Bedford Borough Council
Local Pinch Point Fund
Bedford Western Bypass – Northern Section

Table of bid contents

Local Pinch Point Fund
Application Form Checklist

Department for Transport

Scheme: Bedford Western Bypass Northern Section
Lead authority: Bedford Borough Council

SECTION A

	Section / page	Guidance Ref
A3. Have you appended a map?	Appendix 1	N/A
A6. Have you included supporting evidence of partnership bodies' willingness to participate in delivering the bid proposals?	Section A6, page 3	Para 10-14
A7. Have you appended a letter from the relevant LTB(s) / LEP(s) confirming the priority of the proposed scheme? ***[Optional]***	Appendix 5	Para 10-14

SECTION B

	Section / page	Guidance Ref
B4. Have you enclosed a letter from an independent valuer to verify the market value land if land is being included as part of the non-DfT contribution towards scheme costs?	See section B.4c, p6	Para 40-42
B4. Have you enclosed a letter confirming the commitment of external sources to contribute to the cost of the scheme will be required?	See section B4, p6	Para 40-42
B6. Have you provided a completed Appraisal Summary Table in a format readable by Excel 2003?	Appendix A2	Para 35-39
B6. Have you provided a completed Scheme Impacts Pro Forma in a format readable by Excel 2003? ***[Small projects only]***	Appendix A4	Para 35-39
B6. Have you provided relevant supporting material – and for large schemes – a WebTAG compliant bid?	Appendix A3	N/A
B7. Have you attached a joint letter from the local authority's Section 151 Officer and Head of Procurement confirming that a procurement strategy is in place that is legally compliant and is likely to achieve the best value for money outcome?	Page 17	Para 43-45
B8. Has a letter been appended to demonstrate that arrangements are in place to secure the land to meet the construction milestones?	See section B8, p11	N/A
B8. Has a Project Plan been appended to your bid?	Appendix A7	Para 43-45
B11. Has a QRA been appended to your bid?	Appendix A6	Para 40-42
B11. Has a Risk Management Strategy been appended to your bid?	Appendix A6	Para 40-42
B12. Have you appended evidence of Stakeholder Analysis? ***[Large projects only]***	N/A	Para 40-42
B12. Have you appended a Communications Plan? ***[Large projects only]***	N/A	N/A

B13. Have you provided evidence of an integrated assurance and approval plan? ***[Large projects only]***	N/A	Para 40-42

SECTION D

	Section / page	**Guidance Ref**
D1. Has the SRO declaration been signed?	Section D1, page 16	N/A
D2. Has the Section 151 Officer declaration been signed?	Section D2, page 16	N/A

ECONOMIC CASE CHECKLIST (Large Projects Only)

Schemes seeking more than £5 million in support from the Department are required to submit a full appraisal of the scheme in line with WebTAG guidance. These bids should include sufficient supporting information and material for the Department to undertake a full review of the modeling and appraisal. Large project bidders are required to submit the checklist indicating where key modeling and appraisal information is presented with the bid and supporting annexes.

Complete the standard templates / outputs (in addition to the Appraisal Summary Table):

Template / output	**Provided Yes / No**
Transport Economic Efficiency table*	Appendix 10
Public Accounts table*	Appendix 10
Analysis of Monetised Costs and Benefits table*	Appendix 10
WITA/COBA output files (if used)	N/A

**Note: these tables should be provided in the templates provided un-amended and in a format readable by Excel 2003*

Cost Benefit Analysis

Item	**Section/Page**
A clear explanation of the underlying assumptions used in the Cost Benefit Analysis	N/A
Information on local factors used. For example the derivation of growth factors, M factors in COBA and annualisation factors in TUBA (to include full details of any calculations)	N/A
A diagram of the network (if COBA used)	N/A
Information on the number of junctions modelled (if COBA used), for both the do-minimum and the do-something	N/A
Details of assumptions about operating costs and commercial viability (e.g. public transport, park and ride, etc.)	N/A
Full appraisal inputs/outputs (when used, COBA and/or TUBA input and output files should be supplied)	N/A
Evidence that TUBA/COBA warning messages have been checked and	N/A

found to be acceptable	
Spatial (sectoral) analysis of TEE benefits	N/A
Details of the maintenance delay costs/savings	N/A
Details of the delays during construction	N/A

Economic Case Assessment

Item	Section/Page
Assessment of Environmental impacts, to include an environmental constraints map	N/A
Assessment of Safety impacts and the assumed accident rates presented (COBA output should be provided if an accident only COBA has been run)	N/A
Assessment of Economic impacts	N/A
Assessment of Accessibility impacts	N/A
Assessment of Integration impacts	N/A
Assessment of the Social and Distributional Impacts	N/A
A comprehensive Appraisal Summary Table	N/A
AST worksheets	N/A

