Scheme Name: **South East Blackburn**

ANNEX A

Scheme Description:
Upgrading of A6077 Haslingden Rd to 4-lane single carriageway between Lions Drive and Old Bank Lane with new upgraded northern access to Royal Blackburn Hospital and junction upgrades along the route of the widened road.
Construction of a new link road through Blackamoor Rd development site connecting Blackamoor Rd with Roman Rd at existing Newfield Dr junction, with junction converted to signals and remodelled, and stopping up of Blackamoor Rd arm at existing Blackamoor Rd/Roman Rd/Stopes Brow junction

The purpose of this review is to examine the evidence base for the above scheme in order to identify any gaps
Additional work can then be undertaken on the scheme to ensure the business case for the scheme is comprehensive, which will limit the risk of future challenges.

Business Case	Criteria	Evidence	RAG Analysis	Jacobs Recommendations on Draft SOBC chapters	Promoter Response (Capita)
STRATEGIC	Existing arrangements for the provision of services	*Include a description of the current situation* Mostly covered directly by Section 1.1 *Can services be better utilised, or are more fundamental changes required?* Section 1.1 and 1.2 provide this detail *What are the constraints?* Detail in Section 1.5		Existing structure of highway network shown, limited info on other modes and land use, wider layout of Blackburn and surrounding area. Some additional detail on key drivers of demand (hospital, residential and employment areas) and provision of alternative modes would be helpful Key constraints outlined in section 1.5 but only early WIP info, needs to be confirmed. Limited info on geographic constraints on options available	Further detail on other modes and land uses added. Some additional context text and images added to Section 1.1 of the business case. Please also see the Baseline Conditions Report and the Options Appraisal Summary Report provided as Appendices.
	Problem Identification	*How have the problems been identified?* Section 1.1 identifies main problems *Provide quantification of the extent of the problems* Section 1.1 provides some tables quantifying link stress. Additional quantification would be beneficial		Some additional quantification of other issues beyond just flows and theoretical capacity would be beneficial. Eg quantification of air quality measurements and change over time, existing delays, journey times and reliability, difference in speeds between peak and inter-peak. This should be readily available from data used to validate traffic model or BwD's own reporting. What is root cause of problems - can these be addressed or is scheme just treating symptoms? Some evidence on ability to manage future demand through W&C/Public Transport provision improvements to reduce future traffic growth within network's ability to cope. (i.e. reasons why this would not be sufficient) (some google maps photos provided of peaks, but not inter-peak. Also Google Maps is a bit of a black box with regards to what different colours actually represent)	Further quantification of issues is provided in the Baseline Conditions Report. Some additional text added to Section 1.1 and Section 1.2 of the business case.
	The need for investment	*Why is the scheme needed now?* Section 1.1 and 1.2, Table 1.1.2 shows that critical point is being reached in network		Info presented in table 1.1.2 is good on establishing why intervention is needed now. Could be coupled with more info on other objectives/impacts to tie the threads together - is this preventing delivery of sites, and do sites need to start construction now/soon in order for delivery of meet Local Plan assessment of needs	
	Impact of scheme not being delivered	*Impact on transport network, economy, future development, other schemes etc.* Section 1.2 contains these details		As above, whilst it's clear what the impact of not proceeding is from a transport perspective, lacks a strong connection to the wider economic situation - applications only "at risk" of refusal, ambitions only "threatened" - underplaying potential scale of problem and strength of connection between scheme and growth.	Wording revised to emphasise the potential scale of impacts of not progressing.
