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| **The Strategic Case** |
| 1. ***Project Description*** |
| * 1. ***Purpose***   This package of schemes will deliver initiatives to encourage and make the most of sustainable public transport, cycling and walking transport modes in Colchester, aimed particularly at corridors from the western and eastern side of the town through to the town centre, and at improvements within the town centre.  The objectives of this scheme are:-   * To reduce congestion at key points on the network * To make best use of existing public transport services * To promote, encourage and support sustainable journeys along the corridors * To improve air quality and reduce carbon emissions * To promote healthy and active lifestyles * To support housing and job growth.   1. ***Brief description***   This package of schemes for Colchester Town Centre and its approaches, focuses on traffic and congestion reduction, bus priority and traffic management measures, to improve the economic vitality of the town centre, while delivering operational improvements across the wider town centre area. See attached map.  The work consists of five improvement schemes (Drawings held at **Appendix A**):   * Brook Street Roundabout   This scheme consists of replacing the existing mini-roundabout with a signalised junction. This will involve minor changes to the geometry of the junction in order to introduce traffic signals equipment. (The scheme was originally identified within the Ipswich Road S106 project.) Prior modelling has demonstrated that this will improve traffic flow and queue lengths in this area.   * Town Centre Pedestrian Links & Bus Service Priority Improvements   Improved pedestrian facilities are to be introduced between the bus stop for the new Park & Ride service in the High Street and the town centre in order to provide a better welcome to the main shopping environment. This will include lighting, streetscape and accessibility improvements to Bank Passage, Pelhams Lane and St Nicholas passage, as well as improved route signage. Removal of pinch points associated with bus stops and taxi ranks, reviews of parking and loading and rationalisation of bus stops to improve movement around the town centre for bus services.   * Lexden Road Bus Lane   This requires carriageway widening in order to introduce a new eastbound bus lane along Lexden Road / Southway between the junction with Glen Avenue / Lexden Road and the Maldon Road roundabout. It also consists of the provision of bus priority signals on Southway at the eastbound approach to the Maldon Road roundabout. (The scheme was originally identified within the West Colchester and Stanway Travel Strategy document.) As this lane is in addition to the current two-way flow, bus journey times will be improved without adversely affecting car users. This improvement should aid bus patronage.   * Stanway Cycle Package   The scheme consists of a scalable package of cycle improvements which have been identified, within the West Colchester and Stanway Travel Strategy document, as part of a wider network of improvements in the Stanway / Lexden area. The cycle improvements will offer either segregated or on-road lane designated cycle facilities which will cater for cyclists that are not normally confident alongside general traffic.   * Town Centre Signal Improvements:  |  |  | | --- | --- | | * Queen Street | Modifications to traffic signals on High Street to improve access to East Hill. | | * St Botolph's Street | Removal of the pedestrian crossing over the right turn from St Botolph's Street to assist buses. Relocation of the signal controlled crossing over St Botolph's Street away from the priority junction. | | * St John's Street / Head Gate | Replacement of obsolescent traffic signal equipment and ducts and the introduction of a dedicated cycle phase within the traffic signals. Traffic signal improvements to incorporate a change in operation to reduce lost time, thereby increasing efficiency of operation. |   ***Colchester Town Centre – Summary Map***     * 1. ***Other Opportunities***   Other schemes have been studied for inclusion in this package, including improvements to Butt Road and Mersea Road, junction improvements at St Botolphs and Maldon Road, link based traffic management schemes on Maldon Road and traffic management in the Dutch Quarter and at East Hill and Queen Street. However, in terms of value for money and maximizing benefits, the schemes listed in 1.2 were finally chosen.   * 1. ***Strategic context***   Colchester is one of the fastest growing towns in the country. Over the period 2001-2023, Colchester has allocated land for 19,000 new houses, and is on schedule to deliver this target. The adopted plan for Colchester also allows for the creation of 14,000 new jobs over the same period. The key challenge facing Colchester is accommodating housing and economic growth in the most sustainable way.  The town centre is the major employment area for Colchester, providing approximately 20,000 jobs. Maintaining reliable access across Colchester and throughout the town centre is essential for employment and other town centre opportunities, such as further education, retail and leisure.  Colchester town centre is already a major regional shopping centre, but will also see substantial growth, with 2,000 new homes and planned increases in office and retail floorspace of 40,000m² and 67,000m² respectively.  