIC OUTPUTS AND OUTCOMES - to be collected where relevant to the intervention</b>		
<b>Transport</b>		
<b>Outputs</b>		
Total length of resurfaced roads	-	-
Total length of newly built roads	-	-
Total length of new cycle ways	-	-
Type of infrastructure	Station enhancements and local highway and public realm improvements	
Type of service improvement	Preparations for Crossrail and better access to station	
<b>Outcomes</b>		
Follow on investment at site	To be determined	-
Commercial floor space occupied	To be determined	-
Commercial rental values	To be determined	-

## 7. Further Information for Summary Reports

Crossrail Services are due to serve Langley station from December 2019 and this scheme is designed to improve the facilities in anticipation of an increase in pedestrian numbers. The scheme is due to start on site in April 2017 with completion in March 2018. The first Growth Fund payment is due in March 2018.

**Berkshire Local Transport Body – 16 March 2017**

**2.22 Slough: Burnham Station Access Improvements**

<b>Highlights of progress since November 2016</b>
Work started on site January 2017

**1. The Scheme**

- 1.1. This is a scheme to improve station facilities at Burnham and enhance access to the station from the western part of the Borough, including Slough Trading Estate, and neighbouring areas of South Buckinghamshire. Activities will include new station buildings, lifts, enhancements to the station entrances and parking. Highway improvements and traffic management measures will be carried out to achieve better access for pedestrians, cyclists, buses and general traffic.
- 1.2. The scheme is aimed at preparing the station for the enhanced travel opportunities that will arise when Crossrail services begin in 2019. Some short-term works have been undertaken at Burnham as part of Network Rail’s electrification programme and further investment is committed towards improving accessibility through the DfT Access for All Fund. Rail for London is planning station enhancements in connection with the Crossrail programme and First Great Western retains an interest in station infrastructure improvements as incumbent train operating company.
- 1.3. This scheme will add value to these rail industry plans by upgrading access to the station from the surrounding area.

**2. Progress with the scheme**

- 2.1. Discussions are being held between the Council and its rail partners to coordinate project planning and design work with the aim of delivering the scheme as early as possible to build on and take advantage of rail investment commitments. Detailed proposals are being drawn up by both parties. The Council is carrying out an experimental order on the highway aspects of the scheme this is due to start in October.
- 2.2. WYG have been consulted on business case development bearing in mind that the scheme is a ‘hybrid’ involving both the BLTB value for money assessment and Network Rail’s own processes. The business case will be brought to the March 2016 meeting of the BLTB.
- 2.3. The final design has been through public consultation and is now being prepared for award to the civil works contractor.
- 2.4. Design completed and awaiting pricing by contractor.
- 2.5. Civil work contractor has been appointed and works have started on site in January 2017.

**3. Funding**

- 3.1. The following table sets out the funding for the scheme with £2,000,000 coming from the Expanded Growth Deal announced in January 2015. The bulk of the local contribution will come from rail partners made up of DfT (Access for All fund); Network Rail and Rail for London (Crossrail); and GWR (train operating company).

<b>Source of funding</b>	<b>2015/16</b>	<b>2016/17</b>	<b>2017/18</b>	<b>2018/19</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>Total</b>
Amount from LEP Local Growth Deal	-	2,000,000	-	-	-	-	2,000,000
Local contributions from ....							
- S106 agreements	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
- Council Cap Prog	-	100,000	-	-	-	-	100,000
- Other sources	-	4,150,000	-	-	-	-	4,150,000
<b>Total Scheme Cost</b>	-	<b>6,250,000</b>	-	-	-	-	<b>6,250,000</b>

#### 4. Risks

4.1. The key risks on delivering this Programme Entry scheme and how they will be managed are set out in the table below

Risk	Management of risk	Status
1 Unfavourable response to wider public consultation.	Public consultation and close working with Ward Members and NAGs. On-going dialogue with planning officers to address likely concerns.	Green
2 Difficulty in co-ordinating the design and delivery of the wider access proposals with Crossrail programme.	Close working with Network Rail, First Great Western and Rail for London.	Amber
3 Additional car parking could require substantial earthworks and vehicular access could prove difficult.	Detailed engineering investigations and exploration of alternative options.	Amber
4 Objections to proposed traffic management measures.	Early engagement with stakeholders to address likely issues.	Green
5 Higher than expected costs.	Financial and project management.	Amber
6 Delays in procurement process.	Programme allows sufficient time for process.	Amber

#### 5. Programme

Task	November 2014 Timescale	March 2017 Timescale (where changed)
Programme Entry Status	March 2015 BLTB	
Independent Assessment of FBC	June 2015	Started October 2015
Financial Approval from LTB	July 2015	March 2016
Feasibility work	May 2015	September 2015
Acquisition of statutory powers	n/a	
Cabinet approve scheme	September 2015	January 2016
Detailed design	Autumn 2015	July 2016
Procurement	Autumn 2015	September 2016
Start of construction	January 2016	January 2017
Completion of construction	March 2017	March 2018
One year on evaluation	March 2018	March 2019
Five years on evaluation	March 2022	March 2023

#### 6. Growth Deal Reporting Framework

6.1. The following table is an extract from the Growth Deal reporting matrix. The entries made here will be reported on a project by project basis.

Growth Deal Schemes:	Transport scheme	
Thames Valley Berkshire LEP	2.22 Slough: Burnham Station Access Improvements	March 2017
1. Core Metrics	Planning Numbers	Actual to date
<b>Inputs</b>		
Expenditure	£6,250,000	50000
Funding breakdown		
Local Growth Deal	£2,000,000	50000
s.106 and similar contributions		
Council Capital Programme	£100,000	£100,000
Other	£4,150,000	0
In-kind resources provided		
<b>Outcomes</b>		

Planned Jobs connected to the intervention	-	-
Commercial floor space constructed (square metres)	-	-
Housing unit starts	-	-
Housing units completed	-	-
<b>2. PROJECT SPECIFIC OUTPUTS AND OUTCOMES - to be collected where relevant to the intervention</b>		
<b>Transport</b>		
<b>Outputs</b>		
Total length of resurfaced roads	-	-
Total length of newly built roads	-	-
Total length of new cycle ways	-	-
Type of infrastructure	Station enhancements and local highway and public realm improvements	
Type of service improvement	Preparations for Crossrail and better access to station	
<b>Outcomes</b>		
Follow on investment at site	To be determined	-
Commercial floor space occupied	To be determined	-
Commercial rental values	To be determined	-

## 7. Further Information for Summary Reports

Crossrail Services are due to serve Burnham station from December 2019 and this scheme is designed to improve the facilities in anticipation of an increase in pedestrian numbers. The scheme started on site in January 2017 with completion in March 2018. The first Growth Fund payment is due in March 2017.



**BERKSHIRE LOCAL TRANSPORT BODY (BLTB)**

**REPORT TO:** BLTB

**DATE:** 16 March 2017

**CONTACT OFFICER:** Roger Parkin, Interim Chief Executive Slough Borough Council, lead Chief Executive to the BLTB

**PART I**

**Item 6: Airports National Policy Statement – Consultation Response**

***Purpose of Report***

1. To report on the timetable and content of the government's Airports National Policy Statement consultation.
2. To set out a process and timetable for finalising the LEP's response to this consultation.