	Study Area / affected population	*Include a plan showing the scheme location.* *Provide a description / plan of targeted population.* Section 1.2		Study area and plan of scheme location provided and clear. There is an obvious inconsistency between the study area and the modelled area, as the modelled area has gaps of routes which join other parts of the modelled area, are relatively short and fall entirely within the study area. These gaps should be filled	
	Scheme Objectives	*What are the aims of the proposed scheme, and how do they address all the problems identified?* Section 1.3 provides the scheme objectives		General comment - overly wordy, objectives can be SMART without using S,M,A,R and T as sub-headings. Some inconsistencies within objectives, and despite the use of S,M,A,R and T sub-headings some objectives do not actually fulfil the requirements to be SMART Objective 1: Objective is to "Reduce congestion…" but text and measurement refer to increasing capacity. Re-write text to focus on congestion. Measures of congestion needs to be identified - is it average speeds, journey times, journey time reliability, queue length etc? Is it only focused on peak periods? Need to identify how success is to be monitored and evaluated. Objective 2: Improve Local Air Quality Not sufficiently specific on what the improvement will be and how success measured/determined - i.e. NOx or Particulate emissions. What is AQMA target? Additionally presume BwD are publishing annual reports on measurements at the AQMA, suggest referring to these and the measurements they are publishing. Objective 3: "Support future housing" - a bit woolly, and therefore hard to determine if this objective is achieved, particularly over a wide area and scattering of sites. Scheme could be said to have "supported" housing growth even if developments don't go ahead or would have gone ahead anyway. Suggest more specific target and measurements to be identified - i.e. pick out the key sites. What is impact on achievability of this objective if there is disruption in the wider economy which impacts on the sites? Should objective measurement be linked to performance of identified sites relative to rest of housing market area? Additionally refers to Core Strategy 2011-2026, given some sites are for longer-term delivery objective should refer to adopted and emerging local plan requirements instead. Objective 4: "Support development of employment opportunities" As above a bit woolly, sites need to be identified and named somewhere in the business case. Objective needs to consider the type of employment opportunities developed, as well as uptake - i.e. delivering empty offices doesn't fulfil the objective, the number of new jobs created and filled is what matters.	Objectives updated.
	Strategic Fit (e.g. DfT's business plan and wider government objectives).	*How does the scheme contribute to key objectives, including wider transport and government objectives?* Section		Objectives and priorities clearly identified. For national policy objectives, this section fails to draw the link between the scheme outcomes and these objectives. For regional and local policies and priorities, there is a gap in the narrative between what the scheme will physically deliver (increased capacity and reduced congestion) and what the local policy objectives are (inclusive growth that benefits local people, environment and health, increased demand for housing)	

RAG Analysis	Jacobs Recommendations of Complete SOBC	Promoter Response (Capita)	RAG Analysis	Response (Jacobs)	Updated Promote Response (Capita)	Final RAG Analysis	Final Comment on updated SOBC (Jacobs)
	Details of other modes given now in baseline conditions report. weakness - the walking and cycling section fails to highlight the parts of the cycle network that form part of the Weaver's Wheel route and the Spur and Spoke routes connecting to it. Baseline conditions report contains some info on census demographic data. but detail on key demand drivers still missing (i.e. identifying Hospital and other key employment sites on a location plan) Risks and constraints outlined in section 1.5 updated based on risk registers. Still no info on geographic/environmental constraints provided e.g. Environmental Constraints Plan and physical contraints/ townscape			As before			
	More data on existing delays and JTs provided in baseline report. A comparison of these with forecast delays and JTs along the same routes from the model without the scheme would be beneficial to demonstrate how things get worse. No additonal quantification of present Air Quality measurements provided for the AQMA. This should be available from BwD's air quality monitoring at the AQMA Little further identification of root cause of problems Little further info on Walking/Cycling/Public Transport potential to offset traffic growth. Current extremely poor provision for alternate modes used as justification for why alternate modes would not have an impact in the OAR, but this would seem to indicate in fact that any improvement in provision would represent a step change and could have significant impact.			As before			
	This narrative is now stronger						
	Objectives now clearer Objective 1 - "Enable BwDBC's growth ambitions (up to 2025) to be realised without adversely impacting on the current level of service (congestion) provided by the Haslingden Road Corridor and adjoining local highway network" modelling results (showing greater delay per vehicle in 2026 Scenario R than in the baseline) appear to indicate that the scheme does not meet this objective. This additionally calls into question whether all dependent development can be delivered through the scheme, as a key reason for dependency was that current conditions on the road network were unacceptable. Recommend either providing additional geographic breakdown beyond average delay per vehicle, eg comparison of modelled delay on key JT routes, might help to demonstrate achievement of the objective. Or, consider whether wording of this objective ("adversely impacting on the ***current*** level of service") is appropriate East Lancashire Hightwaws and Transport Masterplan states that Haslingden Road scheme "will widen Haslingden Road and upgrade mini roundabouts to signalised junctions, facilitating future regeneration and reducing congestion. **Safety for cyclists and pedestrians will also be improved**." The highlighted section should have formed an objective for the scheme, given it is a clear aspiration of local policy	Traffic modelling and analysis undertaken since the preparation of the East Lancashire Highways and Transportation Masterplan has indicated that the introduction of signalised junctions would have a detrimental impact on the effective operation of the local highway network. The cost of signalising all of the junctions along the Haslingden Road corridor is also likely to have been prohibitatively high. The current proposals include measures to improve pedestiran crossing facilities at junction by providing dropped kerbs and tactile paving and by widening splitter islands to provide sufficient width to act as pedestrian refuges. There are also wider aspirations for the area to provide fully segregated cycle routes along exisitn public right of ways to improve and extend the Weavers Wheel network in the area. It is hoped that these improvements can be funded through s.106 developer contributions.		Objective 1 has replaced the word "current" with "existing", which does not change the meaning of the objective. There remains a risk that the scheme will not meet the objective. We recommend changing the wording to "...future level of service..." Additional objective to improve safety for pedestrians and cyclists added.			
