Local Highways Maintenance Challenge Fund



Application Form (for Tranche 2A)

The level of information provided should be proportionate to the size and complexity of the scheme proposed. Note that DfT funding is a maximum of £5 million per scheme. An individual local authority may apply only for one scheme.

For schemes submitted by components of a Combined Authority a separate application form should be completed for each scheme, then the CA should rank them in order of preference.

Applicant Information

Local authority name: Nottinghamshire County Council

Bid Manager Name and position: Gary Wood – Group Manager Environment & Highways

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

Contact telephone number: 0115 977 4270 Email address: gary.wood@nottscc.gov.uk

Postal address:

Trent Bridge House, County Hall, Loughborough Road, West Bridgford, Nottingham. NG2 7QP

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.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/transport/roads/dft-funding

SECTION A - Scheme description

A1. Scheme name: A38 and A617 Mansfield Ashfield Regeneration Route

A2. Headline description:

Please enter a brief description of the proposed scheme and its timetable including the completion date (in no more than 50 words)

The proposal is a whole route treatment to rejuvenate the A38 / A617 Mansfield & Ashfield Regeneration Route which is a major east-west corridor between the M1 and the A1. The route has supported business and residential growth in the areas of Mansfield and Ashfield whilst serving as a critical link in the highway infrastructure. Commencement 2 months after approval and completion by Feb 2018.

A3. Geographical area:

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

The A38/A617 transport corridor plays an essential role in delivering growth in the area; through the proposed housing/employment growth planned along it; as well as providing a key east-west link between the M1 and A1 helping link residents/local businesses to the strategic road network and therefore to jobs/markets further afield.

OS Grid Reference: 451233, 359261

Postcode: NG17 4PA

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 on land use, planning etc.

APPENDIX B - Site Plan

A4. Type of scheme (please tick relevant box):		
Small project bids (requiring DfT funding of up to £5 million		
Major maintenance, strengthening or renewal of bridges, tur	nnels, retaining walls or other structures	
Major maintenance or renewal of carriageways (roads)		
Major maintenance or renewal of footways or cycleways		
Major maintenance or renewal of drainage assets		

SECTION B – The Business Case

B1. The Financial Case – Project Costs and Profile

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	2017-18
DfT Funding	5000
Sought	
LA Contribution	500
Other Third Party	500
Funding	

Notes:

- 1) Department for Transport funding is only for the 2017-18 financial year.
- 2) A minimum local contribution of 10% (by the local authority and/or third party) of the project costs is required.

B2	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.

The County Council has allocated £500,000 of County Council Capital funding towards highways maintenance which will be allocated to the A38/A617 improvements should the Bid be successful. This allocation was approved at the County Council meeting of 23rd February 2017 as part of the County Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy budget approval.

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.

As part of the Section 278 Agreement to an adjacent significant development, the developer has agreed to support the rejuvenation of this corridor by carrying out works, approximate value £500,000 which complements the scheme.

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

c) 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 (e.g. through the Access Fund or similar competition).

No other applications for funding associated with this proposal have been made previously to the DfT or other sources.

B3. Strategic Case (Maximum 50 words for each section a) to g)

This section should briefly set out the rationale for making the investment and evidence of the existing situation, set out the history of the asset and why it is needs to be repaired or renewed. It should also include how the scheme it fits into the overall asset management strategy for the authority **and why it cannot be funded through the annual Highways Maintenance Block Funding grant.**

a) What are the current problems to be addressed by your scheme? (Describe economic, environmental, social problems or opportunities which will be addressed by the scheme).

During the last five years, the A38/A617 corridor has suffered delays due to highway maintenance repairs at least 10 failures; causing journey time delay for local businesses and residents during the works. This disruption will continue and increase in the future unless works are undertaken as proposed in this bid.

b) Why the asset is in need of urgent funding?

Since MARR opened traffic volumes utilising this route have increased, particularly for LGVs/HGVs servicing new businesses operating from local industrial/retail parks. HGV volumes are 3-7 times greater than those originally forecast, consequently accelerating deterioration of the roads. The proposals will also improve noise levels at two locations on A38 identified through the 2nd round noise-mapping.

APPENDIX A - MARR Failure Report (Abridged - Full 12-page report is available)
APPENDIX A1 - Map appended to Failure Report.
APPENDIX A2 - Traffic Figures from Failure Report.

c) What options have been considered and why have alternatives have been rejected?

The work involved is far greater than the annual block allocation for 'A' road maintenance in Nottinghamshire. The timing is right now to fit in with the major developments due to take place in the area. Focussing on this route alone, ignoring the decline of the remaining 'A' road network, it would take an estimated seven years to undertake the work being considered as part of this bid.

d) What are the expected benefits / outcomes?

