Local Highways Maintenance Challenge Fund

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: Salford City Council

Bid Manager Name and position: Mr Shoaib Mohammad-Director of Engineering

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

Contact telephone number: 0161 779 6194
Email address: Shoaib.mohammad@salford.gov.uk

Postal address: Salford City Council
Salford Civic Centre
Chorley Road
Swinton
M27 5AW

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: Mr Michael Purcell-KRN Highway Asset Manager

Contact telephone number: 0161 244 1121
Email address: Mike.Purcell@tfgm.com

Postal address: Transport for Greater Manchester
2 Piccadilly Place
Manchester
M1 3BG
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.salford.gov.uk/hps

SECTION A - Scheme description

A1. Scheme name: Key Route Network (KRN) A57 Regent Road, Salford, Carriageway Resurfacing Scheme

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)

The implementation of a proposed carriageway resurfacing scheme, seeks to arrest deterioration of the defined section of the Key Route Network, by selecting areas of carriageway requiring urgent structural maintenance within a key strategic area of the City. Works are expected to be completed by March 2018.
A3. Geographical area:

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

A57 Regent Road – M602 roundabout and main dual carriageway section linking the M60 / M602 to Manchester City Centre and many other sites of regional economical importance. Regent Road provides access to Media City, Salford Royal Hospital and Port of Salford which will promote employment opportunities to both local and regional economies.

OS Grid Reference: E381909 N397892
Postcode: M5 4UQ

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.

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
- Majol 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)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>£000s</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DfT Funding Sought</td>
<td>4198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Contribution</td>
<td>466(10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Third Party Funding</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

   Salford City Council contribution to the scheme at 10%

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).

   This bid originally formed part of the Tranche 1 bid submitted by the GMCA, ranked as the number one priority for Greater Manchester. Unfortunately it was not successful in securing funding in Tranche 1
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).

Regent Road carries over 41,000 vehicles per day (2016 DfT traffic count data) and has increased by 20% over the last 8 years. 15% of this increase took place in the last three years. This is led by major regeneration in the area, demonstrated through job creation and other Greater Manchester growth monitors.

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

Reactive repairs have increased by 170%, leading to increased congestion from road works and greater potential for road traffic accidents. The image below demonstrates the defects and overall direct works costs and SCANNER data - indicating a majority of amber and some red condition confirming the asset is approaching end of lifecycle.
c) What options have been considered and why have alternatives have been rejected?

A wide range of options have been considered including extensive patching, surface treatments, inlays and deep in-situ recycling. The preferred option is to resurface with Hot Rolled Asphalt. A cost benefit analysis has been undertaken to ensure sound a value for money solution is provided and that lifecycle costs and future traffic disruption are minimised. Considerations are outlined below:

### Salford City Council
### KRN Carriageway Resurfacing 2015/16 -2017/18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road No.</th>
<th>Extent</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Average Condition Index</th>
<th>Approx area (m$^2$)</th>
<th>Preferred Treatment Option</th>
<th>OSGR</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A57</td>
<td>Ordsall &amp; Langworthy</td>
<td>M602 Roundabout - Manchester Boundary</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32,267</td>
<td>HRA resurfacing</td>
<td>E381909 N397892</td>
<td>£4,663,967</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Surfacing Material Options Considered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Life Span years</th>
<th>Unit Cost (approx)</th>
<th>Surface Interventions</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MTA - Medium Temperature asphalt</td>
<td>High Stone content</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>£25/m$^2$ 50mm thick</td>
<td>can be dressed in year 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTA - Low Temperature Asphalt</td>
<td>Stone Mastic Asphalt</td>
<td>12 to 15</td>
<td>£22/m$^2$ 35mm thick</td>
<td>re-surface or dress year15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HRA - Hot Rolled asphalt (polymer modified binder)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Hot Rolled Asphalt</strong></td>
<td><strong>25+</strong></td>
<td><strong>£45/m$^2$ 100mm thick</strong></td>
<td>can be dressed in year 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA- Micro Asphalt</td>
<td>Micro Asphalt</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>£17/m$^2$ 15-20mm thick</td>
<td>Re-applied 8-10years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIR- Deep In-situ recycling</td>
<td>Deep Insitu Recycling</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>£41/m$^2$ 100mm thick</td>
<td>Additional Overlay reqd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMA- Grouted Macadam Asphalts</td>
<td>Grouted Macadam</td>
<td>15+</td>
<td>£60/m$^2$ 100mm thick</td>
<td>none - can be dressed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Unit Costs do not include Traffic Management or associated scheme costs