	East Lancashire Highways and Transport Masterplan (which is BwD's own policy) states Haslingden Road scheme "will widen Haslingden Road and upgrade mini roundabouts to signalised junctions, facilitating future regeneration and reducing congestion. **Safety for cyclists and pedestrians will also be improved.**" This requirement has not been identified in the Policy Fit. Scheme does not appear to meet the policy aspirations, and even appears to be adverse for cyclist and pedestrian provision and safety, as upgraded junctions will have two-lane circulatories and will be carrying higher flows, and seemingly no improvement (or even reductions) to cyclist and pedestrian facilities. eg, footway and shared footway space is being lost, and the widened road will be harder to cross and may encourage higher speeds in off-peak times. Explicit evidence of how the scheme will satisfy this ELHTM requirement is needed in the Policy Fit section of the case.	See above.		Some additional info provided in the Strategic Fit section, but the specific text is not included and referred to. General description of improvements in crossing facilities, however specific locations are not identified, and the specific safety improvement requirement is only indirectly addressed.			

Business Case	Criteria	Evidence	RAG Analysis	Jacobs Recommendations on Draft SOBC chapters	Promoter Response (Capita)
STRATEGIC	Option Identification	*How were potential problems identified?* Section *Evidence that alternative options (covering a range of different modes) were considered* Section		List of other highway options considered is provided. Brief details of how they were identified. More detail expected in OAR (to be provided) No detail of consideration of non-highway mode options, whether highway and alternate mode solutions could have been integrated to provide benefits to all users. What has been considered in terms of; Bus priority and better bus provision Non-motorised users Technology Both as a separate solution and to enhance the benefits of the highway options	Please refer to OAR Summary Report and EAST
	Early Assessment and Sifting	*Methodology for sifting options* Section		Description of a sifting approach, detail to be provided in OAR	Please refer to OAR Summary Report and EAST
	Identification of short listed options	*How were the potential options shortlisted?* Section *What were the other shortlisted options?* Section		Other shortlisted options provided, but details of how shortlist was reached from high-level options not provided More detail expected in OAR	Please refer to OAR Summary Report and EAST
	Consideration given to the economic, environmental and social benefits of the possible approaches	*What are the high-level strategic and operational benefits envisaged? How do they link to the objectives of the scheme?* Section		Not clear that these were considered beyond a broad expectation that doing a scheme will be positive	Please refer to the Social and Distributional Impacts Report (Appendix M)
	Consultation / stakeholder engagement	*Provide details of any consultation events or stakeholder engagement that has taken place / is planned?* *Who was consulted?* *Include consultation results where available.* Detail provided in section 1.6		Information provided and seems sensible at high-level, but more detail in separate appendix yet to be provided	Please refer to Communications Strategy, Letters of Support and Public Consultation Responses provided as Appendices E, F and G respectively.
	Preferred Option	*How was the preferred option identified?* Section 1.7 provides some background, but most will be contained in Appendices (to be provided) *Reasons why it was the preferred option.* Section		Description of process of using EAST-like approach. Alternative options identified and best performing, next best and cheaper alternative options identified. Insufficient detail to determine reasons why preferred option selected in main Strat Case document - refer to Option Appraisal Report Appendix which has not yet been provided. Further review required when OAR provided	Please refer to OAR Summary Report and EAST
	Traffic Modelling work undertaken	*Details of any traffic modelling work which has been undertaken.* Section *Results of modelling work* Section *Has the need for any further traffic modelling work been identified?* Section		Clear gap in traffic model with parallel routes to main scheme corridor not fully modelled and not connected when they do connect on the ground. This needs to be addressed	Parallel routes serve different origins and destinations. Alternative route choices would require increased journey distances along congested links. Examples of possible route choice to hospital do not exist as there is unlikely to be a choice of which access to the hospital can be used. Each access serves a different part of the hospital.
