



A285 Chichester to Petworth Safer Roads Investment Plan Phase 2

Safer Roads Fund Application Form

CONTENTS

SECTION A	Project description and funding profile	Page 2
SECTION B	The Business Case	Page 3
SECTION C	Monitoring, Evaluation and Benefits Realisation	Page 7
SECTION D	Declarations	Page 8

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A	Location Plan	Attachment
APPENDIX B	Delivery Programme	Attachment
APPENDIX C	Risk Register	Attachment
APPENDIX D	BCR Supporting Evidence	Attachment
APPENDIX E	WSCC Counter Measures	Attachment
APPENDIX F	Casualty Analysis	Attachment

Funding for Local Transport: Safer Roads Fund



Department
for Transport

Application Form

The level of information provided should be proportionate to the size and complexity of the scheme proposed. As a guide, we would suggest around 10 to 15 pages including annexes would be appropriate.

A separate application form should be completed for each scheme.

Applicant Information

Local Authority Name: West Sussex County Council

Bid Manager Name and Position: Andy Ekinsmyth, Head of Transport and Countryside

Contact telephone number: 0330 22 26687

Email address: andy.ekinsmyth@westsussex.gov.uk

**Postal address: West Sussex County Council, Highways and Transport, County Hall,
Chichester, PO19 1RG**

Please specify the web link where this bid will be published:

<https://www.westsussex.gov.uk/roads-and-travel/roadworks-and-projects/>

SECTION A - Scheme description and funding profile

A1. Scheme name: A285 Chichester to Petworth Safer Roads Investment Plan – Phase 2

A2. Headline description:

The A285 between Chichester and Petworth is identified as Britain's persistently highest risk road by the Road Safety Foundation. This phased programme comprises the introduction of a series of counter measures informed by an assessment of the route by the Road Safety Foundation. The interventions contained in the overall programme intend to raise the star rating of the A285 to a minimum of 2 stars and achieve 3 stars where possible saving an estimated 54 FSI casualties over 20 years.

This bid covers phase 2 that seeks to extend the planned phase 1 works to the whole of the route by introducing countermeasures consisting of shoulder widening and rumble strip edge lining. These works are expected to save an additional 13 FSI casualties over 20 years.

A3. Geographical area:

The A285 is a single carriageway rural route and is one of the few that runs north-south through the South Downs National Park linking the A27 with the A272 in the western part of the county. It passes through the villages of Halnaker and Duncton before reaching Petworth to the north. It is approximately 19 km in length. The route twice rises to around 150m above sea level as it crosses the South Downs at Upwaltham Hill and Duncton Down. A plan of the route is attached in Appendix A

OS Grid Reference: 489540,106775 – 497575,121450

A4. Equality Analysis

A specific Equalities Analysis has not been undertaken for this proposal. However, an Equalities Impact Assessment was undertaken as part of West Sussex revised Road Safety Framework. Road safety interventions of this nature apply equally to all road users, with specific targeting for those road users that exhibit a higher risk. Therefore no adverse impacts have been identified. An individual's perception of relative safety influences their travel choices. Specific road safety interventions aimed at high risk road user groups have the potential to improve opportunity by reducing the risk of injury and thereby improving perceptions of safety.

SECTION B – The Business Case

B1. The Scheme – Summary/History (Maximum 200 words)

The A285 had 47 FSI and 105 slight casualties over the period 2011 to 2015. Identified as Britain's most persistently high risk road in the 2016 EuroRap report, the safety improvement programme seeks to improve the star rating of the route thereby reducing the number and severity of accidents occurring. The proposed programme comprises countermeasures suggested by the Road Safety Foundation in their latest (December 2016) Safer Roads Investment Programme (SRIP).

The programme will be submitted to this fund in three separate bids. The first bid (phase 1) submitted in February 2017 seeks to deal with the 5km section between Thicket Lane and Droke Lane and will comprise of shoulder widening to provide a hard strip, rumble edge lining and improvement works at the Eartham Lane junction. This second bid (phase 2) will tackle the remainder of the route between the A27 and Petworth and will consist of providing the same shoulder widening and rumble edge lining countermeasure in additional sections beyond those addressed in phase 1.

A phase 3 bid to include further schemes (18/19 to 20/21), consisting of junction improvements, improvements to curve delineation, and a number of short sections of vehicle restraint systems will follow by the end of the September 2017 deadline. This will allow feasibility studies and further consultation with stakeholders to be undertaken.

This bid concerns phase 2. These works are expected to save 13 FSI casualties over 20 years.

B2. The Strategic Case (Maximum 350 words)

WSCC adopted a revised Road Safety Framework (RSF) 2016-2026 in March 2016 that set a target to reduce KSIs to 355 by 2020. The projected outturn for 2016 is 484 which compares to an average of 450 FSI in the preceding 10 year period. The WSCC RSF includes the aspiration for Vision Zero and adopting an approach that leads to safer systems interventions.

In the western part of the county the South Downs present a barrier to north south accessibility. The A285 is one of two routes that fulfils this purpose, there being no alternative lower classification roads. The route is therefore the only link that allows direct travel between Chichester and Petworth. Its function is primarily providing local access and medium distance commuting in support of economic activity and leisure access to the National Park. The route carries approx. 5500 AADT predominantly light vehicles with around 2% motorcycles.

