AGENDA ITEM 5

| Report to Accountability Board | Forward Plan reference number: FP/AB/013, FP/AB/022, FP/AB/023, FP/AB/024, FP/AB/025, FP/AB/029, FP/AB/030 | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Date of Accountability Board Meeting: Date of report: | 8 th April 2016 23 rd March 2016 | | | | | | | |
| Title of report: | Business Case Approval | | | | | | | |
| Report by: | Adam Bryan | | | | | | | |
| Enquiries to: | adam.bryan@essex.gov.uk | | | | | | | |

1. Purpose of report

1.1 The purpose of this paper is to make the Board aware of the value for money assessment of business cases for schemes having been through the Independent Technical Evaluator (ITE) process to enable funding to be devolved to scheme sponsors (county and unitary councils) as part of our capital programme management.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 The Board is asked to approve the business cases for the following schemes which have been assessed as presenting high value for money and medium to high certainty of achieving this:
 - West Kent LSTF: Tackling Congestion (£4.2m)
 - Eastbourne Town Centre Movement & Access Package (£2.5m)
 - Thurrock Cycle Network (£1.8m)
 - Kent Rights of Way Improvement Plan (£0.8m)
 - Kent Strategic Congestion Management Programme (£0.7m)
- 2.2 The Board is asked to consider approving funding the following scheme which presents high value for money with low to medium certainty of achieving this:
 - Kent Sustainable Interventions Programme (£0.5m)

Funding approval is permissible under SELEP's Assurance Framework under an exemption for schemes that present Benefit Cost Ratios greater than 1.5:1, but due to their low cost, the complexity and cost / effort to conduct further economic appraisal would be disproportionate to the value of the scheme.

- 2.3 The Board is asked to approve funding for the following scheme that has not been subject to Independent Technical Evaluation:
 - A13 Widening Project Development (£5m)

3. Background

- 3.1 This report brings forward, for release of funding, projects that have successfully completed the Independent Technical Evaluation process, a condition of our Assurance Framework agreed with Government. The projects are:
 - West Kent LSTF: Tackling Congestion is a package of measures that will address the growing connectivity problems caused in West Kent by traffic congestion and a lack of capacity in the strategic road and rail networks, which is damaging business confidence and the competitive advantage that West Kent businesses have traditionally enjoyed. It will focus in particular on addressing the peak hour congestion caused by the school run and journeys to work by increasing the attractiveness of making door to door journeys by sustainable modes. Infrastructure improvements will be delivered at stations, town centres and key interchange points to facilitate multi-modal journeys using public transport, walking and cycling.
 - Eastbourne Town Centre Movement & Access Package: There are high levels of
 planned housing and commercial development proposed within the strategic
 growth area of Eastbourne and South Wealden. The increased demand that this
 will place on the highway network requires a package of measures to improve
 access and movement within Eastbourne town centre that will be a critical
 element in supporting sustainable economic growth. The package will include:
 - o public realm measures,
 - o bus and rail integration, and
 - o improved provision for pedestrians and cyclists in this corridor.
 - Thurrock Cycle Network: The project will deliver a package of cycling and walking
 focussed at addressing barriers such as crossing facilities and missing routes to
 important destinations, such as railway stations. The new routes to be provided
 will be largely off-road, high-quality pedestrian and cycle infrastructure designed
 especially to attract would-be commuter cyclists who currently drive to work
 because of a lack of safe and convenient cycling infrastructure. The key outcomes
 for Thurrock delivering this project are:
 - improve cycling provision and pedestrian connectivity to increase the number of cycling and pedestrian journeys, reduce the number of vehicle trips in the borough, and reduce local congestion on key routes;
 - o enhance local air quality; and
 - improve the health of Thurrock's residents.

Table 2.1: Gate 1 & 2 Assessment of Growth Deal Schemes seeking Approval for Funding for Q1 2016/17

| | Local Growth | Benefit to | Strategic | Economic | Commercial | Financial Case | Management | As | surance of Value for Mo | ney | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|---|-----------------|---|---|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|---|
| Scheme Name | Fund Allocation (£m) | Cost Ratio ('x' to 1) | Case Summary | Case Summary | Case Summary | Summary | Case Summary | Reasonableness of Analysis | Robustness of Analysis | Uncertainty | | | | | | | |
| | | GATE 1: 8.1 | Green/ Amber | Red/Amber | Red/Amber | Red/Amber | Amber | Reasonable methodology with a need for a more detailed economic case. | There is some confusion over the economic case | A few inaccuracies within the economic case. | | | | | | | |
| West Kent LSTF: Tackling Congestion | 4.2 | GATE 2: 8.2 | Green | Green/ Amber | Amber | Green | Green | A proportionate business case, with a clear and comprehensive economic case. | Confusion has been cleared up and accurate methodology has been employed. | Clarification of the economic case was provided. The analysis is reliable. | | | | | | | |
| Eastbourne Town Centre Movement & | 2.5 | GATE 1: 4.65 | Amber | Amber | Amber | Red/Amber | Amber | Reasonable methodology employed with improvement required in the commercial case | More clarity required over the assumptions used in the economic case | There are minor inaccuracies in the business case which reduce certainty. | | | | | | | |
| Access Package | | GATE 2: 4.65 | Green | Green | Green | Green Green Methodology followed is reasonable and proportionate throughout. Robust and been carried this busine | | | Green Green is reasonable and been carried proportionate this business | | | | Green | | | | Inaccuracies have been cleared up and the business case provides a high level of certainty. |
| Thurrock Cycle Network | 1.8 | GATE 1: 2.9 (Middle Scenario) | Red/ Amber | Amber | Red | Red/Amber | Amber | Reasonable and proportionate method, but lacking significant sections of necessary analysis | Some sections are lacking sufficient robustness of analysis | There is some uncertainty, particularly around the commercial case. | | | | | | | |
| | | GATE 2: 2.9 (Middle Scenario) | Green/ Amber | Green | Green | Amber | Green/ Amber | Reasonable and proportionate method followed throughout. | Additional analysis has ensured that the analysis is robust. | The analysis gives a good degree of certainty. | | | | | | | |

| (150,000) (4 (16,000) (4 (16,000) (1 (190,00 | (10 (10 (10 (10 (10 (10 (10 (10 (10 (10 | (100, 20 (54, 20 (5, 20 (2, 20, 20 (2, 20, 20 (3, 20 (6, 20 (10, 20 (1 | Option Chosen Option 4 | Notes |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| 2015;16 2016;10 2016;20 2016;2 | (4 (4 (4 (4 (4 (4 (4 (4 (4 (4 (4 (4 (4 (| (100, 30 (54, 30 (1, 000, 30 (2, 20 (2, 20 (2, 20 (3, 20 (10, | Option Chosen Option 4 | Notes |
| 100,000 100, | (10 (10 (10 (10 (10 (10 (10 (10 (10 (10 | (54,00 (54,00 (2,00 (2,00 (2,00 (2,00 (3,00 (10,00 | Option Chosen Option 4 | Notes |
| Companies | (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) | (1) (2) (2) (3) | Option 4 | |
| (180,000) (190 | (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) | (10) | Option 4 | |
| (16,000) (70,000) (1,000,000) (1,1,000,000) | (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) | (1) | Option 4 Option 4 Option 4 Option 4 Option 4 Option 4 | Covered by approval at February Accountability Board |
| (190,000) (175,0 | (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) | (1) | Option 4 Option 4 Option 4 Option 4 Option 4 | Covered by approval at February Accountability Board |
| (190,000) (192,000) (192,000) (1,950,000) (2,155,000) (1,350,000) (1,255,000) (1,255,000) (1,255,000) (1,255,000) (1,255,000) (1,250,000) (1,250,000) (1,250,000) (1,250,000) (1,28,000) (1 | (1) (1) (2) (1) (2) (3) (4) (4) (6) (6) (6) (6) (6) (6) (6) (6) (6) (6 | (2) | Option 4 Option 4 Option 4 Option 4 | Covered by approval at February Accountability Board |
| (1,380,000) (1,255,000) (1,255,000) (380,000) | (1, 2, 1) (2, 1) (3, 1) (4, 1) | 2) | Option 4 Option 4 | Covered by approval at February Accountability Board |
| (1,380,000) (1,255,000) (396,000) (396,000) (396,000) (396,000) (396,000) (310,000) (400,000) (326,000) (3 | (1) | | Option 4 Option 4 | Covered by approval at February Accountability Board |
| (390,000) (396,000) (396,000) (310,000) (310,000) (310,000) (310,000) (310,000) (326,0 | S S S S S S | | Option 4 | Offset against other underspends |
| (300,000) (310,000) (310,000) (310,000) (40,000) (400,000) (350,000) (336,000) (138,000) (138,000) (138,000) (138,000) (138,000) (138,000) (138,000) (138,000) (138,000) (138,000) (138,000) (138,000) (138,000) (138,000) (138,000) (138,000) (138,000) (1380,000) (138 | 8 8 5 6 | | Option 4 | Covered by approval at February Accountability Board |
| 40,000 (40,000) (40,000) (40,000) (350,000) (350,000) (350,000) (138,000) (1 | 4, 8) 12, 9) 0 | | | Covered by approval at February Accountability Board |
| (400,000) (350,000) (400,000) (356,000) (356,000) (356,000) (138,000) (138,000) (138,000) (138,000) (128,000) (550,000) (550,000) (550,000) (550,000) (550,000) (1,28,000) (1,28,000) (2,300,000) (2,300,000) (1,384,000) (1,000,000) (1,0 | (13) | | | |
| (356,000) (336,000) 10,000 (138,000) 1128,000 (138,000) 128,000 (128,000) (500,000) (956,000) (500,000) (3,881,000) (2,300,000) (1,100,000) (1,280,000) (1,100,000) (1,280,000) (1,100,000) (1,280,000) (1,100,000) (1,280,000) (1,100,000) (1,280,000) (1,100,000) (1,280,000) (1,100,000) (15,266,000) (22,178,000) (1,280,000) (22,178,000) (1,280,000) (22,178,000) (1,280,000) (1,280,000) (1,280,000) (22,178,000) (1,280,000) (22,178,000) | (3) | | | |