***Recommendation***

3. You are recommended to endorse the process for finalising the LEP's response to the government's Airports National Policy Consultation:  
The draft version of the LEP's proposed response will be considered by:
  - BLTB on 16 March
  - TVB LEP Forum on 21 MarchThe final version will be presented to the LEP Forum for approval at its meeting on 24 May.
4. You are asked to comment on the content of the draft response set out in Table 1 below.

***Other Implications***

***Financial***

5. There are no direct financial implications of this report for Berkshire Local Transport Body.

***Risk Management***

6. There are limited risks for Berkshire Local Transport Body associated with the government's Airports National Policy Statement consultation process. It is a public process, and it is open to anyone and everyone to respond. The responsibility for a final decision on airport capacity expansion rests with the government. Even if the National Policy Statement identifies Heathrow as the preferred site, Heathrow Airport Limited will embark on a two-year process to secure a Development Consent Order. This process is itself subject to public consultation and examination-in-public.

## Human Rights Act and Other Legal Implications

7. Slough Borough Council will provide legal support for the BLTB, should any questions arise.
8. In the event that legal challenges to the Airports National Policy Statement arise, it will be the government whose decision is challenged.

### **Supporting Information**

9. The government published its [draft Airports National Policy Statement](#)<sup>1</sup> on 2 February 2017. The consultation period runs for 16 weeks and closes at 11.45pm on 25 May.
10. This report sets out the LEP's approach to responding to the consultation and invites further contributions from members of the Thames Valley Berkshire LEP Forum and the Berkshire Local Transport Body for incorporation in the final version.

The draft version of the LEP's proposed response will be considered by:

- BLTB on 16 March
- TVB LEP Forum on 21 March

The final version will be presented to the LEP Forum for endorsement at its meeting on 24 May.

The consultation process includes a series of [local meetings](#)<sup>2</sup> and a regional meeting (at Reading Town Hall on 12 April, you can register to attend by following the [link](#)<sup>3</sup> here). The LEP's response is one of many ways in which businesses, residents, councils and other organisations can respond. For more detail, please go to <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/heathrow-expansion-draft-airports-national-policy-statement>

11. The process invites written responses to 9 questions. The questions are reproduced below, with an outline of the planned LEP responses.

**Table 1: Outline Response**

Heading	Question	Outline response
Question 1: The need for additional airport capacity	The Government believes there is the need for additional airport capacity in the South East of England by 2030.	Establish the role of aviation in sustaining TVB businesses.  Refer to 945 Foreign Owned Companies in TVB and their role in sustaining SME supply chain (cite Industrial Strategy) and LHR's role in export (freight)  Quotes from <a href="#">SEP</a> <sup>4</sup> : "our international links via Heathrow Airport

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/heathrow-expansion-draft-airports-national-policy-statement>

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/heathrow-airport-and-airspace-consultation-information-events/heathrow-airport-and-airspace-consultation-information-events>

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.aviationconsultations.com/user/register>

Heading	Question	Outline response
	Please tell us your views.	<p>are <b>the principal reason why inward investors choose to locate in TVB</b> and they are a crucial underpinning of ongoing re-investment” (p17)</p> <p>“However, the transport and communications infrastructure on which we rely is simultaneously a local, national and international resource. <b>It is very congested. This in turn is threatening to undermine our intrinsic growth potential.</b> It is therefore essential to invest in it and also to encourage local sustainable transport networks that promote active travel on foot, on bicycle and on public transport.” (p13)</p>
Question 2: The Government's preferred scheme: Heathrow Northwest Runway	Please give us your views on how best to address the issue of airport capacity in the South East of England by 2030. This could be through the Heathrow Northwest Runway scheme (the Government's preferred scheme), the Gatwick Second Runway scheme, the Heathrow Extended Northern Runway scheme, or any other scheme.	<p>Thames Valley Berkshire LEP maintains that none of these are bad options, but that expansion at Heathrow is a superior option to expansion at Gatwick.</p> <p>Reference to <a href="#">“London Heathrow Economic Impact Study”</a> September 2013 by Regeneris for “Western Wedge” LEPs<sup>5</sup> and its main findings that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At present (2013) the activity at Heathrow Airport supports 120,000 jobs and £6bn in economic output across the western wedge economy; a further 170,000 to 230,000 jobs are dependent on the good air connections offered by Heathrow.</li> <li>• By 2040 an extra 35,000 jobs could be created if Heathrow expands compared to a do-nothing option and the region would see annual GVA boosted by £3 billion as a result of the extra activity at Heathrow.</li> <li>• The better air connections could deliver business productivity benefits of £230m to £300m pa from reduced delays and more frequent services, with around 50 additional long and short haul services offered. The expansion of Heathrow would help secure the many jobs in international firms clustered around the airport.</li> </ul> <p>We further conclude that there are significant disadvantages for the Heathrow Extended Northern Runway scheme when compared to the Northwest Runway in respect of the surface access proposals, in particular access to the Great Western mainline.</p> <p>We have also concluded that the surface access proposals for the Gatwick option are over-reliant on routes via London. There are no significant investment proposals to expand capacity on east-west access routes.</p>
Question 3: Assessment principles	The Secretary of State will use a range of assessment principles when considering any application for a Northwest Runway at Heathrow Airport.	Thames Valley Berkshire LEP supports the proposed approach of comparing the <i>“potential benefits, including the facilitation of economic development (including job creation) and environmental improvement, and any long term or wider benefits”</i> with the <i>“potential adverse impacts (including any longer term and cumulative adverse impacts) as well as any measures to avoid, reduce or compensate for any adverse impacts.”</i> (paragraph 4.4 of the draft NPS)

<sup>4</sup> [http://thamesvalleyberkshire.co.uk/Strategic\\_Economic\\_Plan](http://thamesvalleyberkshire.co.uk/Strategic_Economic_Plan)

<sup>5</sup> <http://thamesvalleyberkshire.co.uk/Portals/0/FileStore/StrategicInfrastructure/StrategicInfrastructure/Heathrow%20Economic%20Impact%20Assessment%20-%20Final%20Report.pdf>

Heading	Question	Outline response
	Please tell us your views.	
Question 4: Impacts and requirements	The Government has set out its approach to surface access for a Heathrow Northwest Runway scheme. Please tell us your views.	<p>Thames Valley Berkshire LEP supports the government's objective, "<i>to ensure that access to the airport by road, rail and public transport is high quality, efficient and reliable for both passengers and airport workers who use transport on a daily basis.</i>" (para 5.5 of the draft NPS)</p> <p><b>Transport requirements generated by airport expansion</b></p> <p>Thames Valley Berkshire LEP is aware that not all road and rail users who travel towards, or away from, the airport are passengers or airport workers. The existing road and rail networks help meet a wide variety of non-airport transport needs. We ask that the transport impact assessment (including the air quality impact assessment) takes full account of these non-airport journeys in both the "2-runway" and "3-runway" states.</p> <p>This point is raised by the requirement set out at paragraph 5.15 of the draft NPS, "<i>The applicant should demonstrate in its assessment that the proposed surface access strategy will support the additional transport requirements generated by airport expansion.</i>"</p> <p>This point is engaged again in paragraphs 5.18 and 5.19 of the draft NPS which refer to "<i>the upgrading or enhancing of road, rail or other transport networks or services which are physically needed to be completed to enable the Northwest Runway to operate</i>" either prior to opening or as "<i>additional [runway] capacity becomes fully utilised</i>". These paragraphs go on to introduce the possibility that some of these enhancements might be joint funded by the applicant and the government.</p> <p>We suggest that some care will need to be taken in defining the phrases "<i>additional transport requirements generated by airport expansion</i>" (5.15) and "<i>where a transport scheme is not solely required to deliver airport capacity</i>" (5.18, 5.19) in order to distinguish between:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the demands already in the wider economy of London and the "Western Wedge";</li> <li>• the likely increase in demand from general economic growth; and</li> <li>• the likely increase in demand created by airport expansion.</li> </ul> <p>We consider it would be a perverse outcome if the applicant was required to mitigate adverse impacts that arise from demands already in the wider economy, or mitigate adverse impacts that result from the projected future growth of the wider economy.</p> <p><b>Western Rail Link to Heathrow</b></p> <p>Thames Valley Berkshire LEP argues that the case for investment in the Western Rail Link to Heathrow is clear and based on the needs of a <b>two-runway airport</b>. This view was endorsed by the Airports Commission. (see <a href="#">Final Report</a><sup>6</sup>, para</p>

