

Local Pinch Point Fund Application Form



Department
for Transport

Guidance on the Application Process is available at:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/department-for-transport/series/local-pinch-point-fund>

Please include the Checklist with your completed application form.

The level of information provided should be proportionate to the size and complexity of the scheme proposed. As a guide, for a small scheme we would suggest around 25-35 pages including annexes would be appropriate.

One application form should be completed per project.

Applicant Information

Local authority name(s)*: Northumberland County Council

Bid Manager Name and position: Jemma Reay. Senior Engineer.

Contact telephone number: 01670 622959

Email address: Jemma.Reay@northumberland.gov.uk

Postal address: County Hall
Morpeth
Northumberland
NE61 2EF

When authorities submit a bid for funding to the Department, as part of the Government's commitment to greater openness in the public sector under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and the Environmental Information Regulations 2004, they must also publish a version excluding any commercially sensitive information on their own website within two working days of submitting the final bid to the Department. The Department reserves the right to deem the business case as non-compliant if this is not adhered to.

Please specify the weblink where this bid will be published:

<http://www.northumberland.gov.uk/default.aspx?page=7846>

SECTION A - Project description and funding profile

A1. Project name: Ovingham Bridge Refurbishment

A2. Headline description:

Full structural refurbishment of the 130 year old structure across the River Tyne, between Ovingham and Prudhoe in Northumberland. The scheme includes full repainting of all structural steel/ironwork; Replacement of the deck structure to include new deck panels and cross girders; Repairs to truss members as required; Repairs to abutments, to include waterproofing and repointing.

A3. Geographical area:

Ovingham Bridge is set between the village of Ovingham and the town of Prudhoe. The 130 year old bridge towers over the River Tyne and has good views along it. To the south of the bridge there is a well frequented car park providing access to recreational activities along the River Tyne in a country park. The village of Ovingham is a conservation area, while Prudhoe is a main town with a significant industrial estate. There are several sites of ecological importance downstream of the bridge.

OS Grid Reference: 408616E 563597N

Postcode: NE42 6NP

A location plan is attached as Appendix A.

A4. Type of bid (please tick relevant box):

Small project bids (requiring DfT funding of between £1m and £5m)

Scheme Bid

Structure Maintenance Bid

Large project bids (requiring DfT funding of between £5m and £20m)

Scheme Bid

Structure Maintenance Bid

Note: Scheme and Structure Maintenance bids will be assessed using the same criteria.

A5. Equality Analysis

Has any Equality Analysis been undertaken in line with the Equality Duty? Yes No

A6. Partnership bodies

Utility companies who may require spare ducts on the bridge.

Prudhoe Riverside Park which is adjacent to the south end of the bridge.

A7. Local Enterprise Partnership / Local Transport Body Involvement

It would be beneficial (though not essential) if the relevant LEP or LTB (or shadow(s)) have considered the bid and, if necessary, prioritised it against other bids from the same area. If possible, please include a letter from the LEP / LTB confirming their support and, if more than one bid is being submitted from the area, the priority ranking in order of growth significance.

Have you appended a letter from the LEP / LTB to support this case? Yes No

SECTION B – The Business Case

You may find the following DfT tools useful in preparing your business case:

- [Transport Business Cases](#)
- [Behavioural Insights Toolkit](#)
- [Logic Mapping Hints and Tips](#)

B1. The Scheme - Summary

Please select what the scheme is trying to achieve (this will need to be supported by evidence in the Business Case). Please select all categories that apply.

- Improve access to a development site that has the potential to create housing
- Improve access to a development site that has the potential to create jobs
- Improve access to urban employment centres
- Improve access to Enterprise Zones
- Maintain accessibility by addressing the condition of structures
- Ease congestion / bottlenecks
- Other(s), Please specify -

B2. The Strategic Case

a) What is the problem that is being addressed, making specific reference to barriers to growth and why this has not been addressed previously?

Ovingham Bridge is a 130 year old single lane bridge over the River Tyne carrying in excess of 2000 vehicles/day. It is a commuter route between the town of Prudhoe on the south bank of the river and the A69 trunk road to the north. The bridge is restricted to 3 Tonnes with 6' 6" width restrictors. Despite these restrictions, the bridge carries the heaviest traffic flow in both the morning and evening peak hours out of all the local river crossings in this locality. The nearest alternative bridges are approx. 5km upstream at Bywell, and approx. 4km downstream at Wylam. Because of its high usage the bridge is in need of a full structural refurbishment. Without this, the bridge is likely to close, forcing high volumes of traffic, onto other bridge crossings, especially at peak times.