| - 4,000 (138,000) (138,000) (138,000) (138,000) (138,000) (138,000) (23,000,000) (23,000,000) (3,861,000) (1,100,000) (1,100,000) (1,100,000) (1,100,000) (1,250 | (1) | | | Offset against other underspends |
| 10,000 (138,000) | | | | Offset against other underspends |
| (138,000) | | | | |
| 128,000 129,000 (500,000) (990,000) (990,000) (990,000) (990,000) (990,000) (990,000) (990,000) (990,000) (990,000) (990,000) (1,000,000) | | 1 | | Offset against overspend |
| (500,000) (990,000) (950,000) (916,000) (3,881,000) (3,881,000) (3,881,000) (1,480,000) (1,384,000) (1,000,000) (1,100,000) (1,100,000) (1,000,000) (1,100,000) (1,100,000) (1,000,000) (1,100,000) (1,100,000) (1,000,000) (1,100,000) (1,100,000) (1,000,000) (1,100,000) (1,100,000) (1,000,000) (1,100,000) (1,100,000) (1,100,000) (1,100,000) (1,100,000) (1,100,000) (1,100,000) (1,100,000) (1,100,000) | | | | Offset against underspend |
| (e56,000) (e16,000) (7,300,000) (7,381,000) (7,381,000) (7,381,000) (7,381,000) (7,381,000) (7,000,000 | | | Option 4 | Covered by approval at February Accountability Board |
| (2,300,000) (3,881,000) (1,981,000) (1,981,000) (1,981,000) (1,982 | | | | Offset against other underspends |
| haridge Rd Junction (1,480,000) (1,384,000) (1,384,000) (1,280,000) (1,100,000) (1,100,000) (1,100,000) (1,000,000 | | (1,561,000) | Option 4 | Covered by approval at February Accountability Board |
| (1,480,000) (1,834,000) (1,000,000) (1,100,000) (1,100,000) (1,100,000) (1,100,000) (1,100,000) (1,000,000) (1,000,000) (1,000,000) (1,000,000) (1,000,000) (1,250 | | (403,000) | Option 4 | Covered by approval at February Accountability Board |
| (1,000,000) (1,100,000) (1,250,000 863,000 (7,000,000) (8,317,000) (1,6,266,000) (22,178,000) (2,178,000) (2,178,000) (1,250,000 505,000 700,000 700,000 700,000 700,000 700,000 | | | Option 4 | Covered by approval at February Accountability Board |
| 1,250,000 863,000 (7,000,000) (8,317,000) (7,000,000) (1,000,000) (1,000,000) (1,000,000) (1,250,000 505,000) (1,250,000 700,000) | | | Option 4 | Covered by approval at February Accountability Board |
| (7,000,000) (8,317,000) (1,000,000) (1,000,000) (1,000,000) (1,000,000) (1,250,000) (22,178,000) (1,250,000) (1,250,000) (1,250,000) (1,250,000) (1,00 | | | Option 4 | Covered by approval at February Accountability Board |
| 1,000,000 1,000,000 (1,000,000 (1,000,000 (1,000,000 (1,000,000 (1,000) (1,000 | | | Option 4 | Covered by approval at February Accountability Board |
| (16,286,000) (22,178,009) (6 5,400,000 6,410,000 1,280,000 505,000 700,000 440,000 | | | | |
| 5,400,000 6,410,000 1,250,000 505,000 720,000 440,000 | | | | |
| 5,400,000 6,410,000 1,250,000 505,000 700,000 440,000 | | | | |
| 1,250,000 505,000 720,000 440,000 | | | | Project approved |
| 760,000 440,000 | | | | Project approved |
| | | | | Project approved |
| Maidstone Sustainable Access to Employment Areas | 230,000 230,000 | • | | Project approved |
| A28 Chart Road 1,000,000 1,000,000 (80 000) | | | | Project approved |
| 6,000 | | 00009 | | Project approved |
| Rathmore Road Link, Gravesend 1,740,000 1,740,000 - | | 1 | | Project approved |
| Maidstone Integrated Transport 50,000 50,000 | | | | Project approved |
| 10,470,000 10,381,000 (89,000) | | | | |
| | | | | |
| (000,100,8) (000,767,11) (000,867,2) | | | | |