Heading	Question	Outline response
		<p>8.15, p 155).</p> <p>The scheme is included in the <a href="#">National Infrastructure Delivery Plan 2016-21</a><sup>7</sup> (para 5.8, page 41) under the heading “Projects in Development”, with the suggestion that construction might begin “early in CP6 (2019-2024)”.</p> <p>In launching the consultation, the Secretary of State said “<i>We are also bringing forward plans to deliver western and southern rail access to the airport as quickly as possible to provide greater flexibility, accessibility and resilience for passengers</i>” (<a href="#">Hansard Vol 620, 2 February 2017</a><sup>8</sup>).</p> <p>We urge the government to consider how the commitment to this scheme can be linked to the operation of a two-runway airport and not as a condition of expansion to a three-runway airport.</p> <p><b>Other Surface Access Projects</b></p> <p>Thames Valley Berkshire LEP also supports the development of other major surface access schemes that will contribute to the reduction of road journeys. We support <b>Southern Rail Access to Heathrow</b> as recommended by the Airports Commission and taken up by Network Rail; and <b>Slough Mass Rapid Transit</b> we have invested Local Growth Funds in this scheme in Slough and we support the ambition to extend it onto the airport.</p> <p><b>Duty to Co-operate</b></p> <p>Thames Valley Berkshire LEP notes the reference in the draft NPS to Heathrow Airport Transport Forum (para 5.8) and to the principles set out in the Aviation Policy Framework. The LEP has joined the <a href="#">Heathrow Strategic Planning Group</a><sup>9</sup> (which includes LEPs and Local Authorities neighbouring the airport) in order to fulfil its Duty to Co-operate both with Heathrow Airport Limited, and with the similarly impacted authorities, in producing a co-ordinated response to the Development Consent proposals as they emerge.</p> <p>We suggest that the applicant be encouraged to use the Heathrow Strategic Planning Group in order to meet the expectation that “<i>the applicant should consult Highways England, Network Rail and highway and transport authorities, as appropriate, on the assessment and proposed mitigation measures.</i>” (paragraph 5.9 of the draft NPS) and similar expectations at paragraphs 5.10 and 5.11 of the draft NPS.</p> <p><b>Monitoring and Enforcement</b></p>

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/airports-commission-final-report-and-supporting-documents>

<sup>7</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-infrastructure-delivery-plan-2016-to-2021>

<sup>8</sup> <https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/2017-02-02/debates/35730F10-B97C-480B-B3B2-729D5D408BAC/AirportCapacityAndAirspacePolicy?highlight=airport%20expansion#contribution-DF61E014-7168-47BD-B041-B9ED022ADF66>

<sup>9</sup> <http://www.heathrowstrategicplanninggroup.com/>

Heading	Question	Outline response
		<p>Thames Valley Berkshire LEP agrees that the Surface Access Strategy should “reference the role of surface transport in relation to air quality and carbon” (para 5.8) and that it “must contain specific targets for maximising the proportion of journeys made to the airport by public transport, cycling or walking” (para 5.8) and that it “should also contain actions, policies and defined performance indicators for delivering against targets” (para 5.8). However, we are not convinced that Airport Transport Forum is the right body to “oversee implementation of the strategy and monitor progress against targets alongside the implementation and operation of the preferred scheme” (para 5.8). This reservation is made because the Airport Transport Forum is not independent of the applicant, and has no status or standing to enforce any agreements.</p> <p>Thames Valley Berkshire LEP welcomes paragraphs 5.16 and 5.17 of the draft NPS which set out specific targets and expectations on recording and reporting performance relating to some elements of the surface access strategy. We suggest that these be re-drafted to give better coverage of the whole of the proposed surface access strategy, and include some indication of how an enforcement regime would work, including potential sanctions. (see also paragraph 5.37).</p> <p>Paragraph 5.28 quotes the Airports Commission’s recommendation that “Heathrow Airport should be held to performance targets” for public transport use, but this idea is not developed in the draft NPS.</p> <p>We suggest that a lead Local Authority be identified to take on the monitoring and enforcement role, acting alone, or in concert with other local authorities, possibly through the mechanism of the Heathrow Strategic Planning Group mentioned above.</p>
Question 5: Impacts and requirements	The draft Airports National Policy Statement sets out a package of supporting measures to mitigate negative impacts of a Heathrow Northwest Runway scheme. Please tell us your views.	<p>Thames Valley Berkshire LEP has identified the Western Rail Link to Heathrow (WRLtH) scheme as its number one transport infrastructure priority, and has been promoting this investment on the basis of a two-runway Heathrow. The Airports Commission supported the view there was a need for this scheme whether or not Heathrow expansion was allowed to proceed (see <a href="#">Final Report</a><sup>10</sup>, para 8.15, p 155).</p> <p>We do not regard WRLtH as a mitigation measure for the Northwest Runway Scheme.</p> <p>We fully support the ambition of achieving a three-runway airport with “no net increase in road traffic”: through the work of the <a href="#">Heathrow Strategic Planning Group</a><sup>11</sup> we will work with Heathrow Airport Limited, national agencies and local authorities to deliver credible plans for Southern Rail Access to Heathrow, Slough Rapid Transit and other surface transport interventions that contribute to the goals of modal shift away from cars and improving air quality.</p>

<sup>10</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/airports-commission-final-report-and-supporting-documents>

<sup>11</sup> <http://www.heathrowstrategicplanninggroup.com/>

Heading	Question	Outline response
	Are there any other supporting measures that should be set out?	<p>Land use including open space, green infrastructure and Green Belt</p> <p>The LEP has joined the <a href="#">Heathrow Strategic Planning Group</a><sup>12</sup> (which includes LEPs and Local Authorities neighbouring the airport) in order to fulfil its Duty to Co-operate both with Heathrow Airport Limited, and with the similarly impacted authorities, in producing a co-ordinated response to the Development Consent proposals as they emerge.</p> <p>We suggest that the applicant be encouraged to use this group in order to meet the expectation that “<i>During any pre-application discussions with the applicant, the local planning authority should ...</i>” (para 5.112 of the draft NPS).</p>
	In particular, please tell us your views on: 5.1. Air quality supporting measures	<p><b>Transport requirements generated by airport expansion</b></p> <p>Paragraph 5.32 of the draft NPS says the applicant’s environmental statement should assess “<i>Any significant air quality effects, their mitigation and any residual effects, distinguishing between those applicable to runway construction and operation stages and taking account of the impact that the project is likely to cause on air quality arising from road and other surface access traffic</i>”.</p> <p>As we have noted above, we suggest that some care will need to be taken in defining the phrase “<i>the impact that the project is likely to cause on air quality arising from road and other surface access traffic</i>” in order to distinguish between:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the demands already in the wider economy of London and the “Western Wedge”;</li> <li>• the likely increase in demand from general economic growth; and</li> <li>• the likely increase in demand created by airport expansion.</li> </ul> <p><b>Monitoring and Enforcement</b></p> <p>Paragraphs 5.34 – 5.40 describe how the applicant might make proposals to mitigate any potential adverse effects on air quality. There are many overlaps with the suggested surface access mitigation interventions.</p> <p>We suggest that a lead Local Authority be identified to take on the monitoring and enforcement role, acting alone, or in concert with other local authorities, possibly through the mechanism of the Heathrow Strategic Planning Group mentioned above.</p>
	5.2. Noise supporting measures	With respect to noise impacts that are generated by surface access arrangements, we repeat the comments made earlier about taking care to isolate the impact of airport expansion from other sources and causes of noise nuisance; and the need to create an appropriate monitoring and enforcement arrangements.
	5.3. Carbon emissions supporting measures	With respect to carbon emission impacts that are generated by surface access arrangements, we repeat the comments made earlier about taking care to isolate the impact of airport expansion from other sources and causes of carbon