Modelling

Item		Section/Page
An Existing Data and Traffic Surveys Report to include:		N/A
	Details of the sources, locations (illustrated on a map), methods of collection, dates, days of week, durations, sample factors, estimation of accuracy, etc.	N/A
	Details of any specialist surveys (e.g. stated preference).	N/A
	Traffic and passenger flows; including daily, hourly and seasonal profiles, including details by vehicle class where appropriate	N/A
	Journey times by mode, including variability if appropriate	N/A
	Details of the pattern and scale of traffic delays and queues	N/A
	Desire line diagrams for important parts of the network	N/A
	Diagrams of existing traffic flows, both in the immediate corridor and other relevant corridors	N/A
An Assignment Model Validation Report to include:		N/A
	Description of the road traffic and public transport passenger assignment model development, including model network and zone plans, details of treatment of congestion on the road system and crowding on the public transport system	N/A
	Description of the data used in model building and validation with a clear distinction made for any independent validation data	N/A
	Evidence of the validity of the networks employed, including range checks, link length checks, and route choice evidence	N/A
	Details of the segmentation used, including the rationale for that chosen	N/A
	Validation of the trip matrices, including estimation of measurement and sample errors	N/A
	Details of any 'matrix estimation' techniques used and evidence of the effect of the estimation process on the scale and pattern of the base travel matrices	N/A
	Validation of the trip assignment, including comparisons of flows (on links and across screenlines/cordons) and, for road traffic models, turning movements at key junctions	N/A

	Journey time validation, including, for road traffic models, checks on queue pattern and magnitudes of delays/queues	N/A
	Detail of the assignment convergence	N/A
	Present year validation if the model is more than 5 years old	N/A
	A diagram of modelled traffic flows, both in the immediate corridor and other relevant corridors	N/A

A Demand Model Report to include:		N/A
	Where no Variable Demand Model has been developed evidence should be provided to support this decision (e.g. follow guidance in WebTAG Unit 3.10.1 Variable Demand Modelling - Preliminary Assessment Procedures)	N/A
	Description of the demand model	N/A
	Description of the data used in the model building and validation	N/A
	Details of the segmentation used, including the rationale for that chosen. This should include justification for any segments remaining fixed	N/A
	Evidence of model calibration and validation and details of any sensitivity tests	N/A
	Details of any imported model components and rationale for their use	N/A
	Validation of the supply model sensitivity in cases where the detailed assignment models do not iterate directly with the demand model	N/A
	Details of the realism testing, including outturn elasticities of demand with respect to fuel cost and public transport fares	N/A
	Details of the demand/supply convergence	N/A
A Forecasting Report to include:		N/A
	Description of the methods used in forecasting future traffic demand.	N/A
	Description of the future year demand assumptions (e.g. land use and economic growth - for the do minimum, core and variant scenarios)	N/A
	An uncertainty log providing a clear description of the planning status of local developments	N/A
	Description of the future year transport supply assumptions (i.e. networks examined for the do minimum, core scenario and variant scenarios)	N/A
	Description of the travel cost assumptions (e.g. fuel costs, PT fares, parking)	N/A
	Comparison of the local forecast results to national forecasts, at an overall and sectoral level	N/A
	Presentation of the forecast travel demand and conditions for the core scenario and variant scenarios including a diagram of forecast flows for the do-minimum and the scheme options for affected corridors	N/A
	If the model includes very slow speeds or high junction delays evidence of their plausibility	N/A
	An explanation of any forecasts of flows above capacity, especially for the do-minimum, and an explanation of how these are accounted for in the modelling/appraisal	N/A
	Presentation of the sensitivity tests carried out (to include high and low demand tests).	N/A

Local Pinch Point Fund Application Form

Department for Transport

Guidance on the Application Process is available at:
https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/department-for-transport/series/local-pinch-point-fund

Please include the Checklist with your completed application form.

The level of information provided should be proportionate to the size and complexity of the scheme proposed. As a guide, for a small scheme we would suggest around 25-35 pages including annexes would be appropriate.

One application form should be completed per project.

Applicant Information

Local authority name(s)*: Bedford Borough Council

**If the bid is a joint proposal, please enter the names of all participating local authorities and specify the lead authority*

Bid Manager Name and position: Glenn Barcham,
Assistant Director - Highways and Direct Works

Name and position of officer with day to day responsibility for delivering the proposed scheme.

Contact telephone number: 01234 228075 **Email address:** glenn.barcham@bedford.gov.uk

Postal address: **Borough Hall**
Cauldwell Street
MK42 9AP

When authorities submit a bid for funding to the Department, as part of the Government's commitment to greater openness in the public sector under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and the Environmental Information Regulations 2004, they must also publish a version excluding any commercially sensitive information on their own website within two working days of submitting the final bid to the Department. The Department reserves the right to deem the business case as non-compliant if this is not adhered to.

Please specify the weblink where this bid will be published:
http://www.bedford.gov.uk/bwbppf

SECTION A - Project description and funding profile

A1. Project name: Bedford Western Bypass Northern Section

A2. Headline description:

Please enter a brief description of the proposed scheme (in no more than 100 words)
The Northern Section, together with the existing western section, completes the Western Bypass of Bedford. This will open up land for employment and housing uses, enable the diversion of traffic away from the town centre and provide a new route into Bedford avoiding the local congestion hotspots. The 2.12km single carriageway road links the A428 at Bromham with the A6 north of Bedford. The Scheme has 3 new at grade roundabouts, which will provide access to the proposed development, two improved roundabouts at each end, and crosses the Midland Mainline Railway at the eastern end of the Scheme.

A3. Geographical area:

Please provide a short description of area covered by the bid (in no more than 100 words)
Land to the north of Bromham Road (A4280/A6) to the north-west of Bedford.

OS Grid Reference: **TL019505 – TL038511**
Postcode: **MK40 4AQ**

Please append a map showing the location (and route) of the proposed scheme, existing transport infrastructure and other points of particular interest to the bid e.g. development sites, areas of existing employment, constraints etc.

