

CONTENTS

		Page No.
	Executive Summary	vii
	Brief Description of Scheme	vii
	Overall Aims & Objectives	vii
	Headline Results	viii
	Local Authority Major Schemes – Initial Application for funding approval	ix
	Major Scheme Checklist	xv
1.0	Introduction	1
1.1	The Structure of the Major Scheme Business Case	1
1.2	Hucknall – Background and History	1
1.3	Hucknall – Location and Description	2
2.0	Strategic Context	9
2.1	Overview	9
2.2	National Policy	9
2.3	Regional Spatial Strategy for the East Midlands (RSS8)	10
2.4	Nottingham & Nottinghamshire Joint Structure Plan	14
2.5	Second Local Transport Plan Objectives	16
2.6	Nottinghamshire’s Community Strategy	20
2.7	Ashfield District Council – Local Plan Review/Local Development Framework	24
2.8	Strategic Context Conclusions	27
3.0	Problems and Objectives	29
3.1	Overview of Problems and Objectives	29
3.2	Local Objective 1 – Economic regeneration	29
3.3	Local Objective 2 – Quality of life	32
3.4	Local Objective 3 – Making best use of existing highway assets	34
4.0	Traffic Modelling and Assumptions	35
4.1	Traffic Model Description	35
4.2	Data for Traffic Model	35
4.3	Model Convergence, Calibration and Validation	39
4.4	Forecast Traffic Demand	41
4.5	Public Transport Modelling	42
4.6	Pedestrian Assessment	43

	Page No.
5.0 Scheme Development	45
5.1 Alternative Options Considered	45
6.0 Cost Benefit Analysis	49
6.1 TUBA Economic Appraisal	49
6.2 Pedestrian Benefits and Costs	51
6.3 Public Transport Appraisal	51
6.4 Accident Analysis	52
6.5 Maintenance Delay Costs/Savings	52
6.6 Construction Delay Costs	52
7.0 Preferred Option	55
7.1 Scheme Description	55
7.2 Cost Estimate/Profile	60
7.3 Risk Assessment and Risk Register	62
7.4 Economic Results	62
8.0 Low Cost Option	65
8.1 Scheme Description	65
8.2 Operational Overview	66
8.3 Cost Estimate/Profile	66
8.4 Risk Assessment and Risk Register	69
8.5 Economic Results	69
8.6 Supporting Analysis – Low Cost Option	70
9.0 Problem Mitigation	71
10.0 Overall Value for Money Conclusions	73
11.0 Supporting Analyses – Preferred Scheme	75
11.1 Distribution and Equity	75
11.2 Affordability and Financial Sustainability	75
11.3 Practicality and Public Acceptability	75
11.4 Contribution to the 10 Year Plan	78
12.0 Transport Economic Efficiency	81
13.0 Risk Assessment, Uncertainty and Optimism Bias	83
14.0 Sensitivity and Scenario Analyses	87

15.0	Assessment against Central Government Objectives	89
15.1	Environment	89
15.2	Safety and Security	96
15.3	Economy	96
15.4	Accessibility	97
15.5	Integration	98
16.0	Scheme Delivery and Implementation using PRINCE2	101
16.1	Previous Project Delivery	101
16.2	Project Management	101
16.3	Project Initiation Document	104
16.4	Project Board Meetings at Stage Boundaries	104
16.5	Risk Management	105
16.6	Stakeholder Analysis and Communication Strategy	105
17.0	Financial Overview	107
18.0	Commercial Management Strategy	109
19.0	Monitoring and Evaluation	111
20.0	Conclusions	113