	Level of public support considered?	*What are the attitudes of key groups (e.g. the general public, residents, businesses and wider stakeholders) to the proposed scheme?* Section		Need detail in separate appendix	Please refer to Communications Strategy, Letters of Support and Public Consultation Responses provided as Appendices E, F and G respectively.
	Key risks and constraints identified?	*What are the main risks associated with delivering the scheme?* Section *Include a Risk Register containing appropriate mitigation measures.* Section		Key constraints identified, clear and as expected, but currently WIP	Please refer to updated risk registers provided in Appendix D
	Connectivity with other schemes assessed?	*How does the scheme impact on other planned schemes?* *What is the overall level of impact in combination with other connected schemes?* Section		No detail provided of how this scheme interacts with either any other Pennine gateway schemes, other improvements being undertaken in Blackburn by BwD, or any HE or NR schemes. Some high-level consideration of how the scheme fits with any wider regional (TfN and LCC) priorities and the TfN Strategic Transport Plan and Central Pennines Strategic Development Corridor would also be beneficial. Have HE formally responded that they have no comment, are they supportive, or have they not replied? Do HE have any planned changes to M65 J5?	HE have offered no objection to the planning applications submitted. The scheme proposals were presented to HE (and their Spatial Planning Framework consultants WSP) who recognise the benefits the package will bring to the local network and the borough in terms of enabling growth. HE do however have concerns regarding the impact of growth on the M65 and its junctions.

RAG Analysis	Jacobs Recommendations of Complete SOBC	Promoter Response (Capita)	RAG Analysis	Response (Jacobs)	Updated Promote Response (Capita)	Final RAG Analysis	Final Comment on updated SOBC (Jacobs)
	OAR consideration of non-highway options is very high-level and doesn't hold up to much scrutiny (attributing no impact to most measures) Additionally, no apparent consideration of multi-modal approaches eg parallel segregated cycle routes, improved ped and bike facilities at junctions, bus priority measures at junctions etc.			As before			
	Methodology sound						
	OAR provided						
	A number of the letters of support are for the wrong scheme (North Blackburn!) Additionally, consultation results do not include any summary of number of responses, levels of overall support etc Not clear if stakeholders and general public actually do support scheme	Updated Letter Provided		Correct letters of support provided At present no summary info from consultation indicating overall wider level of support from stakeholders.			
	OAR provided, choice of preferred option appears robust						
	Gap in traffic model still present, no indication of any consideration of route choice in the model. Given the scheme will have non-uniform impacts on congestion across the modelled area (particularly Haslingden Rd will be significantly improved, Blackamoor Rd and Roman Rd will not be much improved) there is potential for some route choice change. We believe that trips between the following areas may be likely to switch route choice between Haslingden Rd and Roman Rd; The Fishermoor area to/from M65 J5 Stoped Brow and Roman Rd South to/from Royal Blackburn Hospital (both entrances) Due to the current limited coverage of the model, any trips being made between these ODs via Roman Rd will appear to exit the modelled area on Roman Rd and re-enter it on Old Bank Ln We recommend you provide either; Evidence that the number of users making these trips is small and will not impact the model, or A sensitivity test demonstrating the impact of switching trips between these routes No low growth or high growth sensitivity tests are provided in line with WebTAG requirements Additionally, no consideration of variable demand despite scheme meeting WebTAG thresholds for requiring VDM. No consideration of impact on/of trip frequency and peak spreading in modelling despite peak spreading issue being identified in Strategic Case Testing to establish need to VDM should be conducted in line with WebTAG M2 Section 2.2. The results of this test need to be presented to demonstrate that VDM is not needed. Trip rates used to model commercial developments appear to be based on per-hectare rates for an industrial estate and are not suitable for modelling a number of the key development sites, which are office-based and will therefore both have significantly higher job densities and different trip patterns in peak hours	The extent of the modelled network was considered at the ASR stage. The modelled area is considered to be appropriate as the parallel routes serve different purposes with A6077 Haslingden Road providing access to the M65 and Roman Road providing access to predominently rural areas to the south. Given the primary objective of the scheme is to allow development to occur without impacting on current levels of service, route choice is not considered to be significantly impacted by the scheme proposals. Additional sensitivity tests have been prepared and results included within the appropriate documentation. It is considered that these sensitivity tests would adequately cover the small probability of any VDM impacts within the study area. There is very little information about the Medi-Park development and if this would be 'office-based' or supply chain or associated industries for the hospital. There is no current plans detailing if this would be B1, B2 or B8 or in what proportions if split across these land uses. There is no trip rate for B1 uses that can be applied to site area and as such use of industrail estate trip rates are considered appropriate. Within our assessments the scenarios have also been controlled to Tempro as per WebTAG guidance and as such the use of alternate trip rates is unlikely to have had a significant impact on modelling or economic appraisal results.		