A4. Type of bid (please tick relevant box):

Small project bids (requiring DfT funding of between £1m and £5m)
Scheme Bid ☒
Structure Maintenance Bid ☐

Large project bids (requiring DfT funding of between £5m and £20m)
Scheme Bid ☐
Structure Maintenance Bid ☐

Note: Scheme and Structure Maintenance bids will be assessed using the same criteria.

A5. Equality Analysis

Has any Equality Analysis been undertaken in line with the Equality Duty? ☒ Yes ☐ No

A6. Partnership bodies

Please provide details of the partnership bodies (if any) you plan to work within the design and delivery of the proposed scheme. This should include a short description of the role and responsibilities of the partnership bodies (which may include Development Corporations,

National Parks Authorities, private sector bodies and transport operators) with confirmatory evidence of their willingness to participate in delivering the bid proposals.
The Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) and the South East Midlands LEP (SEMLEP) are supportive of the Scheme. HCA have provided a financial contribution to the Scheme and SEMLEP are considering doing so on a loan basis.
Landowners and developers have been involved in the plans and designs to date, and continue to remain engaged through the planning process.

A7. Local Enterprise Partnership / Local Transport Body Involvement

It would be beneficial (though not essential) if the relevant LEP or LTB (or shadow(s)) have considered the bid and, if necessary, prioritised it against other bids from the same area. If possible, please include a letter from the LEP / LTB confirming their support and, if more than one bid is being submitted from the area, the priority ranking in order of growth significance.

Have you appended a letter from the LEP / LTB to support this case? ☒ Yes ☐ No

SECTION B – The Business Case

You may find the following DfT tools useful in preparing your business case:

- Transport Business Cases
- Behavioural Insights Toolkit
- Logic Mapping Hints and Tips

B1. The Scheme - Summary

Please select what the scheme is trying to achieve (this will need to be supported by evidence in the Business Case). Please select all categories that apply.

☒ Improve access to a development site that has the potential to create housing
☒ Improve access to a development site that has the potential to create jobs
☒ Improve access to urban employment centres
☐ Improve access to Enterprise Zones
☐ Maintain accessibility by addressing the condition of structures
☒ Ease congestion / bottlenecks
☒ Other(s), Please specify – **Network resilience; economic growth in town centre**

B2. The Strategic Case

This section should set out the rationale for making the investment and evidence on the strategic fit of the proposal. It should also contain an analysis of the existing transport problems, identify the barriers that are preventing growth, explain how the preferred scheme was selected and explain what the predicted impacts will be. The impact of the scheme on releasing growth potential in Enterprise Zones, key development sites and urban employment centres will be an important factor in the assessment process.

In particular please provide evidence on the following questions (where applicable):

a) What is the problem that is being addressed, making specific reference to barriers to growth and why this has not been addressed previously?

The land accessed by this road has long been identified for housing and employment use and is allocated for that purpose in the Bedford Local Plan. The local road network is already at saturation point and cannot accommodate the traffic associated with the growth without additional capacity. It is not feasible to open up the land for growth, thereby causing unacceptable congestion, without constructing the new link road, which also has the benefit of completing the bypass to the west of Bedford, taking A6 through traffic out of Bedford town centre. In addition, the link road will provide an alternative route into Bedford from the west, allowing traffic to avoid the constrained and over capacity junction at Bromham Road/Ashburnham Road, easing congestion at this location.
The Borough Council is therefore taking steps to progress the delivery of the road as the local Highway Authority, including using its statutory powers where necessary.

b) What options have been considered and why have alternatives have been rejected?
Options for the route of the Bedford Western Bypass have been considered several times since the Scheme entered the Trunk Road Programme in 1983, culminating in the current proposal. The Scheme and the housing and employment land opened as a result have been considered in the Local Plan process and have been through local consultation as part of the planning process. This is the only viable option to enable the required growth to take place.

c) What are the expected benefits / outcomes? For example, job creation, housing numbers and GVA and the basis on which these have been estimated.
Directly opening up land for :
1300 houses
Around 1000 jobs
Building of a new school and creation of a country park
Indirectly supporting growth of Bedford through relieving congestion and contributing to regeneration of the town centre, as discussed in Section B6.

d) What is the project's scope and is there potential to reduce costs and still achieve the desired outcomes? For example, using value engineering.
The project covers the construction of a new stretch of road in accordance with adopted policy. The highway design has been through a rigorous value engineering process and appropriate changes were made at that time.

e) Are there are any related activities, that if not successfully concluded would mean the full economic benefits of the scheme may not be realised. For example, this could relate to land acquisition, other transport interventions being required or a need for additional consents?
Some minor highway works in the immediate vicinity of the Scheme on the network are considered to be desirable but these would not have any significant impact on the economics benefits achieved from the Scheme. Land acquisition processes for the Scheme are continuing. A process of negotiation with landowners is ongoing, and the Council has also launched a parallel Compulsory Purchase Order process to reduce delay if negotiations are unsuccessful

f) What will happen if funding for this scheme is not secured - would an alternative (lower cost) solution be implemented (if yes, please describe this alternative and how it differs from the proposed scheme)?
There is no lower cost solution that would achieve the objectives in terms of relieving traffic congestion in Bedford and opening up the allocated development site.

g) What is the impact of the scheme – and any associated mitigation works – on any statutory environmental constraints? For example, Local Air Quality Management Zones.