<sup>12</sup> <http://www.heathrowstrategicplanninggroup.com/>



Heading	Question	Outline response
		emissions; and the need to create an appropriate monitoring and enforcement arrangements.
	5.4. Compensation for local communities	No comment
Question 6: Impacts and requirements	The Government has set out a number of planning requirements that a Heathrow Northwest Runway scheme must meet in order to operate. Please tell us your views.	<p><b>Monitoring and Enforcement</b></p> <p>Paragraphs 4.9 and 4.10 of the draft NPS set out the mechanism for turning the general planning requirements into specific “<i>obligations under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990</i>”</p> <p>We cannot pre-judge the deliberations of the Examining Authority or the Secretary of State in this respect, but we can ask for some thought to be given to identification of an appropriate monitoring and enforcement regime for any obligations that are eventually imposed.</p> <p>An expanded Heathrow Airport will directly impact a number of local authority areas, and it is important to all concerned that and Development Consent Order includes an effective and properly coordinated enforcement regime.</p>
	Are there any other requirements the Government should set out?	No suggestions
Question 7: Draft Airports NPS Appraisal of Sustainability	The Appraisal of Sustainability sets out the Government’s assessment of the Heathrow Northwest Runway scheme, and considers alternatives. Please tell us your views.	No comments
Question 8: General questions	Do you have any additional comments on the draft Airports National Policy Statement or other supporting documents?	No comments
Question 9: General questions	The Government has a public sector equality duty to ensure protected groups have the opportunity to respond to consultations. Please tell us your views on	No comments



Heading	Question	Outline response
	how this consultation has achieved this.	

**Conclusion**

12. Any colleagues wishing to contribute further to shaping the LEP’s response should contact [richard@thamesvalleyberkshire.co.uk](mailto:richard@thamesvalleyberkshire.co.uk). As noted above the [government’s consultation](#)<sup>13</sup> remains open until 25 May 2017.

**Background Papers**

13. The source papers used in compiling this report have been referenced in the text.

---

<sup>13</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/heathrow-expansion-draft-airports-national-policy-statement>

This page is intentionally left blank

**BERKSHIRE LOCAL TRANSPORT BODY (BLTB)****REPORT TO:** BLTB**DATE:** 16 March 2017**CONTACT OFFICER:** Roger Parkin, Interim Chief Executive Slough Borough Council, lead Chief Executive to the BLTB**PART I****Item 7: 2.04 Wokingham Distributor Roads Programme*****Purpose of Report***

1. This report reviews the progress made in delivering the Wokingham Distributor Roads Programme, and seeks your support for the allocation of £24m identified in Growth Deal 1 to support the 2.04.4 Arborfield Cross Relief Road only.

***Recommendation***

2. You are recommended to support the request of Wokingham BC to concentrate all the available £24m for the Distributor Roads programme in scheme 2.04.4 Arborfield Cross Relief Road.

***Other Implications******Financial***

3. There are no direct financial implications of this report; instead it asks members to support Wokingham's request to the DfT that the £24m identified in Growth Deal 1 to support the Wokingham Distributor Roads Programme be concentrated in support for one scheme only (2.04.4 Wokingham Arborfield Cross Relief Road) and that consequently no financial support be available for the other roads in the programme.

***Risk Management***

4. The DfT named 2.04 Wokingham Distributor Roads Programme as a "retained" scheme because it exceeded their threshold of £20m. Therefore the scheme promoter, Wokingham BC, has to pass the DfT assurance processes rather than the BLTB processes.
5. The release of the £24m identified in Growth Deal 1 is a matter for the DfT.

***Human Rights Act and Other Legal Implications***

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

***Supporting Information***

7. The Wokingham Distributor Roads Programme originally had four roads in it, each associated with a Strategic Development Location identified in the Borough's Local Plan:

**Table 1: 2.04 Wokingham Distributor Roads Programme**

2.04	Road	SDL	Comments
2.04.1	Shinfield Eastern Relief Road	South of the M4	Funded outside the Local Growth Deal, including new M4 overbridge and access to University of Reading Science Park. Nearing completion.
2.04.2	North Wokingham Distributor Road	North Wokingham	Part constructed in association with housing sites already built. Complex arrangements site by site with developers.
2.04.3	South Wokingham Distributor Road	South Wokingham	Part constructed in association with housing sites already built. Complex arrangements site by site with developers. Includes new overbridge for Wokingham to Bracknell railway line
2.04.4	Arborfield Cross Relief Road	Arborfield	Wholly within Wokingham BC control a new road to the west of the Arborfield Garrison site

8. The original proposal was to spread the Growth Deal contribution across three roads: 2.04.1 Shinfield Eastern Relief Road was funded outside the Growth Deal. This meant that the assurance framework was engaged for each of the three other roads.
9. The current proposal is to simplify the task of producing business cases (and reduce the costs involved) by concentrating the Growth Deal funding on 2.04.4 Arborfield Cross Relief Road.

**Table 2: Proposed Funding Change**

Before	2.04.2	2.04.3	2.04.4	Total
£m	North Wokingham Distributor Road	South Wokingham Distributor Road	Arborfield Cross Relief Road	
Developer and Local Funding	40.1	32.3	14.5	86.9
Growth Deal	6.1	4.3	13.6	24.0
Total	46.2	36.6	28.1	110.9
After	2.04.2	2.04.3	2.04.4	Total
£m	North Wokingham Distributor Road	South Wokingham Distributor Road	Arborfield Cross Relief Road	
Developer and Local Funding	46.2	36.6	4.1	86.9
Growth Deal	0.0	0.0	24.0	24.0
Total	46.2	36.6	28.0	110.9

10. In order to activate this proposal, Wokingham BC have drafted a letter to send to DfT (see Appendix 1) which requires the support of the LTB.

### ***Conclusion***

11. The preliminary discussions held between Wokingham BC and the DfT officials have produced an elegant solution for ensuring that there is an appropriate level of external scrutiny for the £24m grant towards the Wokingham Distributor Roads Programme.

