



Application Form (for Tranche 2A)

The level of information provided should be proportionate to the size and complexity of the scheme proposed. Note that DfT funding is a maximum of £5 million per scheme. An individual local authority may apply only for one scheme.

For schemes submitted by components of a Combined Authority 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: Kent County Council

Bid Manager Name and position: Alan Casson, Senior Asset Manager – Highways, Transportation and Waste

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

Contact telephone number: 03000 413563 **Email address:** alan.casson@kent.gov.uk

Postal address: Highways, Transportation and Waste
Ashford Highways Depot
4 Javelin Way
Ashford
Kent TN24 8AD

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: N/A

Contact telephone number: N/A **Email address:** N/A

Postal address: N/A

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.kent.gov.uk/about-the-council/strategies-and-policies/transport-and-highways-policies/>

SECTION A - Scheme description

A1. Scheme name: [The Renewal of Safety Barriers on two Major Strategic Roads in Kent](#)

A2. Headline description:

Please enter a brief description of the proposed scheme and its timetable including the completion date (in no more than 50 words)

[A programme of safety barrier renewal on two major strategic roads in Kent – A249 and A229 - where life expectancy of the barriers has been assessed as limited. The work entails verge and central reservation barrier replacement on both roads and is planned to take eleven months, finishing March 2018.](#)

[Appendix 1 – Project Plan](#)

A3. Geographical area:

Please provide a short description of area covered by the bid (in no more than 50 words)

[The bid covers A249 and A229 between M2 and M20 to the north of Maidstone. These heavily trafficked dual carriageways are both strategic diversions for closures of M2 and M20. The A249 is also part of the diversion for Operation Stack. The total length of the two schemes is 15km.](#)

[Appendix 2 – Scheme Location Plan](#)

OS Grid Reference: [N/A](#)

Postcode: [ME5, ME9, ME14 & ME20](#)

Please append a map showing the location (and route) of the proposed scheme, existing transport infrastructure and other points of particular interest to the bid e.g. development sites, areas of existing employment, constraints on land use, planning etc.

[Appendix 3 – Kent Growth Plan](#)

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

Small project bids (requiring DfT funding of up to £5 million)

[Major maintenance, strengthening or renewal of bridges, tunnels, retaining walls or other structures](#)



[Major maintenance or renewal of carriageways \(roads\)](#)



[Major maintenance or renewal of footways or cycleways](#)



[Major maintenance or renewal of drainage assets](#)



SECTION B – The Business Case

B1. The Financial Case – Project Costs and Profile

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	2017-18
DfT Funding Sought	2,800
LA Contribution	450
Other Third Party Funding	0

Notes:

1) Department for Transport funding is only for the 2017-18 financial year.

2) A minimum local contribution of 10% (by the local authority and/or third party) of the project costs is required.

B2 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. 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.

There are no other non-DfT contributions.

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) 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 (e.g. through the Access Fund or similar competition).

None

B3. Strategic Case (Maximum 50 words for each section a) to g)

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 the scheme 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 your scheme? (Describe economic, environmental, social problems or opportunities which will be addressed by the scheme).
Many sections of barriers on these roads have exceeded their life expectancy. Due to their age, replacement components are not readily available, requiring longer lane closures resulting in extended delay and congestion to the high volumes of traffic. This scheme will contribute to alleviating congestion on the wider highway network.

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

The need for this scheme has been identified through a prioritised asset replacement programme but is unfunded due to other Asset Management pressures. Barrier replacement has been highlighted due to:

- age – sub-standard containment
- condition - greater routine maintenance
- availability of components – longer repair lead in time and subsequent traffic delays.

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

The alternative option considered was “do minimum with replacement over 5 years”. The overall cost of this approach is not only financially greater but the length of disruption due to the planned works and unplanned lane closures, following impacts, will also be greater.

d) What are the expected benefits / outcomes?

The additional funding would allow the work to be delivered in a single planned optimised programme, the benefits being:

- less reliance on routine maintenance
- greater confidence for safety
- reduced cost for impact repairs
- less delay and congestion on the highway network

e) Please provide information on the geographical areas that will benefit from your scheme.

This scheme will support the expected growth in Kent, directly benefiting the Mid Kent area. Due to the strategic nature of these roads and their role in connecting the ports to the rest of the country, the benefits stretch to the whole county and beyond.