The bridge is the main route for local and commuter traffic accessing Prudhoe from the north. It provides access to employment and to the various other services available in the town. It also provides employers with direct access to the labour market north of the Tyne - a rural area with small villages and little local employment. If the bridge were to close, this would have a

detrimental effect by restricting access to Prudhoe, necessitating diversions to other bridges further up or downstream, increasing journey times and traffic levels through other settlements.

Prudhoe is one of the main towns in Northumberland, with a population of 11,739 (2007). It is identified as a main town, retail centre and employment location in the Northumberland Core Strategy and is a focus for development and growth. As well as its importance in East Tynedale, its close proximity to Tyne and Wear places it within the Newcastle, Gateshead and North of Tyne Functional Economic Area. There is a substantial industrial estate at Low Prudhoe with a mix of starter units, workshops, some medium sized units and large manufacturing dominated by SCA Hygiene Products. The estate has been successful, with over 36,000 sqm of floorspace developed since 1991, and a steady level of enquiries for units. The County Council plans to extend the estate, however, as it is nearing capacity, further employment sites need to be identified.

A further potential employment site has been identified on the site of the former Prudhoe Hospital. This is currently subject to a masterplan developed by the Homes and Communities Agency. The site has considerable potential for a residential-led mixed use development, with around 7ha available for employment uses. Located within the Green Belt, the site could be developed as a strategic employment site for companies requiring sites in non-industrial locations (for example, corporate office headquarters or hi-tech development), or a mixed use development that could include an element of offices, light industry or a science park.

The Northumberland Employment Land Review (2011) found that, given the low vacancy rates, strong levels of take up and enquiry levels in the Prudhoe area, a strong case has been made for additional employment land allocations in the Core Strategy.

In addition to employment, as a main town Prudhoe is a key hub for education, healthcare, housing and retail. Further employment is provided in the town centre associated with retail and other services. There are plans for a major mixed use development in the town centre, consisting of retail, housing, community uses and offices, anchored by a supermarket. This will increase the attractiveness of Prudhoe as a shopping destination and claw back trade that is currently lost to neighbouring centres. A Town Centre Health Check carried out in 2008 found that just 1.6% of Prudhoe residents shopped in Prudhoe. 47% of expenditure was lost to the Metro Centre and a further 35% to Newcastle. The Health Check found that, while the town centre was considered to be in reasonable health, the number of vacant units was increasing and shoppers perceptions were often negative. Maintaining access to Prudhoe is therefore essential to support the proposed improvements to the town centre.

b) What options have been considered and why have alternatives have been rejected?

In October 2001 a study was undertaken to establish the viability of providing an additional crossing over the River Tyne near Ovingham. The study considered three options varying between £13m and £15m (2001 prices).

In 2007 a further study was carried out to assess the need for an additional crossing of the River Tyne near Ovingham, in response to concern over the existing bridge and the impact of traffic in Ovingham Village.

5 potential options for a new river crossing were considered:

1. A replacement bridge on the site of the existing bridge.
2. A695 Low Prudhoe Roundabout (East) to the A69 Oatens Bank Junction
3. A695 Low Prudhoe Roundabout (East) to the A69 via Holeyln Hall Road, Wylam
4. A695 Low Prudhoe Ind. Est. to the A69 via Gallowhill Lane

5. A695 Eltringham to A69/C254 junction via Ovingham School and Ovington

All the options were assessed against the North East Prioritisation Framework. The study concluded that none of the options would receive the level of funding required when compared to other schemes. All of the options had a negative environmental impact, and options 1 to 4 required extensive new road construction. All of the options were therefore rejected.

In 2009 potential improvements to traffic management were investigated, in order to improve traffic flows and ease congestion on the existing river crossings. This found that a large proportion of the traffic using Ovingham Bridge was made up of commuters, with further traffic generated by nearby schools. The study concluded that upgrading links to the bridge would place further strain upon it, while restricting its use would place further strain on neighbouring bridges and the local minor road network.

The previous studies into a potential new bridge are attached as Appendix F for further information.

c) What are the expected benefits / outcomes? For example, job creation, housing numbers and GVA and the basis on which these have been estimated.