Congestion levels in Colchester are negatively affecting the local economy, especially at key pinch points. These pinch points restrict traffic flows between west and east Colchester, through the Town Centre, and across the rest of the town, and lead to unreliable journey times, late deliveries and gridlock in car parks. In addition to this, air quality is a significant problem in Colchester and the town centre has a declared Air Quality Management Area in a sector of the town that exceeds pollution limits as a result of transport emissions. The Essex Business Survey (2010) found that 35% of businesses are concerned about local traffic congestion, with the road / transport network being identified as a priority for investment.  Ideally, improvements are required before the next tranche of major development scheduled for 2016 onwards, hence the reason for the funding request now.  The South East LEP’s Strategic Economic Plan aims to :  • enable the creation of 200,000 sustainable private sector jobs over the decade to 2021, an increase of 11.4% since 2011  • complete 100,000 new homes by 2021, which will entail, increasing the annual rate of completions by over 50% by comparison with recent years; and,  • lever investment totalling £10 billion, to accelerate growth, jobs and homebuilding.  The SEP acknowledges that growth depends on planned investment in transport and other infrastructure, focussed on 12 growth corridors in the entire SE LEP area, including the following corridors within Essex:  • A120 Haven Gateway;  • A12 and Great Eastern Mainline;  • M11 West Anglia Mainline: London-Harlow-Stansted-Cambridge;  • A127 London-Basildon-Southend;  • A13 London-Thurrock-Canvey Island;  Colchester is located at the intersection of the A120 Haven Gateway and the A12 Great Eastern Mainline Growth Corridors and the SEP states that; Colchester will accommodate significant future growth, with development planned for the town centre and the Northern Gateway creating a new leisure / sporting hub and leveraging £60m of private investment. A digital incubation centre for the creative industries in the heart of Colchester will support this priority sector. The development of a STEM training centre will help raise local skills to support priority sectors across the corridor.  The Essex County Council Corporate Outcomes Framework 2014-2018 sets out the seven high level outcomes that ECC want to achieve to ensure prosperity and wellbeing for Essex residents. Securing these outcomes will make Essex a more prosperous county; one where people can flourish, live well and achieve their ambitions.  The seven outcomes are listed below:  • Children in Essex get the best start in life  • People in Essex enjoy good health and wellbeing  • People have aspirations and achieve their ambitions through education, training and lifelong-learning  • People in Essex live in safe communities and are protected from harm  • Sustainable economic growth for Essex communities and businesses  • People in Essex experience a high quality and sustainable environment  • People in Essex can live independently and exercise control over their lives  This package is complementary to other Colchester schemes under consideration eg Colchester Park and Ride, Colchester LSTF and Colchester ITP. Jointly, they will respond to the objectives detailed above. There is ‘a golden thread’ running from the Colchester LDF core strategy, the Essex Economic Growth Strategy and the Economic Plan for Essex, which pulls these all together, and ensures the future delivery of growth in Colchester in a sustainable manner. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Case for Change** |
| 1. ***Business needs / Reasons*** |
| * + - * ***Outline the rationale for making the investment with reference to the problems with the status quo.***   As part of the Colchester Local Development Framework Core Strategy development process, additional highway infrastructure has been considered in the form of junction and link improvements. However, the scale of the improvements required cannot keep pace with the level of traffic demand likely to arise from growth of the town and are often not feasible in the area of land available, nor is it independent of other initiatives. In addition, Colchester town centre has several, declared and emerging, AQMAs which will be made worse by additional traffic accessing the area.  Congestion in Colchester is already unacceptable. Doing nothing would lead to a situation where none of the growth options in the town could be undertaken without gridlock. This is not an option and the Local Plan is predicated on the introduction of a range of measures to allow growth to take place.  This package of schemes is complementary to the introduction of Colchester Park and Ride and the Colchester LSTF package.   * + - * ***What evidence is there of need for the project?***   Investment in this package of schemes is wholly compliant with the aspirations of the Essex Economic Strategy and the Greater Essex Integrated County Strategy. It supports the delivery of the Essex Local Transport Plan, and has the support of Colchester Borough Council.  The Essex Business Survey (2010) highlighted the need for infrastructure improvements in Colchester. According to Essex businesses, the top three investment priorities were: information and communications technology, particularly high speed broadband networks; more reliable and cheaper transport services; and the road / transport network. Over one third (35%) of businesses are concerned about local traffic congestion, especially large and medium companies.   * + - * ***What impact does the scheme have on releasing the growth or overcoming barriers to growth?