

Local Highways Maintenance Challenge Fund



Application Form: bids for funding in 2019/20

The level of information provided on this form should be proportionate to the size and complexity of the works proposed. An Excel data proforma should also be completed.

Note that DfT funding is a maximum of £5 million per project for bids in 2019-20. An individual local highway authority may apply to bid for only one scheme. Funding will be provided in 2019/20, but it is recognised that construction may go into 2020/21 as well. The closing date for bids is 31 October 2019.

For schemes submitted by a Combined Authority for component authorities a separate application form should be completed for each scheme, then the CA should rank them in order of preference.

Applicant Information

Local authority name: City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council

Bid Manager Name and position: Richard Gelder Highway Services Manager

Name and position of officer with day to day responsibility for delivering the proposed scheme.

Contact telephone number: 01274 437603 **Email address:**
richard.gelder@bradford.gov.uk

Postal address: 4th Floor Britannia House
Hall Ings
Bradford
West Yorkshire BD1 1HX **Postcode**

Combined Authorities

If the bid is from a local highway authority within a Combined Authority, please specify the contact and ensure that the Combined Authority has submitted a Combined Authority Application Ranking Form.

Name and position of Combined Authority Bid Co-ordinator: Steve Heckley, Head of Transport Strategy Implementation

Contact telephone number: 0113 2517 335 **Email address:** steve.heckley@westyorks-ca.gov.uk

Postal address: West Yorkshire Combined Authority, Wellington House, 40-50, Wellington Street, Leeds. **Postcode:** LS1 2DE

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, the local highway authority 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.

Please specify the weblink where this bid will be published:

<https://www.bradford.gov.uk/transport-and-travel/major-highways-schemes>

SECTION A – Description of works

A1. Project name: A650 and A6177 Improvements

A2. Headline description:

Proposed start date 2019

Estimated Completion date 2023

Brief description

The A650 Wakefield Road and the A6177 Ring Road form the strategic route from the Motorway network to Bradford City centre. The roads and supporting infrastructure were constructed around 50 years ago and the fabric now requires significant investment in order to ensure the long term availability, suitability for users, improve public safety, build resilience to our network and support economic activity.

The bid package involves the infilling of a number of subways and replacing with at grade crossings or junction improvements along the A650, refurbishment of the remaining subways on the A6177 Dudley Hill.

The corridor maintenance package also includes highway resurfacing, renewal or renovation of central reservation on the three lane dual carriageway sections. Central reservation barriers where needed will utilise slipform concrete or sectional concrete barrier to replace life expired elements. Updating drainage elements with attenuation where possible. Environmental planting will be used to enhance the visual landscape amenity and direct pedestrians to controlled crossings with reduced need for guardrails.

A3. Geographic area:

Please provide a short description of the location referred to in the bid (in no more than 50 words)
South East of Bradford Centre the A650 Wakefield Road forms the 3 lane dual carriageway which eventually links to Junction 27 M62 and A6177 Ring Road / M606 Junction 3 Staygate.
OS Grid Reference: **417195,432339 to 418324,463430**
Postcode: **BD4 7PE to BD4 9LU**

You might wish to append a map showing the location (and route) of the proposed project, existing transport infrastructure and other points of particular interest to the bid. **See Appendix A3 location and route plan**

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

DfT funding of **up to £5 million in 2019/20**

Structural maintenance, strengthening or renewal of bridges, viaducts, retaining walls or other key structures, footbridge or cycle bridge renewal



Major maintenance, full depth reconstruction of carriageways, structural maintenance of tunnels



Resurfacing of carriageways including improvements to footways or cycleways that are within the highway boundary



Renewal of gullies and replacement of drainage assets



SECTION B – The Business Case

B1. The Financial Case – Project Costs and Profile

Before preparing a proposal for submission, bid promoters should ensure they understand the financial implications of developing the project (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 table below. **Figures should be entered in £000s** (i.e. £10,000 = 10).

Funding profile (Nominal terms)

£000s	2019-20	2020-21
<i>DfT Funding Sought</i>	4,410	<i>DfT funding not available in 2020-21</i>
<i>LA Contribution</i>	490	
<i>Other Third Party Funding</i>	0	

Notes:

- 1) Department for Transport funding will be granted in the 2019-20 financial year but local highway authorities may carry that funding over to following financial years if necessary.*
- 2) There is no specific amount for a local contribution by the local authority and/or a third party but if this is proposed please state what this is expected to be.*

B2. Local Contribution / Third Party Funding

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

- a) The non-DfT contribution may include funding from the local authority or a third party. This should include evidence to show how any third party contributions are being secured, the level of commitment and when they will become available.

No third party funding

- b) Please list any other funding applications you have made for this project or variants of it and the outcome of these applications, including any reasons for rejection (e.g. applications made through any similar competition).