| | 2016/17 Profiled Allocations and 2017/18 Onwards Indicative Allocations | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---------------------------|--|--------------------|-------------|--------------|------------------------|-------------|--------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| | | Transferring to | Status | 2015/16 - ACT | 2016/17 | 2017/10 | 2018/19 | | 2020/21 | Total | Original total D |
| | | - | | E | - 1 | | | 1 | t | Ī | |
| ELEP Ruf Gov Rut GF00001 LGFSE1 | Projects in fight (with adjustments for 15/16 mitigations) Skills Capital Programme | Heid centrally | Annual | 0.000.000 | 12.076.640 | | - 1 | - | | 22,000,000 | 22.000.000 |
| GF00001 LGFSE1 | Skills Capital Programme Mewhaven Flood Defences | East Sussex CC | Approved | 9,923,380 | 12,076,640 | 400,000 | | , | | 1,500,000 | 1,500,000 |
| GF00003 LGF5E3 | Kent and Medway Growth Hub | Kent CC | Approved | 30,000 | 2,000,000 | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | | 6,000,000 |
| GF00004 LGFSE4 | Colchester Broadband Infrastructure | Essex CC | Approved | 200,000 | | | | 4 | - | 200,000 | 200,000 |
| OFCCCCS LGFSE5 | Southend SCAAF - Non Transport | Southend | Approved | 30,000 | 690,000 | 2.000,000 | 2,000,000 | 2,000,000 | - | 6,720,000 | 6.720.000 |
| GF00006 LGFSE6 GF00007 LGFSE7 | Tenbridge Town Centre Regeneration Sittingbourne Town Centre Regeneration | Kent CC Kent CC | Approved Approved | 1,808,000 | 2.155.500 | - 1 | | | - 1 | 2,400,000 | 2,400,000 |
| GF00000 LGFSEB | M30 Junction 4 Eastern Overtinage | Kart CC | Approved | 945,000 | 1,255,000 | | | | | 2,200,000 | 2.200,000 |
| GF00010 LGF5E10 | Kent Thameside LSTF | Kent CC | Approved | 2,090,000 | 810,000 | 500,000 | 400,000 | 400,000 | 300,000 | 4,500,000 | 4,500,000 |
| GF00011 LGFSE11 | Maidstone Gynatory Bypess | Kent CC | Approved | 1,040,000 | 3,580,000 | | - | | | 4,600,000 | 4,600,000 |
| GF00013 LGFEE13 GF00017 LGFEE17 | North Deal transport improvements | Kent CC | Actioned | | 800,000 | - 4 | - 1 | - | - 4 | 800,000 | 800,000 |
| GF00017 LGF5E17 GF00010 LGF5E15 | Folkestone Sections ; orable infrastructure and engineering works A289 Four Elms Roundabout to Methery Tunnel Journey time and Natiwah Improvements | Kant CC Medway | Agerowid | 500,000 | 1,100,000 | 4,500,000 | 5.000,000 | - | * | 11,100,000 | 11,100,000 |
| GF00018 LGFSE19 | Strood Town Centre Journey Time and Accessability Enhancements | Medicay | Approved Approved | 210,000 | 1 250,000 | 3,980,000 | 3.950,000 | | | 9.000.000 | 8,000,000 |
| GF00000 LGF5E20 | Chatham Town Centre Place-making and Public Realm Package | Medway | Approved | 861,000 | 818,000 | 2.321,000 | | - | - 4 | 4,000,000 | 4,000,000 |
| GF00021 LGF5E21 | Medway Cycling Action Plan | Mediray | Approved | 229,000 | 1,000,000 | 1,271,000 | - | + | - | 2,500,000 | 2,500,000 |
| GF00022 LGFSE22 | Medway City Estate Connectivity Improvement Measures | Medway | Apprined | 100,000 | 300,000 | 400,000 | 800,000 | - | + | 2,000,000 | 2,000,000 |
| GF00023 LGFSE23 | Heilshem-Pologate/Eastbourne Sustainable Transport Corridor Coichester LSTF | East Susser CC | Approved | 1 040 000 | * | 2,100,000 | - | | - 1 | 2,100,000 | 2,100,000 |
| GF00025 LGFSE25 GF00026 LGFSE26 | Coichester Integrated Transport Package | Essex CC Essex CC | Approved Approved | 1,010,000 | 990,000 | 1,858,000 | 1,858,000 | | 7 | 5,000,000 | 2,000,000 5,000,000 |
| DF00027 LGFSE27 | Colchester Town Centre | Essex CC | Approved | 1,139,000 | 3,861,000 | The state of | 770003000 | | - | 5,000,000 | 5,000,000 |
| SF00028 LGFSE28 | TOSE LSTF - Essex | Essex CC | Approved | 1,997,000 | 1,003,000 | | | | :+ | 3,000,000 | 3,000,000 |
| GF00029 LGF5E29 | TGSE LSTF - Southend | Southend | Approved | 800,000 | 200,000 | | | | - | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 |
| F00030 LGFSE30 | TGSE LSTF - Thurtock A414 Pinch Point Package: A414 First Avenue & Cembridge Rd junction | Thurrock | Approved | 800,000 | 2,834,000 | 2 000 000 | 1 | - | - | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 |
| 3F00032 LGF8E32 | A414 Maldon to Chalmsford RBS | Essex CC Essex CC | Approved Approved | 5,186,000 | 1,000,000 | 2,000,000 | | | | 2,000,000 | 2,000,000 |
| GF00033 LGFSE30 | Chemsford Station / Station Square / Mill Yard | Essax CC | Approved | 400,000 | 1,575,000 | 1,025,000 | | - 1 | 1 | 3,000,000 | 3,000,000 |