The benefit of the scheme is the retention of this important access route into Prudhoe, supporting local employers, retailers and other services. It maintains access for commuters who would otherwise have to make diversions to other river crossings which would place further strain on those bridges and increase traffic through nearby villages. It also provides employers access to the labour market north of the Tyne, which will be important as further development of employment land takes place.

The proposals for a new supermarket, other retail and office developments in the town centre will create new jobs. The bridge will be important in providing access to this development for communities north of the river, supporting the new jobs by clawing back trade currently lost to neighbouring centres.

d) What is the project's scope and is there potential to reduce costs and still achieve the desired outcomes? For example, using value engineering.

N/A – maintaining an existing Highway structure

e) Are there any related activities, that if not successfully concluded would mean the full economic benefits of the scheme may not be realised. For example, this could relate to land acquisition, other transport interventions being required or a need for additional consents?

Agreement is required from landowners at either side of the bridge to enter their land. Previous repairs to the bridge were undertaken in 2005. Access was not an issue at that time.

Environment Agency consent is required to carry out work over the River Tyne.

f) What will happen if funding for this scheme is not secured - would an alternative (lower cost) solution be implemented (if yes, please describe this alternative and how it differs from the proposed scheme)?

If funding is not provided from the DfT or made available from the County Council, the only alternative solution is to close the road bridge. This will place pressure on adjacent road

crossings and their already congested approaches, particularly at Wylam, which are not capable of carrying more traffic.

g) What is the impact of the scheme – and any associated mitigation works – on any statutory environmental constraints? For example, Local Air Quality Management Zones.

N/A – maintaining an existing Highway structure

B3. The Financial Case – Project Costs

Before preparing a scheme proposal for submission, bid promoters should ensure they understand the financial implications of developing the scheme (including any implications for future resource spend and ongoing costs relating to maintaining and operating the asset), and the need to secure and underwrite any necessary funding outside the Department's maximum contribution.

Please complete the following tables. Figures should be entered in £000s (i.e. £10,000 = 10).

Table A: Funding profile (Nominal terms)

£000s	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	Total
DfT funding sought	312	1,953		2,265
Local Authority contribution	190	603	178	971
Third Party contribution	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
TOTAL	502	2,556	178	3,236

Table B: Cost estimates (Nominal terms)

Cost heading	Cost (£000s)	Date estimated	Status (e.g. target price)
Preliminaries (welfare cabins, workforce 8hr days for 7days/wk)	1,254	12 Feb 2013	Budget cost estimate
Land	23	12 Feb 2013	Budget cost estimate
SPS deck plates	312	12 Feb 2013	Budget cost estimate
Tension Control Bolts	40	12 Feb 2013	Budget cost estimate
Scaffolding (incl maintenance)	352	12 Feb 2013	Budget cost estimate
Fabricated steelwork	125	12 Feb 2013	Budget cost estimate
Painting	201	12 Feb 2013	Budget cost estimate
Waterproofing	23	12 Feb 2013	Budget cost estimate
Paint inspector	49	12 Feb 2013	Budget cost estimate
Design	1940	12 Feb 2013	Budget cost estimate
Supervision	119	12 Feb 2013	Budget cost estimate

Risk register	548	12 Feb 2013	Budget cost estimate
TOTAL	3,236	12 Feb 2013	

Notes:

- 1) Department for Transport funding must not go beyond 2014-15 financial year.
- 2) A minimum local contribution of 30% (local authority and/or third party) of the project costs is required.
- 3) Costs in Table B should be presented in outturn prices and must match the total amount of funding indicated in Table A.

B4. The Financial Case - Local Contribution / Third Party Funding

Please provide information on the following points (where applicable):

- a) *The non-DfT contribution may include funding from organisations other than the scheme promoter. If the scheme improves transport links to a new development, we would expect to see a significant contribution from the developer. Please provide details of all non-DfT funding contributions to the scheme costs. This should include evidence to show how any third party contributions are being secured, the level of commitment and when they will become available.*

N/A – maintaining an existing Highway structure;

- b) *Where the contribution is from external sources, please provide a letter confirming the body's commitment to contribute to the cost of the scheme. The Department is unlikely to fund any scheme where significant financial contributions from other sources have not been secured or appear to be at risk.*

Have you appended a letter(s) to support this case? Yes No N/A

- c) *The Department may accept the provision of land in the local contribution towards scheme costs. Please provide evidence in the form of a letter from an independent valuer to verify the true market value of the land.*

Have you appended a letter to support this case? Yes No N/A

- d) *Please list any other funding applications you have made for this scheme or variants thereof and the outcome of these applications, including any reasons for rejection.*

N/A

B5. The Financial Case – Affordability and Financial Risk

This section should provide a narrative setting out how you will mitigate any financial risks associated with the scheme (you should refer to the Risk Register / QRA – see Section B11).

