## BERKSHIRE LOCAL TRANSPORT BODY (BLTB)

**REPORT TO:** BLTB **DATE:** 20 November 2014

**CONTACT OFFICER:** Ruth Bagley, Chief Executive Slough Borough Council,

lead Chief Executive to the BLTB

#### **PART I**

# Financial Approval 2.02 Bracknell: Warfield Link Road

# **Purpose of Report**

- To consider giving financial approval to scheme 2.02 Bracknell: Warfield Link Road.
- 2. The Warfield Link Road is a new road linking Quelm Lane Roundabout on Harvest Ride to the B3034 Forest Road adjacent to its junction with the A3095 at Three Legged Cross. The road is less than a mile long, and includes two roundabout junctions on its length. The road will facilitate the housing development of up 2,200 houses on this and adjoining sites.
- 3. The new link road is a requirement of the planning consent given for the development of this major housing site. The specification is for a 6m wide vehicle carriage way, with a 2m footpath on one side and a 3m combined footpath and cycleway on the other side. There is also provision for bus stops and traffic calming measures adjacent to the proposed new school. The road, along with the whole development is subject to landscaping and planting conditions.

## Recommendation

- 4. You are recommended to give scheme 2.02 Bracknell: Warfield Link Road full financial approval in the sum of £3,500,000 in 2015/16 on the terms of the funding agreement set out at paragraph 12 step 5 below, subject to
- 5. Written confirmation from WYG, the Independent Assessor, that all aspects of the DfT's current requirements for a full business case for a scheme of this size have been met.

### Other Implications

#### Financial

- 6. Scheme 2.02 Bracknell: Warfield Link Road is one of the named schemes that received approval for spending in 2015/16 in the <a href="Thames Valley Berkshire">Thames Valley Berkshire</a> Local Growth Deal<sup>i</sup> announced on 7 July 2014.
- 7. This report recommends that Bracknell Forest Council be authorised to draw down the capital sum £3,500,000 allocated by the government for this scheme.

8. The funding agreement set out at paragraph 12 step 5 sets out the roles and responsibilities, reporting and auditing arrangements, timing and triggers for payments, contributions from other funders, consequences of delay, consequences of failure, claw back, and evaluation requirements at one and five years on.

## Risk Management

- 9. The risk management arrangements already put in place by the Local Transport Body are as follows:
  - The <u>Assurance Framework<sup>ii</sup></u> has been drafted following DfT guidance and has been approved by the DfT for use in allocating capital funds for transport schemes
  - White Young Green (WYG) have been appointed as Independent Assessors and have provided a full written report (see Appendix 1) on the full business case for the scheme
  - The funding agreement set out at paragraph 12, step 5 makes clear that the financial risk associated with implementation of the scheme rests with the scheme promoter.

# Human Rights Act and Other Legal Implications

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

#### Supporting Information

- 11. The risks associated with delivering the project are considered to be amenable to well-understood management practices. The scheme will be carried out in partnership with Berkeley Homes, the lead developer of the site, and will be subject to Highway Adoption procedures prior to handover.
- 12. The full details of the scheme are available from the <u>Bracknell Forest website</u> ii. A summary of the key points is given below:

Detailed design completion	March 2015	
Procurement	Via developer and a s.278 agreement	
Construction Start	April 2015	
Construction Finish	March 2017	

Source of funding or type of contribution	Cost	
Provisional profiling of BLTB drawdown	2015-16: £3,500,000	
Local contributions from		
- Section 106 agreements	2016-17: £1,700,000	

Total Scheme Cost	£5.2million
-------------------	-------------

13. The table below sets out the details of this scheme's compliance with steps1-5 of paragraph 14 of the full Assurance Framework<sup>iv</sup>.

Assurance Framework Check list	2.02 Bracknell: Warfield Link Road				
	The scheme was originally developed by Bracknell Forest Council in response to its adopted Core Strategy Development Plan Document (Feb 08) which identifies the vision for growth to 2026 which includes a new Strategic Development Location for up to 2,200 homes in North Warfield  In 2013, the outline scheme was not submitted for assessment as part of the Berkshire Local Transport Body procedures in accordance with paragraphs 11 and 12 of the Assurance Framework.				
	Factor	Raw score	Weighting	Weighted score	
	Maximum strategic Impact		2	00010	
Step 1:	Economic Impact		2		
Development of	VFM		1.5		
Scheme proposal;	Ease of Deliverability		1.5		
initial sifting,	Matched Funding		1		
scoring and	Environmental		1		
prioritisation	Social		1		
	Total				
leading to award of Programme Entry Status. (See	The scheme was subsequently co	nsidered fo		ne Strategic	
Programme Entry	The scheme was subsequently co Economic Plan. A similar assessm scheme was given 27.5 points and originally submitted and equal 5 <sup>th</sup> of the SEP.	nent proces d ranked eq of the scher	r inclusion in the s was used and lual 6 <sup>th</sup> of 37 so mes that were i	d the chemes included in	
Programme Entry Status. (See	Economic Plan. A similar assessm scheme was given 27.5 points and originally submitted and equal 5 <sup>th</sup> of the control of the c	nent proces d ranked eg	r inclusion in the s was used and lual 6 <sup>th</sup> of 37 so	d the hemes	
Programme Entry Status. (See	Economic Plan. A similar assessm scheme was given 27.5 points and originally submitted and equal 5 <sup>th</sup> of the SEP.  Factor  Strategy	nent proces d ranked eq of the scher  Raw score 3	r inclusion in the swas used and ual 6 <sup>th</sup> of 37 somes that were incomplete weighting 1.5	d the chemes included in Weighted score 4.5	
Programme Entry Status. (See	Economic Plan. A similar assessment scheme was given 27.5 points and originally submitted and equal 5th of the SEP.  Factor  Strategy Deliverability	nent proces d ranked eq of the scher  Raw score  3 3	r inclusion in the swas used and ual 6 <sup>th</sup> of 37 somes that were included with the week inc	d the chemes included in Weighted score 4.5	
Programme Entry Status. (See	Economic Plan. A similar assessm scheme was given 27.5 points and originally submitted and equal 5 <sup>th</sup> of the SEP.  Factor  Strategy  Deliverability  Economic Impact	nent proces d ranked eq of the scher  Raw score  3 3 3	r inclusion in the swas used and ual 6th of 37 somes that were included with the swar inclu	d the chemes included in Weighted score 4.5 6 12	
Programme Entry Status. (See	Economic Plan. A similar assessm scheme was given 27.5 points and originally submitted and equal 5 <sup>th</sup> of the SEP.  Factor  Strategy  Deliverability  Economic Impact  TVB area coverage	nent proces d ranked eq of the scher  Raw score 3 3 3 2	r inclusion in the swas used and ual 6th of 37 somes that were including the weighting to the state of the swap of	d the chemes included in Weighted score 4.5 6 12 3	
Programme Entry Status. (See	Economic Plan. A similar assessment scheme was given 27.5 points and originally submitted and equal 5th of the SEP.  Factor  Strategy Deliverability Economic Impact TVB area coverage Environment	nent proces d ranked eq of the scher  Raw score 3 3 3 2 2	r inclusion in the swas used and ual 6 <sup>th</sup> of 37 somes that were included with the swar inc	d the chemes included in Weighted score 4.5 6 12 3 1	
Programme Entry Status. (See	Economic Plan. A similar assessm scheme was given 27.5 points and originally submitted and equal 5 <sup>th</sup> of the SEP.  Factor  Strategy  Deliverability  Economic Impact  TVB area coverage	nent proces d ranked eq of the scher  Raw score 3 3 3 2	r inclusion in the swas used and ual 6th of 37 somes that were in the weighting 1.5 2 4 1.5 0.5 0.5	d the chemes included in  Weighted score  4.5 6 12 3 1	
Programme Entry Status. (See paragraphs 11-13)	Economic Plan. A similar assessm scheme was given 27.5 points and originally submitted and equal 5 <sup>th</sup> of the SEP.  Factor  Strategy  Deliverability  Economic Impact  TVB area coverage  Environment  Social	nent proces d ranked eq of the scher  Raw score  3 3 2 2 2 2	r inclusion in the swas used and ual 6th of 37 somes that were in the weighting to the swas and the weighting to the weighting the weighting to the weighting the weighting the weighting the wei	d the chemes included in Weighted score 4.5 6 12 3 1 1 27.5	
Programme Entry Status. (See paragraphs 11-13)	Economic Plan. A similar assessm scheme was given 27.5 points and originally submitted and equal 5 <sup>th</sup> of the SEP.  Factor  Strategy  Deliverability  Economic Impact  TVB area coverage  Environment  Social  Following the announcement of the	rent proces d ranked equation of the schere Raw score 3 3 3 2 2 2 2 2 e Local Ground Exercises and the schere Raw score Schere Raw score Schere Raw score Raw score Schere Raw score Raw s	r inclusion in the swas used and ual 6 <sup>th</sup> of 37 somes that were in the week i	d the chemes included in Weighted score 4.5 6 12 3 1 1 27.5 mmer	
Programme Entry Status. (See paragraphs 11-13)  Step 2: Programme Entry:	Economic Plan. A similar assessm scheme was given 27.5 points and originally submitted and equal 5 <sup>th</sup> of the SEP.  Factor  Strategy  Deliverability  Economic Impact  TVB area coverage  Environment  Social  Following the announcement of th 2014, the scheme was given Prog	nent proces d ranked eq of the scher  Raw score 3 3 2 2 2 e Local Gro	r inclusion in the swas used and ual 6 <sup>th</sup> of 37 somes that were in the week i	d the chemes included in Weighted score 4.5 6 12 3 1 1 27.5 mmmer	