### ***Background Papers***

12. Correspondence between DfT Local Infrastructure Team, the LEP, Wokingham's Finance and Transport teams.

This page is intentionally left blank

Tel: 0118 974 6000  
Email:  
Fax: (0118) 974 6770  
Date:



**WOKINGHAM**  
**BOROUGH COUNCIL**

Mr R Fox  
Major Schemes Casework Officer & Section 31  
Grant Manager  
Local Infrastructure,  
Department for Transport  
Great Minster House  
33 Horseferry Road  
London  
SW1P 4DR

---

Environment  
P.O. Box 153  
Shute End, Wokingham  
Berkshire RG40 1WN  
Tel: (0118) 974 6000

---

---

Dear Mr Fox,

**Growth Deal 1 – DfT retained scheme: Wokingham Distributor Roads (£24m)**

Further to our previous discussions regarding the retained element of Growth Deal 1 funding for roads in Wokingham, Wokingham Borough Council hereby formally request the reallocation of funding currently shared across three separate major highway projects to be reallocated to just one.

As part of the first round of Local Growth Deals in July 2014, Thames Valley Berkshire LEP (TVBLEP) through their Strategic Economic Plan were successful in securing an allocation of £24m towards the delivery of The Wokingham Distributor Roads scheme, namely Arborfield Cross Relief Road (ACRR), North Wokingham Distributor Road (NWDR) and South Wokingham Distributor Road (SWDR). The money is currently apportioned across each of the three projects thus: ACRR - £13.6m, NWDR - £6.1m, SWDR - £4.3m.

As you know the Department for Transport (DfT) have retained approval oversight of the Wokingham Distributor Roads scheme meaning that DfT approval will be required before the funding for the scheme will be released.

As previously discussed approval will be subject to the satisfactory completion of two Business Cases; currently assumed to be ACRR & NWDR. The two projects were chosen based on the Council initial programme that showed both these projects would be progressed before SWDR. Once the Business Cases for these two projects are approved the entire funding allocation would be released to TVBLEP, thus enabling TVBLEP to release part of the funding to WBC for the two approved projects. There would however still be a requirement for the third project to gain approval from TVBLEP before the final amount is released to WBC. The remaining project will also require a Business Case but will be assessed by TVBLEPs independent advisors.

Because of the complicated delivery of both the NWDR & SWDR, i.e. some parts have already been delivered by the developer, some parts are currently being delivered and the Council are due to deliver other parts, the completion of any Business Case is complex. As ACRR is

solely within the control of WBC to deliver, it is proposed that a simpler and quicker approach would be to take the full £24m as one lump and apply it to just one project, i.e. ACRR.

The Councils Section 151 officer has considered the proposal and has confirmed that the reallocation of the local contributions i.e. CIL and S106, can be redistributed in such a way as to enable the full £24m to be allocated to ACRR and that the remaining two projects can be fully funded from developer contributions and Council Capital Budgets.

The proposal has also been considered by TVBLEP and was given formal approval at the meeting of the Berkshire Local Transport Body on 16 March 2017.

To assist you when considering this request we have prepared a quarterly return on the basis of the entire Growth Deal allocation being used for the Arborfield Cross Relief Road project.

We hope that you will consider our request favourably and recognise that this revision will simplify what would be a very complex process. The change would significantly reduce the resource and time burden from the DfT, TVBLEP and Wokingham Borough Council whilst ensuring that all projects defined under the original growth deal bid known as The Wokingham Distributor Roads scheme are delivered efficiently and to time.

Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any questions. We look forward to receiving your reply in due course.

Regards,

**Josie Wragg**  
Interim Director of Environment



**BERKSHIRE LOCAL TRANSPORT BODY (BLTB)****REPORT TO:** BLTB**DATE:** 16 March 2017**CONTACT OFFICER:** Roger Parkin, Interim Chief Executive Slough Borough Council, lead Chief Executive to the BLTB**PART I****Item 8: Assurance Framework - Review*****Purpose of Report***

1. This report reviews the existing [BLTB Assurance Framework<sup>1</sup>](#) in the light of [further guidance from Government<sup>2</sup>](#) (issued in November 2016).
2. The report proposes an approach to be adopted when conducting one- and five-year post-completion monitoring reports.

***Recommendation***

3. You are recommended to confirm that the BLTB Assurance Framework dated 14 November 2013 remains fit for purpose.
4. You are recommended to approve the approach to conducting one- and five-year post-completion monitoring reports set out in Appendix 2

***Other Implications******Financial***

5. There are no direct financial implications of this report; instead it asks members to consider whether or not the current assurance framework which is applied to projects seeking financial approval is fit for purpose and conforms to the latest government guidance

***Risk Management***

6. The principal risk management arrangement employed by the Local Transport Body is adherence to its [Assurance Framework<sup>3</sup>](#), and in particular the use of White Young Green as contracted independent assessors of the full business cases put forward by scheme promoters.

---

<sup>1</sup><http://thamesvalleyberkshire.co.uk/Portals/0/FileStore/StrategicInfrastructure/StrategicInfrastructure/BLTB/Assurance%20Framework%20for%20Berkshire%20Local%20Transport%20Body%2014%20November%202013.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/local-enterprise-partnership-national-assurance-framework>

<sup>3</sup><http://thamesvalleyberkshire.co.uk/Portals/0/FileStore/StrategicInfrastructure/StrategicInfrastructure/BLTB/Assurance%20Framework%20for%20Berkshire%20Local%20Transport%20Body%2014%20November%202013.pdf>

7. Liaison between government officials and the LEP has not raised any concerns about the drafting of the assurance framework currently used by the BLTB, nor with its application.

Human Rights Act and Other Legal Implications

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

**Supporting Information**

9. One of the current activities of the Berkshire Local Transport Body is the management, on behalf of Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership, of the financial contributions to transport schemes funded by successive Local Growth Deals. (Growth Deal 1 was announced in July 2014, GD2 in January 2015 and GD3 in February 2017).
10. To comply with the conditions of the Local Growth Deal, and to provide appropriate levels of scrutiny and transparency to the spending of public money, the LTB has adopted an Assurance Framework; the current version was first adopted on 14 March 2013, and subsequently amended twice, on 19 July 2013 and 14 November 2013.
11. It has operated successfully since then, and the LTB has approved 16 full business cases worth over £52m in Growth Deal contributions.
12. It is being reviewed now for two reasons: in November 2016, the government issued revised guidance; and the first of our schemes is coming up to the anniversary of scheme completion and we need to approve a process for the required one- and five-year post-completion monitoring reports.
13. The government’s revised guidance covers all aspects of LEP and Growth Deal spending; the details as they apply to transport schemes are contained in Appendix B of the new guidance.
14. At Appendix 1 to this document is a table comparing every section of the new Appendix B to our current practice. Arising out of this detailed analysis there are six elements that need further discussion; these are set out in Table 1 below.

**Table 1: Points requiring further discussion**

App 1 Reference Number	Discussion Points	Officers’ View
2	Note the appointment and role of White Young Green as Independent Assessors and plan to re-procure on expiry of existing contract in April 2018. This is a four-year contract and has no extension clause.	Noted. Re-procurement will commence in autumn 2017.

