

Funding for Local Transport: Safer Roads Fund



Department
for Transport

Application Form

The level of information provided should be proportionate to the size and complexity of the scheme proposed. As a guide, we would suggest around 10 to 15 pages including annexes would be appropriate.

A separate application form should be completed for each scheme.

Applicant Information

Local authority name(s)*: Sunderland City Council

**If the bid is a joint proposal, please enter the names of all participating local authorities and specify the lead authority. The lead authority should be the authority with the longest part of the eligible road section.*

Bid Manager Name and position: Mark Jackson, Head of Highways and Transportation

Name and position of officer with day to day responsibility for delivering the proposed scheme.
Ken Heads, Commercial Development Manager

Contact telephone number: 0191 5617969

Email address: ken.heads@sunderland.gov.uk

Postal address: Sunderland City Council
Jack Crawford House
Commercial Road
Sunderland
SR2 8QR

When authorities submit a bid for funding to the Department for Transport, 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 for Transport. The Department for Transport reserves the right to deem the business case as non-compliant if this is not adhered to.

Please specify the web link where this bid will be published:

www.sunderland.gov.uk/saferroadfundapplication

SECTION A - Scheme description and funding profile

A1. Scheme name: Sunderland A1290 Road Safety Improvement Scheme Phase 1

A2. Headline description:

Please enter a brief description of the proposed scheme (in no more than 100 words)

This bid is for transport infrastructure improvements which will deliver improved road safety for motorised and non-motorised users on the stretch of A1290 between the junction with A19 at West Boldon and A184 at Usworth. The scheme will concentrate on junction improvements at identified junctions, along with improvements to the exiting cycling infrastructure.

Phase 1 will concentrate on new cycling infrastructure to link to existing, and junction improvements to a roundabout including a new pedestrian provision to local housing.

Phase 2, to follow and is not covered by this bid document, will concentrate additional identified areas along the A1290. The funding bid for Phase 2 will be submitted in September 2017 following the results of the ViDA analysis from the Road Safety Foundation

A3. Geographical area:

Please provide a short description of area covered by the bid (in no more than 50 words)

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.

This area, divided by a mothballed railway line, connects residential areas, shopping areas and industrial units to the west with larger industrial operations to the east along with areas identified for economic growth such the Sunderland Low Carbon Enterprise Zone and Advanced Manufacturing Park adjacent to Nissan.

Length of eligible road section: 6.4km

OS Grid Reference:

Min E **429472.97**

Min N **557007.69**

Max E **434248.47**

Max N **559783.68**

Postcode: N/A

A location plan for the scheme, Drawing Number SRFB/P01/001 is provided within Appendix A

A4. Equality Analysis

Has any Equality Analysis been undertaken in line with the Equality Duty? Yes – EA is attached as Appendix B

SECTION B – The Business Case

B1. The Scheme – Summary/History (Maximum 200 words)

Please outline what the scheme is trying to achieve

The overall scheme being would deliver accident reductions at identified sites along the 6.4km stretch of the A1290. Phase 1 of the scheme, situated to the west of the existing Nissan Motor Manufacturing (UK) automotive manufacturing facility and associated automotive supply chain and logistics partners, plans on delivering accident reductions by connecting existing cycling infrastructure together and improvements to a sub-standard roundabout facility at an intersection along with new pedestrian facilities connecting local housing and new employment centres.

The estimated costs for these works including design fees and a contingency for risk are £210,000

Scheme proposal drawings are included as Appendix C

B2. The Strategic Case (Maximum 350 words)

This section should set out the rationale for making the investment and evidence of the existing safety problems.

Supporting evidence may be provided in annexes – if clearly referenced in the strategic case. This may be used to assist in judging the strategic case arguments but is unlikely to be reviewed in detail or assessed in its own right. So you should not rely on material included only in annexes being assessed.

What and where are the current road safety problems to be addressed by your scheme?

What road safety options have been considered and why do the proposed ones provide the best solution, particularly in terms of meeting the objective of reducing fatal and serious injury collisions?

What is the impact and the expected road safety benefits / outcomes of the scheme? If possible, provide information on the likely KSI reductions as a result of the scheme.

Accident data shows a number of accidents involving cyclists, including one fatal accident. In the area to the east of the Leamside Line our travel survey data shows there has been a 35% increase in the number of cyclists employed at Nissan and surrounding employers since 2013.

