

## Appendix 3: Scheme Summary

<b>Name of Scheme:</b>	<b>A58 / A672 Corridor Improvement Programme</b>
<b>PMO Scheme Code:</b>	WYTF-PA4-038a-7
<b>Lead Organisation:</b>	Calderdale Council
<b>Senior Responsible Officer:</b>	Mark Thompson
<b>Lead Promoter Contact:</b>	Peter Stubbs
<b>Case Officer:</b>	Simon Collingwood
<b>Applicable Funding Stream(s) – Grant or Loan:</b>	100% funded from the West Yorkshire plus Transport Fund
<b>Growth Fund Priority Area (if applicable):</b>	Growth Deal - West Yorkshire plus Transport Fund
<b>Approvals to Date:</b>	CIP Phase 1 – Programme level decision point 2 approval June 2017, including £235,000 development costs for this scheme to get to outline business case (decision point 3)
<b>Forecasted Full Approval Date (Decision Point 5):</b>	August 2019
<b>Forecasted Completion Date (Decision Point 6):</b>	March 2021
<b>Total Scheme Cost (£):</b>	£6,024,183
<b>Combined Authority Funding (£):</b>	£6,024,183
<b>Total other public sector investment (£):</b>	£0
<b>Total other private sector investment (£):</b>	£0
<b>Is this a standalone Project?</b>	Yes
<b>Is this a Programme?</b>	Yes
<b>Is this Project part of an agreed Programme?</b>	A58/ A672 Corridor Improvements Programme

### Current Assurance Process Activity:



### Scheme Description:

A package of small-scale transport interventions on the A58/A672 corridor, focused on highway improvements, along with improving facilities for active modes.

The scheme involves a package of measures to improve highway efficiency for the benefit of all road users along part of the West Yorkshire Key Route Network (WYKRN), comprising the A58/A672 between Halifax and the M62 Junction 22 via Sowerby Bridge, Ripponden and Rishworth.

### Business Case Summary:

<p><b>Strategic Case</b></p>	<p>The scheme has a good strategic case. Socio-economic drivers are strongly set out, with restrictions to connectivity being well argued as one of the barriers to improving the district's economy. Health benefits of promoting active travel and improving air quality are also set out. However, business drivers are less developed, with restrictions to employment growth being more based on the topography of the district leaving little unsuitable land to develop. CIP cannot address these issues but there is a driver of connecting people along the corridor to other centres of employment in the wider Leeds City Region and Greater Manchester (half of Calderdale residents commute out of district) by improving traffic flow, in particular to the M62.</p>
<p><b>Commercial Case</b></p>	<p>The scheme has a good commercial case. The commercial viability and financial sustainability of the scheme is not dependent upon market demand as the scope of work relates to highway infrastructure improvements. The OBC states that market demand stems from the requirement for transport improvements to support development aspirations and from the scheme being integral to providing a suitable alternative route to the M62 (as it is the designated diversionary route). Financial sustainability beyond the completion of project and the Combined Authority's investment predominantly relates to the affordability of operational / maintenance costs. Whilst details of these costs are not provided in the OBC, it is stated that Calderdale Council's existing maintenance and funding profile will fund these costs.</p>
<p><b>Economic Case</b></p>	<p>The scheme has a good economic case. A long list of 98 potential interventions were developed and considered for this Corridor Improvement Programme project for Calderdale. The schemes range from local junction improvement to developing a new bypass to carry traffic around Sowerby Bridge. Journey time reliability, congestion, future housing growth, active modes, air quality and collisions were used to</p>

	<p>appraise the long list of options which are consistent with SEP priorities and as such is appropriate for such use.</p>
<p><b>Financial Case</b></p>	<p>The scheme has a good financial case but requires some clarification. As preliminary design information is not yet complete, there is a lack of certainty regarding the calculated outturn capital cost. In addition, certain key areas need to be addressed in order to gain confidence in the figures provided, including the calculation of the risk value; use of professional estimates of costs; the merging of preliminaries costs and contingency allowance within the cost plan, and whether construction preliminaries costs are adequately covered.</p> <p>The breakdown of project outturn costs provided in table 21 under section 5.1.1 of the OBC aligns with the key areas stated under the PMO control area on costs, however values are not included against all items as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project Development – (£475,637). Supported by Cost Plan.</li> <li>▪ Land Assembly – not included (£0). Comment inserted stating “land values to be obtained and added”.</li> <li>▪ Enabling works – included (£47,260). Included within Delivery costs in Cost Plan.</li> <li>▪ Delivery – included (£3,746,508). Aligns with Cost Plan after adjusting for Enabling Works.</li> <li>▪ Benefits Realisation Reporting – not included (£0). No comment inserted.</li> <li>▪ Other – Included (£150,000). Comment inserted stating “monitoring and evaluation of transport impacts”. No supporting information or breakdown for this lump sum figure. Not included in Cost Plan.</li> </ul> <p>Risk – included but not supported by the Risk Register or Cost Plan (£769,667). Comment inserted stating “value calculated by a Quantified Risk Assessment. As shown in Appendix I”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Contingency – included (£252,878). Supported by Cost Plan.</li> <li>▪ Inflation – included (£296,998). Supported by Cost Plan.</li> <li>▪ Total - £5,789,183</li> </ul>
<p><b>Management Case</b></p>	<p>The scheme has a good management case. A high level programme has been developed to outline key milestone dates, although this is only demonstrated at a high level within the business case; more detail is required. The Highways and Transportation team will ensure that the scheme’s development and delivery is closely aligned with other projects being led by the team. A summary has been provided for all the key roles on the project and their responsibilities. There is a project board and the right individuals would seem to be on the project board. A copy of the governance structure has been provided with the OBC.</p>

Location map:

