#### BERKSHIRE LOCAL TRANSPORT BODY (BLTB)

**REPORT TO:** BLTB **DATE:** 12 March 2020

CONTACT OFFICER: Josie Wragg, Chief Executive, Slough Borough Council, and lead officer to the

**BLTB** 

Item 5: January 2020 Call for Bids scheme submissions and allocation of the remaining Local

**Growth and BRRP funds** 

#### **Purpose of Report**

- 1. To present the prioritised list of six bids received in response to the January 2020 Local Growth Fund (LGF) and Business Rates Retention Pilot (BRRP) call for bids.
- 2. To recommend the allocation of £2,120,109 LGF and £1,124,000 BRRP to the new and revised schemes.
- 3. To recommend a pipeline of future schemes that can be mobilised quickly should any additional LGF monies become available.
- 4. To note the decision of the LEP's Accountable Body (Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead) that £45,000 LGF can be capitalised and retained for the purposes of carrying out independent assessments of one and five-year post completion evaluations.

#### Recommendation

You are recommended to:

- 5. Approve the prioritisation scores of the six bids received as set out in Table 1.
- 6. Give programme entry status to the schemes set out in Table 2.
- 7. Allocate £2,120,109 LGF to the schemes set out in Table 3.
- 8. Allocate £1,124,000 BRRP to the schemes set out in Table 4.
- 9. Approve the pipeline of prioritised projects for the allocation of any future LG funds as they become available set out in Table 5.

#### **Other Implications**

#### **Financial**

10. Thames Valley Berkshire LEP has secured £142m LGF through three Growth Deals with central government. £24m of this is allocated to a 'DfT retained scheme'. Of the remaining £118m, 90% is spent or invested in projects that have completed, are on site or have Full Business Case (FBC) approval.

- 11. It is a requirement of government that all LGF monies must be transferred to delivery partners by March 2021. In order to do so schemes must have made a "significant" start by this date.
- 12. Local Growth Funds are administered and controlled by Thames Valley Berkshire LEP and the Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead, the LEP's Accountable Body.
- 13. Business Rate Retention Pilot funding is administered jointly between Thames Valley Berkshire LEP, Bracknell Forest Council and the Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead. The planning figure of £36m for 2018-19 & 2019-2020 is based on current estimates of business rates collection during the period and no revisions are anticipated.

#### Risk Management

- 14. The risk management arrangements already put in place by the Local Transport Body are as follows:
  - a) The <u>Assurance Framework</u> has been drafted following DfT guidance and has been approved by the DfT for use in allocating capital funds for transport schemes.
  - b) Hatch Regeneris have been appointed to act as Independent Assessors for all LGF-funded and BRRP schemes.
  - c) The principle of allocating LGF and BRRP to non-transport schemes was agreed by the LEP Board on 10 July 2018, revisited by the BLTB on 19 July 2018 (minute 7) and a decision ratified by the LEP Forum on 24 July.
- 15. The Berkshire authorities have identified the LEP and its associated processes as an appropriate framework for managing the BRRP sums available; in this instance this means programme management by the BLTB and ultimate sign-off by the LEP Forum. The LEP Forum ratified this approach on 27 March 2018.
- 16. The implication is that promoters of infrastructure projects seeking funding from the BRRP will need to follow the same assurance framework as for LGF. This means acceptance at "programme entry" stage, followed by submission and independent assessment of a WebTAG compliant Full Business Case before being considered for financial approval.

#### <u>Human Rights Act and Other Legal Implications</u>

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

#### **Supporting Information**

- 18. The call for bids was approved at your meeting on <u>14 November 2019</u> (item 20), and the prioritisation methodology is set out at Appendix 2 below.
- 19. The table below sets out the details of the bids received. The full pro-forma submissions of the 6 registered bids are available via the hyperlinks in the table below. Hatch Regeneris, the Independent Assessor has also been involved in this process and has endorsed our approach.

# **Prioritisation**

20. Table 1 shows the results of the prioritisation scoring.

Table 1

| Weighting                | 1.5 | 2                | 4                      | 1           | 1                      | 0.5       |                            |      |                         |                  |
|--------------------------|-----|------------------|------------------------|-------------|------------------------|-----------|----------------------------|------|-------------------------|------------------|
| Factor                   | SEP | Deliv-<br>erable | Econo<br>mic<br>Impact | TVB<br>area | Natura<br>I<br>Capital | l<br>Valu | Total<br>Weighted<br>score | Rank | Contributi<br>on Sought | Cumulative spend |
| LGF Eligible Projects    |     |                  |                        |             |                        |           |                            |      |                         |                  |
| Reading Buses:           |     |                  |                        |             |                        |           |                            |      |                         |                  |
| Completing the           | 4.5 | 6                | 8                      | 2           | 3                      | 1.0       | 24.5                       | 1    | 1,541,243               | 1,541,243        |
| Connection               |     |                  |                        |             |                        |           |                            |      |                         |                  |
| 2.29 Wokingham:          |     |                  |                        |             |                        |           |                            |      |                         |                  |
| Winnersh Triangle Park   | 4.5 | 4                | 8                      | 1           | 2                      | 0.5       | 20.0                       | 2    | 1,411,142               | 2,952,385        |
| and Ride - Extension     |     |                  |                        |             |                        |           |                            |      |                         |                  |
| 2.24 Newbury: Railway    |     |                  |                        |             |                        |           |                            |      |                         |                  |
| Station improvements -   | 4.5 | 4                | 8                      | 1           | 1                      | 1.0       | 19.5                       | 3    | 640,000                 | 3,592,385        |
| Extension                |     |                  |                        |             |                        |           |                            |      |                         |                  |
| Slough Langley High      | 4.5 | 2                | 8                      | 2           | 1                      | 0.5       | 18.0                       | 4    | 4 000 000               | 7 502 205        |
| Street (phases 1, 2 & 3) | 4.5 | 2                | 0                      | 2           | 1                      | 0.5       | 16.0                       | 4    | 4,000,000               | 7,392,363        |
| BRRP Eligible Projects   |     |                  |                        |             |                        |           |                            |      |                         |                  |
| Superfast Broadband -    | 4.5 | 6                | 8                      | 2           | 1                      | 0.5       | 22                         | 1    | 46,920                  | 46,920           |
| Extension                | 4.5 | U                | O                      | _           | 1                      | 0.5       | 44                         | 1    | 40,320                  | 40,320           |
| 2.30 TVB Smart City      | 4.5 | 6                | 4                      | 2           | 2                      | 0.5       | 5 19                       | 2    | 283,620                 | 220 540          |
| Cluster Extension        | 4.5 | 0                | 4                      | _           | 2                      | 0.5       | 13                         |      | 203,020                 | 330,540          |

# **Programme Entry**

- 21. Of the six bids received, four are for projects that already have Programme Entry status and their bids seek additional finance for the schemes.
- 22. Reading Buses and Slough Langley High Street are new schemes and this report recommends you award them programme entry status as set out Table 2.

Table 2

| Scheme               | Programme Entry | Conditions                                      |
|----------------------|-----------------|---|
|                      | status          |   |
| Reading Buses:       | Unconditional   | none  |
| Completing the       |                 |   |
| Connection           |                 |   |
| Slough Langley High  | Conditional     | That you authorise the LEP to award             |
| Street (phases 1,2 & |                 | programme entry status subject to sufficient LG |
| 3)                   |                 | funds becoming available to support at least    |
|                      |                 | phase 1 of the scheme.                          |

# **Local Growth Funds**

- 23. £2,120,109 of LGF remains available for allocation to schemes.
- 24. As outlined in Table 1, two of the schemes submitted as part of this call for bids process meet the criteria for BRRP as they assist in delivering a pan Berkshire digital infrastructure. These are extensions to existing LGF projects, therefore in order to maximise overall investment, it is recommended that they are transferred to BRRP. Due to the amount of BRRP funding available only a proportion of the TVB Smart City Cluster has been transferred. This brings the total LGF available to reallocation to £2,913,569.
- 25. Two existing projects, scheme 2.24 Newbury: Railway Station Improvements and scheme 2.29 Wokingham Winnersh Triangle Park and Ride, have identified funding shortfalls that risk the deliverability of the existing scheme. These were submitted to the call for bids alongside additional enhancements. In order to safeguard the original schemes, the essential works have been prioritised.
- 26. You are recommended to allocate the available LGF according Table 3.