Programme Entry Status. (See paragraphs 11-13)	Economic Plan. A similar assessm scheme was given 27.5 points and originally submitted and equal 5 <sup>th</sup> of the SEP.  Factor  Strategy  Deliverability  Economic Impact  TVB area coverage  Environment  Social  Following the announcement of the	nent proces d ranked eq of the scher  Raw score 3 3 2 2 2 e Local Gro	r inclusion in the swas used and ual 6 <sup>th</sup> of 37 somes that were in the week i	d the chemes included in Weighted score 4.5 6 12 3 1 1 27.5 mmmer	
Programme Entry Status. (See paragraphs 11-13)  Step 2: Programme Entry: evolution of the	Economic Plan. A similar assessm scheme was given 27.5 points and originally submitted and equal 5 <sup>th</sup> of the SEP.  Factor  Strategy  Deliverability  Economic Impact  TVB area coverage  Environment  Social  Following the announcement of th 2014, the scheme was given Prog	Raw score  3 3 3 2 2 2 e Local Groramme Ent	r inclusion in the swas used and ual 6th of 37 somes that were in the weighting 1.5 2 4 1.5 0.5 0.5 Total owth Deal in sury Status by the	d the chemes included in Weighted score  4.5 6 12 3 1 27.5 mmer	
Programme Entry Status. (See paragraphs 11-13)  Step 2: Programme Entry: evolution of the scheme from	Economic Plan. A similar assessm scheme was given 27.5 points and originally submitted and equal 5 <sup>th</sup> of the SEP.  Factor  Strategy  Deliverability  Economic Impact  TVB area coverage  Environment  Social  Following the announcement of the 2014, the scheme was given Programment BLTB meetings held on 24 July 20	Raw score  3 3 3 2 2 2 e Local Groramme Ento 114 <sup>v</sup> .	r inclusion in the swas used and ual 6th of 37 somes that were in the weighting to the weig	d the chemes included in Weighted score 4.5 6 12 3 1 1 27.5 mmer e	
Programme Entry Status. (See paragraphs 11-13)  Step 2: Programme Entry: evolution of the scheme from outline proposal to full business case, external view on	Economic Plan. A similar assessm scheme was given 27.5 points and originally submitted and equal 5 <sup>th</sup> of the SEP.  Factor  Strategy  Deliverability  Economic Impact  TVB area coverage  Environment  Social  Following the announcement of the 2014, the scheme was given Progen BLTB meetings held on 24 July 2004.	Raw score  3 3 3 2 2 2 2 e Local Groundler  a Local Groundler  ble in the Son draft since	r inclusion in the swas used and ual 6th of 37 somes that were in the weighting to the weig	d the chemes included in Weighted score 4.5 6 12 3 1 1 27.5 mmer e	
Programme Entry Status. (See paragraphs 11-13)  Step 2: Programme Entry: evolution of the scheme from outline proposal to full business case, external view on the business case,	Economic Plan. A similar assessm scheme was given 27.5 points and originally submitted and equal 5 <sup>th</sup> of the SEP.  Factor  Strategy  Deliverability  Economic Impact  TVB area coverage  Environment  Social  Following the announcement of the 2014, the scheme was given Programment BLTB meetings held on 24 July 20  A scheme outline has been availated Annexe (scheme 2.07 page 48) in the final version since March 2014	Raw score  3 3 3 2 2 2 e Local Groramme Ento 114°. ble in the Sen draft since I.	r inclusion in the swas used and ual 6th of 37 somes that were in the swar was a swar were in the swar was a	d the chemes included in Weighted score  4.5 6 12 3 1 27.5 mmer ee	
Programme Entry Status. (See paragraphs 11-13)  Step 2: Programme Entry: evolution of the scheme from outline proposal to full business case, external view on	Economic Plan. A similar assessm scheme was given 27.5 points and originally submitted and equal 5 <sup>th</sup> of the SEP.  Factor  Strategy  Deliverability  Economic Impact  TVB area coverage  Environment  Social  Following the announcement of the 2014, the scheme was given Progen BLTB meetings held on 24 July 2000 A scheme outline has been availated Annexe (scheme 2.07 page 48) in the scheme 2.07 page 48) in the scheme was given Progen BLTB meetings held on 24 July 2000 A scheme outline has been availated Annexe (scheme 2.07 page 48) in the scheme was given Progen BLTB meetings held on 24 July 2000 A scheme outline has been availated Annexe (scheme 2.07 page 48) in the scheme was given Progen BLTB meetings held on 24 July 2000 A scheme outline has been availated Annexe (scheme 2.07 page 48) in the scheme was given Progen BLTB meetings held on 24 July 2000 A scheme outline has been availated Annexe (scheme 2.07 page 48) in the scheme was given Progen BLTB meetings held on 24 July 2000 A scheme outline has been available Annexe (scheme 2.07 page 48) in the scheme was given Progen BLTB meetings held on 24 July 2000 A scheme 2.07 page 48) in the scheme was given Progen BLTB meetings held on 24 July 2000 A scheme outline has been available Annexe (scheme 2.07 page 48) in the scheme was given Progen BLTB meetings held on 24 July 2000 A scheme Annexe (scheme 2.07 page 48) in the scheme was given Progen BLTB meetings held on 24 July 2000 A scheme Annexe (scheme 2.07 page 48) in the scheme Annexe (scheme 2.07 page 48) i	Raw score  3 3 3 2 2 2 2 e Local Grown Ent 1914. ble in the Sen draft since I.	r inclusion in the swas used and ual 6th of 37 somes that were in the weighting 1.5 2 4 1.5 0.5 0.5 Total owth Deal in sury Status by the EP Implementate December 200 st details of the swarp status of the s	d the chemes included in Weighted score 4.5 6 12 3 1 1 27.5 mmer e	