Please ensure that in the risk / QRA cost that you have not included any risks associated with ongoing operational costs and have used the P50 value.

Please provide evidence on the following points (where applicable):

a) What risk allowance has been applied to the project cost?

A risk allowance of £548k has been applied to the project cost. For further detail see the risk register and QRA in Appendix B.

b) How will cost overruns be dealt with?

Cost overruns will be funded by the County Council.

c) What are the main risks to project delivery timescales and what impact this will have on cost?

The main risks are:

1) Obtaining licence areas to allow access under both sides of the bridge. This is not land acquisition but an agreement between parties to enter their land. The substructures of the bridge were repaired in 2005. Land entry did not present an issue at the time.

2) Obtaining EA Consent to erect the scaffold and carry out work over a main river.

3) Extra work to repair trusses may be required, once cross girders have been removed.

d) How will cost overruns be shared between non-DfT funding partners (DfT funding will be capped and will not be able to fund any overruns)?

N/A

B6. The Economic Case – Value for Money

This section should set out the full range of impacts – both beneficial and adverse – of the scheme. The scope of information requested (and in the supporting annexes) will vary according to whether the application is for a small or large project.

Small project bids (i.e. DfT contribution of less than £5m)

a) Please provide a description of your assessment of the impact of the scheme to include:

- **Significant positive and negative impacts (quantified where possible);**

Negative Impacts

- Ovingham continues to be subjected to high volumes of cars and light vans.
- The road between Ovingham and the A69 continues to carry high volumes of cars and light vans.

Positive Impacts

- Full refurbishment of the bridge provides a design life of 120 years.
- Time to first major maintenance will be 25 to 35 years.
- Maintains an important river crossing where there have been little or no additional crossings constructed in the last 60 years. This has not kept pace with developments.

- Widens the available space on the bridge deck for vehicles thus providing a better crossing facility.
- Eliminates noise caused by the existing deck construction.
- Provides spare capacity for utility companies, eg superfast broadband connections.
- ***A description of the key risks and uncertainties;***

Key risks and uncertainties identified in the risk analysis for the scheme are summarised as follows:

- Delays to painting due to inclement weather
- Loss of scaffold around bridge piers during painting
- Risk of truss repairs becoming more extensive, requiring further works
- Loss of time associated with the above.

Further detail on risks is set out in the Risk Register in Appendix B.

- ***A short description of the modelling approach used to forecast the impact of the scheme and the checks that have been undertaken to determine that it is fit-for-purpose.***

Modelling is considered to be unnecessary as the bid is to maintain an existing highway structure. Traffic count data provided in Appendix A illustrate the importance to the local highway network of the existing single lane crossing, in particular how the single lane crossing carries the same number of cars as Wylam bridge further downstream (Wylam bridge carries two way traffic).

Feasibility reports of providing a new crossing put the scheme in excess of £30million (est 2013 prices). Refurbishment of the existing structure is required to maintain redundancy in the river crossing in this locale.

**** Small projects bids are not required to produce a Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) but may want to include this here if they have estimated this.***

b) Small project bidders should provide the following as annexes as supporting material:

- **A completed Scheme Impacts Pro Forma which summarises the impact of proposals against a number of metrics relevant to the scheme objectives. It is important that bidders complete as much of this table as possible as this will be used by DfT – along with other centrally sourced data – to form an estimate of the BCR of the scheme. Not all sections of the pro forma are relevant for all types of scheme (this is indicated in the pro forma).**
- **A description of the sources of data and forecasts used to complete the Scheme Impacts Pro Forma. This should include descriptions of the checks that have been undertaken to verify the accuracy of data or forecasts relied upon. Further details on the minimum supporting information required are presented against each entry within the pro forma.**

Has a Scheme Impacts Pro Forma been appended? Yes No N/A

Has a description of data sources / forecasts been appended? Yes No N/A

The Scheme Impacts Pro Forma, including a description of the data used, is attached as Appendix C.