Table 3

|   | Scheme costs | Available unallocated LGF |
|---|--------------|---------------------------|
| Original unallocated LGF:                             |              | £2,120,109                |
| Transfer of LGF digital projects to BRRP:             | 1            |                           |
| Superfast Broadband Complete Coverage                 | £500,000     | £2,620,109                |
| TVB Smart City Cluster project extension              | £293,460     | £2,913,569                |
| Approve new LGF funding:                              | •            |                           |
| Independent Assessment Reports                        | £45,000      | £2,868,569                |
| Scheme 2.24 Newbury: Railway Station Improvements     | £300,000     | £2,568,569                |
| (essential Gateline)                                  |              |                           |
| Scheme 2.29 Wokingham Winnersh Triangle Park and Ride | £736,142     | £1,832,427                |
| (essential Car Park)                                  |              |                           |
| Reading buses: Completing the Connection              | £1,541,243   | £291,184                  |

#### **Business Rates Retention Pilot**

27. £1,124,000 of BRRP remains available for allocation to schemes.

Table 4

|   | Scheme costs | Available unallocated BRRP |  |  |
|---|--------------|----------------------------|--|--|
| Original unallocated BRRP                 |              | £1,124,000                 |  |  |
| Transfer of LGF digital projects to BRRP: |              |                            |  |  |
| Superfast Berkshire                       | £500,000     | £624,000                   |  |  |
| TVB Smart City Cluster project            | £293,460     | £330,540                   |  |  |
| Approve new BRRP funding                  |              |                            |  |  |
| Superfast Berkshire Complete Coverage     | £46,920      | £283,620                   |  |  |
| TVB Smart City Cluster project extension  | £283,620     | £0                         |  |  |

# Pipeline of future LGF schemes

- 28. Further LGF may become available because schemes that already have LGF allocations may not be able to proceed. We are working closely with scheme promoters for the following schemes:
  - a) Scheme 2.33 GWR: Maidenhead to Marlow branch line upgrade
  - b) Scheme 2.38 Theale Station Park and Rail upgrade
  - c) Scheme 2.40 Windsor Town Centre package

In the event that further funds become available for re-allocation, we have prepared a "pipeline" list of schemes to which we are asking you to give conditional approval. (see Table 5 below).

Table 5

| Rank | Scheme   | £m      | Cumulative |
|------|--|---------|------------|
| 1    | 2.29 Wokingham Winnersh Triangle Park and Ride -       | £675k   | £675,000   |
|      | enhancements   |         |            |
| 2    | 2.24 Newbury: Railway Station improvements - extension | £340k   | £1,015,000 |
| 3    | Slough Langley High Street extension – phase 1         | £1.324m | £2,339,000 |
| 4    | Slough Langley High Street extension – phase 2         | £1,033m | £3,372,000 |
| 5    | Slough Langley High Street extension – phase 3         | £1,643m | £5,015,000 |
|      |  | £5,015m |            |

#### **Conclusion**

29. There is an imperative to use unallocated LGF monies by March 2021 and to ensure that BRRP monies are used most effectively. The projects submitted and ranked in the January 2020 Call for Bids process enable us to expedite schemes which will contribute to the delivery of the SEP/BLIS as well as create a pipeline of projects which will ensure that any residual LGF monies are utilised.

# Background Papers 30. The Call for Bids scheme papers can be found in Appendix 1 below and ranking methodology is available on request.

# Appendix 1 BLTB 12 March 2020: January Call for Bids summary

| Re-all | Re-allocated LGF funding – Proposed Project ranking |  |   |               |               |                   |
|--------|---|--|---|---------------|---------------|-------------------|
| Rank   | Bidder  | Short Title                                    | Short Description   | Notes         | Amount sought | Already<br>Funded |
| 1      | Wokingham Borough<br>Council                        | Winnersh Triangle Parkway Extension (Car Park) | Development of a single deck car park (constructed over the existing ground level car park), improved access to the station and improved public realm.  | Extension     | £736,142      | £2,850,000        |
| 2      | West Berkshire Council                              | Newbury Station Extension (Gateline)           | It amends original plans for Scheme 2.24 Newbury: Railway Station Improvements and seeks to deliver better arrangements for the cycle hubs, business start-up and access to and from the south side of the station. | Extension     | £300,000      | £6,051,000        |
| 3      | Reading Buses                                       | Completing the Connection                      | Delivering customer access to live travel information and smart ticketing for local and inter-urban public transport across the Thames Valley Berkshire region.   | New<br>scheme | £1,541,243    | N/A               |
| 4      | Wokingham Borough<br>Council                        | Winnersh Triangle Parkway<br>(Enhancements)    | As above.   | Extension     | £675,000      | £2,850,000        |
| 5      | West Berkshire Council                              | Newbury Station<br>(cycle provision)           | As above.   | Extension     | £140,000      | £6,051,000        |
| 6      | West Berkshire Council                              | Newbury Station Extension (Business Units)     | As above.   | Extension     | £200,000      | £6,051,000        |
| 7      | Slough Borough Council                              | Langley High Street 1 Phase 1                  | Introduce a two-lane, in each direction, carriageway on the B470 Station Road/ Langley High Street between Langley Station and Elmhurst Road.   | Extension     | £1,324,000    | N/A               |

| 8  | Slough Borough Council                        | Langley High Street 2 Phase 2         | As above.  | Extension | £1,033,000 | N/A        |
|----|---|---------------------------------------|--|-----------|------------|------------|
| 9  | Slough Borough Council                        | Langley High Street 3 Phase 3         | As above.  | Extension | £1,643,000 | N/A        |
| 10 | Thames Valley<br>Berkshire LEP                | Independent Assessment of evaluations | To fund LEP five-year evaluation reports for HMG – currently no provision.   | New       | £45,000    | N/A        |
|    | Re-allocated BRRP funding – Proposed projects |                                       |  |           |            |            |
| 1  | West Berks Council                            | Superfast Berkshire complete coverage | This bid seeks resource funding for a 3-month exercise identifying solutions for stranded customers & providing a route to SFB connection, increasing TVB SFB coverage to c100%. | Extension | £46,920    | £500,000   |
| 2  | Reading Borough<br>Council                    | TVB Smart City Cluster                | Extend 'Thames Valley Berkshire Smart City Cluster' project to all of Berkshire through the inclusion of Slough and the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.                 | Extension | £283,620   | £1,730,000 |

#### **APPENDIX 2 – PRIORITISATION METHODOLOGY**

- 1. The following methodology is substantially the same as that used in Growth Deal 1, 2, 3 (2016), 3 (2018), BRRP1 and BRRP2 bidding rounds.
- 2. First bids are checked for compliance with the overall eligibility criteria for the funding round. Schemes with missing, incomplete, inadequate or late pro-forma information may not be considered. All schemes declared eligible are then scored and allocated a priority ranking on the long list, or pipeline, of schemes. All qualifying schemes are scored and placed in order in the pipeline.
- 3. As and when funds become available, schemes are proposed for programme entry status following the "cab-rank" principle. Before being granted programme entry status, each scheme is assessed against its place in the prioritised list, available funds and its readiness to proceed to financial approval.
- 4. On each factor, a scheme will be awarded high (3 marks), medium (2 marks) or low (1 mark), see appendix 3 for the details of how marks are allocated. On each factor, each scheme is bound to score at least one mark, and will be given the highest mark that is supported by the information in the pro-forma. So, if a scheme submission matches both the examples for a medium and a high judgement, it will be judged high.
- 5. These raw scores are then weighted to reflect the relative importance of the six factors as follows:

| Factor  | Weighting |
|---|-----------|
| Infrastructure Projects will contribute to the delivery of the Thames Valley Berkshire SEP* | 15%       |
| Deliverability  | 20%       |
| Long-term, sustainable economic growth  | 40%       |
| Tangible benefit to the sub-region  | 10%       |
| Investing in natural capital  | 10%       |
| Maximising social value   | 5%        |
| Total   | 100%      |

<sup>\*</sup>The Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) will be augmented with the Local Industrial Strategy (LIS) in due course