**Preferred Option for Key Route Network**
d) What are the expected benefits / outcomes?

Resurfacing Regent Road will provide a safe passage, journey time reliability with no reactive maintenance resulting in reduced congestion and higher customer satisfaction for the 41,000 daily traffic journeys using this regional gateway. Undertaking these works by March 2018 will perfectly dovetail into the Growth Deal Major Projects timetable for this project.

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

This project will benefit the economy of the region by providing a more commodious route along this strategic east/west link. It provides transportation links across GM to areas of economic growth and is strategic route from the M60 directly into the heart of Manchester Centre, and a vital link road to Northern Powerhouse super growth areas and locations of regional economic significance.

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)?

A viable alternative low cost solution is not available. It is unlikely that adequate funding will be available to facilitate resurfacing of Regent Road within the timescales of delivery for Growth Deal funded major schemes. Eventually the road will reach critical state and the only option will be expensive full depth reconstruction creating more congestion and stifling economic progress.
g) What is the impact of the scheme?

At the eastern edge of the proposed scheme work is already under way to deliver the Manchester Salford Inner Relief Route Scheme (MSIRR). In addition a further £15m has been secured from GDF3 to undertake capacity improvements at Trafford Road. Resurfacing Regent Road will link the two DfT funded major projects significantly enhancing the economical and asset management benefits.

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) £5,100 figures should be entered in £000s (i.e. £10,000 = 10)

What is the DfT contribution sought as a % and that annual total 82.353% (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?
5% based on recent experience

b) How will cost overruns be dealt with?
A developed partnering arrangement is key to preventing cost overruns. Adequate management/supervision will minimise this. Any occurrences will be dealt with under existing contractual procedures. The partnership supply chain successfully entered an extension of three years from 2017, ensuring works are carried out quickly, efficiently and within accurately calculated estimates.
c) What are the main risks to project delivery timescales and what impact this will have on cost?

No foreseen risks other than delays from planned utility/third party works or emergency occurrences. Early consultation and early contractor involvement will reduce these types of risk as far as possible. The following Risk Assessment identifies risks to delivery and appropriate mitigation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk to the Delivery of the Project</th>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Risk Assessment</th>
<th>Risk Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility Unplanned Works</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Disruption/Public Transport Delays</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity Management</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerging Incidents (eg. Leaks etc)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
- Low Impact
- Medium Impact
- High Impact
- Very High Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 to 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5 to 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11 to 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20 to 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 to 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B5. Equality Analysis

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

The scheme poses no adverse equality issues. The scheme specific Equality Impact Assessment is available for perusal if required.
**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).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A description of the do-minimum situation (i.e. what would happen without Challenge Fund investment).</th>
<th>Continued deterioration of the network on an exponential basis leading to poor infrastructure condition increased reactive maintenance costs and potential liability for the Authority in terms of third party liability claims, potential for reduced inward investment from the private sector and reputational damage. Based on current deterioration rate and increasing defects it is estimated that the cost to undertake major structural maintenance will increase by 25% -30% after 2018.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Details of significant monetised and non-monetised costs and benefits of the scheme (quantified where possible)</td>
<td>An assessment of the defects and reactive repair costs over the previous 6 years has which accounts for approximately 5% of the Councils total carriageway defects. This outlines significant potential revenue cost savings upon completion of the capital investment at the proposed KRN sites. In summary projected savings are quantified as:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of scheme (km)</td>
<td>1.35km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td><strong>Total Vehicles</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Cars</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>LGV</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>HGV</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Vehicles</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Cars</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>LGV</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>HGV</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### c) Other VfM information where relevant - depending on type of scheme bid:

| Details of required restrictions/closures if funding not provided (e.g. type of restrictions; timing/duration of restrictions; etc.) | N/A |
| Length of any diversion route, if closure is required (over and above existing route) (km) | N/A |
| Regularity/duration of closures due to flooding: (e.g. number of closures per year; average length of closure (hrs); etc.) | N/A |
| 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) | Data 2014-2016 inclusive  
Regent Road M602- Manchester border,  
19 collisions, 4 Serious 15 Slight.(5 rear shunt/skid)  
Using existing data for resurfacing schemes, the expected percentage in reduction in collisions is 46% (Source TMS Consultancy)  
The average value for the prevention of per injury collision in a built up environment is £99,528 (Source DfT). Therefore 46% reduction = Regent Rd (2.9 Collisions/yr) £288,631 |
| Number of existing cyclists; forecasts of cycling usage with and without the scheme (and if available length of journey) | Data 2014-2016 inclusive  
Regent Road M602- Manchester border,  
19 collisions, 4 Serious 15 Slight.(5 rear shunt/skid)  
Using existing data for resurfacing schemes, the expected percentage in reduction in collisions is 46% (Source TMS Consultancy)  
The average value for the prevention of per injury collision in a built up environment is £99,528 (Source DfT). Therefore 46% reduction = Regent Rd (2.9 Collisions/yr) £288,631 |

### 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.

Salford has successfully delivered two schemes using Pinch Point funding at Irwell Street and Port Salford. Both projects involved improving junctions where good traffic management plans were key to delivery. The lessons learned would be to expand communication activity to further inform the public about disruption associated with the scheme. This would include demand management measures such as highlighting the delays anticipated and highlighting alternative routes or travel options. This work will be co-ordinated with network management teams and utilise electronic communication such as social media and the web to reach as wide an audience as possible.

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

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

☒ Yes  ☐ No

Name of MP(s) and Constituency

Rebecca Long Bailey
Salford and Eccles Constituency (See letter below)
Dear Department of Transport

Local Highways Maintenance Challenge Fund

I write in support of Salford Council’s application for funding of the Key Route Network (KRN) A57 Regent Road, Salford, Carriageway Resurfacing Scheme. The proposed carriageway resurfacing will seek to address the deterioration of the road outlined in the bid, which is a key corridor running through Salford and into Manchester city centre.

With the city of Salford expanding, specifically in the areas around Regent Road, we in Salford are seeing the increase in traffic continuing to grow. The improvements if approved will be a significant benefit to Salford and will ensure the key route outlined in the bid is safe and comfortable for the high amount of traffic journeys it is subject to on a daily basis.

Additionally the project will benefit Salford’s economy, and that of Greater Manchester overall by providing a more comfortable journey along this key route for the growing number of users. The corridor provides transportation links across GM to key areas of Salford such as Media City, Salford Royal Hospital, Salford University and much more. As well as providing a strategic and direct route into Manchester city centre from the M60 motorway.

There are various public transport stops and hubs, including trains, buses and the Metrolink which enhances transportation of Salford residents across the city to areas of employment.

I do hope that you can take into consideration the application from Salford Council for the Local Highways Maintenance Challenge Fund of their Carriageway Resurfacing Scheme bid.

Yours Sincerely

Rebecca Long-Bailey MP

---

d) List other stakeholders supporting the Scheme:
1. Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM)
2. 
3. etc.
SECTION C: Declarations

C1. Senior Responsible Owner Declaration

As Senior Responsible Owner for Key Route Network (KRN) A57 Regent Road, Salford, Carriageway Resurfacing Scheme I hereby submit this request for approval to DfT on behalf of Salford City Council and confirm that I have the necessary authority to do so.

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

Name: Ben Dolan
Position: Strategic Director
Signed:

C2. Section 151 Officer Declaration

As Section 151 Officer for Salford City Council 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
- 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: Neil Thornton
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