The Scheme has been designed to minimise environmental impacts and to include mitigation measures where appropriate. These measures have been thoroughly reviewed as part of the planning process. It is considered that the Scheme will have a beneficial impact on NO2 reduction in the Bedford Town Centre Air Quality Management Zone.

B3. The Financial Case – Project Costs

Before preparing a scheme proposal for submission, bid promoters should ensure they understand the financial implications of developing the scheme (including any implications for future resource spend and ongoing costs relating to maintaining and operating the asset), and the need to secure and underwrite any necessary funding outside the Department's maximum contribution.

Please complete the following tables. **Figures should be entered in £000s** (i.e. £10,000 = 10).

Table A: Funding profile (Nominal terms)

£000s	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	Total
DfT funding sought		4500	[redacted]	4500
Local Authority contribution		4000	2525	6525
Third Party contribution	4975			4975
TOTAL	4975	8500	2525	16000

Notes: The overall cost in Table A is the construction cost and does not include preparation, land acquisition or compensation costs.
The actual cash-flow on the project is anticipated to also include arrangements for future developer contributions and advance borrowing, as discussed below

Table B: Cost estimates (Nominal terms)

Cost heading	Cost (£000s)	Date estimated	Status (e.g. target price)
Utility diversions	800	Jan 2013	Defined cost
Construction (incl contingency)	13650	Jan 2013	Estimated cost
Supervision	900	Jan 2013	Estimated cost
Other costs	650	Jan 2013	Estimated cost
TOTAL	16000	Jan 2013	Estimated Cost

Notes:
1) Department for Transport funding must not go beyond 2014-15 financial year.
2) A minimum local contribution of 30% (local authority and/or third party) of the project costs is required.

3) Costs in Table B should be presented in outturn prices and must match the total amount of funding indicated in Table A.

B4. The Financial Case - Local Contribution / Third Party Funding

Please provide information on the following points (where applicable):

a) The non-DfT contribution may include funding from organisations other than the scheme promoter. If the scheme improves transport links to a new development, we would expect to see a significant contribution from the developer. Please provide details of all non-DfT funding contributions to the scheme costs. This should include evidence to show how any third party contributions are being secured, the level of commitment and when they will become available.

A number of funding contributions towards the Scheme are already known or under negotiation. These are:

- a grant of £4.975million from the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) already made towards procurement of the Scheme under a legal agreement between the HCA and the Council

- an existing decision to allocate £4.0million from the Council's own Growth Area Fund resources

- A potential Growing Places Fund (GPF) contribution from the South East Midlands Local Enterprise Partnership (SEMLEP) to be repaid, and for an amount and terms to be agreed

- Future Development contributions being negotiated through the planning process (anticipated at this stage to be made as development proceeds and primarily used to repay any SEMLEP or other loan)

- Such other Council funding as might be required to close any residual gap, anticipated to be needed even with a LPPF contribution.

Whilst the total cost of the Scheme can only be determined when land acquisition and compensation costs are known, non-DfT funding sources are in excess of 70% of the total cost, with the local contribution significantly exceeding the minimum 30% value.

b) Where the contribution is from external sources, please provide a letter confirming the body's commitment to contribute to the cost of the scheme. The Department is unlikely to fund any scheme where significant financial contributions from other sources have not been secured or appear to be at risk.

Have you appended a letter(s) to support this case? ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A

The Executive Decisions to enter into a legal agreement with the HCA and to allocate the Council's GAF funds are a matter of public record and can be provided on request.

c) The Department may accept the provision of land in the local contribution towards scheme costs. Please provide evidence in the form of a letter from an independent valuer to verify the true market value of the land.

Have you appended a letter to support this case? ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A

The Scheme requires Borough Council land to be made available for its construction. This value is not included in the overall Scheme funding contributions discussed above.

d) Please list any other funding applications you have made for this scheme or variants thereof and the outcome of these applications, including any reasons for rejection.

The original funding model for the Scheme was for it to be 100% developer funded, and implemented part way through the development. This approach was abandoned several years ago as unworkable.

B5. The Financial Case – Affordability and Financial Risk

This section should provide a narrative setting out how you will mitigate any financial risks associated with the scheme (you should refer to the Risk Register / QRA – see Section B11).

Please ensure that in the risk / QRA cost that you have not included any risks associated with ongoing operational costs and have used the P50 value.

Please provide evidence on the following points (where applicable):

a) What risk allowance has been applied to the project cost?
A contingency sum of 5% has been applied to all construction costs in Table B. As noted in Section B3 above, the project costs do not include land acquisition and compensation costs. Network Rail has objected to the CPO and is seeking compensation for air rights. This issue will need to be resolved before the contract is let.
b) How will cost overruns be dealt with?
The form of contract to be used will transfer the majority of commercial risk to the Contractor. In this way, the Borough Council considers that the cost overruns will be kept to a minimum and that variation orders will be limited to those promoted by the Council as Employer under the Contract. These will only be issued when considered to be absolutely necessary. Cost overruns will be met by the Borough Council.
c) What are the main risks to project delivery timescales and what impact this will have on cost?
The main risks to programme are the outcome of the Public Inquiry into the Compulsory Purchase Order and Side Roads Orders and the securing of funding. Whilst these may delay the start of the project, they are not considered to have a significant cost impact on the Scheme. See Appendix 6.
d) How will cost overruns be shared between non-DfT funding partners (DfT funding will be capped and will not be able to fund any overruns)?
As stated above, cost overruns will be the liability of the Borough Council.