Further traffic data is included in 2007 Tyne Crossings Study, attached as Appendix E1.

- **A completed Appraisal Summary Table. Bidders are required to provide their assessment of all the impacts included within the table and highlight any significant Social or Distributional Impacts (SDIs). Quantitative and monetary estimates should be provided where available but are not mandatory. The level of detail provided in the table should be proportionate to the scale of expected impact with particular emphasis placed on the assessment of carbon, air quality, bus usage, sustainable modes, accessibility and road safety. The source of evidence used to assess impacts should be clearly stated within the table and (where appropriate) further details on the methods or data used to inform the assessment should be attached as notes to the table.**

Has an Appraisal Summary Table been appended? Yes No N/A

The AST is attached as Appendix D.

- **Other material supporting the assessment of the scheme described in this section should be appended to your bid.**

Appendix E1 and E2 contains the previous studies into a potential new bridge crossing and provides useful background information.

**** This list is not necessarily exhaustive and it is the responsibility of bidders to provide sufficient information to demonstrate the analysis supporting the economic case is fit-for-purpose.***

B7. The Commercial Case

This section should set out the procurement strategy that will be used to select a contractor and, importantly for this fund, set out the timescales involved in the procurement process to show that delivery can proceed quickly.

- a) Please provide evidence to show the risk allocation and transfer between the promoter and contractor, contract timescales and implementation timescales (this can be cross-referenced to your Risk Management Strategy).***

All risk is carried by the in-house contractor.

- b) What is the preferred procurement route for the scheme and how and why was this identified as the preferred procurement route? For example, if it is proposed to use existing framework agreements or contracts, the contract must be appropriate in terms of scale and scope.***

The preferred procurement route is to carry out the work using in-house contractor. Subcontractors (scaffolding, steelwork fabrication and painting) will be subject to a tender process.

- c) A procurement strategy will not need to form part of the bid documentation submitted to DfT. Instead, the Department will require the bid to include a joint letter from the***

local authority's Section 151 Officer and Head of Procurement confirming that a strategy is in place that is legally compliant and is likely to achieve the best value for money outcome.

Has a joint letter been appended to your bid? Yes No

A joint letter is appended as Appendix F.

****It is the promoting authority's responsibility to decide whether or not their scheme proposal is lawful; and the extent of any new legal powers that need to be sought. Scheme promoters should ensure that any project complies with the Public Contracts Regulations as well as European Union State Aid rules, and should be prepared to provide the Department with confirmation of this, if required.***

B8. Management Case - Delivery

Deliverability is one of the essential criteria for this Fund and as such any bid should set out any necessary statutory procedures that are needed before it can be constructed.

a) A detailed project plan (typically in Gantt chart form) with milestones should be included, covering the period from submission of the bid to scheme completion. The definition of the key milestones should be clear and explained. The critical path should be identifiable and any key dependencies (internal or external) should be explained. Resource requirements, task durations, contingency and float should be detailed and easily identifiable. Dependencies and interfaces should be clearly outlined and plans for management detailed.

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

Attached as Appendix G.

b) If delivery of the project is dependent on land acquisition, please include a letter from the respective land owner(s) to demonstrate that arrangements are in place in order to secure the land to enable the authority to meet its construction milestones.

Has a letter relating to land acquisition been appended? Yes No
 N/A

c) Please provide summary details of your construction milestones (at least one but no more than 5 or 6) between start and completion of works:

Table C: Construction milestones

	Estimated Date
Start of works	7 April 2014
Road closure commencing	13 May 2014
Repair and paint superstructure commencing	4 July 2014
Rebuild superstructure commencing	21 January 2015
Finish painting to substructure commencing	21 May 2015

d) Please list any major transport schemes costing over £5m in the last 5 years which the authority has delivered, including details of whether these were completed to time and budget (and if not, whether there were any mitigating circumstances)

No major schemes have been completed in the last 5 years. Most recent major scheme, Pegswood Bypass, was completed in 2007.

B9. Management Case – Statutory Powers and Consents

a) Please list separately each power / consents etc obtained, details of date acquired, challenge period (if applicable) and date of expiry of powers and conditions attached to them. Any key dates should be referenced in your project plan.