| GF00034 LGF5E34 | Basildon Integrated Transport Package | Essex CC | Approved | 1,853,000 | 58,000 | 1,866,000 | 1,868,000 | 1,868,000 | 1,445,000 | 9,000,000 | 9,000,000 |
| | Queeraway Gateway Road | East Sussex CC | Approved | 1,683,000 | 4,317,000 | 4 | - | 4 | - | 6,000,000 | 15,000,000 (9,0 |
| F00037 L0F5E36 | | Essex CC | Approved | 6,800,000 | (1,000,000) | 25 (22 44) | 15 (75 14) | 8.000 cm | 2.444.444 | 5,800,000 | 5,800,000 |
| | Total | | | 43,022,860 | 44,275,140 | 52 627 000 | 16,478,000 | 9,260,000 | 2,745,000 | 137,420,000 | 146,420,000 (9,0 |
| Annual Lauren | Projects in fight +1 year approval only | 434 | T I American | 1 2000 | 200 | | - | - | | 4 244 244 | 130000 |
| 2F00009 LGFSE9 | A35 London Rd Spoidharst Rd Year The Rd. Tun Welle Kert Stateson Companion Management assessment | Kant CC Kant CC | Approved - 1st yr sety | 800,000 | 198,000 | 1,000,000 | 800,000 | 800,000 | 800,000 | 1,800,000 | 4,800,000 |
| 3F00014 L0FSE14 | Kent Stategic Congestion Management programme Kent Rights of Way improvement plan | Kert CC | Approved - 1st yr only Approved - 1st yr only | 200,000 | 200,000 | 150,000 | 150,000 | 150,000 | 150,000 | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 |
| 2F00015 LGFSE15 | Kent Sustainable Interventions programme | Kert CC | Approved - 1st yr only | 164,000 | 550,000 | 800,000 | 600,000 | 586,000 | 500,000 | 3,000,000 | 3,000,000 |
| FOODIS LOFSEIS | West Kant LSTF | Kert CC | Approved - 1st yr orly | 804,000 | 1,396,000 | 700.000 | 700,000 | 700,000 | 900,000 | 4,900,000 | 4,900,000 |
| F00024 LGFSE24 | Eastbourne and South Wealden Walking and Cypling LBTF peckage | East Sussex CC | Approved - Tat yr only | 600,000 | 750,000 | 500,000 | 1,750,000 | 2.500,000 | 2,500,000 | | 8,600,000 |
| | Total | | | 3,172,000 | 3,892,000 | 3,760,000 | 4,000,000 | 4,736,000 | 4,550,000 | 24,100,000 | 24,100,000 |
| | Projects in flight - Emorget Soward for approval early | | | | | | | | | | |
| F00085 LGFSE51 | North Bexhill Access Road | East Sussex CC | Approved | 6,410,000 | 6,190,000 | 4,000,000 | - | - 4 | | 16,600,000 | 5,000,000 11,0 |
| 3F00066 LGFSE49 | Swallows Business Park | East Sussex CC | Approved | 506,000 | 885,000 | - | - | - | - | 1,400,000 | 1,400,000 |
| 0F00007 LOFSE50 0F00005 LOFSE47 | Sovereign Herrour Innovation Fert/Strategy; Infrastructure Meldatone Sustainable Access to Employment Areas | East Sussex CC Kent CC | Approved Approved | 440,000 230,000 | 1,770,000 | - | | - 4 | - 1 | 1,700,000 | 1,700,000 |
| 3/00054 LGFSE48 | A28 Stury Road Integrated Transport Package | Kert CC | Approved | 6,000 | 40.000 | 254,000 | | - | | 300,000 | 300,000 |
| 3F00008 LGF9E42 | A28 Chart Road | Kert CC | Approved | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | 6,000,000 | 1,200,000 | | 10,200,000 | 10,200,000 |
| DF00053 LGF5E45 | | Kert CC | Approved | 1,740,000 | 2,480,000 | - 4 | - | | - 4 | 4,200,000 | 4,200,000 |
| PRODON LOFSE41 | Maidatone Integrated Transport Tetal | (Kent 00 | Approved - Feb T yr only | 50,000 | 1,250,000 | 7,254,000 | 2,000,000 8,000,000 | | - 1 | 8,900,000 45,300,000 | 8,900,000 |
| | | 7 | | THE COUNTY | - Control | | | | - | | |
| DF000e1 | Later starts not yet crought breand Thaner Parkney | Kant CC | Flot approved | 1 | - 2 | 4,000,000 | 6,000,000 | | 1 | 10,000,000 | 10,000,000 |
| 2F00040 LGFSB44 | Stury Link Road | Kart CC | Not approved | | 1,000,000 | 2,450,000 | 2.450,000 | | | 5,900,900 | 5,900,000 |
| F00042 | Heatings and Beshill Juryction capacity improvements package | East Sussex CC | Not approved | 1 | | 1,500,000 | 1,500,000 | 1,500,000 | 1,500,000 | 6,900,000 | 6,000,000 |
| F90042 | Hastings and Baxhill LSTF walking and cycling package | East Sussex CC | Not approved | - | - | | 2,000,000 | 2,000,000 | 2,000,000 | 5,000,000 | 8,000,000 |
| F00044 | Eastbourne town certre LSTF access & Impresement package | East Sussex CC | Not approved. | | 2,480,000 | 505,000 | 1,500,000 | 1,500,000 | | 6,000,000 | 8,000,000 |
| F00045 | Southers and Rochand SCAAP (Southers Central Area Action Plan) - Transport Package | Southend | Net approved | 1 9 | 1,750,000 | 1,750,000 | 1,500,000 | 2,000,000 | - 1 | 7,000,000 5,000,000 | 7,000,000 5,000,000 |
| F00047 | Thurrock Cycle Network Lendon Gateway/Stanford is Hope | Thurrock Thurrock | Not approved | 1 | 1,000,000 | 2,000,000 | 3,000,000 | 1,000,000 | 500,000 | 7,500,000 | 7,500,000 |
| F00048 | A131 Chelmsford to Braintree | Essex CC | Not approved | | 10000000 | 1,830,000 | 1,830,000 | - Deriotti | 900000 | 3,660,000 | 3,660,000 |