9	Consider what further action, if any, is required to meet the minimum requirement to “set out how the assessment and scrutiny of business cases will be quality assured.”	The current arrangement is for quality assurance to be an internal matter for the appointed independent consultant. As the “assessment and scrutiny of business cases” is already being performed by an independent consultant, further quality assurance steps are not considered necessary.
15	Need to check that our current practice is acceptable to meet the minimum requirement of “The VfM assessment must be signed off as true and accurate by a named officer with responsibility for Value for Money assessments within Local Enterprise Partnerships.”	Currently, the VfM certificate signatory is an officer of the scheme promoter, not the LEP. Completed certificates are available via a scheme promoter’s website. The truth and accuracy is checked by the independent assessor on behalf of the LEP. Further scrutiny steps are not considered necessary.
27	Need to decide how to respond to the recommendation that “Business cases must be published (and publicised) before funding approval decision is made so that external comment is possible” and that “the above period should be at least 3 months”	As noted in response to the accompanying minimum requirements, the current practice is to make Full Business Cases publicly available in advance of considering funding approval. The officers see no merit in introducing a minimum notice period of 3 months for schemes that have already been exposed to public notice and scrutiny via planning, traffic regulation or other public notice procedure.
36	Need to decide how to respond to the recommendation that “Local Enterprise Partnerships should prepare an evaluation ‘handover pack’ as part of the appraisal process ...”	The LEP’s independent assessors are responsible both for reviewing the Full Business Case for each scheme, and for assuring the one- and five-year post-completion evaluation.  We consider that in these circumstances a ‘handover pack’ is not necessary  See elsewhere in this report a detailed process for one- and five-year post-completion monitoring.
37	Need to decide how to respond to the option to “Set out how Local Enterprise Partnerships will share best practice obtained from evaluation and monitoring reports”	See elsewhere in this report a detailed process for one- and five-year post-completion monitoring, including the requirement to identify significant “lessons learnt”

### ***Proposed process for one- and five-year post-completion monitoring***

15. Paragraph 17 of the current Assurance Framework says the following,  
*“Evaluation post implementation. Evaluation post implementation will be in accordance with DfT guidance. This will be conducted by the LTB’s independent assessors. The LTB will publish an initial report based on data collected at least one year post scheme opening; and a final report based on both ‘one year after’ data and further data collected approximately five years after scheme opening.”*

16. Now that our first scheme to complete, 2.07 Bracknell Coral Reef, is approaching its first anniversary, we have drafted a process for complying with this requirement, which is set out at Appendix 2.
17. We expect to receive the first one-year post-completion report on the Coral Reef scheme in November 2017.

### ***Conclusion***

18. The Assurance Framework currently in use is fit for purpose, and does not require further amendment to comply with the requirements of the government's latest guidance to LEPs.

### ***Background Papers***

19. The source papers used in compiling this report have been referenced in the text.

## Appendix 1

This Appendix gives a detailed comparison of the recommendation in Appendix B of [Local Enterprise Partnership National Assurance Framework](#)<sup>4</sup> and the [existing BLTB Assurance Framework](#)<sup>5</sup>

2.1 Value for Money			
DCLG heading	DCLG Text (see Appendix B page 18)	TVB LEP current practice	Suggested action for TVB LEP
1	Commentary Local Enterprise Partnerships will need to be satisfied that the proposed schemes will achieve value for money.	See Current Assurance Framework (CAF) para7 Strategic Objectives and Purpose "...To ensure value for money is achieved from individual schemes and the overall investment programme..."	No action necessary
2	Commentary Local Enterprise Partnerships will need to demonstrate that they have established processes to ensure that the modelling and appraisal is sufficiently robust and fit for purpose for the scheme under consideration. This should describe how they will ensure that the modelling and appraisal of schemes meets the guidance set out in WebTAG.	CAF para 15, "TVB LEP will appoint consultants to perform the role of independent assessors...."  White Young Green were appointed for a four-year term in April 2014. There are no extension provisions in the contract.	Note the appointment and role of White Young Green as Independent Assessors and plan to re-procure on expiry of existing contract in April 2018.
3	Commentary The use of WebTAG, which is mandatory for all schemes, does not preclude additional assessments or methodologies (e.g. wider economic benefits) being employed to prioritise and assess the overall business case for a scheme.	CAF para 14, step 2, "The scheme proposer will develop a full <a href="#">Transport Business Case</a> in line with current DfT guidance..." This applies to scheme which have reached Programme Entry Stage. Our prioritisation procedures use a range of metrics.	No action necessary

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/local-enterprise-partnership-national-assurance-framework>

<sup>5</sup> <http://thamesvalleyberkshire.co.uk/Portals/0/FileStore/StrategicInfrastructure/StrategicInfrastructure/BLTB/Assurance%20Framework%20for%20Berkshire%20Local%20Transport%20Body%2014%20November%202013.pdf>

2.1 Value for Money				
DCLG heading	DCLG Text (see Appendix B page 18)	TVB LEP current practice	Suggested action for TVB LEP	
4	Commentary	Neither does it dictate the weighting or importance that decision-makers should attach to any aspect of the WebTAG assessment or any additional assessment. In particular, the Benefit to Cost Ratio is only one component of the value for money assessment and should not be the sole driver of decision-making.	Our prioritisation methodology uses six-factors, of which one, “deliverability” includes an assessment of the scheme’s likelihood of demonstrating the required value-for-money rating	No action necessary
5	Commentary	The overriding principle is that the full range of the material costs and benefits of a scheme, both quantified and unquantified, should be available to decision-makers.	The pro-formas in use at prioritisation stage and later allow scheme promoters to describe the full range of costs and benefits associated with each scheme	No action necessary
6	Minimum Requirement	The modelling and appraisal of schemes contained in business cases must be developed in accordance with the guidance published in WebTAG at the time the business case is submitted to Local Enterprise Partnerships for approval.	CAF para 14, step 2, “The scheme proposer will develop a full <a href="#">Transport Business Case</a> <sup>6</sup> in line with current DfT guidance...”	Minimum requirement already met

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.dft.gov.uk/publications/transport-business-case>

2.1 Value for Money			
DCLG heading	DCLG Text (see Appendix B page 18)	TVB LEP current practice	Suggested action for TVB LEP
7	Minimum Requirement Central case assessments must be based on forecasts which are consistent with the definitive version of NTEM (DfT's planning dataset). This requirement doesn't stop Local Enterprise Partnerships considering alternative planning assumptions as sensitivity tests and considering the results of these in coming to a decision about whether to approve a scheme.	CAF para 14, step 2, "Where necessary, Central Case assessments will be based on forecasts which are consistent with the definitive version of NTEM (DfT's planning dataset)."	Minimum requirement already met
8	Minimum Requirement The appraisal and modelling will be scrutinised by Local Enterprise Partnerships to ensure it has been developed in accordance with the WebTAG. This will be undertaken independent of the management unit or authority promoting the scheme. The Local Enterprise Partnership's local assurance framework will set out how this will be done.	CAF para 15, "TVB LEP will appoint consultants to perform the role of independent assessors. The appointment process will be a competitive tender. The procurement exercise will examine the credentials and capability of the bidders in respect of their: independence; their technical ability and their available resources. This will be tested against a specification which establishes the scope of the assessment, and the provision of post implementation evaluation."	Minimum requirement already met
9	Minimum Requirement The local assurance framework must set out how the assessment and scrutiny of business cases will be quality assured.	CAF is silent on this matter. The contract with WYG includes a section "RELIANCE ON THE CONSULTANT'S SKILL AND CARE" which describes quality assurance responsibilities	Consider what further action, if any, is required to meet this minimum requirement

