

Local Highways Maintenance Challenge 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, for a small scheme we would suggest around 10 to 15 pages including annexes would be appropriate and for a larger scheme, 15 to 30 pages.

A separate application form should be completed for each scheme up to a maximum of one large bid and one small bid for each local highway authority.

Applicant Information

Local authority name(s)*: Tameside MBC

**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: Alan Jackson Head of Environmental Services Highways and Transport

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

Stephen Hall Environmental services manager Structures and Special Projects

Contact telephone number: 0161 342 2818 **Email address:**
alan.jackson@tameside.gov.uk

Postal address:
Tameside MBC, Environmental Services, Council Offices Wellington Road Ashton –
Under- Lyne OL6 6DL

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: TMBC website
(tameside.gov.uk/walls)

SECTION A - Scheme description and funding profile

A1. Scheme name: Tameside MBC Retaining wall Structural replacement and strengthening schemes Phase 2

A2. Headline description:

Please enter a brief description of the proposed scheme (in no more than 50 words)

Many of the historic retaining walls that support certain roads, form part of the only connecting route into villages and small rural communities require reconstruction to modern standards. The retaining walls are suffering a lack of maintenance, which has led to the gradual deterioration of the walls over time.

A3. Geographical area:

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

The schemes generally provide support to the KRN highways. Each of the structures

Grid location is as described in Appendix A and E;

The schemes are;

Roe Cross Longdendale, Mottram Rd Hyde, Mottram Rd Longdendale Manchester Road Hyde, Manchester Road Mossley, Wakefield Rd Stalybridge, Woolley Lane Hyde, Stamford Street Stalybridge, Mottram Cutting, and Hollingworth Retaining walls

OS Grid Reference: see Appendix A, plans Appendix E

Postcode:

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 £5m and £20m)

Major maintenance, strengthening or renewal of bridges, tunnels, 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

Upgrade of Street Lighting

Large project bids (requiring DfT funding of between £20m plus)

- | | |
|--|--------------------------|
| Major maintenance, strengthening or renewal of bridges, tunnels, retaining walls or other structures | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Major maintenance or renewal of carriageways (roads) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Major maintenance or renewal of footways or cycleways | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Major maintenance or renewal of drainage assets | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Upgrade of Street Lighting | <input type="checkbox"/> |

A5. Equality Analysis

Has any Equality Analysis been undertaken in line with the Equality Duty? Yes No
In Line with general Council policy .

SECTION B – The Business Case

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

The hilly nature of the borough of Tameside means that there are a number of roads that have been built along the sides of valleys and hills. To support these roads and ensure the safety of those who use them, retaining walls were built. Some of these are very old, with some being built during the Industrial Revolution.

Many of these walls support roads which are used by people to travel to work and for taking their children to school and, in some cases, these walls support roads that form part of the only connecting route into villages and small rural communities. Others are on main road links.

Over recent years, although some funding has been available to repair and maintain the roads the retaining walls support, the level of funding for repairs and maintenance to the retaining walls themselves has not been as high. The increasing use and volume of traffic on the roads, along with a lack of funding for maintenance, has led to the gradual deterioration of the walls over time.

The borough council of Tameside would hope to be able to implement long term solutions to provide support to the roads. The works to repair or replace these walls across the borough will be vital to ensure the use of these roads in the future.

B2. The Strategic Case (Maximum 650 words)

The retaining walls proposed for reconstruction / strengthening are regularly assessed as per the "Management of Highway Structures Code of practice" guidelines. As part of the 2 yearly general inspections the condition of the walls has been seen to deteriorate. The indices used to evaluate the conditions of the walls shows continued deterioration. The walls will be strengthened or replaced, and by carrying out this work it will remove the need for future high maintenance reactive expenditure.(See Appendix E)

The overarching objective is to ensure the safety of the public by attending to the backlog of safety maintenance on a number of retaining walls and slopes.

More specific objectives in line with national, regional and local priorities are to:

- meet objectives to deliver aspects of the Greater Manchester Local Transport Plan by making the roads safer and ensuring accessibility to key locations across the boroughs;
- reduce the maintenance backlog to ensure the availability and reliability of the highway network to ensure the continued sustainability and accessibility of communities; and
- maintain the road network and highways structures in a way that continues to contribute to the quality of the landscape, bio-diversity and the environment of the areas concerned.

There are also two issues to be highlighted namely:

1. There is at least one large structures within the scheme that is in the town centre and near busy shopping areas.
2. Structures in rural locations are of equal importance to smaller towns and district centres separated by rural areas and play a key role in the economic regeneration prospects for certain towns within the borough as a whole.