***   The Economic Growth Strategy has the stated ambition to make Essex the location of choice for business. To grow, the Essex economy depends on the efficient movement of people, goods and information, via effective and reliable transport and communications networks at competitive prices to provide access to markets and suppliers. The Economic Growth Strategy also acknowledges that future economic prosperity depends on ensuring a ready supply of development land, new housing and the coordinated provision of appropriate infrastructure.  This package of schemes helps deliver the EGS ambition; to make Essex the location of choice for business; for those already based in Essex and for those who may choose Essex in the future. It also meets the aim of the infrastructure workstream - future economic prosperity depends on ensuring a ready supply of development land, new housing and the coordinated provision of appropriate infrastructure.   * + - * ***What will happen if the proposed project is not funded from LGF?***   If this package of schemes is not introduced, the existing road and public transport networks will become even more congested and overcrowded than at present, and accessibility within and around Colchester will continue to worsen.   * + - * ***Is there a potential to reduce costs and still achieve the desired outcomes?***   This is a scalable package of measures and reduction in scheme funding will have a proportionate effect on delivery and, consequently, the benefits outcome. |
| 1. ***Benefits*** |
| * 1. ***Estimate jobs and homes (direct, indirect, safeguarding, construction etc)***   This bid will indirectly support the unlocking of 860 new jobs and 910 new homes.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | **2015/16** | **2016/17** | **2017/18** | **2018/19** | **2019/2020** | **2020/2021** | **2021 to 2025** | **Total** | | Jobs | 86 | 86 | 86 | 86 | 86 | 86 | 344 | 860 | | Homes | 91 | 91 | 91 | 91 | 91 | 91 | 364 | 910 |  * + - * ***Describe the methodology of how the number of jobs and homes is estimated***   The forecast increase in jobs and homes has been well established through various prior studies and it has been assumed that the delivery of new jobs and homes is flat-rated over the period, as per above.   * + - * ***List all main direct and indirect; quantitative and qualitative; cash releasing and non-cash releasing benefits associated with the investment***   The package is designed to be complementary to the Park and Ride scheme and will provide benefits associated with the removal of traffic from Colchester town centre, improving the retail experience for visitors. The public realm aspects of the package will support Colchester’s Better Town Centre objectives. |
| 1. ***Risks*** |
| * 1. ***Provide a summary of key risks to the delivery of the scheme (including financial, commercial, economic and management)***   Public consultations will be undertaken for Brook Street and Lexden Road Bus Lane. TROs will be required to support the scheme and will be published in a timely manner.  See risk assessment below.   * 1. ***Risk Assessment***  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Risk description** | **Likelihood** | **Impact** | **Likelihood x Impact** | **Mitigation** | **Risk Owner** | | Statutory Processes risk – Traffic Regulation Orders | 3 | 4 | 12 | Early pubic engagement will be programmed to facilitate this process. | ECC | | Unable to secure stakeholder (bus operators, traders, taxis, Network Rail, members of the public etc) engagement and acceptance of the scheme in full | 2 | 4 | 8 | Establish continuing positive discussions with key stakeholders and ensure early public consultation. | ECC | | Traffic Management during works | 2 | 3 | 6 | ECC will ensure information is made available to members of the public, specifically during the construction period to ensure any traffic management plans are communicated accordingly. | ECC / Ringway Jacobs | | Statutory Undertaker diversions | 3 | 3 | 9 | As with other projects, early engagement with Statutory Undertakers will be undertaken. | ECC | | Tender prices at variance with estimates leading to re-design or scheme cancellation | 4 | 4 | 16 | Obtain recent tender information for use in price base comparison | Ringway Jacobs / ECC | | Weather events hinder or delay the works | 2 | 2 | 4 | Introduce programme float | Ringway Jacobs / ECC | | C3 prices at variance with estimates leading to re-design or scheme cancellation | 4 | 4 | 16 | Ensure timely C3 and C4 requests | Ringway Jacobs / ECC | | Discovery of undeclared utilities during construction | 4 | 4 | 16 | Undertake GPR surveys and timely trial holes | Ringway Jacobs | | Discovery of contaminated ground or material on site | 3 | 3 | 9 | Undertake timely site investigation | Ringway Jacobs | | Unforeseen ground conditions – redesign required | 3 | 3 | 9 | Undertake timely site investigation | Ringway Jacobs / ECC | | Claims from nearby residents on noise and vibration | 3 | 3 | 9 | Undertake pre-construction monitoring, and ensure contractor is aware of his responsibilities | Ringway Jacobs / ECC | | Invasive species found on-site, additional cost for site clearance | 1 | 1 | 1 | Undertake site survey | Ringway Jacobs | | Construction costs escalation | 4 | 4 | 16 | Undertake pre-construction monitoring | Ringway Jacobs | | Unforeseen discovery of protected species. | 1 | 1 | 1 | Undertake surveys for protected species, early site clearance | Ringway Jacobs | | Contractor fails on delivery timing resulting in programme overrun | 3 | 4 | 12 | Tender scheme using appropriate quality questions to identify potential issues | Ringway Jacobs | |