B6. The Economic Case – Value for Money

This section should set out the full range of impacts – both beneficial and adverse – of the scheme. The scope of information requested (and in the supporting annexes) will vary according to whether the application is for a small or large project.

<u>Small project bids (i.e. DfT contribution of less than £5m)</u>

a) Please provide a description of your assessment of the impact of the scheme to include:

- Significant positive and negative impacts (quantified where possible);
- A description of the key risks and uncertainties;
- A short description of the modelling approach used to forecast the impact of the scheme and the checks that have been undertaken to determine that it is fit-for-purpose.

The Scheme produces significant benefits for traffic in Bedford. By opening up a new route into Bedford from the west, the Scheme not only increases capacity for traffic entering Bedford, it provides an alternative route around a local congestion hotspot (the Bromham Road Double Mini Roundabout junction).

The new capacity provided by the Scheme is essential to enable the associated housing and employment development to proceed. Those developments are a key part of Bedford's economic growth plans.

By completing the north-south bypass of Bedford, the Scheme will reduce the level of traffic in Bedford town centre. This has three important impacts

a) Improving air quality within the Air Quality Management Area

b) Reducing congestion for the remaining traffic in town

c) Enabling improvements to Bedford Town Centre, including the potential downgrading of the High Street as a through route, facilitating economic growth in the town centre.

The traffic benefits of the Scheme are produced from two principal effects:

- **time savings of existing traffic on the corridor avoiding the congested Bromham Road**
- **time savings of traffic diverting to the corridor as a quicker way of reaching their destination**

A considerable amount of traffic using the Scheme is attracted from other routes, some of which are less suitable. In addition to providing benefits to the vehicles which reroute, this will also benefit the traffic remaining on those alternative routes.

The Scheme is predicted to reduce the number of accidents on the route, as the majority of traffic in the corridor will be using the new road, engineered to modern standards. The existing road has many frontages and significant pedestrian and cycling movements. Surveys have shown that a significant proportion of cyclists are school children travelling to a nearby upper school. Removing traffic from the current road will reduce this interaction, improving the journey experience for all travellers.

Network resilience will be enhanced by the Scheme through the provision of an alternative route in to Bedford. This will be important in the future when the Bromham Road railway bridge is rebuilt by Network Rail to permit the electrification of the Midland Main Line and creation of the Electric Spine freight route.

Economic assessment for the Scheme has been undertaken using outputs from the Bedford Traffic Model. This is a network assignment model in the SATURN software suite. This was updated and revalidated in 2012 to a 2011 base year, and so reflects up-to-date traffic conditions. The model was validated to DMRB standards including flow counts and journey time routes near to the Scheme. Future year modelling was prepared for 2021 and 2031 years, with growth controlled to Tempro levels using locally-prepared location and trip rate information. This gives the correct level of traffic growth overall whilst ensuring that trip ends are correctly located on the model network. The future year matrix is a fixed-trip matrix, assigned to a network with all anticipated infrastructure improvements included.

The base year validation confirms that the model is suitable and appropriate for use. Checks undertaken on the future year models show that the matrix growth is in line with DfT Tempro forecasts and that network delays are not excessive to the extent of unrealistically affecting the assignment process. These checks confirm that the model is fit for the purpose of assessing traffic movements and delays under forecast conditions.

The model LMVR and Forecasting Report are included on the CD supplied to DfT, and are available on request to Bedford Borough Council if required.

Using output from the model forecasts with and without the Scheme, an indicative TUBA analysis was undertaken. Further details are contained within the "Traffic Explanatory Note" in Appendix 3, which also details the calculation of the figures show in the Scheme Impacts Proforma.

This TUBA analysis gave a BCR for the Scheme of 6.05. This compares to a previous partial analysis using a spreadsheet methodology which produced a BCR of 4.06.

Risks and uncertainties associated with the level of benefits predicted are associated with the accuracy of the model and the uncertainties of future development and traffic growth. The model, overall, has been validated to appropriate standards. Flow validation on Bromham Road is good, but the journey time validation does not meet the required standard, as the model is unable to replicate the current level of delay at the Bromham Road double mini roundabout junction. This results in a lower than observed journey time along Bromham Road. It is considered that this will deflate rather than inflate the level of benefits predicted, as the full journey time saving of using the Scheme will not be reflected in the model outputs.

The model used is not able to take account of the impact of congestion on the number of trips made, although it does account for congestion in the routing of those trips. This is likely to have a small but noticeable effect on traffic volumes across the network with consequent impacts on journey times in the model. Although unquantified, it is considered that this impact is small compared to the scale of benefits predicted.

Traffic forecasts in the future are subject to significant uncertainty as they are linked to economic growth, housing and employment growth, and general trends in vehicle use. This risk has been minimised by controlling the future year matrix growth to Tempro predictions, which make allowance for trends and anticipated economic growth when producing the forecasts.

In conclusion, the Scheme has been assessed in an appropriate way, using available modelling and economic appraisal tools. These have shown that the Scheme has a BCR which places it in the very good value for money category.