Restore route to a condition capable of withstanding the industrial, retail and domestic development for which it was originally proposed in the Sherwood Growth Zone Report & East Midlands Regional Plan 2009. This protects a key part of the Resilient Network (M1 Emergency Diversion) and a Critical Asset (A+E Hospital) It is also needs to support the planned growth along this important corridor.

e) Please provide information on the geographical areas that will benefit from your scheme.

Ashfield/Mansfield districts both have higher than average unemployment levels (2%) with levels in Sutton-in-Ashfield East at 2.9%. The route links the mid-Nottinghamshire HMA forming the spine of the travel to work area and is therefore vital to those travelling to/during work, particularly the residents/numerous businesses along the route.

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)? Likely to be surface course only repairs which add a shorter useful life than 2-coat as prescribed in the deterioration report from 2011. A single section/junction would be resurfaced each year or every other year depending upon deterioration rate compared with countywide requirements and available finance. g) What is the impact of the scheme? Longevity for this critical section of resilient network (Hospital A+E/M1 Diversion/future development/regeneration). Reduced overall maintenance cost, particularly with TM and high-spec materials for greater useful life. Reduction in temporary TM for reactive maintenance. Greater reliability of traffic flow. Reduced exposure to 3rd party claims. **B4.** Affordability and Financial Risk (maximum 50 words for each of a) to c) What is your Authority's most recent total outturn annual capital spending on highways maintenance (Year 2016-17 - Projected) £15,300 figures should be entered in £000s (i.e. £10,000 = 10) What is the DfT contribution sought as a % and that annual total 32.68% (to 2 decimal places) 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 5% allowance has been made utilizing Quantified Risk Assessment on Project Costs modelling on a P50 cost estimate. If required a 'Monte Carlo' analysis on the cost can be undertaken to understand the cost and dependencies between the P50 & P90 estimate. b) How will cost overruns be dealt with? Managed within the constraints of the financial profile by careful monitoring and adjusting scope as necessary. Stringent cost monitoring through close liaison with contractor, with NCC picking up the risk of any cost overrun. c) What are the main risks to project delivery timescales and what impact this will have on cost? There are no unusual risks associated with this project. The routine risks of weather and supply chain malfunction have been covered and will be managed. A risk log has been developed for the project. **B5. Equality Analysis** Has any Equality Analysis been undertaken in line with the Equality Duty? X Yes □No

B6. Value for Money

a) For all scheme bids, promoters should provide, where available, an estimate of the Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) of the scheme.

Benefit Cost Ratio over 3 years is estimated at 1.3 and over 5 years at 1.6

Where a BCR is provided please be aware that DfT may wish to scrutinise the data and assumptions used in deriving that BCR.

used in deriving that BCR.		
b) Please provide the following data will form a key part of our assessment: Note this material should be provided even if a BCR estimate has been supplied and has also to be entered and returned as an MS Excel file in the VfM Annex MS Excel file).		
A description of the do-minimum situation (i.e. what would happen without Challenge Fund investment).	We estimate that in 3 years, the Road Condition Index (RCI) for the sections covered by this proposal will have deteriorated to between 40% & 50% 'Red' (requiring structural maintenance) We further estimate that figure will rise to around 75% to 85% 'Red' in 5 years. This increases the amount of 200mm deep base excavation as opposed to 100mm 2-coat resurfacing.	
Details of significant monetised and non- monetised costs and benefits of the scheme (quantified where possible)	The estimated increase in cost of this scheme in 3 years' time as a result of continued deterioration would be £1.49m. The estimated increase after 5 years would be £2.99m.	
	Single TM set-up hence reduced cost. Shorter operational window. Minimise impact on travelling public. Minimise losses to business and community at large. Reduced carbon footprint from shorter time on site for operational vehicles and reduced emissions from stationary traffic.	
Length of scheme (km)	6.9km	
Number of vehicles on affected section (Average Annual Daily Traffic in vehicles and if possible split by vehicle type) – to include details of data (age etc.) supporting this estimate.	A617 A38 to A60 (Oct 2015 manual count) AADT: 21,605 - HGV: 1,335 - LGV: 2,395 - Cars: 17,612 A60 to A6117 (Sept 2015 manual count) AADT: 22,604 - HGV: 1,746 - LGV: 2,824 - Cars: 17,572 A6117 to A6191 (Mar 2015 manual count)	
	AADT: 13,392 - HGV: 1,472 - LGV: 1,538 - Cars: 9,891	
	<u>A38</u>	
	Coxmoor Road to A617 (Countywide Growth 2005-2015) AADT: 27,100 - HGV: 1,570	
	A617 to Kings Mill Jctn (Countywide Growth 2005-2015) AADT: 27,350 - HGV: 905	
	Kings Mill to Wilmore Way (Countywide Growth 2005-2015) AADT: 23,950 - HGV: 285	
	Wilmore Way to Sheepbridge Ln (C'wide Growth 2005-2015)	