N/A – Scheme falls under permitted development;

b) Please list separately any outstanding statutory powers / consents etc, including the timetable for obtaining them.

Environment Agency consent is required for both permanent and temporary works. This will be obtained 8 weeks from submission of the application.

B10. Management Case – Governance

Please name who is responsible for delivering the scheme, the roles (Project Manager, SRO etc.) and responsibilities of those involved, and how key decisions are/will be made. An organogram may be useful here. Details around the organisation of the project including Board accountabilities, contract management arrangements, tolerances, and decision making authorities should be clearly documented and fully agreed.

An organogram is enclosed in Appendix H showing the structure of the project team with the overriding governance and scrutiny roles.

B11. Management Case - Risk Management

All schemes will be expected to undertake a thorough Quantified Risk Assessment (QRA) and a detailed risk register should be included in the bid. The QRA should be proportionate to the nature and complexity of the scheme. A Risk Management Strategy should be developed and should outline on how risks will be managed.

Please ensure that in the risk / QRA cost that you have not included any risks associated with ongoing operational costs and have used the P50 value.

Has a QRA been appended to your bid? Yes No
Attached as Appendix I.

Has a Risk Management Strategy been appended to your bid? Yes No
Attached as Appendix J.

B12. Management Case - Stakeholder Management

The bid should demonstrate that the key stakeholders and their interests have been identified and considered as appropriate. These could include other local authorities, the Highways Agency, statutory consultees, landowners, transport operators, local residents, utilities companies etc. This is particularly important in respect of any bids related to structures that may require support of Network Rail and, possibly, train operating company(ies).

a) Please provide a summary of your strategy for managing stakeholders, with details of the key stakeholders together with a brief analysis of their influences and interests.

The County Council has an agreed approach to Stakeholder Management, set out in its project management and delivery framework called "Northumberland Way". The framework defines stakeholders as all individuals or groups who have an interest in the scheme, recognising that stakeholders may change as the project progresses.

The approach to stakeholder management for this scheme has three aims:

1. The project will have a Communication Plan and Stakeholder Management Plan in place.
2. Key stakeholders will be engaged in the development of the scheme from design through to construction.
3. Their interests will be regularly assessed during the life of the scheme.

The Governance Structure in Section B10 identifies the role of the Stakeholder Group in managing this scheme.

Key Stakeholders have been identified as follows:

Ovingham & Prudhoe County Councillors – Initial briefing as part of the DfT bid submission process. Regular email updates thereafter.

Ovingham Parish Council & Prudhoe Town Council – Regular updates on scheme progress.

Prudhoe Community Partnership – Regular updates on scheme progress.

Public – Wylam bridge was strengthened in 2007. A series of road shows took place to inform the public of the work to be carried out and the duration of the road closure. A similar process will be undertaken for this scheme. As the work progresses a liaison group will keep the public informed. This will take place monthly and involve up to ten representatives from the surrounding area, (this process is currently in use at Wark Bridge refurbishment).

Landowners – Discussions to begin when funding is confirmed.

Natural England & Environment Agency – Consent is required to erect scaffold and carry out works over the River Tyne. NCC will appoint an ecologist to advise on constraints and litigation.

b) **Can the scheme be considered as controversial in any way?** Yes No
If yes, please provide a brief summary (in no more than 100 words)

c) **Have there been any external campaigns either supporting or opposing the scheme?**

Yes No

If yes, please provide a brief summary (in no more than 100 words)

B13. Management Case - Assurance

We will require Section 151 Officer confirmation (Section D) that adequate assurance systems are in place.

See section D2

SECTION C – Monitoring, Evaluation and Benefits Realisation

C1. Benefits Realisation

Please provide details on the profile and baseline benefits and their ownership. This should be proportionate to the size of the proposed scheme.

The benefits of the scheme are:

- Maintaining an important access route to/from Prudhoe.
- Benefits the local economy by providing access to services and employment.

These benefits will be 'owned' by all stakeholders, i.e. the local community and all visitors.

C2. Monitoring and Evaluation

Evaluation is an essential part of scheme development and should be considered and built into the planning of a scheme from the earliest stages. Evaluating the outcomes and impacts of schemes is important to show if a scheme has been successful.

Please set out how you plan to measure and report on the benefits identified in Section C1, alongside any other outcomes and impacts of the scheme

Two monitoring and evaluation frameworks have been defined that include provision for a comprehensive measurement of impact and a more streamlined monitoring process. The outline methodology of the frameworks is provided below for the following:

- A) A full scheme impact evaluation; and
- B) Pre and post scheme opening monitoring.