Evidence of likely impact of route choice provided and demonstrates impact likely to be modest Zero growth now provided Some fairly limited information indicating scale of impact of VDM expected to be small provided. We do not consider this especially robust but recognise that Level 3 Analysis reduces need for VDM. Additional information has been sought on how forecast demand has been calculated, specifically how TEMPro constraint has been applied. This, coupled with development trip rates, remains a key area of concern as we need assurance that the difference in traffic volumes between scenarios P/S and R is not being underestimated.	Trip Rates Additional text added into para 2.8.2 of the LMFER report stating that *'Assumptions have been made around trip rates from potential future employment sites impacting on the modelled area, with the exact future use of a number of sites, particularly around RBH and the Medipark site, currently unknown. These could be supply chain industries for the hospital with shift patterns outside of peak periods.'* No sensitivity test has been undertaken to test the impact of higher trip rates assocated with office developemnt, however it is acknowledged that trip rates have been constrained to TEMPRO. Requested evidence about how the trip rates might differ. VDM Additional text added into the first paragraph of Page 19 of the LMFER. Requested modelling evidence which shows that the existing levels of service have been maintained		Additional info provided on application of TEMPRO contraint and trip rates. Some concerns remain about how the forecast demand has been determined, and we believe that the methodology of not applying background growth, and of constraining development traffic to NTEM BwDBC average levels in a modelled area significantly smaller than the district as a whole, result in an under-estaimation of future traffic levels by about 4% of baseline traffic. We do not believe that these will result in a change in the VfM category of the scheme however, although it is possible that the scheme's capacity will be reached earlier than anticipated from the traffic modelling.
	Consultation results do not include any summary of number of responses, levels of overall support etc Not clear if stakeholders and general public actually do support scheme			As previously			
	Key risks updated, full risk register with light-touch QRA provided						
	Can details of those discussions with HE and WSP be included in the Strategic Case. Additionally there appears to be a risk that a lack of capacity at M65 J5 could prevent the identified unlocked developments going ahead. **This is a potential showstopper**. Need to demonstrate that there is not an adverse impact on HE's network and M65 J5 from the dependent developments with the scheme in place. Without such evidence there is a risk that HE will object to development proposals after the scheme has been delivered, preventing the economic benefits from being realised without further investment. Still no detail how scheme impacts on other schemes in BwD and wider area. Scheme contains part of Weavers Wheel route and the spoke and spur routes leading to it, but no mention of this in Strat case and the impact the scheme will have on the Weavers Wheel	More detail provided by Mike Cliffe.		Confirmation of Highways Agency position from Local Plan IDP and adoption, HE to fund any works to M65, no residual risk to existing allocations Slight residual risk to Blakewater College site as it is not a local plan allocation, but as existing use is school it is unlikely to have significant net impact on M65 and be objected to, and only forms a small part of overall economic outputs. Additional info to be provided on how developments will contribute to W&C improvements and interact with Weaver's Wheel			

Business Case	Criteria	Evidence	RAG Analysis	Jacobs Recommendations on Draft SOBC chapters	Promoter Response (Capita)
ECONOMIC	Outline approach to assessing value for money.	*Evidence of any VfM assessment which has already been undertaken.* Section			
	Consideration of economic, environmental, social and distributional impacts.	*Qualitative / Quantitative assessment of the likely impact of the scheme* Section			
	Appraisal Summary Table	*Has an AST been produced?* Section			
	BCR	*Details of any economic appraisal work which has already been undertaken. Provide an indication of the likely VfM (using relevant schemes to benchmark where appropriate) where VfM assessment not been completed yet.* Section			
FINANCIAL	Scheme Cost	*Please provide as much detail as possible, including:* *- scheme development costs* *- itemised construction costs* *- running costs* *- maintenance costs* *- range cost estimates* *How were the scheme costs calculated?* Section 3.1 provides light detail of capital costs from tender submission			