| P00049 | A414 Hanow to Chairmsford | Essex CC | Not approved | - | | | 1,830,000 | 1,830,000 | - | 3,880,000 | 3,660,000 |
| 3F00050 | A133 Colchester to Clacton | Essex CC | Not approved | | - 4 | | 1,370,000 | 1,370,000 | | 2,740,000 | 2,740,000 |
| H00051 | A131 Braintree to Surbury A13 Widening – development | Essex CC | Not approved | | 5,000,000 | | | 900,000 | 900,000 | 1,900,000 5,000,000 | 1,800,000 5,000,000 |
| F00052 | A13 Widening - development Purfeet Centre | Thurrock Thurrock | Not approved Not approved | | 5,000,000 | | | | | 5,000,000 | 5,000,000 |
| P00067 | Southend and Rochford Joint Area Action Plan (Airport) | Essex CC | Not approved | | 3,200,000 | | | - | | 3,200,000 | 3,200,000 |
| 3F00058 | Dover Western Dock Ravval | Kert CC | Not approved | | 5,000,000 | , | 1 | | - | 5,000,000 | 5,000,000 |
| | Ashford International Rail Connectivity (Ashford Spurs) | Kent CC | Not approved | - | 2,000,000 | 1 840 100 | 2000 | - 4 | - | 2,000,000 | 2,000,000 |
| JF00060 | Westhanger Lorry Park | Kert CC | fitt approved | - | | | 2,000,000 | - 1 | | 3,000,000 | 3,000,000 |
| F00062 | Rochester Airport Falkestone Seafrant | Madway Kent OC | Not approved Interpret | 1 | 4,000,000 | 1,000,000 | 1 | - 1 | - | 4,400,000 5,000,000 | 4,400,000 5,000,000 |
| F00060 | Chairestore Seattors Chairestord City Growth Area Scheme | Esses CC | fex approved | | | | 3,500,000 | 5,500,000 | 1 | 10,000,000 | 10,000,000 |
| DF00064 | Chelmaford Flood Alleviation Scheme | Easax CC | fiet approved | | | * | 800,000 | | | 800,000 | 800,000 |
| F00065 | Beshill Enterprise Park - now subsumed within North Beshill Access Rid | East Suseex CC | Not approved | - 1 | - | - 4 | - | - 4 | - 4 | | 2,600,000 (2.6 |
| F0008 | Housing Regeneration Project (Coastal Group) | Held Centrally | Not approved | - | 2.000,000 | 4 | - 2 | 4411 | 4000 | 2,000,000 | 2,000,000 |
| F00070 | Beautieu Park Railway Station | Essex CC | Not approved | | - | 1,250,000 | 25 400 000 | 5,750,000 | 5,000,000 | 12,000,000 | 12,000,000 |
| SF00071 | M20 Junction 10s A738 London Road 8255 St Clarinatis Was | Held centrally | Not approved | 1 | - | 8.300,000 | 1,400,000 | 3,100,000 | 1 | 4,200,000 | 19,700,000 |
| 2F00072 2F90073 | A225 London Road B255 St Clements Way A32/A27 pasters improvement policings | Kerd CC Earl Server CC | Not approved. | | | | 71 (586) (466) | | 2,000,000 | | 4,000,000 |
| | Total | | | 4 | 34,745,000 | 21,635,000 | 43,780,000 | | | | 153,160,000 (2,6 |
| | Grand initial | 7 | | 55 575 060 | 87,777 146 | 68.322 656 | 72.268 MM | 43.264.000 | 19,105,000 | 357,700 000 | 387,380,000 |
| | Grand total | | | 90,515,860 | 47,117,140 | 90,022,000 | 12,298,000 | 44, £94,000 | 19,190,000 | 507,000,000 | 301,000,000 |
| | Total grant funding (15/16)/indicative funding (future years) | | | 69,450,000 | B2,270,227 | 68,176,467 | 72,365,037 | 45,002,319 | 28,422,319 | 365,685,369 | |
| | Principles surprise based partition programmy a laborate by a security | 1 | | (11,797,500) | 11.797 536 | 1 | | - 3 | | 1 | |
| | Funding awaps to local partner programmes (should be net nil) Skills carry-forward | 1 | | (1,076,640) | | | | - 4 | | | |
| | Pro- | 7 | | | 2,832,773 | A AND STORY | igna pase | N 745 016 | (9 502 a.m.) | IR SAR WAS | |
| | Difference | _ | | - 3 | 2,612,778 | 746,633 | (109,037) | [1,746,310] | (9,227,319) | (8,306,368) | |
| | Related Schemes | 1 | | _ | | | | | | | |
| | A127 Road Safety and Nativon: Resilience Peckage | Essex CC | Approved - DIT | | 1,100,000 | 500,000 | 400,000 | 1,400,000 | - 1 | 4,000,000 | |
| | A127 Junction Improvements: Kert Eline Collect A127 Microsoppe and Rooms Maintenance | Southend Southend | Approved - DVT | | 3,800,000 | 200,000 | 1,000,000 | 3,000,000 | 3,000,000 | 4,500,000 8,000,000 | |
| | A127 Highways and Bridge Maintenance A127 Fairgles Interchange Junction Improvements | Essex CC | Approved - DIT Not suproved | 400,000 | 300,000 | AN,000 | 1,00,00 | | 10,000,000 | | |
| SECOND LOCKEST | | | | - | | notes forces | 3,440,000 | - | | | |
| F00079 LGFSE37 F00062 LGFSE40 | A127 Junction Improvements: The Bell | Southend | Not supproved | | 140 | 300,000 | 2,042,000 | - | - | 4,500,000 | |
| F00079 LGFSE37 F00062 LGFSE40 F00064 | A127 Junction Improvements: The Bell A13 Widening | Southend 7 | Not approved Not approved. | | 1 | | 25,000,000 | - 1 | - 1 | 75,000,000 | |