Assurance	
Framework	2.02 Bracknell: Warfield Link Road
Check list	
paragraphs 15 and 16)	responsible officer.
	Any comments or observations on the scheme received by either TVB LEP or BFC have been fully considered during the development of the scheme.
	<ul> <li>The report of the Independent Assessor is attached at Appendix 1. The Independent Assessor was asked to report as follows:</li> <li>Completeness – has the promoter prepared a complete Full Business Case submission, when judged against the prevailing advice from the DfT</li> <li>Accuracy – has the promoter performed the relevant calculations and assessments accurately and without error</li> <li>Relevance – has the Full Business Case considered all relevant matters, including use of appropriate forecasting models and planning assumptions, and has it included any irrelevant considerations such as unduly-optimistic assumptions or out of date modelling data</li> <li>Value for Money – does the scheme promoter's Value for Money assessment comply with the prevailing DfT guidance</li> <li>Evaluation arrangements – has the scheme promoter made provision for appropriate post-implementation evaluation of the scheme.</li> <li>Remedies – where the independent assessment reveals a gap between the FBC supplied and the standard anticipated by the DfT guidance, then the advice for the LTB should include recommendations for remedial actions required – e.g., collection of further details actions required – e.g., collection of</li> </ul>
Step 3: Conditional Approval	further data, sensitivity tests on particular assumptions etc.  The Independent Assessor has recommended that in this case a Conditional Approval is appropriate. There are a number of technical issues that are not yet resolved between the scheme promoter and the independent assessor about the presentation of the business case. These unresolved issues mean that the proposal is not yet fully compliant with the DfT requirements. However, the Independent Assessor has indicated that these technical shortcomings are not sufficiently serious to undermine the overall conclusion that this scheme represents good value for money.
Step 4:	The scheme has a Benefit - Cost Ratio (BCR) of 7.668.
Recommendation of Financial Approval - High Value for Money	DfT has set thresholds of 2.00 (High VfM) and 4.00 (Very High VfM) and schemes with BCRs above these thresholds can described as having High or Very High Value for Money.
- Support of the Independent assessor	As noted above the scheme has the conditional support of the Independent Assessor.
	The recommendation is that you give the scheme Conditional Approval.
Step 5: Formal Agreement - roles	Roles: The BLTB is a part funder of the scheme. Bracknell Forest Council is the scheme promoter, and is the relevant highway and planning authority.