The road is 12 miles (19 km) long and currently has a EuroRap risk rating of 199.6 fatal or serious crashes per billion kilometres travelled. 96% of the deaths and serious injuries were to vehicle occupants and motorcyclists. The death and serious injury rate to vehicle occupants on the Risk Mapping scale is medium-high risk. The addition of motorcyclists doubles the measured risk of death and injury. Together this gives the road the label of high risk and puts it at the top of Table 2 - "Britain' persistently higher risk roads (2009-11 & 2012-14)" in the 2016 EuroRap report. The Star Rating for vehicle occupants and motorcyclists is poor with only 15% achieving the desired 3-star minimum. 85% of the route rates 1 and 2-star for vehicle occupants and motorcyclists.

The 2016 EuroRap publication indicated that the risk increased by 35% between 2009-11 and 2012-14 despite the implementation of a number of low cost safety measures and a national

reduction in the number of fatal and serious injuries. While these improvements had a positive impact on casualty figures; in 2015 the number of fatal or serious accidents per year dropped to only one incident; during 2016 casualties rose again to seven FSI accidents including 3 fatalities. This recent increase in casualties serves to underline the need to bring about sustainable safety improvements via upgrading the route quality and consistency to 2 and 3 stars.

B3. The Financial Case – Project Costs

Table A: Funding profile (Nominal terms)

£000s	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	Total
<i>DfT Funding Sought</i>	£1532				
<i>LA Contribution</i>					
<i>Other Third Party Funding</i>					

Notes:

(1) Department for Transport funding will not be provided beyond 2020/21 financial year.

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

Not applicable.

B5. The Financial Case – Affordability and Financial Risk (maximum 300 words)

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

An optimism bias of 25% has been included. This lies between the 44% (at Programme Entry) and 15% (Conditional Approval) for fixed link schemes, as set out in TAG Unit A1.2. Given that this scheme has a short programme, a well-defined scope, and a low risk of significant problems from adverse ground conditions etc., this is considered to be a reasonable assumption

b) *How will cost overruns be dealt with?*

WSCC will apply appropriate project management to ensure that costs are as indicated and cost overruns should be contained within the contingency sum. However should an unforeseen event leading to additional costs occur, consideration would be given to how those costs would be met within the County Council's total core capital programme of £687.3m. Any additional resources would require approved via a change request subject to published capital programme governance rules.

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

RISK 1: Restrictive working – The nature of the route may require restrictive working and tender rates may not be as expected.

RISK 2: Weather and other unforeseen events – this may lead to project overrun / abortive work

and therefore potential claims

RISK 3: Road space availability – delays to the start of work may lead to potential claims

RISK 4: Consultation – adverse reaction to proposals may lead to additional design requirements and therefore increased costs

RISK 5: Environmental Assessments – discovery of unforeseen environmental requirements may lead to delaying the start of the project and therefore potential claims

RISK 6: Statutory undertakers – unforeseen equipment in the highway verge may lead to additional design and therefore increased costs

B6. The Economic Case – Value for Money

The calculation of scheme benefits is primarily driven by the Road Safety Foundation's VIDA software. Further information is provided in Annex D, but key details are as follows:

Scheme Cost (current prices, undiscounted): £1532.4k

Present Value of Cost: £1,091.7k

Present Value of Benefits: £2,134.6k

Net Present Value (NPV): £1200.0k

Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR): 1.96

All present values are given in 2010 prices, discounted to 2010.

The BCR has been calculated on the projected reductions in fatal and serious casualties. This is very likely to be an underestimate in respect of the potential to reduce total casualties i.e. also including slight casualties that have not been included in the calculation.

B7. The Commercial Case (Maximum 300 words)

The smaller scale works associated with phase 1 have already been implemented during February and March 2017. For this WSCC used its retained Highway Term Maintenance Contract (TMC) with Balfour Beatty Living Places (BBLP). The conditions of this contract are based upon the NEC3 Engineering and Construction Contract and the NEC Term Service contract. Option C - Target contract with activity schedule was used. Detailed information is available on request.

For subsequent stages within the phase 1 bid, WSCC is carrying out a Benchmark Activity to compare open tendering prices against the TMC prices to provide an indication of value for money for future stages. This activity will also include those works associated with this phase 2 bid. The West Sussex Framework Contract will be used in the Benchmark Activity. The conditions of the Framework are based upon the NEC3 Engineering and Construction Contract. To be awarded work contractors undergo competition via a competitive tendering process in accordance with public procurement regulations to ensure value for money

The Benchmark Activity will take place during April and May 2017 and a decision then taken regarding which contract arrangement to use.

B8. Management Case – Delivery (Maximum 300 words)

A project plan is attached at appendix B. As Highway Authority WSCC has appropriate powers to deliver the works as described. The South Downs National Park Authority are included in the stakeholder group and support the need to reduce casualties on the A285.