6. The calculation will be performed according to the following table:

| Factor  | Raw So | cores |     | Weighti | Weighted scores |      |      |
|---|--------|-------|-----|---------|-----------------|------|------|
|   | High   | Med   | Low | ng      | High            | Med  | Low  |
| Contribute to the implementation of the Thames Valley Berkshire SEP | 3      | 2     | 1   | x 1.5   | 4.5             | 3.0  | 1.5  |
| Deliverability  | 3      | 2     | 1   | x 2.0   | 6.0             | 4.0  | 2.0  |
| Long-term, sustainable economic growth                              | 3      | 2     | 1   | x 4.0   | 12.0            | 8.0  | 4.0  |
| Tangible benefit to the sub-region                                  | 3      | 2     | 1   | x 1.5   | 4.5             | 3.0  | 1.5  |
| Investing in natural capital  | 3      | 2     | 1   | x 0.5   | 1.5             | 1.0  | 0.5  |
| Maximising social value   | 3      | 2     | 1   | x 0.5   | 1.5             | 1.0  | 0.5  |
| Total   |        |       |     | Max =   | 30.0            | Min= | 10.0 |

- 7. The range of possible scores will be 30 (all high scores) 10 (all low scores). A ranking putting all the submitted schemes in order will be produced.
- 8. The schemes are first scored by staff from the LEP, and then moderated with the scheme promoter. Once all the scores are moderated and agreed, the draft prioritised list is published for further checking before being recommended to BLTB for approval.
- 9. As agreed at the July 2019 BLTB meeting, and following on from the concerns about deliverability, the independent assessor suggested adding an extra stage of assurance and checking at the point where a scheme is converting from next in line in the priority list to programme entry status.

Schemes seeking programme entry status from BLTB will therefore need to meet three conditions:

- a) To have the highest priority in the long-list of pipeline schemes
- b) There being sufficient available uncommitted funds in the relevant funding programme
- c) To have submitted a Full Business Case development programme to the satisfaction of the LEP's Independent Assessor

The Full Business Case development programme will include, amongst other things:

- a) a timetable for producing an Appraisal Specification and Option Assessment Reports as well as the five cases of the Full Business Case
- b) a statement of what modelling tools are available
- c) a commitment to delivering sufficient design work and operational planning prior to FBC submission

#### APPENDIX 2 - THE SCORING METHODOLOGY FOR THE SIX FACTORS

# 1. Infrastructure Projects will contribute to the implementation of the Thames Valley Berkshire SEP or emerging Local Industrial Strategy

|   |                   | Examples of Descriptors   | Scoring Guide   |
|---|-------------------|---|---|
| Contribute to the implementation of the Thames Valley Berkshire SEP | High<br>3 marks   | <ul> <li>The Housing SDL cannot proceed without this         Distributor Road; investment in this scheme will unlock £££'s of private investment</li> <li>This scheme is identified as part of Core Policy XX Town Centre Regeneration in the Council's adopted Core Strategies         Document</li> <li>The development of MRT on this corridor is key to increasing the capacity of the network to deliver the journeys that will support the growing economy</li> </ul> | A high score will be awarded to proposals for direct investment which:  Support one or more of the objectives¹ in the SEP, in particular (see page 30):  3 Labour Supply: Address congestion; Bring forward planned housing  6 Functioning Towns: Infrastructure within towns; Infrastructure between towns; Town centre investment  AND/OR  Are directly linked to the following connectivity issues named in the SEP Implementation Plan² section on Infrastructure (page 9):  Packages 1, 2 and 3: further phases or extensions of projects funded in Growth Deal 1, 2 and 3  Package 5: MRT schemes  Package 6: Access to London Heathrow; Access to London via motorway and rail; Electrification beyond Newbury; Rail links to London Gatwick; Third Thames Crossing near Reading  AND/OR  Promote local sustainable transport networks (see Strategy p 17) |
| Contribute to t   | Medium<br>2 marks | <ul> <li>This infrastructure will help unlock a housing scheme of [less than 100] units</li> <li>This scheme will support the regeneration of the industrial estate, and contribute to the retention of x,000 jobs in the borough</li> </ul>  | A medium score will be awarded to proposals for other investments which support:  • Education Estate  • Employment Sites  • Utilities  • Local housing sites  |
|   | _ 5 ≥ 4           |   | A low score will be awarded to all other proposals  |

 $\frac{http://www.thamesvalleyberkshire.co.uk/getfile/Public%20Documents/Strategic%20Economic%20Plan/TVB%20SEP%20-%20Strategy.pdf?inline-view=true)}{}$ 