No previous applications made

B3. Strategic Case (sections (a) to (g) below)

This section should **briefly** set out the rationale for making the investment and evidence of the existing situation, set out the history of the asset and why it is needs to be repaired or renewed. It should also include how it fits into the overall asset management strategy for the authority **and why it cannot be funded through the annual Highways Maintenance Block Funding grant.**

a) What are the current problems to be addressed by the proposed works? (Describe economic, environmental, social problems or opportunities which will be addressed by the scheme).

The A650 Wakefield Road and the subways were constructed in 1969. The subways provide vital pedestrian and cycle link to communities, businesses and educational facilities either side of the busy strategic 3 lane dual carriageway. The subways are not suitable of traffic loadings greater than 40/44T and as such are impediments to Abnormal load vehicles which restricts routes through the district particularly the east of the city centre.

* Inspections on these particular subways and subway interchanges highlight issues with the brickwork, concrete spalling, internal lighting, drainage, fly tipping, vandalism and graffiti.

* The parapet walls, pedestrian barriers and lighting columns are regularly hit by vehicles which are costly to repair.

* The subways are unpopular and a survey highlighted pedestrians often cross the carriageway and jump over the barriers rather than use the subways.

Removal of the subways will result in a significant reduction in on-going and longer term maintenance costs and liabilities.

The central reserve pedestrian barriers are life expired. Piecemeal repairs to accident damaged sections do not match the original barriers and this has resulted in a visually poor appearance.

The subways have been part of a long term refurbishment plan initially proposed for LTP2 2006-2011, however only minor repairs were undertaken as the long term usage of the subways was under review. Pedestrians had started crossing at grade rather than risking perceived anti-social encounters in the Subways. The LTP1 and 2 Capital funding structure drew clear distinction between the maintenance block and the integrated transport elements. Subways were low on the integrated transport agenda, the maintenance block could fund refurbishment but not removal and replacement with at grade controlled crossings. Post LTP2 austerity has reduced all maintenance budgets to structural safety and essential works only.

The 2019 Challenge fund provides the opportunity to holistically approach the strategic corridor to address the removal of the subways and replacement with at grade crossings together with the necessary highway and UTC infrastructure. It is envisaged that economies of scale can be achieved to reduce costs and disruption through dealing with the corridor as a whole.

- Bowling Back Lane/Neville Road Roundabout – infilling of subways, road realignment and at grade crossing
- Rook Lane, Rhine Street and Fenby Street – infilling of subways and at grade crossing
- Dudley Hill interchange – refurbishment of existing subway interchange and strengthening of parapets.

The junction improvement/at grade crossings will provide the following benefits:

- Removal of structures assets with a significant reduction in on-going and longer term maintenance costs and liabilities in accordance with Highway Maintenance budget saving proposals specifically relating to maintenance of subways.
- Support from the local stakeholders by providing a preferred at grade crossing option (as determined at a consultation exercise carried in June 2018 including Ward Councilors).
- Removal of subways which are unpopular and perceived as dangerous by pedestrians.
- Improved control of traffic at major interchanges

- Increased capacity of through traffic.

Surfacing, central reserve upgrading and drainage improvements will reduce the requirement for ongoing piecemeal repairs and will improve public safety.

Works on the A650/A6177 dual carriageway corridor are difficult to implement due to restrictions to minimize disruption. By planning and suitable Contractor engagement, costs and disruptions can be controlled and kept to a minimum.

Costs of major maintenance and renewal are significantly beyond what the annual maintenance allocation would normally fund. The 2019 Challenge fund is the first opportunity to bid for the capital to implement.

b) Why the asset is in need of urgent funding?

Our anticipated average annual DfT Highway Maintenance Capital Block Funding for bridges over the next five years is likely to average under £1m per annum. The total cost of carrying out this major project is estimated at £4.9million over the 4 years funding period. Directing all our annual allocation to this project will result in a lack of investment on other highway structures assets which also require maintenance. There would be significant social, economic and environmental impact were it necessary to impose restrictions on any of the structures with repair costs for a piecemeal maintenance approach expected to be well above that for planned works.

Infilling/removing the A650 Wakefield Road Subways; will address issues with the parapets which are substandard and are liable to vehicular strikes. The subways provide vital links for communities and require removing in order to improve public safety. Providing at grade crossings and upgraded central reserve barriers will encourage the use of the crossings and discourage pedestrians from crossing a busy dual three lane highway at other locations.

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

Do Nothing – Deterioration will continue, subways will become unsafe for use resulting in closure and potential closure with no alternative crossings.

Do Minimum – Phased removal or refurbishment over a longer timescale. Install temporary concrete barriers as necessary. These actions will be more expensive, disruptive and closures may eventually be necessary to ensure public safety.