|  |
| --- |
| **The Economic Case** |
| 1. ***Options*** |
| * 1. ***Please provide a description of the main options for investment, together with their relative advantages and disadvantages (a SWOT analysis):-***   SWOT analysis of the overall options for investment:   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Strengths**:   * Largest town in north-east Essex with fastest growing population * Well-established partnership working with CBC * Strong and unique connectivity to the markets of London and the south-east, with onward connections to Europe and other international markets * High employment rate * Significant environmental and historical assets * Cultural and tourism appeal * Served by major railway line with good connectivity to London | **Weaknesses:**   * Major road congestion at peak times within Colchester on the principal roads and junctions and in the town centre * Restricted land availability for development in some areas * Disconnected public transport links * Lack of connected cycleways | | **Opportunities:**   * Tie-in with good progress undertaken as part of Colchester Cycle Town. * Fully utilise the land, labour and capital assets to achieve Colchester’s economic and growth potential * Large pockets of land available for housing development * Important location for housing development * Making transport links more resilient to incidents and congestion * Fully realise the potential of economic links with London, including capacity to accommodate growth to the East of London | **Threats**:   * Potential decline of London as a world financial services centre * Significant change at the next General Election (2015) may bring changes in policies and investor confidence * Prevailing economic conditions discourage private sector investment, including bringing forward key development sites * Continuing / increasing threat to town centre viability * Lack of value employment stunting economic growth and increasing the level of under-employment * Public concern that growth will lead to increased congestion as a result of failure to invest in adequate infrastructure improvement |  * ***Do Nothing***   As part of the Colchester Local Development Framework Core Strategy development process, additional highway infrastructure has been considered in the form of a series of junction and link improvements. However, as stated above, the scale of the improvements required cannot keep pace with the level of traffic demand likely to arise from growth in the town and are often not feasible in the area of land available, nor is it independent of other initiatives. In addition, Colchester town centre has several, declared and emerging, AQMAs which will be made worse by additional traffic accessing the area.  Congestion in areas around Colchester town centre is already unacceptable. Doing nothing would lead to a situation where none of the growth options in the town could be undertaken without gridlock. This is not an option and the Local Plan is predicated on the introduction of a range of measures to allow growth to take place.   * ***Do Minimum***   A reduced (minimum) package could be to introduce the recommendations one at a time, in a piecemeal fashion. However, this would dis-proportionately reduce the impact of the improvements and is not recommended.   * ***Do Something (best and final option; least net present cost option; highest risk adjusted NPV option; etc)***   The full package addresses the town centre access issues and is the preferred approach. In addition, there are other aspects which would be beneficial, such as the ability to provide bus, cycle and walking priority routes and infrastructure which assists the improvement in air quality in the town centre. |
| * 1. ***Recommended Option: What is the preferred option – and why?***   The preferred option is the ‘Do Something’. This will ensure improvements are made to the network that will improve journey time reliability and improve efficiency of the transport network to facilitate the growth of employment and housing. |