#### PEOPLE

- 1. Use better those who are already in the workforce
- 2. Inspire the next generation and build aspirations and ambition
- 3. Ensure that economic potential is not restricted by labour supply issues IDEAS
- 4. Ensure that knowledge is effectively commercialised and grown within Thames Valley Berkshire
- 5. Strengthen networks and invest in the 'soft wiring' to use ideas better
- 6. Make Thames Valley Berkshire's towns genuine hubs in the ideas economy
- ${}^2http://www.thamesvalleyberkshire.co.uk/getfile/Public%20Documents/Strategic%20Economic%20Plan/TVB%20SEP%20-\\ \%20Implementation%20Plan.pdf?inline-view=true$

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 1}\,\mbox{The objectives}$  of the SEP are (see page 30 of

# 2. Deliverability

| 2              |                   | Examples of Descriptors  | Scoring Guide  |
|----------------|-------------------|--|--|
|                | High<br>3 marks   | <ul> <li>Outline Planning permission<br/>and/or positive planning<br/>history</li> <li>Partnership finance clearly<br/>identified</li> <li>Preliminary Benefit cost ratio<br/>(BCR) calculated as positive</li> </ul>          | A high score will be awarded to capital proposals which have a strong prospect of a start on site in the relevant period for this call for bids. This will be awarded if there is a positive assessment of all of:  a) Land assembly, ownership or control  b) Planning permission  c) Optimism bias in preliminary value for money calculations  AND (where relevant) a positive assessment of  d) Partnership arrangements across boundaries or agencies           |
| Deliverability | Medium<br>2 marks | <ul> <li>Features in published Local<br/>Plan</li> <li>Finance subject to further<br/>discussion</li> <li>No preliminary BCR<br/>calculation, but comparable<br/>schemes have recently been<br/>positively assessed</li> </ul> | A medium score will be awarded to proposals which have a reasonable prospect of a start on site the relevant period for this call for bids. This will be awarded if there is a positive assessment of two of:  a) Land assembly, ownership or control  b) Planning permission  c) Optimism bias in preliminary value for money calculations  AND (where relevant) a positive assessment of  d) Partnership arrangements across boundaries or agencies where relevant |
|                | Low<br>1 mark     |  | A low score will be awarded to all other proposals   |

# 3. Long term sustainable economic growth

|  |                   | Examples of Descriptors  | Scoring Guide   |
|--|-------------------|--|---|
| th                                     | High<br>3 marks   | <ul> <li>This scheme will also support development which will add 39,322 sq m of retail space and bring 400 jobs to the area</li> <li>The scheme will facilitate development of 25,000m2 of retail space 60,000m2 of office space and 800 new dwellings.</li> <li>85,800sqm of employment development.</li> <li>SDL incorporates up to 15,000sqm of employment.</li> </ul> | A high score will be awarded to a proposal which can quantify (in terms of commercial or retail floor space, jobs or houses) a major regeneration, large new development or other substantial impact on the economy which is directly linked to the transport scheme  |
| Long-term, sustainable economic growth | Medium<br>2 marks | <ul> <li>Enabling commercial and residential development</li> <li>Enabling redevelopment for housing of frontage properties currently blighted.</li> <li>Enhancing the attractiveness of town centre and associated major redevelopment sites</li> <li>Supporting Town Centre Regeneration</li> </ul>  | A medium score will be awarded to a proposal which can quantify (in terms of commercial or retail floor space, jobs or houses)  EITHER  a minor regeneration, small new development or other minor impact on the economy which is directly linked to the scheme;  OR  a major regeneration, large new development or other substantial impact on the economy which is indirectly linked to the scheme |
|  | Low<br>1 mark     | <ul> <li>GVA to be investigated</li> <li>Improving journey times and reliability</li> <li>Customers and suppliers will also benefit from better access, improved journey times, and lower vehicle operating costs</li> <li>Reducing congestion on a key highway corridor</li> </ul>  | A low score will be awarded to all other proposals.   |

# 4. Tangible benefit to the sub-region

|                                    |                   | Examples of Descriptors   | Scoring Guide  |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|---|--|
| Tangible benefit to the sub-region | High<br>3 marks   | <ul> <li>The scheme will support x,000 jobs, which will provide employment for people from across the TVB area</li> <li>The planned catchment for the new retail units is a 25-mile radius</li> <li>The proposed route runs through three boroughs</li> </ul> | A high score will be awarded to proposals which have significant impact well beyond a local area |
|                                    | Medium<br>2 marks | X,000 sq m of refurbished<br>employment space will allow the<br>borough to be more competitive<br>in retaining jobs   | A medium score will be awarded to proposals which have a major impact, but only in a local area  |
|                                    | Low<br>1 mark     | The primary school will support<br>the development of 100 houses<br>in the neighbourhood  | A low score will be awarded to all other proposals   |