# Assurance Framework Check list

2.02 Bracknell: Warfield Link Road

- responsibilities
- reporting
- auditing
- timing and triggers for payments,
- contributions from other funders,
- consequences of delay,
- consequences of failure.
- claw back,
- evaluation one and five years on

Responsibilities: The BLTB is responsible for allocating the capital finance in accordance with the Assurance Framework. Bracknell Forest Council is responsible for all aspects of the design, procurement, construction and implementation of the scheme, including its responsibilities as highway and planning authority, and any other statutory duties.

Reporting: In addition to any reporting requirements within Bracknell Forest Council, the scheme promoter will also make summary reports on progress to each meeting of the BLTB until the scheme reaches practical completion. In particular, Bracknell Forest Council will report on any change in the size, scope or specification of the scheme; and on any substantial savings against the scheme budget whether achieved by such changes to the size, scope or specification of the scheme, or through procurement, or through the efficient implementation of the scheme.

Auditing: If and when the DfT or Slough Borough Council (acting as accountable body for the BLTB) requests access to financial or other records for the purposes of an audit of the accounts, Bracknell Forest Council will cooperate fully.

Timing and Triggers for payments: Bracknell Forest Council will submit an annual invoice for each financial year together with a certificate of work completed. Slough Borough Council (acting as accountable body for the BLTB) will satisfy itself of the correctness of the certificate before paying the invoice.

Contributions from Other Funders: Bracknell Forest has secured £1,700,000 of s.106 contributions secured by Bracknell Forest Council in 2016/17

Consequences of Delay: In the event that the scheme experiences minor delays to its programme (no more than 10 weeks), Bracknell Forest Council will report these delays and the reasons for them, and the proposed remedial action to the next available meeting of the BLTB. In the event that the scheme experiences major delays to its programme (11 weeks or longer) Bracknell Forest Council will be required to seek permission from BLTB to reschedule any payments that are due, or may be delayed in falling due because of the delay to the programme.

Consequences of Failure: As soon as it becomes apparent to Bracknell Forest Council that it will not be possible to deliver the scheme at all, written notice shall be given to Slough Borough Council (acting as accountable body for the BLTB). No further monies will be paid to Bracknell Forest Council after this point. In addition, consideration will be given to recovering any monies paid to Bracknell Forest Council in respect of this scheme.

Claw back: If the overall scheme achieves savings against budget,

Assurance Framework Check list	2.02 Bracknell: Warfield Link Road
	these savings will be shared by the BLTB and the other funders noted above in proportion to the amounts committed to the original budget. Slough Borough Council (acting as accountable body for the BLTB) reserves the right to claw back any such savings amounts, and any repayments due as a consequence of scheme failure.
	Evaluation One and Five years on: Bracknell Forest Council will work with WYG to produce scheme evaluations One and Five years after practical completion.

## Conclusion

14. This is a well-planned scheme that will directly contribute to the development of the North Warfield Strategic Development Location.

# **Background Papers**

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

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment data/file/327587/35 Thames Valley Berkshire Growth Deal.pdf

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

iiihttp://www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/strategiceconomicplan

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

vhttp://www.slough.gov.uk/moderngov/ieListDocuments.aspx?Cld=601&Mld=5148&Ver=4

vihttp://thamesvalleyberkshire.co.uk/Portals/0/FileStore/StrategicEconomicPlan/TVB%20SEP%20-%20Annexes%20to%20Implementation%20Plan.pdf

viihttp://www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/strategiceconomicplan