Previous local repairs have been undertaken to sections of the walls where local collapses have occurred or where local damage has been incurred due to road vehicle accidental damage. Continued attempts can be made to carry out local repairs on an ad hoc basis, but this is considered neither of significant scale to improve the safety of the structures in the long term nor economically justifiable due to the unplanned nature of repairs.

(Cost of congestion and delays to motorist in the event of a failure and the need for reactive traffic controls, causing delay on the network.

The suggested additional costs of congestion and delay of:

- £9.78 per hour of additional delay in the morning peak (or 16p / minute)
- £10.05 per hour of additional delay in the evening peak hour (or 17p / minute)
- £10.79 per hour of additional delay during the daytime inter-peak period (or 18p / minute).

See also Table 1 ref(TfGM report based on Department for Transport WebTAG Data Book (Nov 2014 Release v1.3b.) App B)

The schemes included form part of a significant backlog of work which has been beyond the scale of recent maintenance budget allowances and as such has only been possible to deal with on a minor scale on an as needs basis.(Phase 1 only partly addressed these issues)

The work programme will also support Tameside's Corporate Plan by improving public safety through maintenance of the road network and stimulating the economy by providing a sound infrastructure to support investment.

10 retaining structures in Tameside have been identified by the council as needing key strengthening work

The retaining structures are extracted from the authority's own Highway structure database, and those at the top of the list in terms of need for works and having the lowest BCI scores.

Details of the condition of the asset and previous inspection data are included in Appendix A to this application.

Due consideration will be made to ensure that the wild life immediately in the proximity of the proposed works will not be adversely affected by the undertaking of a full ecological survey prior to commencement of the works.

The retaining structures directly affect main road networks in Tameside, and in particular some are the main links between towns in some rural areas.

The work will also support Tameside Council's Business Plan ensuring that congestion is kept to a low level during maintenance of the highway network. This in turn will help other objectives

to be met, as a sound highway network will encourage investment and in turn create employment opportunities in the borough.

Should the works not be undertaken the possibility of sudden local collapses cannot be ruled out, particularly during periods of inclement weather such as heavy rain or frost. In the event that this is the case then significant lengthy diversions would be necessary in several cases creating further congestion on the network particularly if in an unplanned arrangement. In addition it could be possibly many years before the traffic flows could be restored to their former levels as additional funding may then have to be found, prior to carrying out the necessary support repairs

Should the funding not be available then consideration may be necessary to temporary repair most urgent areas of disrepairs which would be costly and an uneconomic use of resources This may include temporary propping works or local lane restrictions with traffic control.

As a follow up in Phase 2 of the Challenge fund bidding Tameside Council will be seeking funding for future urgent repairs to its bridge stock which has similarly been underfunded

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	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	Total
<i>DfT Funding Sought</i>	400	1150	585	2135
<i>LA Contribution</i>	40	260	267	567
<i>Other Third Party Funding</i>				

Due to 2015/16 budgets already committed LA overall contributions totalling 21% are allocated across the 3 year programme.

Notes:

- 1) Department for Transport funding must not go beyond 2017-18 financial year.***
- 2) A minimum local contribution of 10% (local authority and/or third party) of the project costs is required.***

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.

- 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

- 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.

T

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 (you should refer to the Risk Register – see Section B10).

Please ensure that in the risk register 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 risk allowance of 10% has been applied to the cost of construction works as outlined in the QRA (App D)
- b) How will cost overruns be dealt with?
Any cost overruns for the scheme will be carefully managed in line with the QRA and will be met by Tameside MBC through its own internal funding processes
- c) What are the main risks to project delivery timescales and what impact this will have on cost?
The main risks to the project delivery timescales are as follows;
- a) **Unchartered or incorrectly chartered underground utilities found thereby delaying construction works.**
- b) **Unforeseen ground conditions resulting in additional costs associated with revised foundation designs and construction costs.**
- c) **Land agreements with adjoining land owners where temporary access licences may be required to undertake the required works.**

B6. The Economic Case – Value for Money

- a) **If available for smaller scheme bids, promoters should provide an estimate of the Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) of the scheme.**
- b) **For larger schemes costing £20 million or more we would expect the bid to include a BCR and this should align with WebTAG - <https://www.gov.uk/transport-analysis-guidance-webtag>**

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. This should include:

- A description of the key risks and uncertainties in the data and assumptions and the impact these have on the BCR;
- Key assumptions including (but not limited to): detail of the data used to support the analysis, 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 evidence to demonstrate that it is fit-for-purpose.
- TfGM has carried out an evaluation of the BCR score for the all the retaining wall schemes based on the information supplied in the Vfm table for each scheme see Appendix F. The score provided is 9.20
- The Structures Asset Management Planning Toolkit (Atkins Toolkit) has generated Chart 07 appended to this application. It shows the performance at risk and traffic delay Costs associated with the current network condition.
- The Toolkit output expenditure requirement is £3.9m for 2015-16, only c. £400k is anticipated form the present Funding arrangement for Tameside MBC Highway Structures.
- There is a projected funding spike of £50m is nothing is done in year 10.
- The Toolkit suggests this Council should have an average £6.9m average annual expenditure on the Highway Structures network

c) Please provide the following data which may form a key part of our assessment:
Note this material should be provided even if a BCR estimate has been supplied (unless already covered in a VFM Annex).