	Funding Arrangements	*Detail the funding sources and values which have been outlined.* LEP Growth Deal 3 Funding: BWD's own contribution: *Outline any potential risks to securing funding.* None apart from this assurance			
	Key Risks	*Please provide a risk register including mitigation measures.* Appendix D *Has any sensitivity analysis been undertaken? What are the results?* Risk register includes QRA, risk allowance included in costs			
COMMERCIAL	Is there a robust contracting and procurement strategy?	*Outline the intended procurement strategy.* ECI through framework with mini-bid from framework contractors *How was the proposed procurement approach developed?* Section		Appropriate strategy provided sufficient interest from framework contractors	
MANAGEMENT	Key risks and constraints identified?	*What are the main risks associated with delivering and implementing the scheme?* *Include a Risk Register containing appropriate mitigation measures.* Section		Risk mitigation strategy appears sound, use of fixed price contract will transfer risks to private sector Risk register not yet provided	Please refer to updated risk registers provided in Appendix D
	Delivery Programme	*Please include indicative timescales for:* *- Scheme Development* *- Design* *- Procurement* *- Construction* Project programme outlined in section 5.3		Programme looks ambitious but achievable, need confirmation from tender responses that 1-year timeframe to complete is realistic Plenty of time between assurance and start of construction	All tender responses confirmed that they were able to deliver to the timescales outlined in the programme.

RAG Analysis	Jacobs Recommendations of Complete SOBC	Promoter Response (Capita)	RAG Analysis	Response (Jacobs)	Updated Promote Response (Capita)	Final RAG Analysis	Final Comment on updated SOBC (Jacobs)
	TUBA files not provided for scrutiny, annualisation factors and their derivation not provided. Reported GVA impacts, due to lack of consideration of decay and long appraisal period, are implausible Lack of sensitivity testing for high/low growth	TUBA files provided. GVA Recalculated and sensitivity tests completed.		TUBA files provided, seem fine GVA impacts have been updated and reporting updated Zero growth sensitivity test now provided shows Med VfM (1.8 BCR) Level 3 analysis with LVU now provided, overall provides reasonable confidence of at Med/High VfM. However some issues with modelling cause concerns that may impact on these BCRs.			
	Very light-touch DI Non-Journey time impacts only considered at very high level. Approach to assessing GVA benefits does not consider decay of economic impacts over time, which coupled with 60-year appraisal period results in implausible results Shortfall in dependency evidence for a number of sites Reporting of overall economic impacts lacks a clear summary table comparing outcome of all Pennine Gateway schemes with predicted. Several inconsistencies in reporting of economic impacts of scheme in different parts of the business case.	GVA Recalculatd. Dependency evidence (particularly planning letter) altered and reporting of economic outputs updated.+G41:I43F41:I43E41:I43L36H41:I43F41:I43E41:I43D41:I43L36H41:I43A40:I46B41:I43C41:I43D41:I43E41:I43		GVA appraisal period reduced to 15 years from scheme opening to acount for decay Depdendency evidence gap filled with updated Planning Officer letter			
	AST produced but does not contain summary scoring, only refers to other documents, some of wh	AST updated		Updated AST and other documents were not provided			
	BCR calculation not consistent with WebTAG A2.2 guidance - includes trips from dependent development (comparison of modelled scenarios Q and R) when it explicitly should exclude these (comparison of Scenarios P and S) Significant issues with modelling due to; Model coverage Trip generation from developments Lack of consideration of peak spreading and variable demand Lack of High and Low growth sensitivity tests Significant issues with monetised Greenhouse Gas assessment, appraisal either needs to be significantly changed to meet WebTAG A3 requirements or, if evidence indicates scale of impact unlikely to be significant at UK-wide level, replace with a qualitative assessment.	BCR Calculation updated. GHG assessment included as qualitative assessment only. On review, we also believe there is sufficeint doubt around the calculation of accident benefits from COBALT that these should be omitted from the overall BCR calculation. The results are presented with and without COBALT disbenefits.		BCR calculation updated, now complies with WebTAG Awaiting information on identified weaknesses in modelling approach Level 3 analysis indicates similar magnitude of Transport User Benefit and External Transport Impacts, and LVU switching values indicate BCR close to 2.0. This provides additional confidence as modelling limitations affect both benefits and dis-benefits similarly Greenhouse gas assessment reverted to qualitative			
	Text in financial case does not make it clear enough that these are tender returns (still mentions Capita as providing the scheme cost estimates) The range of tender cost submission could be provided (anonymised) to indicate the spread of cost estimates and provide confidence in the stated tender. No details of operation and maintainace costs provided			17/12/19- Capita to confirm whether a tender query that was raised over what should be included in the contractor's costing will impact the cost estimate.			