	Page No.
<u>Figures</u>	
Figure 1 The Strategic Road Network	3
Figure 2 The Regional Road Network	4
Figure 3 Aerial photograph of Hucknall Town Centre	6
Figure 4 Schematic Plan of the existing Hucknall Town Centre	7
Figure 5 Major development sites in Hucknall	28
Figure 6 Model Area Coverage (Extract from LMVR)	36
Figure 7 Hucknall Base AM Peak Medium Network (Extract from LMVR)	37
Figure 8 Location of Matched Registration Survey (2005) – (Extract from LMVR)	38
Figure 9 Comparison of modelled and observed link and turning movements and Journey time validation (Extract from LMVR)	40
Figure 10 Geographical distribution of impacts	76
Figure 11 PRINCE 2 Project Organisation Chart	103
<u>Photographs & Images</u>	
Photograph 1 High Street looking east	2
Photograph 2 High Street looking west	2
Photograph 3 Hucknall Market Place (2007)	5
Photograph 4 Baker Street/High Street junction	5
Photograph 5 NET Station at Hucknall	5
Photograph 6 Station Road/Linby Road roundabout	5
Photograph 7 Hucknall Market Place (2007)	30
Photograph 8 Vacant retail unit	30
Photograph 9 Vacant retail unit	30
Photograph 10 Vacant former Safeway property	31
Photograph 11 Vandalism to the rear of the former Safeway property	31
Artist's Impression 1 - Proposed High Street pedestrianisation – looking west	55

	Page No.
Artist's Impression 2 - Proposed High Street pedestrianisation – looking east	56
Artist's Impression 3 - Proposed High Street pedestrianisation – looking west	56
Artist's Impression 4 - Proposed 'Bus Plug' junction with High Street	58
Artist's Impression 5 – Proposed 'Bus Plug' viewed from north towards High Street	58

Appendices

Appendix A	Extract from Local Transport Plan for Greater Nottingham 2006/7 to 2010/11
Appendix B	Public Consultation Summary
Appendix C	Risk Register
Appendix D	Responses from Statutory Consultees and Other Key Stakeholders
Appendix E	Worksheets for Preferred Scheme
Appendix F	Gateway Review - Project Assessment Spreadsheet
Appendix G	PRINCE2 Project Initiation Document
Appendix H	Project Programme and Out-turn Bid Cost Details
Appendix I	Service Diversity Review
Appendix J	RFA Endorsement
Appendix K	Independent report verifying cost estimate
Appendix L	Section 151 Officer sign-off for cost estimate

Diagrams

Diagram 1	Existing traffic flows at 2006 (AADT) levels
Diagram 2	Predicted Open Year flows in 2011 – Do Minimum
Diagram 3	Predicted Open Year flows in 2011 – Do Something
Diagram 4	Predicted Open Year flows in 2026 – Do Minimum
Diagram 5	Predicted Open Year flows in 2026 – Do Something
Diagram 6	COBA Network

Tables

Table 1	Transport Economic Efficiency (TEE) – Preferred Scheme Option
Table 2	Public Accounts – Preferred Scheme Option
Table 3	Analysis of Monetised Costs and Benefits – Preferred Scheme Option
Table 4	Appraisal Summary Table (AST) Preferred Scheme Option
Table 5	Present Value of Cost Calculations (Central Government Component) - Low Cost Alternative
Table 6	Present Value of Cost Calculations (Local Government Component) - Low Cost Alternative
Table 7	Present Value of Cost Calculations (Total) - Low Cost Alternative
Table 8	Transport Economic Efficiency (TEE) – Low Cost Alternative
Table 9	Public Accounts – Low Cost Alternative
Table 10	Analysis of Monetised Costs and Benefits – Low Cost Alternative
Table 11	Appraisal Summary Table (AST) Low Cost Option
Table 12	Appraisal Cost Proforma Summary Sheet
Table 13	Before and After Implementation Comparisons

Drawings

Drawing No.	Plan A/Rev.A/Oct 2000 – Hucknall Transport Study Options
Drawing No.	ES/00974/28 Proposed Pedestrianisation & Relief Road Scheme Plan A (2001)
Drawing No.	EN/00974/44 General Layout Plan B (June 2003)
Drawing No.	EN/00974/45 Shortened Relief Road Plan C (June 2003)
Drawing No.	B/1982500/100 Rev. B Option 1
Drawing No.	B/1982500/101 Rev. B Option 2
Drawing No.	B/1982500/102 Rev. C Option 3 - Preferred Scheme Layout
Drawing No.	H1/JH04723/01 Traffic Noise Contours 2011 - without scheme situation
Drawing No.	H1/JH04723/02 Traffic Noise Contours 2011 – with scheme situation
Drawing No.	H1/JH04723/03 Traffic Noise Contours 2026 – without scheme situation
Drawing No.	H1/JH04723/04 Traffic Noise Contours 2026 – with scheme situation
Drawing No.	JH/11209/07 Environmental Constraints Map

Executive Summary

Scheme Name: Hucknall Town Centre Improvement Scheme, promoted by Nottinghamshire County Council and Ashfield District Council.