A description of the do-minimum situation (i.e. what would happen without Challenge Fund investment).	Refer to TMBC Structures asset Management Planning Toolkit outputs(App C)
Details of significant monetised and non-monetised costs and benefits of the scheme (quantified where possible)	
Length of scheme (km)	
Number of vehicles on affected section (AADT in vehicles and if possible split by vehicle type) – to include details of data (age etc.) supporting this estimate.	

d) 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.)	Refer to Chart 07 of TMBC Structures asset Management Planning Toolkit outputs (App C)
Length of any diversion route, if closure is required (over and above existing route) (km)	
Regularity/duration of closures due to flooding: (e.g. number of closures per year; average length of closure (hrs); etc.)	
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)	
Number of existing cyclists; forecasts of cycling usage with and without the scheme (and if available length of journey)	

B7. The Commercial Case (maximum 300 words)

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.

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.

Tameside MBC propose to design the projects and to let the contracts under the preferred procurement route ie via the Chest to appropriately qualified contractors in this field and with whom the council already possesses recent experience. Some of the works may be procured through the Council's in house Tameside MBC Engineering Operations organisation.

The risk of the project will lie with Tameside MBC . The contract timescales will match those shown in the attached spend profiles as far as reasonably practical

**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 is likely to achieve the best value for money outcomes is required from your Section 151 Officer below.*

B8. Management Case - Delivery (maximum 300 words – for b)

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) 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.

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

- b) Please summarise any lessons your authority has learned from the experience of delivering other DfT funded programmes (such as pinch point schemes, local majors, Local Sustainable Transport Fund, and Better Bus Areas) and what would be different on this project as a result.

All major projects are carried out following appropriate project management principles and processes. As part of this approach, post-delivery reviews are undertaken. To date key lessons have been; early contractor involvement may be helpful with regards to planning, option appraisals, techniques and phasing, Innovation etc.

Also, managing of communications and publicity both about why schemes are being promoted and benefits also how impacts are to be mitigated etc. are now core part of delivering major schemes. Locally inform residents and businesses of the value of the

works in the long term, to better assist with the effects of disruption to the network during the works.

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.

Senior Responsible Officer- Ian Saxon Assistant Executive Director - Environmental Services

Project Manager Stephen Hall/ Lee Holland

Key decisions will be made through Tameside Council Standing Orders and other associated approval/ governance processes

B10. Management Case - Risk Management

A risk register covering the top 5 (maximum) specific risks to this scheme should be attached as an annex including, if relevant and in the top 5, financial, delivery, commercial and stakeholder issues. Appendix C/ F

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?

Yes

No

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

The benefits that will result from the implementation of these schemes will include;

Improved safety of road users where structures are upgraded.

Improved reliability of the network. Failures in the current support structures are likely to lead to major localised disruptions in the event of local collapses and the dls benefits of such occurrences should be set against the likely gains of a safe and fully operational network.

Improved access leading to improved links for future investment for jobs

Underpinning of future investment opportunities to increase the number of jobs located in the areas, with increased opportunities for growth of residential and business links

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. Evaluating the outcomes and impacts of schemes is important to show if a scheme has been successful.

The evaluation of the benefit to these schemes will be the elimination of consequential effects of possible future disruption through road lane closures due to local failures or potential loading restriction issues. The schemes will result in a 'safe' network, ready to meet the demands of a locally strong economy.

Whilst TMBC will report on the successful delivery of the project it is understood TfGM will compile a single impact monitoring evaluation report on the overall programme

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 Tameside MBC Retaining wall Structural replacement and strengthening schemes Phase 2, 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 Tameside MBC will have all the necessary powers in place to ensure the planned timescales in the application can be realised.

Name:

ALAN JACKSON

Signed:



Position: HEAD OF ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES
- HIGHWAYS & TRANSPORT

D2. Section 151 Officer Declaration

Tameside MBC

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:

BEN JAY

Signed:



Submission of bids:

The deadline for bid submission is 5pm, 9 February 2015

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

roadmaintenance@dft.gsi.gov.uk copying in steve.berry@dft.gsi.gov.uk