	No confirmation in case that BwD will cover any cost overruns Section 151 Officer letter has not been provided	Mike Cliffe to provide		Updated signed S151 Officer letter received 19/12/19. LEP confirmed they are happy with content.			
	All tendering done, contract in place, all seems good						
	Risk register now provided						
	Detailed programme provided does not appear to be complete (missing pages?)			Awaiting full programme			

Business Case	Criteria	Evidence	RAG Analysis	Jacobs Recommendations on Draft SOBC chapters	Promoter Response (Capita)
MANAGEMENT	Governance / Assurance work	*Who is in charge? What is the allocation of roles and responsibilities? Is there a Project Board?* Sections 5.1, 5.4, 5.6 - project board answering to LEP board, overseeing all decisions and meeting fortnightly, monthly progress meetings on-site *What control measures will be put in place to ensure the scheme development process is managed suitably?* Section *Has a SGAR been undertaken / scheduled?* Section		Project board but mostly comprises non-BwD staff. SRO is not a BwD officer. Is Timo Murphy seconded into BwD, and does the contract cover the full project programme? Can you provide some details on continuity plans in the event that he leaves. Senior users only includes Growth & Development, no membership from other internal stakeholders. Neither Senior Users or Senior suppliers appears to include membership from environmental, bus or sustainable transport representatives. Structure and management controls all ok.	Timo Murphy is a Capita employee and not seconded into BwD. Capita has a strategic partnership with BwD. Both organisations have worked collaboratively for 17 years. BwD and Capita have resilience in their teams to ensure continuity and that the delivery of the scheme is not jeopardised should anyone leave.
	Evidence of similar projects that have been successful.	*Provide details of similar projects and their successfulness.* Section 5.1		Only project of similar magnitude presented - Wainwright Way (£11m) - had cost overruns. More details needed on the scale of these overruns and how change was handled, what are lessons learned, how have they been implemented?	The main lesson learned and implemented was the inclusion of a Project Management Team into all Growth Deal and Major Schemes. Previously, schemes had been administrated by the Civil Engineering Design team who covered both the technical design amendments, Internal Project Management, Contract Project Management, Financial Management, Client care and Works management element of the scheme. The Project Management team were able to take on Financial management and Client Care aspects of the project and the associated reporting to the Client, allowing the Civil Design Team to concentrate on the Project Management element of the NEC Construction Contract. The Wainwright Way scheme was procured through an open tender. The GD3 schemes have been procured through an established Framework Contract which, through regular meetings with the Framework Contractors has led to an Open and Transparent relationship between the Client and Contractor. The Framework Contractors "buy" into the scheme through Invitation to Tender meetings. Upper levels of rates for Bills of Quantities have been established, giving the Client comfort in knowing the upper cost of the scheme before Tenders are submitted. In applying for the Framework, each Contractor has had to demonstrate works on schemes of a similar size and difficulty, furthermore the Quality Assessment for the GD3 schemes asked the Contractor to demonstrate the mechanisms they will employ to complete the scheme within their Tendered price. The Wainwright Bridge Scheme was a Target Cost Scheme with Bills of Quantities. It is noted that monitoring the Target Cost element; "pain and gain" proved to add further administration duties. This issue has been removed in the current form of Contract for the GD3 SE Blackburn project.