# 5. Investing in Natural Capital

|                              |                  | Examples of Descriptors   | Scoring Guide  |
|------------------------------|------------------|---|--|
|                              | High – 3 marks   | <ul> <li>No adverse noise, biodiversity, heritage or water environment impacts and enhancement of landscape features</li> <li>The proposal includes the decontamination of xx hectares of former industrial land</li> <li>The proposal includes on site generation of electricity from renewable sources</li> </ul> | A high score will be awarded to proposals which  |
|                              |                  |   | EITHER   |
|                              |                  |   | can quantify a positive impact   |
|                              |                  |   | OR   |
|                              |                  |   | can demonstrate that mitigating measures will significantly reduce any negative impacts on one or more of the following: |
|                              |                  |   | greenhouse gas emissions;  |
|                              |                  |   | air quality;   |
| Investing in Natural Capital |                  |   | noise disturbance;   |
|                              |                  |   | <ul> <li>natural environment, heritage and landscape; and</li> </ul>   |
|                              |                  |   | streetscape and urban environment.   |
| l i                          | Medium – 2 marks | <ul> <li>minor benefits in terms of air quality / carbon emissions compared to the 'do nothing' situation</li> <li>Reducing slow moving/ queuing traffic would contribute to reduction in NO2 emissions in AQMA</li> </ul>  | A medium score will be awarded to proposals which  |
| esting                       |                  |   | EITHER   |
| Inve                         |                  |   | make un-quantified positive claims about impact on the above environmental factors                                       |
|                              |                  |   | OR   |
|                              |                  |   | can demonstrate that mitigating measures will  |
|                              |                  |   | reduce negative impacts  |
|                              | Low – 1 mark     | <ul> <li>Carbon emissions will be reduced through a more direct route for freight vehicles</li> <li>Decrease in the number of people affected by noise and improvements in local air quality</li> <li>Positive impact on carbon emissions.</li> </ul>   | A low score will be awarded to all other proposals   |
|                              |                  | Promoting public transport over private car use   |  |

# 6. Maximise Social Value

|                       |                  | Examples of Descriptors   | Scoring Guide  |
|-----------------------|------------------|---|--|
| Maximise social value | High – 3 marks   | <ul> <li>This stretch of road, including the junction, is responsible for an annual 40 slight injury accidents (approx 5% of the Borough's overall figure) and a further 8 KSI accidents in the last three years. The scheme is designed to reduce both these figures by half in three years following completion.</li> <li>This scheme will create xx apprenticeships in association with the local college</li> </ul> | A high score will be awarded to proposals which can  EITHER quantify a positive impact on, OR can demonstrate that mitigating measures will significantly reduce any negative impacts in relation to one or more of the following:  • personal affordability;  • physical activity;  • road accidents;  • crime and security;  • access to a range of goods and services; and  • community severance OR can open up apprenticeships or new jobs associated with the proposal to local unemployed and long-term unemployed people |
|                       | Medium – 2 marks | <ul> <li>Positive impact for the communities affected by ratrunning</li> <li>Facilitates residential development including new primary school and extra care home facility</li> <li>Reduced risk of accidents as result of better management of traffic and better provision for road crossings.</li> <li>It is likely that the scheme would lead to impacts that would require full SDI appraisal.</li> </ul>          | A medium score will be awarded to proposals which  EITHER  make un-quantified positive claims about impact in relation to the above social/distributional issues  OR  can demonstrate that mitigating measures that will reduce but do not eliminate negative social/distributional impacts  |
|                       | Low – 1 mark     | <ul> <li>Allowing opportunities to develop local walking and cycling improvements</li> <li>Improved journey times to and from London</li> <li>There are no significant impacts.</li> <li>It is unlikely that the scheme would lead to any impacts that would require full SDI appraisal. The expected impacts are likely to be both marginal in extent and dispersed among people groups or spatially.</li> </ul>       | A low score will be awarded to all other proposals   |