Brief Description of Scheme.

Hucknall lies to the north of Nottingham City in Greater Nottingham and is a former coalfield community. The High Street retail and business core is generally run down and is suffering a continuing decline with many vacant shops and retail units evident.

The main High Street experiences high levels of congestion and the pedestrian environment is constrained. Road safety in the town centre is an issue. There have been 23 injury accidents along the High Street since 2002, of which 10 involved pedestrians, 2 involved cyclists and 2 involved motor cyclists, thus emphasising the plight of vulnerable road users in this location and the scheme aims to address this issue.

With over 3,000 new houses being built by 2011 and 7 hectares of industrial development proposed the existing travel demands through the town will increase exacerbating congestion and road safety problems. The current congested town centre is constraining economic growth. With an enviable location close to the NET tram link to Nottingham this new housing growth needs to be exploited and transform Hucknall into a vibrant town centre and thus a sustainable community.

The scheme involves pedestrianising the High Street between the South Street/Baker Street junction and the Watnall Road junction. A new inner relief road, running parallel with the High Street, will deal with displaced traffic and will also accommodate additional traffic generated from new developments. A new two-way 'bus only' link will also be constructed to connect the proposed new road with the remaining trafficked portion of High Street. The existing roundabout at the junction of Linby Road and Station Road will be replaced with a new traffic signal controlled junction.

Enhanced pedestrian and cycle facilities will be provided to improve links between the distinct parts of the town which are currently isolated from each other except when travelling by car. A plan of the preferred option (Option 3: Drawing no. B1982500/102 Rev.C) is enclosed at the rear of this document.

This scheme scored highly against regional objectives in the Regional Funding Allocation process and is now the County Council's top priority major scheme in the Greater Nottingham Plan area.

Overall Aims and Objectives.

The scheme will:

- Promote the urgent renewal and regeneration of Hucknall town centre and create an attractive and prosperous retail centre;

- Reduce levels of traffic congestion through Hucknall town centre;
- Improve the quality of environment for pedestrians
- Improve bus service reliability by reducing delays by re-routing buses via the new road and bus link;
- Provide enhanced pedestrian and cycle facilities in the vicinity of the town centre, improving links between different parts of the town and achieving greater integration with the tram/rail interchange;
- Enhance the status of public transport in order to encourage a modal shift away from the private car.

Nottinghamshire County Council propose to commence detailed design in late Autumn 2007 with a view to commencing construction in 2010 and completing within the second Local Transport Plan period by the end of 2011.

Headline Results.

The estimated cost of the preferred option is £10.051m at current prices. This cost has been fully risk assessed. The cost benefit analysis gives the following results:

Present Value of Costs (PVC)	-	£7.554 m
Present Value of Benefits (PVB)	-	£77.94 m
Net Present Value (NPV)	-	£70.386 m
Benefit to Cost Ratio (BCR)	-	10.32

The scheme therefore represents high value for money, contributes to national, regional and local transport objectives and maximises benefits whilst having minimal environmental impact.