** Small projects bids are not required to produce a Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) but may want to include this here if they have estimated this.*

b) Small project bidders should provide the following as annexes as supporting material:

- A completed Scheme Impacts Pro Forma which summarises the impact of proposals against a number of metrics relevant to the scheme objectives. It is important that bidders complete as much of this table as possible as this will be used by DfT – along with other centrally sourced data – to form an estimate of the BCR of the scheme. Not all sections of the pro forma are relevant for all types of scheme (this is indicated in the pro forma).

- A description of the sources of data and forecasts used to complete the Scheme Impacts Pro Forma. This should include descriptions of the checks that have been undertaken to verify the accuracy of data or forecasts relied upon. Further details on the minimum supporting information required are presented against each entry within the pro forma.

Has a Scheme Impacts Pro Forma been appended? ☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Has a description of data sources / forecasts been appended? ☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

- A completed Appraisal Summary Table. Bidders are required to provide their assessment of all the impacts included within the table and highlight any significant Social or Distributional Impacts (SDIs). Quantitative and monetary estimates should be provided where available but are not mandatory. The level of detail provided in the table should be proportionate to the scale of expected impact with particular emphasis placed on the assessment of carbon, air quality, bus usage, sustainable modes, accessibility and road safety. The source of evidence used to assess impacts should be clearly stated within the table and (where appropriate) further details on the methods or data used to inform the assessment should be attached as notes to the table.

  Has an Appraisal Summary Table been appended? ☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

- Other material supporting the assessment of the scheme described in this section should be appended to your bid.

  Additional documents supplied to support this analysis are:
  Traffic and economics note, Bedford Western Bypass – Appendix 3
  Local Model Validation Report, Bedford Traffic Model (2012)
  Forecasting Report, Bedford Traffic Model (2012)

** This list is not necessarily exhaustive and it is the responsibility of bidders to provide sufficient information to demonstrate the analysis supporting the economic case is fit-for-purpose.*

Large project bids (i.e. DfT contribution of more than £5m)

c) Please provide a short description of your assessment of the value for money of the scheme including your estimate of the BCR. This should include:

- Significant monetised and non-monetised costs and benefits;
- A description of the key risks and uncertainties and the impact these have on the BCR;
- Key assumptions including (but not limited to): appraisal period, forecast years, level of optimism bias applied; and
- A description of the modelling approach used to forecast the impact of the scheme and the checks that have been undertaken to determine that it is fit-for-purpose.

N/A

d) Detailed evidence supporting your assessment – including a completed Appraisal Summary Table – should be attached as annexes to this bid. **A checklist of material to be submitted in support of large project bids has been provided.**

  Has an Appraisal Summary Table been appended? ☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

- Please append any additional supporting information (as set out in the Checklist).

**It is the responsibility of bidders to provide sufficient information for DfT to undertake a full review of the analysis.*

B7. The Commercial Case

This section should set out the procurement strategy that will be used to select a contractor and, importantly for this fund, set out the timescales involved in the procurement process to show that delivery can proceed quickly.

a) Please provide evidence to show the risk allocation and transfer between the promoter and contractor, contract timescales and implementation timescales (this can be cross-referenced to your Risk Management Strategy).
The Borough Council intends to let a contract whereby the majority of risk is taken by the Contractor, including design, adverse weather, unforeseen circumstances etc in order to provide greater cost certainty at tender and final outturn. The design has been undertaken by the promoter but the risk of design creep will be transferred to the contractor upon award. The implementation timescale risk currently lies with the Borough Council as it is not in a position to take the project forward until the orders are confirmed and the funding is secured. Contract timescale will be defined in the contract but this will become the Contractor's risk upon award with liquidated damages applying should this overrun. The attached risk register identifies the transfer of this risk and how this transfer affects the residual commercial risk that remains.

b) What is the preferred procurement route for the scheme and how and why was this identified as the preferred procurement route? For example, if it is proposed to use existing framework agreements or contracts, the contract must be appropriate in terms of scale and scope.
As stated above, cost certainty is of prime importance to the Borough Council given that funding will be limited, and the Borough Council will be responsible for cost overruns. For this reason, a design and construct form of contract is to be used amended to transfer commercial risk to the Contractor as much as is practically possible. Given that the 7 Tenderers have already been through a OJEU PQQ process for their selection, the emphasis for the tender submissions will be cost over quality as this is the main focus for the promoter.

c) A procurement strategy will not need to form part of the bid documentation submitted to DfT. Instead, the Department will require the bid to include a joint letter from the local authority's Section 151 Officer and Head of Procurement confirming that a strategy is in place that is legally compliant and is likely to achieve the best value for money outcome.

Has a joint letter been appended to your bid? ☒ Yes ☐ No

**It is the promoting authority's responsibility to decide whether or not their scheme proposal is lawful; and the extent of any new legal powers that need to be sought. Scheme promoters should ensure that any project complies with the Public Contracts Regulations as well as European Union State Aid rules, and should be prepared to provide the Department with confirmation of this, if required.*

B8. Management Case - Delivery

Deliverability is one of the essential criteria for this Fund and as such any bid should set out any necessary statutory procedures that are needed before it can be constructed.

a) A detailed project plan (typically in Gantt chart form) with milestones should be included, covering the period from submission of the bid to scheme completion. The definition of the key milestones should be clear and explained. The critical path should be identifiable and any key dependencies (internal or external) should be explained. Resource requirements, task durations, contingency and float should be detailed and easily identifiable. Dependencies and interfaces should be clearly outlined and plans for management detailed.