**5.4 Transport scheme assessment approach**

***5.4.1 Provide a brief description of a (spreadsheet-based) modelling and appraisal methodology as well as detail of data source used***

See **Appendix B**.

***5.4.2 List all assumptions made for transport modelling and appraisal***

See **Appendix B**.

***5.4.3 Provide key positive and negative impacts of the schemes in the table below as described in the Appraisal Summary Table and Social Distribution Impact analysis, where it is appropriate, supported by evidence.***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Category of impacts** | **Quantified/Qualitative impact** | **Large Beneficial to Large Adverse** |
| **Economy** | Business users and providers  Reliability  Regeneration  Wider Impacts | Moderate Beneficial  Moderate Beneficial  Moderate Beneficial  Moderate Beneficial |
| **Environment** | Noise  Air Quality  Greenhouse gas  Landscape  Townscape  Heritage  Biodiversity  Water Environment | Slight Beneficial  Slight Beneficial  Slight Beneficial  Slight Adverse  Slight Adverse  Neutral  Neutral  Neutral |
| **Social** | Commuting & Other users  Accidents  Physical Activity  Journey Quality  Reliability Option and non-use values  Security  Access to Services  Affordability  Severance | Large Beneficial  Slight Beneficial  Large Beneficial  Large Beneficial  Slight Beneficial  Moderate Beneficial  Moderate Beneficial  Neutral  Neutral |
| **Public Accounts** | Cost to broad transport budget Indirect tax | Slight Beneficial |

***The scheme promoters are NOT required to use Tuba type appraisal analysis. If any scheme promoter is interested in estimating value for money then a spreadsheet based analysis should be undertaken.***

***Value for Money Statement***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Present Values in 2010 prices and values** |
| **PVB** | £9,491,562 |
| **PVC** | 5,092,955 |
| **NPV = PVB - PVC** | 4,398,607 |
| **Initial BCR = PVB / PVC** | **1.86** |
| **Adjusted BCR** | N/A |
| **Qualitative Assessment** | The BCR presented here is based on benefits associated with modal shift; however, the DfT recognises the significant health related benefits that investment in cycling and walking can offer (‘Claiming the Health Dividend, Nov 2015 and VfM Assessment for Cycling Grants, Aug 2014). |
| **Key Risks, Sensitivities** | The assessment did not benefit from formal modelling, but was based on standard, reasonable assumptions. Please see additional information in **Appendix B.** |
| **VfM Category** | Medium (1.5 – 2.0) |