Local Authority Major Schemes - Initial Application For Funding Approval

Lead Scheme Promoter:	Nottinghamshire County Council	Region:	East Midlands
Lead Scheme Promoter (if not in the list above) Please type the name in this box:	N/A		
Other Scheme Promoter:	Ashfield District Council		
Scheme Name:	Hucknall Town Centre Improvements		
Has an application for DfT funding been Previously submitted for this scheme or any variant of it? If so, please provide details including Scheme Name.	No		
Type of Funding (e.g. LTP Major, TIF, CIF etc.)	LTP Major Scheme		
If other, please specify:	N/A		
Scheme Type:	Road		
Subtype:	Integrated transport measures including: Bus Priority, Cycling and Walking, Inner Relief Road and Junction Improvements		
Scheme Description (no more than 100 words):	Hucknall is a declining shopping centre with a lack of amenities and limited variety of retail provision. The main High Street is congested and provision for alternative transport choice is poor. The scheme is comprised of an integrated package of proposals which include: pedestrianisation of part of the High Street; construction of a new relief road, construction of a two way 'bus only' link road between the High Street and the new road; and replacement of an existing roundabout junction with new traffic signals. The scheme also includes the provision of improved pedestrian/cycling facilities and addition of landscaped features.		
Has an Economic Impact Report been included (Y/N)?	N		
Approval Sought:	Programme Entry		
Name and contact details of LA officer responsible for submitting bid:	Nicola Read Nottinghamshire County Council, Trent Bridge House, Fox Road, West Bridgford Nottingham NG2 6BJ Tel: 0115 9774526 Email: nicola.read@nottscc.gov.uk		
Name and contact details of the Senior Responsible Officer:	Ray Dunajko Address as above Tel: 0115 9772065 Email: ray.dunajko@nottscc.gov.uk		

Year	Preparatory Costs (£m)	Please select the year from the drop-down lists						Total (£m)	
		Pre-2007/08	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12		
		(£m)	(£m)	(£m)	(£m)	(£m)	(£m)		
DfT Contribution requested	0.4295	--	0.091 (Prep costs)	0.1165 (Prep costs)	0.149 (Prep costs)	0.073 (Prep costs)	3.377 (DfT)	5.765 (DfT)	9.5715
LA Contribution	0.4295	1.820	0.041 (Prep costs)	0.0165 (Prep costs)	0.00	0.049 (Prep costs)	0.200	2.1265	
Developer contribution *		0	0.050 (Prep costs)	0.100 (Prep costs)	0.149 (Prep costs)	0.024 (Prep costs)	0.677	0	1.000
Others	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Total funding requirement	0.859	1.820	0.182	0.233	0.298	4.200	5.965	12.698	
The DfT contribution should exclude VAT and optimism bias but should include costs estimated from a QRA.									
All figures should include inflation. Please state what inflation assumption(s) have been used:					Land costs inflated at 5% pa compound to 2010 Fees inflated at 4% pa compound to 2010 Construction cost inflated at 7% pa compound to 2011				

* Developer contribution based on informal agreement 'in principle' by Ashfield District at the time of submission of this MSBC, pending formal decision by their Cabinet. Developer Contributions are being held by Ashfield District Council pending release.

Please provide an estimated timescale in months (giving a range if necessary). (If prices are expected to be known by the time powers are in place e.g. in case of Early Contractor Involvement, please leave the middle question blank.	
Between Programme Entry being granted and all necessary powers being in place (as necessary for Conditional Approval):	32 months
Between Conditional Approval being granted and Contractor prices being known (as necessary for Full Approval):	
Between Full Approval and completion of the scheme:	19 months

Contents of the Major Scheme Business Case (PART THREE - already prepared - as per previous guidance)

Please give **brief** details, under each heading below and indicate page/paragraph numbers to indicate where this is covered in detail in the MSBC.

STRATEGIC	MSBC Reference
<p>Impact of scheme on LTP targets or longer term objectives:</p> <p>Targets -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve accessibility • Reduce congestion/improve air quality • Safety • Make more efficient use of the existing transport network • Contributing to economic regeneration • Quality of life <p>The proposals will contribute significantly to the above targets. The scheme: improves accessibility; promotes a modal shift from the private car to alternative transport modes including walking, cycling and public transport; reduces social exclusion; supports wider economic regeneration and improves the quality of life of Hucknall's residents and visitors. Bus services benefit greatly by significantly reducing delays currently experienced and the scheme makes best use of the existing transport network. The proposals will improve road and personal safety on the High Street.</p>	<p>Section 2.5 & Appendix A</p>
<p>Please state briefly how/where this scheme proposal has been prioritised in the LTP submitted in July 2005?</p> <p>The scheme is the County Council's top priority major scheme in the Greater Nottingham Plan area and received the support of Full Council on 4th July 2007.</p>	<p>Section 2.5 & Appendix A</p>
<p>Fit with regional objectives and priorities:</p> <p>Accords well with RSS8 by regenerating part of the Three Cities Sub Area in a sustainable manner. Better transport links, improved accessibility, promotion of traffic growth reduction through development of integrated transport proposals are key elements of the objectives and strategies contained in the East Midlands Spatial Strategy, Regional Transport Strategy and Regional Economic Strategy. The scheme will directly support these objectives and also improves safety and the quality of the environment in the town centre by removing traffic from the High Street.</p>	<p>Section 2.3 & Appendix A</p>
<p>Evidence of specific support from regional bodies:</p> <p>The new draft East Midlands Regional Plan due for publication in 2008 cites the Hucknall Town Centre Improvement Scheme as an investment priority.</p>	<p>Section 2.3 & Appendix A</p>
<p>Fit with local non-transport objectives (e.g. regeneration, health, education etc.):</p> <p>The scheme will support a number of local policies relating to regeneration, economic vitality, urban renewal, health, safety & crime reduction, education & learning, air quality and business investment, as identified in Nottingham City Council and Nottinghamshire County Council's Joint Structure Plan and Ashfield District Council's Local Plan Review and future Local Development Framework.</p>	<p>Sections 2.4, 2.6, 2.7 & Appendix A</p>