Has a project plan been appended to your bid? ☒ Yes ☐ No

b) If delivery of the project is dependent on land acquisition, please include a letter from the respective land owner(s) to demonstrate that arrangements are in place in order to secure the land to enable the authority to meet its construction milestones.

Has a letter relating to land acquisition been appended? ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A

The Project Plan assumes that the land will be obtained through the CPO process as the worst case scenario. Discussions are ongoing with the landowners to obtain the land by negotiation but to mitigate the risk of this not succeeding, the Borough Council has commenced the CPO process to obtain greater certainty of delivery timescale.

c) Please provide summary details of your construction milestones (at least one but no more than 5 or 6) between start and completion of works:

Table C: Construction milestones

The dates below are consistent with the Project Plan and are based on land acquisition taking place as a result of the CPO needing to be pursued.

	Estimated Date
Start of works	**March 2014**
Earthworks and Drainage	**Summer 2014**
Railway bridge complete	**March 2015**
Pavement, signs, lighting, road markings	**Summer 2015**
Opening date	**September 2015**
Completion of works (if different)	

d) Please list any major transport schemes costing over £5m in the last 5 years which the authority has delivered, including details of whether these were completed to time and budget (and if not, whether there were any mitigating circumstances)

The western section of the Bypass was completed in December 2009 at a final cost of £29.16m. The contract was let by the former County Council without all necessary agreements in place, without appropriate controls for utilities works and without proper design reviews having been undertaken. These issues led to cost and time overruns. The Borough Council, who inherited the contract, has undertaken a full feedback appraisal of the contract and has implemented a de-risking strategy that has led to the procurement process defined above and other measures being undertaken such as the diversion of utility apparatus pre-contract.

B9. Management Case – Statutory Powers and Consents

a) Please list separately each power / consents etc obtained, details of date acquired, challenge period (if applicable) and date of expiry of powers and conditions attached to them. Any key dates should be referenced in your project plan.

Planning Consent for Bypass (ref 11/02114/MAF) **28th February 2012**
Non-material amendments to red line (ref 12/02084/NMA) **19th November 2012**
Supplementary Planning Consent (ref 12/02106/MAF) **3rd January 2013**

b) Please list separately any outstanding statutory powers / consents etc, including the timetable for obtaining them.

Compulsory Purchase Order - Public Inquiry July 2013 | SoS decision expected January 2014

Side Roads Order - Public Inquiry July 2013 | SoS decision expected January 2014

Planning consents referred to above have conditions requiring further information to be submitted to the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of construction. See Appendix 9.

B10. Management Case – Governance

Please name who is responsible for delivering the scheme, the roles (Project Manager, SRO etc.) and responsibilities of those involved, and how key decisions are/will be made. An organogram may be useful here. Details around the organisation of the project including Board accountabilities, contract management arrangements, tolerances, and decision making authorities should be clearly documented and fully agreed.

The Project Manager for delivery of the Scheme is Glenn Barcham, Assistant Director Highways and Direct Works who is responsible for the overall management of the Scheme through the design and construction stages.

Overall governance of the project is managed by a corporate team led by the Borough Council Chief Executive, with all relevant disciplines and key partners represented, including planning, property, housing, legal and highways.

The project is also supported by specific external advisors, for example, design, finance, legal, valuation, planning and procedures.

Key decisions are taken by the elected Mayor through reports prepared by the appropriate service area, including delegated authority to act for the authority.

B11. Management Case - Risk Management

All schemes will be expected to undertake a thorough Quantified Risk Assessment (QRA) and a detailed risk register should be included in the bid. The QRA should be proportionate to the nature and complexity of the scheme. A Risk Management Strategy should be developed and should outline on how risks will be managed.

Please ensure that in the risk / QRA cost that you have not included any risks associated with ongoing operational costs and have used the P50 value.

Has a QRA been appended to your bid?	☒ Yes	☐ No
Has a Risk Management Strategy been appended to your bid?	☒ Yes	☐ No

The risk management of the project utilises a Quantified Risk Assessment in terms of low medium or high, not in financial terms. This is then developed to show the mitigation strategy for each risk and describes the residual risk after the mitigation actions have been applied. See Appendix 6.

B12. Management Case - Stakeholder Management

The bid should demonstrate that the key stakeholders and their interests have been identified and considered as appropriate. These could include other local authorities, the Highways Agency, statutory consultees, landowners, transport operators, local residents, utilities companies etc. This is particularly important in respect of any bids related to structures that may require support of Network Rail and, possibly, train operating company(ies).

a) Please provide a summary of your strategy for managing stakeholders, with details of the key stakeholders together with a brief analysis of their influences and interests.

Stakeholders in this project include the Highways Agency, Local Parish Councils, Network Rail, Utility Companies, landowners, Transport Operators and local residents.

All of these stakeholders are being consulted in ways that are appropriate for each and these are summarised below;

Highways Agency - Ongoing discussions relating to Detrunking and land ownership

Local Parish Councils - Internal liaison processes to provide progress information

Network Rail - Liaison is nearing completion for the Bridge Agreement which is ready to sign. Discussions are ongoing in relation to air rights compensation.