2.1 Value for Money				
DCLG heading		DCLG Text (see Appendix B page 18)	TVB LEP current practice	Suggested action for TVB LEP
10	Recommended	Set out mechanisms for providing early advice to scheme promoters on whether the study approach is fit-for-purpose, particularly in relation to modelling and Social & Distributional Impacts (which both can have significant lead times)	The WYG contract anticipates that a scheme promoter will produce Option Assessment and Appraisal Specification Reports for review prior to submission of a Full Business case. This has been the practice.	Recommended practice already used
11	Optional	A description of how Local Enterprise Partnerships will ensure that WebTAG will be applied by scheme promoters in a proportionate and robust way.	The application of WebTAG is the responsibility of each scheme promoter, not the LEP. The LEP commissions an independent consultancy who provide robust reports on the application of the scheme	Current practice meets the outcome envisaged in this option
12	Optional	A description of the circumstances under which external scrutiny or audit of the appraisal or modelling of schemes would be commissioned e.g. controversial or particularly costly schemes.	All schemes are subject to external scrutiny, either by WYG, our independent consultants, or, in the case of retained major schemes, by the DfT	Current practice meets the outcome envisaged in this option
13	Commentary	Local Enterprise Partnerships will need to put in place a process for producing a Value for Money (VfM) statement for all schemes put forward for approval summarising their overall assessment of the economic case. This VfM statement will need to be reviewed and updated at each approval stage.	CAF, para 14, step 2, "... all schemes will ... include a VfM statement signed by a senior responsible officer."  The reference to multiple approval stages does not apply, as we operate a single approval stage.	No action necessary



2.1 Value for Money				
DCLG heading	DCLG Text (see Appendix B page 18)	TVB LEP current practice	Suggested action for TVB LEP	
14	Minimum Requirement	A value for money statement for each scheme in line with published DfT WebTAG guidance and DfT advice on assessing VfM must be presented for consideration to Local Enterprise Partnerships at each approval stage.	CAF, para 14, step 2, "... all schemes will ... include a VfM statement signed by a senior responsible officer."  The reference to multiple approval stages does not apply, as we operate a single approval stage.	Minimum requirement already met
15	Minimum Requirement	The VfM assessment must be signed off as true and accurate by a named officer with responsibility for Value for Money assessments within Local Enterprise Partnerships.	CAF, para 14, step 2, "... all schemes will ... include a VfM statement signed by a senior responsible officer."  The signatory is an officer of the scheme promoter, not the LEP. The truth and accuracy is checked by the independent assessor on behalf of the LEP.	Need to check that our current practice is acceptable
16	Recommended	Set out what processes will be put in place to ensure that all impacts of a scheme (monetised and non-monetised) will be assessed by officers on a consistent basis and are based on reasonable assumptions.	The requirement of our CAF is for the scheme promoter's Full Business Case to be WebTAG compliant. The independent assessor checks it for <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Completeness</li> <li>• Accuracy</li> <li>• Relevance</li> <li>• Value for Money</li> <li>• Evaluation arrangements</li> </ul>	Current practice meets the outcome envisaged in this recommendation
17	Commentary	Local Enterprise Partnerships will need to confirm that they agree to only approve schemes that meet a minimum VfM threshold and put in place the appropriate checks and balances to ensure compliance with this requirement.	CAF para 14, step 4, "Where a scheme can demonstrate high value for money and receive a positive assessment, and have this validated by the independent assessor, a report to this effect may be prepared for the LTB recommending approval ..."	No action necessary

2.1 Value for Money				
DCLG heading		DCLG Text (see Appendix B page 18)	TVB LEP current practice	Suggested action for TVB LEP
18	Commentary	The overwhelming majority of local major schemes funded in recent years were assessed by the Department as offering at least “high” value for money.	No comment	No comment
19	Commentary	We would like to ensure that the value for money of major transport investment is maintained and therefore would expect that Local Enterprise Partnerships would only in exceptional circumstances agree to fund schemes with lower than “high” value for money.	No comment	No comment
20	Commentary	If Local Enterprise Partnerships wish to retain the flexibility to fund schemes assessed at less than “high” value for money, the assurance framework should clearly set out the circumstances under which funding for such schemes would be considered, and outline any additional scrutiny or conditions that would apply.	CAF para 14, step 4, “Where a scheme can demonstrate high value for money and receive a positive assessment, and have this validated by the independent assessor, a report to this effect may be prepared for the LTB recommending approval ...”	No action necessary
21	Minimum Requirement	Local Enterprise Partnerships must either; only approve schemes that offer at least “high” value for money, as assessed using DfT guidance, or; set out the limited circumstances under which schemes offering lower than “high” value for money would be considered.	CAF para 14, step 4, “Where a scheme can demonstrate high value for money and receive a positive assessment, and have this validated by the independent assessor, a report to this effect may be prepared for the LTB recommending approval ...”	Minimum requirement already met

2.1 Value for Money				
DCLG heading		DCLG Text (see Appendix B page 18)	TVB LEP current practice	Suggested action for TVB LEP
22	Minimum Requirement	Schemes must be assessed against the relevant thresholds at each approval stage.	We operate a single approval stage	Minimum requirement already met
23	Commentary	Local Enterprise Partnerships are required to demonstrate separately (in other sections of the assurance framework) that they are transparent and open when reporting the results of modelling and appraisal, and that they have plans in place to obtain the necessary resources to fulfil the requirement to secure Value for Money.	All scheme promoters are required to make their Full Business Case publicly available via their web site	No action necessary

Table 2 (continued)

2.2 External views on business cases				
DCLG heading		DCLG Text	TVB LEP current practice	Suggested action for TVB LEP
24	Commentary	This section should outline what arrangements exist for Local Enterprise Partnerships to invite and consider any external comment and/or scrutiny of business cases prior to approval. In previous DfT guidance, bidding Local Authorities were required to place their business case on their own websites when bids were submitted for funding and that practice should continue.	CAF para 16, "all Schemes seeking final approval will arrange for their business cases to be published, and for any comments from interested parties or the public to be collected and reported to the BLTB prior to any decision being made ...". In addition outline descriptions of schemes are available post Programme Entry stage	No action required

2.2 External views on business cases				
DCLG heading	DCLG Text	TVB LEP current practice	Suggested action for TVB LEP	
25	Minimum requirement	Business cases must be published (and publicised) before funding approval decision is made so that external comment is possible.	CAF para 16, “ ... all Schemes seeking final approval will arrange for their business cases to be published, and for any comments from interested parties or the public to be collected and reported to the BLTB prior to any decision being made ...”	Minimum requirement already met
26	Minimum requirement	Opinions expressed by the public and stakeholders must be available to relevant members or boards of Local Enterprise Partnerships when decisions are being taken.	CAF, para 16, “all Schemes seeking final approval will arrange for their business cases to be published, and for any comments from interested parties or the public to be collected and reported to the BLTB prior to any decision being made ...”	Minimum requirement already met
27	Recommended	The above period should be at least 3 months.	Not sure that a full three months between Full Business Case submission and decision is achievable or desirable.	Needs further discussion
28	Recommended	Local Enterprise Partnerships should make public how they have taken external comments into account	CAF, para 16, “all Schemes seeking final approval will arrange for their business cases to be published, and for any comments from interested parties or the public to be collected and reported to the BLTB prior to any decision being made ...”	Recommendation already met

Table 2 (continued)