<p>Additional LA measures to complement the scheme (e.g. demand restraint, IT block-funded measures): <i>Better / safer pedestrian routes:</i> improvements have been made along Watnall Road. <i>Better bus facilities:</i> improvements have been made to 31 bus stops in Hucknall. <i>Better access to the railway station:</i> the development of the former colliery site enabled the construction of a new distributor road, funded by developers. <i>Better / safer cycle routes:</i> new routes have been constructed along the main radial roads into the town centre, Annesley Road, Nottingham Road and Watnall Road.</p>	Section 2.5.5
<p>APPRAISAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY</p>	MSBC Reference
<p>Benefit to Cost Ratio (BCR) claimed: 10.32 (excluding optimism bias)</p>	Section 7.4.8
<p>List and short description of key non-monetised benefits claimed: Improvements in air quality are anticipated. Journey ambience has been given a beneficial score because traveller stress and frustration will be reduced once congestion starts to ease in peak periods. The security objective has been assessed as having a beneficial impact as a result of improved lighting and the additional usage of CCTV cameras on High Street. Journey reliability is expected to improve for all private vehicles and bus operators. Finally, severance will be reduced as a result of improvements in pedestrian and cycling facilities for the whole study area.</p>	Section 15
<p>Short description of type of modelling used: The economic benefits of the scheme have been evaluated using TUBA (Version 1.7), the inputs into the TUBA model have been derived from the Hucknall SATURN traffic model. Matrices covering demand, travel time and distance between each origin/destination pair have been 'skimmed' from the Do Minimum and Do Something model assignments to form the basis of the economic appraisal. COBA has been used to evaluate accident changes within the study area.</p>	Section 6
<p>List of fully appraised alternatives: Lower cost alternative</p>	Section 8
<p>Has an Economic Impact Report been included (Y/N)? No – Hucknall is not an area with recognised regeneration status and as a consequence WebTAG dictates that an Economic Impact Report is not needed.</p>	Section 15
<p>DELIVERY</p>	MSBC Reference
<p>Name of Senior Responsible Owner: Ray Dunajko Head of Service Local Transport Plans & Programmes Nottinghamshire County Council</p>	Section 16.2.6
<p>Key risks identified in risk register:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Value of compensation payments to adjoining land owners will exceed budget allocation • Unchartered services will be encountered during excavation • Utilities will provide inaccurate estimates for diversions • Unauthorised occupation of buildings to be demolished will delay the contract 	Sections 13, 7.3, 8.4 and Appendix C