It is neither economical, nor effective long-term policy for the stewardship of these major assets to proceed with any of these alternatives with drawbacks compared to planned major maintenance such as:-

- a greater risk to operational efficiency and safety;
- inability to effectively budget or plan for maintenance;
- maintenance is likely to be more disruptive and costly;
- allowing deterioration to spread more widely;
- worsening asset condition and
- an increased maintenance demand in the long term; and
- interim restrictions on the highway for safety reasons.

d) What are the expected benefits / outcomes?

Ensure long term resilient network in the Bradford District.

A second suitable route from the motorway network for Abnormal loads will increase availability of the network providing further resilience.

Subway infilling and junction improvements/at grade controlled crossings will improve public safety, encourage and increase usage and reduce the risk of pedestrian accidents as a result of local residents attempting to cross a busy dual carriageway at other uncontrolled locations.

Removal of structures assets with a significant reduction in on-going and longer term maintenance costs and liabilities in accordance with Highway Maintenance budget saving proposals specifically relating to maintenance of subways.

There will be reduced whole life costs for assets and the investment will also help reduce maintenance backlog.

Ensuring long term availability of these assets will contribute towards promoting and supporting economic activities in the district and region at large.

Avoid additional costs and adverse economic impact associated with unplanned restrictions which may be introduced.

Collaboration and joint working with other Council departments will reduce financial risks.

Condition of each asset will improve resulting in an increase in their Depreciated Replacement Cost (DRC) and an increase in overall stock valuation.

Overall condition of stock will be maintained or improved as the annual capital allocation will remain available to be spent on other highway structures assets requiring investment.

Costs associated with works and disruptions will be higher should a piecemeal approach be adopted for the maintenance works.

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)?

Deterioration will continue and accelerate. Programmed maintenance works will be undertaken in small affordable chunks. This would result in longer periods of disruption and cost much more. The resources available to invest in the maintenance and/or improvement of the rest of the highway structures stock will be constrained for 5 -10years. Lack of funding will increase reactive maintenance which in the long term will cost more. Restrictions may be imposed on some structures in the medium term until funding is secured.

g) What are the economic, environmental and social impacts of completing this project?

The availability of DfT Challenge Funding provides an opportunity to reduce the long term maintenance costs, ensure availability and contribute towards maintaining/improving overall condition of the bridges stock and help the authority build resilience on the highway network. It will also bring real benefits to local communities, the district and region including:

- Improvements in public safety;
- Support continued economic activity;
- Better, and therefore more economic use of resources;
- Planned rather than unplanned work on the highway;
- Reduction in highway disruption;
- Build resilience

- Avoidance of loss of amenity to those who are dependent on critical routes;
- Enhancing the appearance of the built environment on the A650 corridor into the city.

B4. Equality Analysis

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

B5. The Commercial Case

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

What is the preferred procurement route for the scheme? For example, if it is proposed to use existing framework agreements or contracts, the contract must be appropriate in terms of scale and scope.

Framework contract

Direct labour

Competitive tender

**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. An assurance that a strategy is in place that is legally compliant and is likely to achieve the best value for money outcomes is required from your Section 151 Officer below.*

B6. Delivery of project

Are any statutory procedures, such as planning permission, required to deliver the project? If yes please provide details below;

Yes No

Details of statutory procedures before works can commence

None

SECTION C: Declarations

C1. Senior Responsible Owner Declaration

As Senior Responsible Owner for A650/A6177 Improvements I hereby submit this request for approval to DfT on behalf of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council and confirm that I have the necessary authority to do so.

I confirm that City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council will have all the necessary powers in place to ensure the planned timescales in the application can be realised.

Name: Steve Hartley

Signed:



Position: Strategic Director for Place

C2. Section 151 Officer Declaration

As Section 151 Officer for City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council I declare that the scheme cost estimates quoted in this bid are accurate to the best of my knowledge and that City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council

- has allocated sufficient budget to deliver this scheme on the basis of its proposed funding contribution
- will allocate sufficient staff and other necessary resources to deliver this scheme on time and on budget
- 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
- has the necessary governance / assurance arrangements in place
- has identified a procurement strategy that is legally compliant and is likely to achieve the best value for money outcome
- will ensure that a robust and effective stakeholder and communications plan is put in place

Name:

CHRIS CHAPMAN

Signed:



Submission of bids:

The deadline for bid submission is 5pm on **31 October 2019**

Successful bids for Challenge Fund Tranche 2B are to be funded in 2019/20.

An electronic copy only of the bid including any supporting material should be submitted to:

roadmaintenance@dft.gov.uk copying in Paul.O'Hara@dft.gov.uk