|  |
| --- |
| **Commercial Case** |
| 1. ***Procurement Route*** |
| Procurement Strategy  The eastern Highways Alliance and SMARTe and the Highways Agency Framework have all been used extensively in prior major projects eg A12 Junction 28, NAR3, Colchester Park and Ride and Berechurch Road.  Lexden Road Bus Lane  The Lexden Road Bus Lane scheme will be delivered through the Eastern Highways Alliance or an equivalent. The benefits of this approach are as follows:   * Proven track record of delivery and existing partnership arrangement * Scale and complexity of this component of the package warrants the use of contractors who are used to dealing with bigger and more complex schemes. * The utilisation of the Framework is endorsed by the ECC procurement team.   All Other Schemes in the Package  Construction of a schemes will be delivered through the Essex Highways Service Direct Delivery Framework using supply chain partners. The benefits via this route are:-   * Early involvement with the contractor * Use of Supply Chain partners who are familiar with the delivery of smaller complex projects under tight deadlines * Flexibility and opportunity to accelerate the delivery of smaller elements through the ‘Walk, Talk and Build’ process, thus increasing confidence in project delivery timeframe * The utilisation of the Framework is endorsed by the ECC procurement team.   Risk Allocation  ECC will bear all risk for the project as part of its role as Highways Authority.  Maintenance  Work will be carried out on the existing highway network. All highway improvement works will be inspected annually and maintained by the Highways Authority. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Financial Case** |
| * ***Total cost of the project*** |
| Listed below are the elements of gross costs, excluding optimisation bias.  The rates used reflect construction projects of a similar size and nature and are at current day prices (Q3 2014). The scheme cost estimates have been derived using the Ringway Jacobs cost estimating tool, which is based upon commercially benchmarked data.  See **Appendix C** for scheme cost estimates.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | **\* Cost** **Estimate status (E; F; D; T)** | **2014/15**  **£000** | **2015/16**  **£000** | **2016/17**  **£000** | **2017/18**  **£000** | **2018/19**  **£000** | **2019/20**  **£000** | **2020/21**  **£000** | | Procurement Cost | D |  | 654 |  |  |  |  |  | | Feasibility Cost | D |  | 201 |  |  |  |  |  | | Detail Design Cost | D |  | 527 |  |  |  |  |  | | Management Cost | D |  | 363 |  |  |  |  |  | | Construction Cost | D |  | 2,437 |  |  |  |  |  | | Contingency | D |  | 98 |  |  |  |  |  | | QRA | D |  | 451 |  |  |  |  |  | | Stats | D |  | 321 |  |  |  |  |  | | **VAT (if appropriate)** | **D** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | **Sub-total**  **Non-Works** | **D** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | **Sub-total Works** | **D** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | **TOTAL COST** | **D** |  | **5,052** |  |  |  |  |  |   \*E = Broad estimate, D = Detailed estimate, T = Tender price, F= Feasibility estimate |
| * ***Source of funding*** |
| List here the amount of funding sought   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Funding Source** | **2014/15**  **£000** | **2015/16**  **£000** | **2016/17**  **£000** | **2017/18**  **£000** | **2018/19**  **£000** | **2019/20**  **£000** | **2020/21**  **£000** | | LGF |  | 5,000 |  |  |  |  |  | | Private Developers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Borrowing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Income |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | **Other** (insert as many rows as required) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | **Local Contribution Total (leverage)** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | **Other Funding**  ECC |  | **52** |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | **TOTAL FUNDING** |  | **5,052** |  |  |  |  |  |      |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Type of Funding** | **Funding Source** | **Please identify how secure the funds are** | **When will the money be available** | | Public | LGF | Secure | April 2015 | | Borrowing |  |  | | Income |  |  | | **Other** (insert as many rows as required) |  |  | | **Local Contribution Total (leverage)** |  |  | | **Private** | Please list all developers |  |  | |  |  |  | | Private Developers Total |  |  | |  | **Other Funding**  ECC | Secure | April 2015 | |
| * 1. ***Affordability gap*** |
| * ***Is there an affordability gap?***   No |