The evaluation principles are consistent with current guidance on evaluation methodologies, including those contained in "Department for Transport: Local major Capital Schemes" (National Audit Office 2011). The objectives contained within the evaluation plan relate to the anticipated benefits that are expected to arise from the scheme.

A) Full scheme impact evaluation

A key challenge for transport evaluations is demonstrating the link between schemes and their impacts and outcomes. The Full Impact Evaluation methodology has been designed to provide a means by which attribution can be identified.

As identified in the HMT's Magenta Book logic models are often used to outline how the theory, assumptions and evidence are linked together providing a rationale for the intervention. An outline logic model has been summarised below for the Ovingham Bridge Refurbishment scheme. This model provides an overview of the links between the context (congestion and desire for economic growth) and the expected outcomes (including sustainable improvement in the local economy).

The methodology outlined below in Table 1 identifies the methods that could be used to carry out the impact evaluation. Full impact evaluations are designed to provide a measurement of the extent that observed changes have derived from the intervention. Therefore the methods proposed are designed not only to identify whether the desired benefits have been achieved but also the extent any changes in conditions would have occurred anyway.

The evaluation includes both quantitative and qualitative methods by which to identify counterfactual conditions including benchmarking against broader trends and discussions with businesses and stakeholders to identify attribution. By considering wider contextual conditions the ability to isolate impacts from potential displacement is also considered.

For transport indicators a direct comparison can be made between conditions before and after opening whilst, where possible, compared against local and national evidence. For wider impacts, including economic, interviews with beneficiaries and stakeholders would be designed to capture how the new infrastructure had affected economic performance and contributed to strategic added value.

Table 1: Component tasks for undertaking full impact evaluation

Benefit	Indicator
Maintain access to Prudhoe	Completion of works to timescale and budget
	New
	Existing traffic counts
	Existing Data
	Journey time data on local routes
	New

B) Scheme Monitoring

Monitoring of the scheme through the use of indicators would enable an understanding of the impact of the scheme to be understood with particular focus on traffic conditions in the area. The types of measures and indicators that could be used to identify the extent the scheme has contributed towards its anticipated benefits are identified in Table 2.

Table 2: Component tasks for scheme monitoring

Benefit	Indicator
Benefit the local economy by providing access to services and employment	Stakeholder interviews to establish the impact on the local economy
	New
	Economic indicators for the Prudhoe area, including number of employees by sector (taken from Business Register and Employment Survey).

	Existing and new data.
--	------------------------

SECTION D: Declarations

D1. Senior Responsible Owner Declaration

As Senior Responsible Owner for [scheme name] I hereby submit this request for approval to DfT on behalf of [name of authority] and confirm that I have the necessary authority to do so.

I confirm that [name of authority] will have all the necessary statutory powers in place to ensure the planned timescales in the application can be realised.

Name: *BARRY KENNEDY*

Signed:

Position: *CORPORATE DIRECTOR*

Barry Kennedy

D2. Section 151 Officer Declaration

As Section 151 Officer for [name of authority] I declare that the scheme cost estimates quoted in this bid are accurate to the best of my knowledge and that [name of authority]

- has allocated sufficient budget to deliver this scheme on the basis of its proposed funding contribution
- accepts responsibility for meeting any costs over and above the DfT contribution requested, including potential cost overruns and the underwriting of any funding contributions expected from third parties
- accepts responsibility for meeting any ongoing revenue requirements in relation to the scheme
- accepts that no further increase in DfT funding will be considered beyond the maximum contribution requested and that no DfT funding will be provided after 2014/15
- confirms that the authority has the necessary governance / assurance arrangements in place and, for smaller scheme bids, the authority can provide, if required, evidence of a stakeholder analysis and communications plan in place

Name: *STEVEN MASON*

Signed:

Steve P Mason

Submission of bids:

For both small bids and large bids the deadline is 5pm, **21 February 2013**

One hard copy and a CD version of each bid and supporting material should be submitted to:

Steve Berry
Local Transport Funding, Growth & Delivery Division
Department for Transport
Great Minster House
33 Horseferry Road
London
SW1P 4DR

An electronic copy should also be submitted to steve.berry@dft.gsi.gov.uk