Deliverability Risk Assessment - Approach

- 1.7 This assesses the deliverability risk associated with a particular scheme. The deliverability risk considers:
 - Specific project risks these relate to public acceptability, feasibility and so on. A 'RAG'
 assessment will be made against each of these deliverability criteria.
 - Risk outcomes The impact of individual risks on overall deliverability risk in terms of key outcomes – these will also be RAG rated:
 - Programme risk what is the a risk / likelihood that the scheme will be delivered later than planned?
 - Showstopper risk what is the risk / likelihood that the scheme could be either cancelled or delayed beyond the LGF programme period – i.e. drop out of the programme?

Specific project risks

1.8 Below we list the key project specific risks and the considerations that will be taken into account in making the RAG assessment. The RAG rating will be based on an informed judgement taking account of these considerations (rather than through a formulaic approach), and supported by a rationale.

| Ris | ik Area | Key Considerations |
|-----|--|---|
| | Public and Stakeholder Acceptability | Does the project have public and stakeholder support? Has public consultation been undertaken? Does the nature of the scheme mean the proposal is likely to face greater acceptability risk? |
| | Feasibility | Is the proposal: Technically feasible (engineering feasibility) Technologically feasible (proven technology) Legally feasible – can be delivered within regulatory and legal framework (e.g. State Aid) |
| | Planning Risk | What powers / consents are required? Have they been secured? What is the risk that powers / consents may not be granted? |
| | Cost Risk / Affordability / Funding | What is the risk (how likely) and impact (who bears the risk and could it be absorbed) of a cost over-run? What is the status of 3rd Party Funding – identified, committed, secured etc.? |
| | Value for Money | What is the VfM case for the scheme? What is the risk it could fall below the VfM threshold (as per the SELEP Assurance Framework) |
| | Complexity / Dependence Flexibility of Scheme | Does the scheme rely on a range of institutions to deliver the project? Are there significant project dependencies? Is the scheme flexible – can it be re-defined in scope and detail to mitigate certain risks |

Deliverability Risk Assessment – Outputs

- 1.9 The outputs from the deliverability assessment will include:
 - A scheme by scheme risk summary, including project specific risks and risk outcomes.
 - Overall programme-level risks including overall value of schemes, by year, in the low, medium and high risk categories.