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential difficulties in obtaining EA approval for culvert designs • Utilities will require longer lead-in times than anticipated to carry out diversions. 	
<p>Gateway Risk Score (schemes over £40m gross only):</p> <p>55 – LOW</p>	Appendix F
<p>Key milestones with dates (no more than 5):</p> <p>Programme Entry - December 2007 First appointment under ECI - October 2009 Confirmation of the Orders - October 2009 Full Approval - June 2010 Set up site to commence works - July 2010</p>	Section 11.3 and Appendix H
<p>List of most important stakeholders:</p> <p>Statutory Consultees Local Residents Business Users Bus Operators Utility Companies (to be added to PRINCE2 organisation Chart as detailed design progresses)</p>	Sections 11.3, 16.2.6 and 16.6
<p>FINANCIAL</p>	MSBC Reference
<p>Brief description of how cost estimates are derived:</p> <p>Our consulting engineers, Jacobs, have undertaken a preliminary design and works estimate drawing on costs from recent contracts. All relevant estimates from the statutory undertakers have been obtained and Nottinghamshire County Council's Corporate Property Department Valuer has valued land costs. Risks have been quantified by Nottinghamshire County Council's Highway Design Group.</p>	Sections 7.2, 8.3 & Appendix C (Risk)
<p>Details of measures to secure non-DfT contributions (if applicable):</p> <p>N/A</p>	N/A
<p>Is there likely to be any significant revenue liability (not including routine maintenance). If so please describe briefly and estimate annual liability:</p> <p>No</p>	N/A
<p>COMMERCIAL</p>	MSBC Reference
<p>State type of procurement to be employed:</p> <p>Early Contractor Involvement</p>	Section 18
<p>If Early Contractor Involvement (ECI) is planned please provide short description of current state of play:</p> <p>Two stage tender following notification of the scheme with OJEU. The two stage tender would be on the basis of a quality and price evaluation following a Stage one short-listing process on the basis of a pre-qualification questionnaire. The first stage of ECI will commence after the anticipated public inquiry.</p>	Section 18
<p>Would the scheme involve/require ongoing private sector involvement when in operation? If so please give brief details:</p> <p>No</p>	N/A

Major Scheme Appraisal Checklist

Scheme Description

Item	Section/Page
A detailed physical description of the scheme, and the other appraised option(s), including maps, scale diagrams and a written commentary.	Sections 7.0 & 8.0, Drawings (see rear of document)

Strategic Case

Item	Section/Page
The objectives of the scheme	Section 3.0
A description of the process by which the scheme came to be identified as the preferred option for meeting those objectives	Sections 5.0, 7.0 & 8.0
How the objectives of the scheme align with wider local objectives, particularly those of the relevant Local Transport Plan.	Section 2.0
How the objectives of the scheme align with sub-regional and regional objectives, (except for schemes of predominantly local significance)	Section 2.0
Written endorsement from regional bodies	Appendix J

Value For Money

Cost Benefit Analysis

Item	Section/Page
A clear explanation of the underlying assumptions used in the Cost Benefit Analysis.	Section 6.0
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).	Sections 4.0 & 6.0
A diagram of the network (if COBA used).	Diagram 6
Information on the number of junctions modelled (if COBA used), for both the do-minimum and the do-something.	Section 6.0
Details of assumptions about operating costs and commercial viability (e.g. public transport, park and ride, etc.).	Section 6.0
Full appraisal inputs/outputs (when used, COBA and/or TUBA input and output files should be supplied).	Section 6.0 & CD supplied
Details of the maintenance delay costs/savings.	Section 6.0
Details of the delays during construction.	Section 6.0

NATA Assessment

Item	Section/Page
Evidence of consultation with key stakeholders (including any NGOs consulted and responses).	Appendix D
Assessment of Environmental impacts, to include an environmental constraints map.	Section 15.1 & Drawing (see rear of document)
Assessment of Safety impacts and the assumed accident rates presented (COBA output should be provided if an accident only COBA has been run).	Section 15.2 & CD supplied
Assessment of Economic impacts.	Section 15.3
Assessment of Accessibility impacts.	Section 15.4
Assessment of Integration impacts.	Section 15.5
A comprehensive Appraisal Summary Table.	Tables 4 & 5
The following supporting analyses:	
Distribution and Equity.	Sections 8.6 & 11.1
Affordability and Financial Sustainability.	Sections 8.6 & 11.2
Practicality and Public Acceptability (Evidence of public consultation supplied).	Sections 8.6, 11.3 & Appendix B
Contribution to 10 year plan targets.	Sections 8.6 & 11.4
NATA worksheets.	Appendix E