Appendix 3 – Kent Growth Plan

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)?

There is no lower cost proposal to this scheme. Without this additional funding KCC will continue to manage the barriers on a reactive basis in accordance with the Code of Practice.

g) What is the impact of the scheme?

As the proposal is for the replacement of an existing asset there will be no significant negative environmental or social impacts for its implementation. The benefits for the scheme are detailed in section B3(d) above.

B4. Affordability and Financial Risk (maximum 50 words for each of a) to c)

What is your Authority's most recent total outturn annual capital spending on highways maintenance (Year **2016/17**) **£37,936 figures should be entered in £000s** (i.e. £10,000 = 10)

What is the DfT contribution sought as a % of that annual total **7.381%** (to 3 decimal places)

This section should provide a narrative setting out how you will mitigate any financial risks associated with the scheme

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

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

The Risk Register includes cost allowances for the identified risks. Kent has also liaised with the Term Maintenance Provider to use existing detailed contract rates and have a high confidence in the cost of this scheme.

[Appendix 4 – Costed Risk Register](#)

b) How will cost overruns be dealt with?

KCC will manage the project and will meet the cost of any overruns.

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

The main risks to the project delivery timescale have been identified and costed in the Risk Register and include:

- shortages of equipment
- shortages of labour
- major incidents on both roads and adjoining motorways.

[Appendix 4 – Costed Risk Register](#)

B5. Equality Analysis

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

[Appendix 5 – Equality Impact Analysis](#)

B6. Value for Money

a) For all scheme bids, promoters should provide, where available, an estimate of the Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) of the scheme.

Where a BCR is provided please be aware that DfT may wish to scrutinise the data and assumptions used in deriving that BCR.

b) Please provide the following data will form a key part of our assessment:

Note this material should be provided even if a BCR estimate has been supplied and has also to be entered and returned as an MS Excel file in the VfM Annex MS Excel file).

[Appendix 6 – Completed VfM Pro-Forma](#)

A description of the do-minimum situation (i.e. what would happen without Challenge Fund investment).

The reactive maintenance operations would continue and barrier upgrades would be delivered over a period of 25 years.

	<p>The do-minimum situation is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • programmed upgrading of existing barriers (gradual process, based on local funding availability) • continue with existing regimes of routine maintenance and inspections • replace obsolete sections of barrier where damage has been sustained and replacement components are no longer available • reactively repair sections of vehicle damaged barrier • vegetation removal within central reservation and verges <p>The consequences of this approach will mean the following issues will not be addressed immediately:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • vehicle containment will not be improved • insufficient working width • substandard barrier heights • incorrect terminals • barrier condition • protection of other assets • replacement of Tensioned OBB and TCB <p>All of the above factors will affect vehicle containment.</p> <p><u>Appendix 7</u> – Summary of Congestion Caused by Closures</p>															
<p>Details of significant monetised and non-monetised costs and benefits of the scheme (quantified where possible)</p>	<p>Monetised benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • £130,454 pa Savings on re-tensioning • £50,736 pa Saving on reactive repairs <p>Non monetised benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All barrier to current standard • Potential reduction in severity of personal injuries • Greater protection to other assets • Repairs to barriers could be undertaken more expediently • Extended asset life • Better safety and health • Reduction in traffic delays through shorter repair times • Competitive pricing for repairs due to greater number of suppliers 															
<p>Length of scheme (km)</p>	<p>Total 15.14 km (A249 – 6.07km, A229 - 9.07km)</p>															
<p>Number of vehicles on affected section (Average Annual Daily Traffic in vehicles and if possible split by vehicle type) – to include details of data (age etc.) supporting this estimate.</p>	<table> <tr> <td>Total:</td> <td>A249:</td> <td>A229:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>AADT 112,555</td> <td>AADT - 44,292</td> <td>AADT – 68,230</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Cars - 33,301</td> <td>Cars – 54,216</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>LGV – 7,336</td> <td>LGV – 10,627</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>HGV – 3,334</td> <td>HGV – 2,646</td> </tr> </table>	Total:	A249:	A229:	AADT 112,555	AADT - 44,292	AADT – 68,230		Cars - 33,301	Cars – 54,216		LGV – 7,336	LGV – 10,627		HGV – 3,334	HGV – 2,646
Total:	A249:	A229:														
AADT 112,555	AADT - 44,292	AADT – 68,230														
	Cars - 33,301	Cars – 54,216														
	LGV – 7,336	LGV – 10,627														
	HGV – 3,334	HGV – 2,646														
<p>c) Other VfM information where relevant - depending on type of scheme bid:</p>																