Statement from Cllr B Lanzer, Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport

Improving road safety is a priority for WSCC and having the opportunity to improve the safety record of the A285 with the support of the Department for Transport is an opportunity I am very keen to take. I therefore confirm that, as part of WSCC's highways capital improvement programmes for 2017/18 and 2018/19 WSCC will use all endeavours to deliver the improvement works in accordance with the project plan.

B9. Management Case – Governance (maximum 300 words)

Programme Delivery Team

As a named section of the H&T capital delivery programme, the Director for Highways and Transport has delegated authority to enact the programme. The capital programme is administered under WSCC's capital governance process. The Highways and Transport Capital Hub, chaired by the Director of H&T, receives monthly progress and risk management reports. Issues that cannot be resolved at this meeting are escalated to the Strategic Capital Improvement Board. The programme delivery team will report to the H&T Capital Hub and comprises:

Senior Responsible Officer – Matt Davey, Director of Highways and Transport

Programme Executive – Andy Ekinsmyth, Head of Transport and Countryside

Programme Manager – Jon Forster, Team Leader AIP

Programme Officers – David Jukes and Simon Osborne

Designer – WSP Alan Cowan

Contractor – Balfour Beatty Living Places (for stage 1 of bid 1) tbc dependant on outcome of price activity assessment.

The Programme Manager will be responsible for overall delivery, financial compliance, risk management, reporting and day to day decisions within the delivery and financial framework set out in this document and as agreed by the Programme Executive and Senior Responsible Officer. Key decisions and overall progress will be managed via the H&T Capital Hub that meets monthly. The Programme Executive will report and be accountable to the Senior Responsible Officer

Stakeholder Group

A stakeholder group comprising of local elected members, parish councils, representatives of the South Downs National Park, Sussex Police and the local Highway Manager will be formed as a consultative body. The function will be to help inform the local needs during construction, disseminate information to other interested parties and the public to ensure support and success of the scheme.

B10. Management Case – Risk Management

Risk Management: A risk register is attached at Appendix C

SECTION C – Monitoring, Evaluation and Benefits Realisation

C1. Benefits Realisation (maximum 250 words)

Benefits are determined by the Road Safety Foundation's globally-used iRAP methodology, and its application through the VIDA software. We understand that the Road Safety Foundation are in separate discussion with the DfT regarding this approach, so it is not presented in detail here, but further information can be found on the iRAP website (<http://irap.org/en/about-irap-3/methodology>).

In essence, iRAP considers the total number of fatal or serious injuries (FSI) on a road, and provides estimates of FSI savings for each countermeasure based on a large volume of global research. These FSI savings have then been monetised using values taken from the TAG databook, July 2016, Table A4.1.1.

Benefits therefore comprise an annual reduction in FSI casualties compared to a baseline established over 5 complete years from 2011 to 2015 (the decision baseline), this will be compared against a preconstruction baseline established from the 5 year data immediately prior to the start of construction. This data will be available by the time monitoring begins approximately 14 months post construction and will be used to check the validity of the decision baseline.

C2. Monitoring and Evaluation (maximum 250 words)

Since the benefits of the scheme are dependent on a reduction in FSI casualties, the scheme benefits will be monitored by continuing to collect this information as normal through the STATS19 database. The baseline value has been established from data collected 2011-2015 (the last 5 complete years available when undertaking the analysis).

Annual monitoring of the reported injury collision numbers will begin when 12 months data is available post completion and then continue on an annual basis. Effectiveness of the scheme will be determined initially at 3 years post completion by comparing the current annual average number of FSI casualties against the decision baseline and preconstruction baseline 5 year averages, this will then continue for a minimum of 6 years in total, The FSI collision rate per million vehicle kilometres pre and post scheme and changes in the slight casualty rates will also be considered.

The monitoring will look for reductions in the number of casualties arising from the SRIP collision types detailed in the table in appendix F. Particular emphasis will be given to the number of run-off type accidents (currently 50% of all FSI) in order to test the main counter measures employed (shoulder widening and rumble edge line).

WSCC will publish the results of the monitoring on line and report direct to the DfT on an annual basis for a period to be agreed. A written report will be completed for the authority's Road Safety Board once post 3 years collision data is available.

It is normal WSCC practice to monitor accidents on safety schemes on a monthly basis post completion so that any serious problems can be identified and remedial work arranged quickly. In normal circumstances this monthly monitoring is not reported outside of the Road Safety Team but could be made available on request. If required a Stage 4 Road Safety Audit (1 year post construction) in accordance with HD19/15 will be undertaken.

SECTION D: Declarations

D1. Senior Responsible Owner Declaration

As Senior Responsible Owner for A285 Chichester to Petworth Safer Roads Investment Plan – Phase 2 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 West Sussex County Council will have all the necessary powers in place to ensure the planned timescales in the application can be realised.

Name: Matt Davey

Signed:

Position: Director of Highways and Transport

D2. Section 151 Officer Declaration

As Section 151 Officer for West Sussex County Council I declare that the scheme cost estimates quoted in this bid are accurate to the best of my knowledge and that West Sussex 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:

Signed:

Katharine Eberhart

Submission of bids:

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

saferroadsfund@dft.gsi.gov.uk

APPENDICES