2.3 Evaluation and Monitoring			
DCLG heading	DCLG Text	TVB LEP current practice	Suggested action for TVB LEP

29	Commentary	The following requirements on the evaluation and monitoring of outcomes apply to all transport schemes.	No comment	No comment
30	Minimum requirements	Local Enterprise Partnerships must put in place mechanisms to ensure that schemes are monitored and evaluated in line with the latest DfT guidance on the evaluation of local major schemes. In particular Local Enterprise Partnerships should:	CAF para 17, "Evaluation post implementation will be in accordance with DfT guidance. This will be conducted by the LTB's independent assessors. The LTB will publish an initial report based on data collected at least one year post scheme opening; and a final report based on both 'one year after' data and further data collected approximately five years after scheme opening.	Minimum requirement already met
31	Minimum requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>set out proportionate evaluation and monitoring (M&amp;E) plans that clarify: 1) requirements for individual schemes including funding of M&amp;E activities; 2) responsibility for undertaking M&amp;E, how minimum standards will be met and timescales for completion and decisions.</li> </ul>	The LEP has a M&E plan, which includes some small (under £5m schemes) and some large (over £5m schemes) with a detailed schedule of data to be collected and published one year and five years post completion.	Minimum requirement already met
32	Minimum requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ensure that, for each scheme, there is clarity about how spend against delivery of outputs will be reported.</li> </ul>	Promoters submit a scheme pro-forma, including spend against delivery and outputs, 6 times a year to an Officers' meeting and 3 times a year to the Local Transport Body	Minimum requirement already met

33	Minimum requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ensure that M&amp;E plans are in place for schemes by the time that funding is signed off or before any data collection is programmed.</li> </ul>	The LEP M&E plan is already in place	Minimum requirement already met
34	Minimum requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>put in place processes to ensure that the results of any evaluation and monitoring are published.</li> </ul>	CAF para 17, "The LTB will publish an initial report based on data collected at least one year post scheme opening; and a final report based on both 'one year after' data and further data collected approximately five years after scheme opening.	Minimum requirement already met
35	Recommended	Local Enterprise Partnerships should have the results of any evaluation and monitoring reviewed independently of the scheme promoter.	CAF para 17, "Evaluation post implementation will be in accordance with DfT guidance. This will be conducted by the LTB's independent assessors. ..."	Recommendation already met
36	Recommended	Local Enterprise Partnerships should prepare an evaluation 'handover pack' as part of the appraisal process that documents all key assumptions so that those responsible for scheme evaluation can fully understand how appraisal estimates were produced and can examine the potential drivers of any differences between forecasts and outturns.	<p>The LEP's independent assessors, WYG are responsible both for reviewing the Full Business Case for each scheme, and for assuring the one year on evaluation.</p> <p>We consider that in these circumstances a 'handover pack' is not necessary</p>	Consider what further action, if any, is required to meet this recommendation
37	Optional	Set out how Local Enterprise Partnerships will share best practice obtained from evaluation and monitoring reports.	Not yet reached	Consider what further action, if any, is required to implement this option

38	Commentary	Local Enterprise Partnerships and scheme promoters should refer to published DfT frameworks for advice on monitoring outcomes (e.g. reducing congestion, improving journey reliability etc.) measures, data collection methods and potential data sources.	No comment	No comment
----	------------	--	------------	------------

## Appendix 2

### Guidance for one- and five-year-on monitoring reports for BLTB funded local transport schemes

1. This guidance is for promoters of transport schemes part funded by Berkshire Local Transport Body, and for the BLTB's independent assessors.
2. The BLTB Assurance Framework currently says

*“17. Evaluation (Guidance Paragraphs 76-77): Evaluation post implementation. Evaluation post implementation will be in accordance with DfT guidance. This will be conducted by the LTB's independent assessors. The LTB will publish an initial report based on data collected at least one year post scheme opening; and a final report based on both 'one year after' data and further data collected approximately five years after scheme opening.”*

3. In addition, the LEP's overall Monitoring and Evaluation Plan for the Growth Deal has identified 4 transport schemes to be subject to extended monitoring and evaluation.
  - 2.01 Newbury King's Road Link Road
  - 2.06 Reading Green Park Station
  - 2.08 Slough Mass Rapid Transit
  - 2.14 Reading East Reading Mass Rapid TransitFurther, 2.04 Wokingham Distributor Roads, which is a Department for Transport (DfT) retained scheme is included in the LEP M&E plan
4. In general terms, one- and five-year monitoring reports should follow the DfT guidance which is available at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/monitoring-and-evaluation-framework-for-local-authority-major-schemes>
5. BLTB monitoring reports will focus on the following basic questions about the scheme
  - a. did it get built?
  - b. was it to plan?
  - c. was it on time?
  - d. was it to budget?
  - e. is it working ok?
  - f. what impact has it had?
  - g. any learning points?
6. For BLTB schemes we will make a distinction within the DfT's "standard" category (up to £50m scheme cost) for small schemes (less than £5m scheme cost). This will be to ensure that the burden of monitoring reports is proportional to the size of the scheme.



7. For small schemes (up to £5m scheme cost), the scheme promoter will propose a monitoring methodology that is proportional to the small size of the scheme. Where it is appropriate to add to or subtract from the standard monitoring listed in the DfT guidance, the proposed methodology will explain why such changes are necessary.
8. For larger schemes (greater than £5m scheme cost), the same provisions will apply, but with the expectation that the DfT's "standard" category requirements will be applied.
9. It is anticipated that for both smaller and larger schemes the methodology will include an introduction to the scheme and its context, including reference to the original justification for the investment, explaining whether this was an economic development reason, or a transport one. It is also anticipated that this introduction will highlight any differences between the relevant monitoring period and the business model forecast period.
10. The role of the independent assessor will be to
  - a. review the proposed methodology
  - b. give the scheme promoter any feedback prior to compilation of the monitoring report
  - c. on receipt of the draft monitoring report, check for compliance with the proposed methodology
  - d. give the scheme promoter any feedback prior to the publication of the final report
  - e. notify the LEP of any issues regarding the accuracy, completeness and relevance of the monitoring report.

This page is intentionally left blank

## BLTB Forward Plan 2017/18

<b>20<sup>th</sup> July 2017</b>	
<p><i>Deadline for final reports:</i> 10<sup>th</sup> July</p> <p><i>Agenda published:</i> 12<sup>th</sup> July</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial approval for 2.13 Wokingham: Thames Valley Park and Ride</li> <li>• Financial approval for 2.14 and 2.25 Reading East Reading Mass Rapid Transit Phases 1 and 2</li> <li>• Financial approval for 2.16 Maidenhead: Station Access</li> <li>• Financial approval for 2.28 Bracknell: A3095 Corridor Improvements</li> <li>• Progress reports</li> <li>• Forward Plan</li> </ul>
<b>16<sup>th</sup> November 2017</b>	
<p><i>Deadline for final reports:</i> 6<sup>th</sup> November</p> <p><i>Agenda published:</i> 8<sup>th</sup> November</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial approval for 2.23 Reading South Reading MRT Phases 3 and 4</li> <li>• Financial approval for 2.24 Newbury Station Improvements</li> <li>• Financial approval for 2.26 Maidenhead Town Centre: Missing Links</li> <li>• One year on implementation report: 2.07 Bracknell Coral Reef</li> <li>• Progress reports</li> <li>• Forward Plan</li> </ul>
<b>15<sup>th</sup> March 2018</b>	
<p><i>Deadline for final reports:</i> 5<sup>th</sup> March</p> <p><i>Agenda published:</i> 7<sup>th</sup> March</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial approval for 2.27 Wokingham Winnersh Relief Road Phase 2</li> <li>• Progress reports</li> <li>• Forward Plan</li> </ul>

### Other items

- Scheme evaluation and monitoring (to be scheduled)
- Programme and risk management (to be scheduled)

This page is intentionally left blank