This number is expected to increase following the completion of the EZ and IAMP schemes.

The expected outcomes of the scheme are to provide safer alternatives for cyclists and pedestrians, also increasing safety at the junctions identified as the most dangerous by slowing approach speeds of vehicles.

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 for Transport’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 | 2017-18 | 2018-19 | 2019-20 | 2020-21 | Total |
|----------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| <i>DfT Funding Sought</i> | 210 | | | | |
| <i>LA Contribution</i> | <i>Nil</i> | | | | |
| <i>Other Third Party Funding</i> | <i>Nil</i> | | | | |

Notes:

(1) Department for Transport funding will not be provided beyond 2020/21 financial year.

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. 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.*

Not Applicable at this stage

B5. The Financial Case – Affordability and Financial Risk (maximum 300 words)

This section should provide a narrative setting out how you will mitigate any financial risks associated with the scheme.

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

a) *What risk allowance has been applied to the project cost?*

A risk cost has been allowed for within the works estimate, and has been applied based on probability and potential impact to the scheme. A contingency cost has been identified and a total sum of £40,000 allocated.

b) *How will cost overruns be dealt with?*

Given the nature of the project cost overruns beyond the risk allowance are not envisaged. However, Sunderland City Council accepts responsibility for meeting any costs over and above the Department for Transport contribution requested, including potential cost overruns. A letter is attached to the bid from the Section 151 Officer which confirms the procurement and funding arrangements Sunderland City Council have in place.

c) *What are the main risks to project delivery timescales and what impact this will have on cost?*

The works are considered to be routine in nature with the main cost and time risks being associated with traffic conditions and temporary traffic management arrangements. There is potential that some utility diversions will be required, although this risk will be reduced further once trial excavations are undertaken to establish the exact location of apparatus. A Quantified Risk Assessment has been undertaken for the overall scheme which identifies potential risks to the scheme and an allowance for associated costs.

B6. The Economic Case – Value for Money

If available, promoters should provide an estimate of the Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) of the scheme (particularly for schemes costing more than £100,000)

Where a BCR is provided please provide separate reporting in the form of an Annex to the bid to enable scrutiny of the data and assumptions used in deriving that BCR.

Where a BCR is not available/appropriate other values of value for money should be demonstrated. These should be commensurate with the value of the scheme.

The BCR for these schemes has been calculated at 4.8. The explanation behind the calculations is included in the appendices

B7. The Commercial Case (Maximum 300 words)

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

What is the preferred procurement route for the scheme? For example, if it is proposed to use existing framework agreements or contracts, the contract must be appropriate in terms of scale

and scope.

**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 for Transport with confirmation of this, if required.*

An assurance that a strategy is in place that is legally compliant is likely to achieve the best value for money outcomes is required from your Section 151 Officer below.

Associated civil engineering works and other related maintenance activities will be arranged through the Council's standard procurement rules and procedures.

Existing regional partnerships and contractual arrangements will be utilised where appropriate. This will remove costs associated with the tender process and achieve value for money.

B8. Management Case – Delivery (Maximum 300 words)

Deliverability is one of the essential criteria and, as such, any bid should set out if any statutory procedures are needed before it can be delivered.

a) *An outline project plan (typically in Gantt chart form) with milestones should be included as an annex, 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 contingency periods, key dependencies (internal or external) should be explained. Successful schemes will be subject to quarterly monitoring to assess progress against milestones and to track spend.*

Has a project plan been appended to your bid?

Yes – included as Appendix D

b) *A statement of intent to deliver the scheme within this programme from a senior political representative and/or senior local authority official.*

Included in Section D1

B9. Management Case – Governance (maximum 300 words)

Please name who is responsible for delivering the scheme, the roles (Project Manager, SRO etc.) and set out the responsibilities of those involved and how key decisions are/will be made. An organogram may be useful here. This may be attached as an Annex.

An organogram attached as Appendix E showing reporting structure

The Senior Responsible Owner is Les Clark, Chief Operating Officer (Place). He will have overall responsibility for the projects objectives and benefits. The SRO has appointed the Project Manager. The SRO as the client will be responsible for the appointment of a Principal Designer and Principal Contractor.

The Project Board manages the development and delivery of the scheme. It makes decisions and recommendations for the Project Team. The Senior Supplier represents the interests of those designing, procuring and constructing the programme's products. The Senior User is responsible for specifying the needs of those who will use the programme's products, and for monitoring that the solution will meet those needs in terms of functionality and ease of use.