Modelling

Item	Section/Page
An Existing Data and Traffic Surveys Report to include:	
Details of the sources, locations (illustrated on a map), methods of collection, dates, days of week, durations, sample factors, estimation of accuracy, etc.	Section 4.0
Details of any specialist surveys (e.g. stated preference).	Section 4.0
Traffic and passenger flows; including daily, hourly and seasonal profiles, including details by vehicle class where appropriate.	Section 4.0
Journey times by mode, including variability if appropriate.	Section 4.0
Details of the pattern and scale of traffic delays and queues.	Section 4.0
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.	Diagrams 1-5

An Assignment Model Validation Report to include:	
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.	LMVR
Description of the data used in model building and validation with a clear distinction made for any independent validation data.	LMVR
Evidence of the validity of the networks employed, including range checks, link length checks, and route choice evidence.	LMVR
Details of the segmentation used, including the rationale for that chosen.	LMVR
Validation of the trip matrices, including estimation of measurement and sample errors.	LMVR
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.	LMVR
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.	LMVR
Journey time validation, including, for road traffic models, checks on queue pattern and magnitudes of delays/queues.	LMVR
Detail of the assignment convergence.	LMVR
Present year validation if the model is more than 5 years old.	LMVR
A diagram of modelled traffic flows, both in the immediate corridor and other relevant corridors.	LMVR
A Demand Model Report to include:	
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).	Section 4.4
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:	
Description of the methods used in forecasting future traffic demand.	Forecasting Report
Description of the future year demand assumptions (e.g. land use and economic growth - for the do minimum, core and variant scenarios).	Forecasting Report
Description of the future year transport supply assumptions (i.e. networks examined for the do minimum, core scenario and variant scenarios).	Forecasting Report
Description of the travel cost assumptions (e.g. fuel costs, PT fares, parking).	Forecasting Report
Comparison of the local forecast results to national forecasts, at an overall and sectoral level.	Forecasting Report
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.	Forecasting Report
If the model includes very slow speeds or high junction delays evidence of their plausibility.	Forecasting Report
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.	Forecasting Report
Presentation of the sensitivity tests carried out (to include optimistic and pessimistic tests).	Forecasting Report

Delivery

Item	Section/Page
Governance	
Named Senior Responsible Owner (SRO)	Appendix G
Proposed Governance Structure	Section 16.2
Composition of Project Board	Section 16.2 & Appendix G
Details of resourcing level for the scheme	Section 16.0

Project Planning	
Project Plan (e.g. in GANNT chart form)	Appendix H
List of key milestones and dates	Section 11.3 & Appendix H
Clear critical path and dependencies	Appendix H
Risk Management	
Risk Register with likelihood, probability and mitigation measures, including Quantified Risk Assessment.	Section 13.0 & Appendix C
Description of proposed Risk Management process and escalation procedures.	Section 13.0 & Appendix C
Stakeholder Management	
Identification and analysis of key stakeholders and their interests.	Section 16.0 & Appendix G
Description of public consultation already carried out.	Section 11.3 & Appendix B
Plans for future consultation and stakeholder management.	Section 16.0 & Appendix D
Evidence of consultation with Statutory Bodies (Natural England, English Heritage and Environment Agency) and their responses.	Appendix D
Evaluation	
Statement of core evaluation objectives	Section 19.0
Assurance (schemes with gross cost of £50m or more)	
Confirmation of date Gateway Review carried out (or planned).	N/A

Commercial

Item	Section/Page
Preferred procurement route with rationale for choice	Section 18.0
For ECI proposals, contract type and risk sharing arrangement	Section 18.0
Details of proposed risk sharing approach (for other than traditional procurement)	Section 18.0 and Appendix C

Financial

Item	Section/Page
Detailed cost breakdown	Sections 7.2 & 8.3
Evidence of how cost estimates have been derived	Sections 7.2 & 8.3

Independent surveyor's report verifying cost estimates	Appendix K
Details of and justification for inflation assumption used.	Page X
Costing for risk based on QRA	Appendix C
Estimate of eligible preparatory costs	Page X
Details of measures to secure necessary third party contributions, if applicable	N/A
Description and estimate of any ongoing revenue liability (other than routine maintenance) and proposals to meet it	N/A
Section 151 Officer sign-off for cost estimates	Appendix L