



Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership

## **Independent Assessment Summary Report: A329 Corridor (Martins Heron) Improvement**

Business Case Independent Assessment

Report No. RT-A087383-20

WYG  
Executive Park  
Avalon Way  
Anstey  
Leicester  
LE7 7GR

15<sup>th</sup> January 2017  
Copyright © WYG EPT Ltd 2017



## REPORT CONTROL

Document: Business Case Independent Assessment

Project: A329 Corridor (Martins Heron) Improvement

Client: Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership

Job Number: A087383

File Origin: N:\Projects\A087383 - Thames Valley LTB Support\reports\2016-11\_Reports\RT20 - Martins Heron A329\

Document Checking:

Primary Author	Gabriel Davis	Initialled:	GD
----------------	---------------	-------------	----

Contributor	Panagiotis Thrasyvoulou	Initialled:	PT
-------------	-------------------------	-------------	----

Contributor		Initialled:	
-------------	--	-------------	--

Review By	Colin Shields	Initialled:	CS
-----------	---------------	-------------	----

Issue	Date	Status	Checked for Issue
1	07/11/2016	Draft	CS
2	09/11/2016	Final	CS
3	15/01/2017	Final	CS

## Contents

1	Executive Summary .....	1
2	Submitted Information.....	2
3	Option Assessment Report - Review .....	3
4	Appraisal Specification Report - Review .....	4
5	Full Business Case Review .....	5
6	Conclusion .....	7
	Appendix A – Business Case Checklist.....	8

## Appendices

Appendix A – Business Case Checklist

# 1 Executive Summary

1.1 This technical note provides an independent review of the A329 Corridor Improvement Business Case submission to the Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership. This scheme has been known as Martins Heron, as alterations to the Martins Heron roundabout form a major part of the scheme.

## SCHEME SUMMARY

1.2 The A329 Corridor Improvements includes the following highway changes:

- Replacement of Martins Heron roundabout with a fully signalised junction;
- Modifying the highway between the junction of A329 London Road / B3017 Priory Road and A329 London Road / Fernbank Road and also the layout at the junctions themselves.

## REVIEW FINDINGS

1.3 A number of items of further information have been requested and these have now been provided.

1.4 The predicted Benefit to Cost Ratio (BCR) of the scheme has been revised downward, reported to be 4.1 over 60 years. A BCR of above 4.0 represents **Very High Value for Money (VfM)**.

1.5 DfT and TVB LEP guidance recommends that only schemes with a High or Very High Value for Money (VfM) be taken forward for funding.

1.6 In conclusion, with the receipt of the additional information that has been provided, it is now possible to fully recommend the Business Case as submitted with the supplementary information.

## 2 Submitted Information

2.1 The Business Case independent assessment was carried out based upon the following reports and appendices submitted by Bracknell Forest Council and their consultant team (WSP/Parsons Brinkerhoff):

- BFC\_A329 Corridor Improvement\_Appraisal Specification Report\_260816.docx;
- BFC\_A329 Corridor Improvements\_Business Case\_FINAL.pdf.
- BFC\_A329 Corridor Improvements\_Additional Information\_FINAL.pdf
- BFC\_A329 Corridor Improvements\_Option Assessment Report\_FINAL.pdf
- BFC\_A329 Corridor Improvements\_Further Information\_FINAL.pdf
- BFC\_A329 Corridor Improvements\_Information\_161216\_FINAL.pdf
- AQ Memo December 2016 issued 161216.pdf
- E-mails from Craig Drennan
- Martins Heron Roundabout Concept.lsg3x
- 5118-001 MHR.DWG (scheme layout)
- MHR-5118-001.pdf (scheme layout)

### 3 Option Assessment Report - Review

3.1 There has now been an Options Assessment Report (OAR) submitted.

## 4 Appraisal Specification Report - Review

4.1 The Appraisal Specification Report (ASR) was reviewed in September 2016. The review identified some items for consideration and explained that these should be addressed before submission of the full business case.

4.2 The WYG review of the ASR is given in the September 2016 note [ref: WYG\_Martins\_Heron-ASR\_Review\_(2016-09-06)].



## 5 Full Business Case Review

- 5.1 The Full Business Case (FBC) contains some omissions that we would expect to see within the document. These have been supplied in supplementary documents and e-mail correspondence.
- 5.2 The document is titled a Business Case. It is assumed here that it is a Full Business Case.
- 5.3 Options assessment is an integral part of the Transport Business Case. The options that have been considered over the history of the scheme are set out in Chapter 3 of the Business Case. These options are presented in an Options Assessment Report (OAR).
- 5.4 Details of the scheme layouts are good. It is easy to understand what the scheme entails. Details of the signal controllers or the signal timings have been submitted.
- 5.5 Scheme costs are £3.8m PVC. A detailed breakdown of the costs is required for the Business Case and has been included in Appendix B. Unfortunately the text in Appendix B as originally supplied was not legible. A legible version has been provided.
- 5.6 Optimism bias of 44% has been applied and no Quantified Risk Assessment (QRA) at the appropriate level of detail has been conducted. It would normally be expected at this stage that a QRA would be undertaken.
- 5.7 The objectives of the A329 Corridor Improvements are to:
- Provide capacity enhancements to deal with the existing capacity whilst also accommodating an increase in future movements within the sub-region, most notably between Bracknell, Ascot, Windsor, Wokingham and beyond;
  - Make the arrival into Bracknell straightforward, attractive and give people a good first impression;
  - Improve journey times, reliability and journey quality for all road users;
  - Improve accessibility to Bracknell for pedestrians, cyclists and road users;
  - Reduce congestion and its environmental impacts.

- 5.8 The scheme has been assessed on pure transport grounds.
- 5.9 The modelling methodology uses the Bracknell Multi-Modal Transport Model (BMMTM), which has been updated to a 2013 base year.
- 5.10 Some significant rerouting appears to occur as a result of the scheme. This is indicated in Table 5.4 and described in the text. Network plots of the area showing the rerouting of traffic have been provided.
- 5.11 Low and High Growth scenarios have been produced as required by WebTAG guidance.
- 5.12 The benefits considered in the appraisal are:
- Economy benefits using TUBA;
  - Greenhouse gases using TUBA.
- 5.13 The scheme appears to affect traffic flows and speeds adjacent to properties. Hence there is a need for environmental assessments. Reasoned arguments are provided that demonstrate it would not be proportionate to undertake full environmental assessments.
- 5.14 The Public Accounts (PA), Transport Economic Efficiency (TEE) and Analysis of Monetised Costs and Benefits (AMCB) tables need to be provided in the Business Case.
- 5.15 Cobalt accident analysis has been performed in order to assess the safety impacts of the scheme.
- 5.16 The revised Linsig produces a new core scenario that is reported to have a **BCR of 4.1**.

## 6 Conclusion

- 6.1 The Full Business Case (FBC) contained some omissions that we would expect to see within the document. These omissions have been supplied in a series of supplementary documents.
- 6.2 The scheme as presented has a **Very High Value for Money** with a **BCR of 4.1**.
- 6.3 DfT and TVB LEP guidance recommends that only schemes with a High or Very High Value for Money (VfM) be taken forward for funding.
- 6.4 In conclusion, it is now possible to recommend the Business Case as submitted, along with the supplementary information.



## Appendix A – Business Case Checklist

Project Number: A087383  
 Scheme: Martins Heron Rbt  
 Submitted by: Slough Borough Council

Strategic Case	Addressed within Business Case	Notes	Economic Case	Addressed within Business Case	Notes	Financial Case	Addressed within Business Case	Notes	Commercial Case	Addressed within Business Case	Notes	Management Case	Addressed within Business Case	Notes
Business Strategy	Y	Sections 4.3, 4.4, 4.5	Options appraised	Y	Section 5.2	Costs	Y	Sections 6.2	Output based specification	Y	Section 7.2	Evidence of similar projects	Y	Section 8.2
Problem Identified	N	Section 4.6. Table 4.1 is presenting the identified problems, but there is no description of the problems (evidence base underpinning this). There shouldn't be a reference to the scheme in this section, only the presentation and the description of the identified problems.	Assumptions	Y	Section 5.3. Clear and detailed. There should be an extra heading separating the Economic Appraisal from the Assumption.	Budgets / Funding Cover	Y	Sections 6.3	Procurement Strategy	Y	Section 7.1 must be changed to 7.3	Programme / Project dependencies	N	A detailed project programme is not yet available.
Impact of not changing	Y	Section 4.9	Sensitivity and Risk Profile	Y	Section 5.4	Accounting Implications	Y	Sections 6.4	Sourcing Options	Y	Section 7.2 must be changed to 7.4	Governance	Y	Section 8.4
Drivers for change	Y	Not assessed but not compulsory	Appraisal Summary Table	Y	Appendix C				Payment Mechanisms	Y	Section 7.3 must be changed to 7.5	Programme / Project Plan	N	A detailed project programme is not yet available.
Objectives	Y	Section 4.10	Value for Money Statement	Y	Section 5.6				Pricing Framework and charging mechanisms	N	Not included	Assurances and approvals	Y	Section 8.5
Measures for success	N	Section 4.11. Measures of success have to be related to the objectives, identifying how the objectives will be appraised. Specific, realistic, measurable and time-bound.							Risk allocation and transfer	Y	Section 7.4 (change numbering appropriately)	Communication & Stakeholders	Y	Section 8.6
Scope	N	not included							Contract length	Y	Section 7.5 (change numbering appropriately)	Project Reporting	Y	Section 8.7
Constraints	Y	Section 4.12							Human resource issues	Y	Not completed but not compulsory	Implementation of work streams	Y	Not included but not compulsory
Inter-dependencies	Y	Section 4.13							Contract management	Y	Section 7.7 (change numbering appropriately)	Key Issues	Y	Section 8.9
Stakeholders	Y	Section 4.14. The contribution of each stakeholder to the scheme should be outlined.										Contract Management	Y	Section 8.10
Options	Y	Chapter 3 - Option Assessment										Risk Management	Y	Section 8.11
												Benefits realisation	Y	Section 8.12
												Monitoring and evaluation	Y	Section 8.13
												Contingency	Y	Section 8.14
												Options	Y	Section 8.15