The Project Manager is Ian Vickers, Group Engineer for Major Projects. He will have day to day responsibility for the project and will be responsible for delivering the project and achieving the objectives he will be assisted in this process by Engineer Martin Forster. The Project Manager will also be responsible for the monitoring and evaluation processes.

The Highway Design team, headed by Chris Wells, Infrastructure and Commercial Group Engineer, are responsible for carrying out design works as specified by the Project Manager. The team will meet with the project manager and assistant project Manager to discuss progress and highlight any issues and the next steps required.

B10. Management Case – Risk Management

Risk management is an important control for all projects but this should be commensurate with cost. For projects where the costs exceed £100,000, a risk register covering the top 5 (maximum) specific risks to this scheme should be attached as an annex.

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

Has a risk register been appended to your bid?

Risk Register and Risk Management Plan attached as Appendices E and F

The Risk Management Process has been identified as follows:

Identification - as part of preparing this submission, the risks associated with the proposals have been identified. The top 5 risks are summarised in the attached Quantified Risk Appraisal (Appendix E) as requested although further risks were identified at this stage. The register identifies the impact of the risk if it was to occur, and also the likelihood.

The register will be a 'live' document and maintained proactively and owned by the Project Manager.

Costing – The cost estimation for each risk considers minimum, medium and maximum values, which outputs a P50 value for each risk.

Management - Actions to mitigate risk will be managed and monitored by the Project Manager at Interim Reviews. Team members best placed to manage the identified risks will be assigned ownership of specific actions, with progress reported on a regular basis to the Project Manager. A Risk workshop will take place during the design phase of the project to see if further risks can be identified.

Review – The risk register will be reviewed and updated on a regular basis. Where the severity of a particular risk impact changes, the cost and programme implications will be reviewed and future actions agreed if necessary. Residual risk would be also subject to review at the end of the project and inform the Lesson Learned process.

SECTION C – Monitoring, Evaluation and Benefits Realisation

C1. Benefits Realisation (maximum 250 words)

Please provide details on the profile of benefits, and of baseline benefits and benefit ownership and explain how your scheme design will lead to the outputs/outcomes. This could be achieved by logic maps, text descriptions, etc. Information should focus on road safety benefits.

This should be proportionate to the cost of the proposed scheme.

The benefits of the scheme are estimated at £1,224,197, based upon forecasted accident reductions to all road users over the lifetime of the implemented works. This is detailed in full in the attached Appraisal Summary Table and Pro Formas.

Other benefits that are expected to result from the works but have not been monetised include:

Decongestion benefits for other road users due to mode shift from car journeys.

Short-term absence from work is estimated to reduce by 6% due to increased physical activity.

Wider health benefits such as the reduction in coronary heart disease, stroke and colon cancer
Reductions in air and noise pollution.

Reduced car parking costs for employers due to transfer from commuting by car to cycling.

C2. Monitoring and Evaluation (maximum 250 words)

Evaluation is an essential part of scheme development and should be considered and built into the planning of a scheme from the earliest stages. Periodic monitoring and evaluating the outcomes and impacts of schemes, in addition to evaluation findings towards the end, is also important to show if a scheme has been successful.

Where possible, bidders should describe any baseline info (or other counterfactual) they will use for the evaluation.

Please set out how you plan to measure and report on the road safety benefits identified in Section C1, alongside any other outcomes and impacts of the scheme. Scheme promoters are expected to contribute to platforms for sharing and disseminating the lessons learned, as directed by the Department for Transport.

Based upon the scheme objectives, the main measurable Evaluation Objective will be monitoring the number of accidents reported after completion of all the measures.

This will be compared against the existing accident data that was used to compile the bid, adjusted for an increase in traffic in the area. The data is provided by police records and collated by Tyne & Wear Traffic and Accident Data Unit.

The other benefits that are expected to result from the works but have not been monetised result largely from an expected mode shift from single car occupancy to cycling. Mode share data for work commuting in the area is collected by the Council's 'Go Smarter to Work' team on an annual basis. There are also cycle counters in the area that will be used to monitor cycle use in the area on an annual basis.

As a result of the anticipated mode shift to cycling there is an assumption that this will lead to a minor decrease in air and noise pollution, however this would be too negligible to be cost effective to monitor.