Details of required restrictions/closures if funding not provided (e.g. type of restrictions; timing/duration of restrictions; etc.)	Without the funding no restrictions or closures would be required however the existing reactive maintenance/ management regime would continue to result in sever traffic delays and disruption on both Kent and Highways England networks.		
Length of any diversion route, if closure is required (over and above existing route) (km)	None required – Lane closures only		
Regularity/duration of closures due to flooding: (e.g. number of closures per year; average length of closure (hrs); etc.)	Not Applicable		
Number and severity of accidents: both for the do minimum and the forecast impact of the scheme (e.g. existing number of accidents and/or accident rate; forecast number of accidents and or accident rate with and without the scheme)	The scheme will not reduce the accident rate but a new barrier will operate more effectively and the predicted severity of personal injury accidents will be reduced by 80% for vehicle impacts with the barriers.		
	<u>Ave. annual No. of accidents</u> (based on last 3 years data):		
		Do min. (Current)	With Scheme (Forecast)
	A249		
	Ave. total annual crashes	21	17
	Slight crashes	17	14
	Serious crashes	4	3
	Fatal crashes	0	0
	Rate per mvKm	0.21	0.17
	Struck barrier	6	
	A229		
	Ave. total annual crashes	20	13
	Slight crashes	18	12
	Serious crashes	2	1
Fatal crashes	0	0	
Rate per mvKm	0.09	0.05	
Struck barrier	11		
Number of existing cyclists; forecasts of cycling usage with and without the scheme (and if available length of journey)	There are cycle routes, generally off-carriageway, adjacent to both roads, behind verge safety barriers. National Cycle Route 17 runs alongside the A229.		
		<u>A249</u>	<u>A229 (NCR19)</u>
	Current Usage	0-5 users/day	5-10 users/day
	Forecast Usage	0-5 users/day	12-15 users/day

B7. The Commercial Case

This section categorizes 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

Council Contractor

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.*

B8. Delivery (maximum 50 words for a) and 100 words for b)

a) Are any statutory procedures required to deliver the project, if yes please provide details below;

Yes No

Details of statutory procedure (50 words maximum)

b) Please summarise any lessons your authority has learned from the experience of delivering other DfT funded programmes (such as Challenge Fund tranche 1, pinch point schemes, local majors, Local Sustainable Transport Fund, Better Bus Areas) and what would be different on this project as a result.

c)

Lessons learned:

- Early engagement with utilities companies is essential
- Incentivisation would enhance Value Engineering opportunities
- Clear communication required between stakeholders

Utilities were identified as the major issue, the appointment of a dedicated Coordinator is considered to be essential to ensure clear communication and to enhance opportunities for cost savings.

B9. Stakeholder Support (maximum 50 words for a) and 100 words for b)

d) Does this proposal have the support of the Local MP(s);

Yes No

Name of MP(s) and Constituency

- 1 – Tracey Crouch, Member of Parliament for Chatham & Aylesford
- 2 – Helen Whately, Member of Parliament for Faversham & Mid Kent
- 3 – Helen Grant, Member of Parliament for Maidstone and The Weald

e) List other stakeholders supporting the Scheme:

None

SECTION C: Declarations

C1. Senior Responsible Owner Declaration

As Senior Responsible Owner for **Major Renewal of Safety Barriers on Major Strategic Roads in Kent** I hereby submit this request for approval to DfT on behalf of **Kent County Council** and confirm that I have the necessary authority to do so.

I confirm that **Kent County Council** will have all the necessary powers in place to ensure the planned timescales in the application can be realised.

Name: **Andrew Loosemore**

Signed:

Position: **Head of Service, Highways Asset Management**



C2. Section 151 Officer Declaration

As Section 151 Officer for **Kent County Council** I declare that the scheme cost estimates quoted in this bid are accurate to the best of my knowledge and that **Kent County 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: **Dave Shipton (Deputy s151 officer for KCC)**

Signed:



Submission of bids:

The deadline for bid submission is 5pm on:

31 March 2017 for Challenge Fund Tranche 2A (2017/18 funding)

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

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