	Who is the client / sponsor?	*Include details of the client / sponsor of the scheme.* Section 5.1			
	Fall back Plans	*Do alternative schemes exist? Is there a lower cost alternative?* Section		Outlined in Strategic Case, alternative lower-cost options identified	
	Arrangements for monitoring and evaluating the intervention.	*What will constitute success for the project, and how will it be measured?* Section		Need M&E plan M&E section makes repeated reference to DfT feedback and DfT framework for Local Authority Major Schemes. At £11m this is not a major scheme, and the DfT is not expected to provide any input. Please change the text to reflect the situation for this scheme. Several of the metrics selected do not appear to match the expected scheme outputs. Eg; Total lengths of newly built road: Link road will contribute to this metric Follow on investment at site: This is an expected economic output Commercial floor space occupied: This would be expected to be reported alongside job creation metrics Commercial rental values: as above Additionally some metrics expected but missing, eg: Average AM, PM and IP journey times along entire corridor Air quality (NOx and Particulate measurements) in Blackamoor Rd AQMA M&E plan will need to include table of expected outcomes for metrics eg. what sites are being considered for the housing, commercial floorspace and jobs metrics, what are expected units completed/jobs created by key dates at each. Additionally locations of traffic counts, air quality measurements, journey time measurements etc and forecast outcomes Please ensure, where appendices are referenced by multiple cases (eg M&E plan referenced in Strat and Mgt cases) that appendix numbering is consistent.	M&E Updated to reflect current scheme. Please also refer to Appendix C.

RAG Analysis	Jacobs Recommendations of Complete SOBC	Promoter Response (Capita)	RAG Analysis	Response (Jacobs)	Updated Promote Response (Capita)	Final RAG Analysis	Final Comment on updated SOBC (Jacobs)
	Major issues: Air Quality (AQ). At least one part of the scheme is located within an AQMA and one of the objectives of the scheme is to improve AQ in the AQMA. However, there appears to be little mention of the monitoring for AQ. Whilst the promoter is following DfT's "standard" M&E, AQ is covered by "Enhanced". There also appears to be some confusion between Carbon and AQ. Carbon (aka Greenhouse Gases) is not the same as AQ, it is a sub-set of AQ, as is PM10s or NOx (NOx for this AQMA) – so whilst Carbon can be monitored as part of AQ, those elements associated with the AQMA need to be monitored too. Also, the report seems to say, "carbon will be monitored" without specifically stating how. Congestion / "level of service". The report makes many references to speed, but only 1 or 2 references to journey times. Congestion needs to be measured by route journey times, not speeds at isolated points on the road network. Locations of the journey time routes should be clearly stated. There are items within the LEP's Growth Deal M&E Framework that appear to be missing from the M&E report e.g. total length of newly built road ("none" is incorrect), type of infrastructure delivered, follow on investment at site, commercial floorspace occupied etc. Other issues: a) Outcomes are short-term, impacts are long-term. Impacts are shown in the Benefits Realisation table but appear to be missing from the main body of the report. Also, some of the statements re outcomes are long-term i.e. they're impacts. This is applicable to both the main body of the report and the logic map in Appendix E. b) Some beneficiaries appear to be missing e.g. residents within the AQMA. Might also be worth reordering the beneficiaries in an order of priority / impact. c) Accidents. Annual monitoring is more typical, and analysis typically 3 and 5 years after (whilst it's OK to collect the data at 6 months or annual intervals, the actual comparison with the "before" data should not be undertaken until 3 years have elapsed at the earliest). d) Pedestrians appear to be omitted from the surveys, yet there is an objective to aim to improve facilities for this group. e) New roads constructed = none is incorrect f) Follow-on investment should be included g) Type of infrastructure delivered should be included h) Locations of surveys are either vague or not stated e.g. MCCs (but locations aren't stated), AQ sites (but locations aren't stated – Blackamoor junction?). 4. Other comments:- a) Typo's = "North Blackburn" scheme, "Collections" instead of "Collection" in chapter title. b) Inconsistencies = completion on p1 says March 2021, whereas p2 says April 2021	M&E Report Updated to address comments.		Updated M&E plan provided. High priority issues resolved. In section 1 and other places the aims/objectives/expected impacts of the scheme refer to reduction in delay, improvements in level of service, or no deterioration from the existing level of service etc. Given discussion about wording of Objective 1 in strategic case, similar recommendations about wording in the M&E plan apply. I.e. do not state expected net improvements/no change from present when actual forecast indicates only no net change from Do Minimum once dependent development is built. Similarly, in various places, a reported expected impact is "transport economic efficiency savings from reduced user delays" - modelling results of scenarios P and R indicates that, once dependent development is built, there will not be a net reduction in delays. Consider re-wording this. Remember that only the future with development unlocked (modelled Scenario R) will be directly observed and monitored. It is not possible to directly observe resultant impacts of scenarios P and S in M&E. Annual Average CO2 emissions still included for monitoring indirectly via Air Quality indecies, this is not particularly robust and not needed to assess any of the scheme objectives, so could be removed			