| t R | th c | Ř | the | tbc | Ř | tbc | tbc | LGFSE51 | LGFSESO | LGFSE49 | LGFSE48 | LGFSE47 | LGFSE46 | LGFSEAS | LGFSE44 | LGFSE43 | LGFSE42 | LGFSE41 | LGFSE40 | (GFSE39) | LGFSE38 | LGFSE37 | LGFSE96 | LGFSE35 | LGFSE34 | | LGFSE31 | |
|------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|---|--|---|---|--|--|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|-------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| A131 Chelmsford to Braintree | London Gateway/Stanford le Hope | Thurrock Cycle Network | Southend Central Area Action Plan (SCAAP) - Transport Package | Eastbourne town centre LSTF access & improve package | package | Hastings and Beshill junction capacity improvements package | Thatet Partway | North Beshill Access Road and Beshill Enterprise Park | Sovereign Harbour (alca Site Infrastructure investment) | Swallow Business Park, Hailsham (A22/A27 Growth Corridor) | Additional Spars | Maidstone Sustainable Access to Employment | A28 Sturry Rd Integrated Transport Package | Rathmore Road | A28 Sturry Link Road | Maidstone integrated Transport | A28 Chart Road | A127 Essential Bridge and Highway Maintenance Southend | A127 The Bell | A127 Kent Elms Corner | A127 Capacity Enhancements Road Safety and Network Resilience (ECC) | A127 Fairglen Junction Improvements | Colchester Park and Ride and Bus Priority measures | Queensway Gateway Road | Basildon Integrated Transport Package | Chelmsford Station / Station Square / Mill Yard | Cambridge Rd junction A414 Maldon to Chelmsford RBS | Project Name |
| Esen | Thurrock | Thurrock | Southend | ment East Sussex | East Sussex | East Sussex | Kent | East Sussex | East Sussex | wth East Sussex | Kent | Kent | Kent | Kent | Kent | Kent | Kent | Southend (retained) | Southend (retained) | Southerd (retained) | Essex (retained) | Essex (retained) | es Essex | East Sussex | Essex | Essex | Essex | Promoter |
| | g | × | W | 3 | × | | 2 | | Ì | Ì | Z | | | | | | | N | | × | | N | | | | | - | Stakeholder Acceptability - Assessment |
| Within highway | Subject to detail I BC | | | Risk around consultation | consultation | Within highway | Subject to detail in BC, Require positive support of potential operator and/or DIT Rail (as franchisee) | Consultation | | | Subject to detail in BC | | | | | | | tbc | the | tòc | | фс | | Consultation complete | | Delays due to complexity | | Comment |
| 1 | 7 | | | | | | in adulye dative | | | | 5 | | | | | | ı | | | | | | | İ | | | | Feasibility - Assessment |
| | | The second secon | | | | | Project is feasible | | | | Project is feasible. However, should seek assurance that HSI services would stop at Ashford if infrastructure provided. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | The second secon | Comment |
| - | | | × | | | | ble M | 2 | | | a dd as | | | 2 | | | | × | × | N | | E | | K | | | - | (securing of powers & consents) - Assessment |
| | | BC Subject to detail in | Subject to detail in BC | | | | Subject to detail in BC | Risk/threat of judicial review | | | Subject to detail in BC | | | Land acquisition planned for 15/16, but some risk of delay to Q1 16/17 | | | | Ř | th | thc | | tbc | | Risk / threat of judicial review | | | | Comment |
| Page | Z | 5 | 5 | | | | 5 | | | | = | ı | | 17 | | | | 3 | × | × | | 8 | | ı | | | | Affordability / Funding - Assessment |
| Page 86 of 196 | Risk linked to complexity | scalable | tbc, but should be scalable | | scalable | thc, but should be scalable thc, but should be | Latest cost estimate is significantly above £10m (GF allocation, so currently a funding gap exists, further design/cost work on-going. | | | | EU match funding not secured. Currently a funding gap. | | | | | | | uncertainty | uncertainty | uncertainty | | uncertainty | | | | | | Comment |
| 196 | z | 8 | 8 | | | r 7 | F M M | | | h | of the second | | | | | | | × | 3 | 3 | | W | | ı | | | | VFM RISK - Assessment |
| VIM uncertain | VfM uncertain | probably good VfM | probably good VIIM | | probably good VRM | VIM uncertain, but probably good VIM VIM uncertain, but | VIM uncertain | | | | VIM uncertain | | | | | | | VfM uncertain | VM/uncertain | VRA uncertain | | VfM uncertain | | | | | | Comment |
| | r/w | | M | Ī | 3 | | ž | ı | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | I | 2 | | | Flexibility of Scheme - Assessment |
| | Low for Phase 1. M for Phase 2 (Station refurb) | | Ř | | - | 130012 | the | | | | Mix of funding parties, NR delivery, and HS1 operator. | - | | | | | | tbc | 菜 | the | | tbc | | | Delays to forecourt works | delivery - ECC, NR and TOC | contractors | Comment Delay caused |
| | | | | | | | | | | | # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # | 1 | | 1 | 1 2 6 | 1 8 | | 2.5 | | | # P | 2.1 | n/a Co | | ge . | Z 2 | - 8 | Showstopper Risk |
| | | | | | | | Current funding pap, and VfM uncertain. | | | | Currently HSL operator has stated that service only guaranteed if delivered by 2018. Therefore programme risk effectively translates into showstopper risk. | 15/16 start | Brought forward from 16/17 for | Brought forward from 15/17 for 15/16 start | Business case not ready for spending in 15/16 - moving back to 16/17 start | Brought forward from 16/17 for 15/15 start | Brought forward from 16/17 for 15/16 start | risks | risks | risks | Being implemented the - but unlikely to be showstooper | risks | Complete | JR potential to delay project | Being implemented | Complex project | Being implemented | Constners |
| | Z | 2 | | × | | | | × | | | | N | × | 2 | × | | | | | | | 2 | | M | z | Z | | Programme risk |
| | Phase 1 planning on spending in Q4 of 16/17 > tight programme. Phase 2 more complex and greater inherent risk. | Consultation > delay risk | Low risk for 16/17, subject to AB in June | planned expenditure for Q4 16/17, so delay would impact on spend in year. | on spend in year. Consultation > potential delay risk. Includes | Consutation > potential delay risk. All planned | Verrick kouns currently unresolved implications for programme. | Planning risk | | | Funding issues to be resolved. | The state of the s | Approved but scheme on hold until 16/17 | Three quarters of spend land acquisition. Minor risk of slippage to $16/17$ | Business case not ready for spending in 15/16 - moving back to 16/17 start | Sippage from spend identified in 15/16 but, as scheme brought forward, not perceived to be risk for 16/17 | scheme brought forward, not perceived to be risk for 15/17 | the - but unlikely to be showstopper risks Slippage from spend identified in 15/16 but, as | tbc - but unlikely to be showstopper risks | tbc - but unlikely to be showstopper risks | | programme risks | Complete Off / HE processes and planning [the] present | Slippage from 15/16 and planning risk | Slippage from 15/16 to 16/17, but should be able to spend within 16/17. | Sippage from 15/16 to 16/17, but should be able to spend within 16/17. | special returns on the | Continent Sippage from 15/16 to 16/17, but should be able to |