AADT: 19,450 - HGV: 235

APPENDIX C - Traffic Count Map

c) Other VfM information where relevant - depending on type of scheme bid:		
Details of required restrictions/closures if funding not provided (e.g. type of restrictions; timing/duration of restrictions; etc.)	Given the strategic status of this road it would <u>never</u> be fully closed due to its condition but it will be prone to ever more restricted availability through lane closure and speed / width reductions to maintain safety. This will adversely affect journey times.	
Length of any diversion route, if closure is required (over and above existing route) (km)	No diversion associated with this as road cannot be fully closed due to its strategic importance.	
Regularity/duration of closures due to flooding: (e.g. number of closures per year; average length of closure (hrs); etc.)	Not Applicable - Not subject to flooding events.	
Number and severity of accidents: both for the do minimum and the forecast impact of the scheme (e.g. existing number of accidents and/or accident rate; forecast number of accidents and or accident rate with and without the scheme)	Not Applicable - The accidents occurring on this route are not associated with surface texture.	
Number of existing cyclists; forecasts of cycling usage with and without the scheme (and if available length of journey)	Not applicable - The proposals will not impact on the local cycle network (cycle facilities are off-carriageway adjacent to the road)	

B7. The Commercial Case

This section categorizes the procurement strategy that will be used to appoint a contractor and, importantly for this fund, 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.

Framework Contract	\boxtimes
Council Contractor	
Competitive Tender	

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

B8. Delivery (maximum 50 words for a) and 100 words for b)
a) Are any statutory procedures required to deliver the project, if yes please provide details below;
☐ Yes ⊠ No
(Road space booking required only - Utilities have been issued with Section 58 - NRSWA Act 1990 to discuss any potential 'road space sharing' and negate the risk of conflicts and/or subsequent short / mid-term road openings, post-completion)
Details of statutory procedure (50 words maximum)
b) Please summarise any lessons your authority has learned from the experience of delivering other DfT funded programmes (such as Challenge Fund tranche 1, pinch point schemes, local majors, Local Sustainable Transport Fund, Better Bus Areas) and what would be different on this project as a result.
NCC / Via design teams have a proven track record of in house delivery of DfT funded projects Experience shows key lessons to be:
Appoint dedicated project manager to be single conduit on the project for all parties; this to be extended to this project, not always case with maintenance.
Carry out comprehensive ECI with appointed contractor and value engineer designs to identify cost savings and best delivery method. Carry out meaningful consultation / exchange of information with affected parties in advance of works including thorough advanced signing. Special emphasis required on this project given likelihood of traffic delay.
B9. Stakeholder Support (maximum 50 words for a) and 100 words for b)
c) Does this proposal have the support of the Local MP(s);
⊠ Yes □ No
Name of MP(s) and Constituency
1. Sir Alan Meale - Mansfield
2. Gloria De Piero - Ashfield
d) List other stakeholders supporting the Scheme:
1. David Ralph – Chair D2N2 Local Enterprise Partnership.
2. Rob Mitchell - Chief Executive, Ashfield District Council.
3. Bev Smith – Chief Executive, Mansfield District Council.
4. Caroline Cox - Operations Director, Mansfield & Ashfield 2020.
APPENDIX D - Letters of Support

SECTION C: Declarations

C1. Senior Responsible Owner Declaration

As Senior Responsible Owner for [scheme name] I hereby submit this request for approval to DfT on behalf of [name of authority] and confirm that I have the necessary authority to do so.

I confirm that [name of authority] will have all the necessary powers in place to ensure the planned timescales in the application can be realised.

Name: Gary Wood Signed:

Position: Group Manager Environment & Highways

C2. Section 151 Officer Declaration

As Section 151 Officer for [name of authority] I declare that the scheme cost estimates quoted in this bid are accurate to the best of my knowledge and that [name of authority]

- has allocated sufficient budget to deliver this scheme on the basis of its proposed funding contribution
- will allocate sufficient staff and other necessary resources to deliver this scheme on time and on budget
- 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
- has the necessary governance / assurance arrangements in place
- has identified a procurement strategy that is legally compliant and is likely to achieve the best value for money outcome
- will ensure that a robust and effective stakeholder and communications plan is put in place

Name:	Signed:
Nigel Stevenson	Delin

Submission of bids:

The deadline for bid submission is 5pm on:

31 March 2017 for Challenge Fund Tranche 2A (2017/18 funding)

An electronic copy only of the bid including any supporting material should be submitted to:

roadmaintenance@dft.gsi.gov.uk copying in Paul.O'Hara@dft.gsi.gov.uk