|  |
| --- |
| **Management Case - Delivery** |
| 1. ***Delivery*** |

|  |
| --- |
| * 1. ***Provide high level information about arrangements that will ensure delivery of this project***   Some preparatory work had been previously undertaken on some of these schemes which will allow a fast start to this programme.    **Project Management Arrangements and Governance**  **Background**  This plan outlines the project structures and processes that will be used to govern activities.  **Project Organisation**  The organisation to deliver the scheme is indicated in Figure 1 below. The roles and responsibilities of the parties indicated in the figure are described in the following paragraphs.    *Figure 1: Arrangements for Scheme Delivery*  **Roles of Key Interested Parties:**  **South East Local Enterprise Partnership Board (SELEP)** – brings together senior officers and transport portfolio holders of the partner statutory authorities promoting the scheme. Essex County Council acts as the lead authority for the scheme and provides the project’s Senior Responsible Owner.  The arrangements between the statutory authorities promoting the scheme are in the process of being formalised through a joint working partnership agreement. This sets out the basis for governance of the project and for the financial contributions to be made by each party.  **Project Board** – is responsible for the direction and overall management of the scheme. The Project Board is chaired by the Senior Responsible Owner and made up of the Executive and Senior User for each of the partner statutory authorities, the Project Assurance Lead and the Business Change Lead. These roles are defined below. Project Board meetings are normally held every six weeks. The Project Manager reports regularly to the Project Board, keeping members informed of progress and highlighting any issues or concerns.   * The responsibilities of the Project Board include: * Setting the strategic direction of the project, in the context of local policies and the work of the SELEP * Defining the scope and setting the timescales for major project milestones * Approving the appointment of the Project Manager * Providing the Project Manager with the strategy and decisions required to enable the scheme to proceed to programme and resolve any challenges * Securing necessary approvals through the partner statutory authorities * Approving the project scope of work, programme and budgets, as well as any subsequent changes * Signing off completion of each stage of the project and authorising the start of the next stage * Monitoring project risks and taking any appropriate action to mitigate risks.   **Delivery Teams** – reporting to the Project Manager, the Delivery Teams (one for each partner statutory authority) are responsible for organising and delivering work packages on the highways under the authority’s jurisdiction. The Essex Delivery Team has the additional responsibility for common work packages.  **Project Support** – this team is responsible for project administration, including document control, project team communications, arranging meetings, updating plans, and chasing up the completion of actions.  **Individual Roles:**  **Senior Responsible Owner (P Bird, ECC)** – has ultimate responsibility and delegated authority for ensuring effective delivery of the scheme on time and on budget.  **Project Manager (P McLean, ECC)** – is the individual responsible for organising, controlling and delivering the scheme. The Project Manager leads and manages the project team, with the authority and responsibility to run the project on a day-today basis.  **Executives (C Stephenson, ECC; D Stanesby, ECC) –** represent the group in each partner statutory authority with responsibility for obtaining funding for the scheme and securing resources to deliver it. In Essex County Council this is the Transport Strategy and Engagement Group.  **Senior Users (D Forkin, ECC)** – represent the group in each partner statutory authority who will oversee the future day-to-day operation of the scheme.  **Project Assurance Lead (E Deppe, Ringway Jacobs)** – provides an independent view of how the scheme is progressing. Tasks include checking that the project remains viable in terms of costs and benefits (business assurance), the users' requirements are being met (user assurance), and that the project is delivering a suitable solution (technical assurance).  **Business Change Lead** – is responsible for facilitating internal and external transition required to support the successful establishment of the scheme.  Resources to support this project will be prioritized to ensure efficient delivery at the earliest opportunity.  **Stakeholders**  There have been a number of stakeholder discussions, with CBC etc, primarily involved with Park and Ride, but also discussing the proposals contained in the scheme above. Within the last few years, ECC has worked with CBC on their ‘Better Town Centre’ Programme and this has involved a number of public consultation events which have covered the topics in this package.  Colchester Borough Council and Essex County Council have both worked together during development of the Colchester Local Development Framework. This collaborative working facilitated the production of the LDF Core Strategy Transportation Topic Paper, which identified the transport needs for Colchester if growth was to be realised within the town. The Core Strategy and Transportation Topic Paper formed part of the suite of documents that went through the Examination in Public process, and the LDF was found to be ‘Sound’.  **Risk Management:**  A proactive risk management procedure is in operation, including a quantified risk assessment approach, which ensures that risks are continuously identified, owners assigned and mitigation measures put in place. Regular reviews check the status of each risk and regulate their control and mitigation. Project procedures also require that should the likelihood or severity of risks be identified as increasing by this process, responsibility for its mitigation is escalated upwards through the project management chain to ensure that this is achieved.  All risks are currently owned by the partner authorities. As the project develops it is expected that some of these risks will be transferred to contractors constructing the infrastructure. In addition, Essex County Council uses a proprietary online Risk Register to assess levels of risk and to track the progress of the risk management strategy for the scheme. The §151 Officer also has access to this system. Risks are categorised into five main areas, i.e.:   * Project and programme risks related to delivery; * Consultation and stakeholder acceptance; * Reputational risks to the project partner authorities (and ultimately the contractors and service providers); * Statutory Processes; and * Financial and funding risks. * ***Benefit realisation plan and monitoring*** – See below   Full details Full details of monitoring and evaluation aspects will be developed alongside detailed scheme development.   * ***Independent Technical Evaluators’ sign off*** |