Utility Companies - Utility apparatus affected by the Scheme has been diverted pre-contract as part of the de-risking strategy

Landowners - The landowners affected, which includes the Borough Council, are very limited in number and they are very conversant with developments on the project.

Transport Operators - these are being consulted in relation to proposed traffic management measures.

Local residents - Meetings with residents have been held providing information on the details of the Scheme, and these will co

b) Can the scheme be considered as controversial in any way? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, please provide a brief summary (in no more than 100 words)

At the time of submission of this bid, there are objections to the CPO submitted by the landowners.

c) Have there been any external campaigns either supporting or opposing the scheme?

☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, please provide a brief summary (in no more than 100 words)

The Borough Council has sought support for the Scheme through a local petition.

d) For large schemes please also provide a Stakeholder Analysis and append this to your application.

Has a Stakeholder Analysis been appended? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A

e) For large schemes please provide a Communications Plan with details of the level of engagement required (depending on their interests and influence), and a description of how and by what means they will be engaged with.

Has a Communications Plan been appended? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A

B13. Management Case - Assurance

We will require Section 151 Officer confirmation (Section D) that adequate assurance systems are in place.

For large schemes please provide evidence of an integrated assurance and approval plan. This should include details around planned health checks or gateway reviews.
N/A

SECTION C – Monitoring, Evaluation and Benefits Realisation

C1. Benefits Realisation

Please provide details on the profile and baseline benefits and their ownership. This should be proportionate to the size of the proposed scheme.

Construction of housing and employment areas – expected to commence at the same time as construction of the Scheme with approximately half complete within 5 years

Reduction in journey time and congestion in the Bedford Area – generally within 12 months of Scheme opening, with full redistribution of traffic on the Bedford Western and Southern bypasses taking place over a number of years.

C2. Monitoring and Evaluation

Evaluation is an essential part of scheme development and should be considered and built into the planning of a scheme from the earliest stages. Evaluating the outcomes and impacts of schemes is important to show if a scheme has been successful.

Please set out how you plan to measure and report on the benefits identified in Section C1, alongside any other outcomes and impacts of the scheme

The principal traffic monitoring methods would be through traffic counters installed on the existing network. These would provide information on traffic volume changes, which could be compared to forecasts and monitored for variations.

Journey time information was obtained for the existing route in 2011 for the purposes of updating our traffic model. We propose to undertake a one-off journey time/speed survey 12 months after opening of the road to monitor the impacts on speed and congestion.

House building progress will be monitored through the usual planning procedures.

A fuller evaluation for large schemes may also be required depending on their size and type.

SECTION D: Declarations

D1. Senior Responsible Owner Declaration

As Senior Responsible Owner for Bedford Western Bypass I hereby submit this request for approval to DfT on behalf of Bedford Borough Council and confirm that I have the necessary

authority to do so. I confirm that Bedford Borough Council will have all the necessary statutory powers in place to ensure the planned timescales in the application can be realised.	
Name: Glenn Barcham	Signed: 
Position: Assistant Director Highways and Direct Works	

D2. Section 151 Officer Declaration	
As Section 151 Officer for Bedford Borough Council I declare that the scheme cost estimates quoted in this bid are accurate to the best of my knowledge and that Bedford Borough Council - has allocated sufficient budget to deliver this scheme on the basis of its proposed funding contribution - accepts responsibility for meeting any costs over and above the DfT contribution requested, including potential cost overruns and the underwriting of any funding contributions expected from third parties - accepts responsibility for meeting any ongoing revenue requirements in relation to the scheme - accepts that no further increase in DfT funding will be considered beyond the maximum contribution requested and that no DfT funding will be provided after 2014/15 - confirms that the authority has the necessary governance / assurance arrangements in place and, for smaller scheme bids, the authority can provide, if required, evidence of a stakeholder analysis and communications plan in place	
Name: TREVOR RUFF	Signed: 

Submission of bids:

For both small bids and large bids the deadline is 5pm, **21 February 2013**

One hard copy and a CD version of each bid and supporting material should be submitted to:

Steve Berry
Local Transport Funding, Growth & Delivery Division
Department for Transport
Great Minster House
33 Horseferry Road
London
SW1P 4DR

An electronic copy should also be submitted to steve.berry@dft.gsi.gov.uk

BEDFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL

Borough Charter granted in 1166

Chief Executive: P. J. Simpkins

Mr. S. Berry,
Head, Highways Maintenance Branch,
Local Transport Funding, Growth & Delivery,
Department for Transport,
2/1 Great Minster House,
33 Horseferry Road,
London.
SW1P 4DR.

Please ask for: Dawn Ashpole
Direct line: 01234 228419
E-mail: andy.watkins@bedford.gov.uk
Fax no: 01234 276492

Your ref:
Our ref:
Date: 20th February, 2013.

Dear Mr. Berry,

Local Pinch Point Fund

I can confirm that the Council has a Procurement Strategy in place for this scheme and, as such, is compliant with relevant regulations.

To ensure that a suitable number of qualified supplier's tendered the Council placed a contract notice within the Official Journal of the European Union and selected to follow a two part restricted process in accordance with the UK Public Contract Regulations 2006. The selection process has now been concluded and the award will be made following an Invitation to Tender process, with the contract being awarded to the supplier providing the most economically advantageous tender.

Yours sincerely,

Trevor Roff,
Director of Finance & Corporate Services.

Andy Watkins,
Assistant Director of Finance & Corporate Services.