**Colchester TC T&A**

**BENEFITS REALISATION PLAN SUMMARY**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Benefits** | **Performance Indicator** | **Type\*** | **When Delivered** | **Responsibility for Delivery** | **How Measured** | **Success Management** |
| 1. | **Economy:**  Improve the economic efficiency and reliability of the local road network by reducing congestion on the main arterial roads. | SEP | DFB | Completion of full scheme | ECC / CBC Scheme Project Managers | Measure pre-scheme peak period traffic flows, journey times baseline figures compared to post-opening.  After surveys within 3 months and then 1 year after scheme opening.  Surveys on existing & new network. | Based on PRINCE II Project Management principles. Project team will use established best practices for this type of scheme. |
| 2. | **Economy:** Encourage more people to use sustainable travel with improved bus services, improved pedestrian access and upgraded cycleway connections. | SEP | DFB | Completion of full scheme | ECC / CBC Scheme Project Managers | Measure pre-scheme peak period traffic flows, journey time baseline figures compared to post-opening – 3 months and 1 year after. | Based on PRINCE II Project Management principles. Project team will use established best practices for this type of scheme. |
| 3. | **Sustainability:** Improve sustainability by encouraging people to use sustainable travel with improved bus services. | SEP | DFB | Completion of full scheme | ECC / CBC Scheme Project Managers | Measure bus usage pre and post scheme – 3 months and 1 year after. Conduct passenger surveys to measure levels of customer satisfaction – 3 months after. | Based on PRINCE II Project Management principles. Project team will use established best practices for this type of scheme. |
| 4. | **Sustainability:** Improve sustainability by providing improved cycleway and pedestrian connections. | SEP | DFB | Completion of full scheme | ECC / CBC Scheme Project Managers | Measure cycleway usage pre- and post- scheme – 3 months and 1 year after. Conduct cycle surveys to measure levels of satisfaction – 3 months after. Similarly, conduct pedestrian surveys – 3 months after. | Based on PRINCE II Project Management principles. Project team will use established best practices for this type of scheme. |
| 5. | **Economy:** Provide improved and cost effective access to town centre. | SEP | DFB | Completion of full scheme | ECC / CBC Scheme Project Managers | Measure car peak period traffic flows, journey time baseline figures.  Surveys within 3 months and then 1 year after scheme opening. | Based on PRINCE II Project Management principles. Project team will use established best practices for this type of scheme. |
| 6. | **Accessibility:** Facilitates access to town centre. | SEP | DFB | Completion of full scheme | ECC / CBC Scheme Project Managers | Conduct specific journey time surveys once scheme is complete – 3 months after. | Based on PRINCE II Project Management principles. Project team will use established best practices for this type of scheme. |
| 7. | **Integration:** Integrateland-use, regeneration & transport policy by providing public transport infrastructure as part of the strategy for regeneration and growth. | SEP | DNFB | During design and on completion of full scheme | ECC / CBC Scheme Project Managers | Undertake before and 3 months after infrastructure comparisons. | Liaise with other Councils throughout scheme design to ensure seamless scheme integration. Project teams will use established best practices for this type of scheme. |
| 8. | **Safety:** Address congestion and capacity issues to the town centre for residential, commuter and commercial traffic. | SEP | DNFB | Completion of scheme | ECC / CBC Scheme Project Managers | Pre-scheme accident baseline figures compared to post opening.  After data collection within 1 year after scheme opening.  Figures from ECC accident data base to be supplied by Essex Police. | Based on PRINCE II Project Management principles. Project team will use established best practices for this type of scheme. |
| 9. | **Safety:** Flows will be improved as traffic is taken out of the network. | SEP | DNFB | Completion of scheme | ECC / CBC Scheme Project Managers | Pre-scheme accident baseline figures compared to post opening.  After data collection within 3 months and then 1 year after scheme opening.  Figures from ECC accident data base to be supplied by Essex Police. | Based on PRINCE II Project Management principles. Project team will use established best practices for this type of scheme. |
| 10. | **Environment:** Ensurecompliance with international, national, regional and local plans, policy and legislation. | ECC / CBC Locally Defined | IB | During design and on completion of full scheme | ECC / CBC Scheme Project Managers | All current and proposed legislation & policies will be adhered to.  Full consultation with all key local stakeholders during process. | Project team will use established best practices for this type of scheme. |
| 11. | **Environment:** Minimise project programme slippages and delays through the early identification of environmental / topographical issues. | ECC / CBC Locally Defined | DFB | During design and on completion of full scheme | ECC / CBC Scheme Project Managers | Monitor progress regularly (weekly) against programme until completion of scheme. | Undertake early Environmental and Topographical checks to avoid later issues. Project team will use established best practices for this type of scheme. |

**\*Types: Direct Financial Benefit (DFB), Direct Non-financial Benefit (DNFB), Indirect Benefit (IB)**