

SECTION A - Project description and funding profile

A1. Project name: Preston City Centre Congestion Reduction

A2 : Please enter a brief description of the proposed project (no more than 50 words)

Ringway is the critical strategic link in Preston city centre's highway infrastructure. The project aims to provide a comprehensive solution to congestion and maximise the efficiency of existing capacity, including physical works and upgrades to technology, to unlock investor potential, create new jobs and support delivery of residential developments.

A3 : Please provide a short description of area covered by the bid (no more than 50 words)

Preston is Lancashire's largest urban centre and focal point for the Preston, South Ribble and Lancashire City Deal, with the city experiencing a series of transformational changes over the next decade. In addition to functioning as a relief road, Ringway facilitates traffic movements between Enterprise Zones and longer distance destinations.

OS Grid Reference: **Riversway - SD511298 to New Hall Lane – SD555298**

Postcode: **Riversway – PR2 2YP New Hall Lane – PR1 4SS**

Please append a map showing the location (and route) of the project, existing transport infrastructure and other points of particular relevance to the bid, e.g. housing and other development sites, employment areas, air quality management areas, constraints etc.

Please see Appendices A and B

A4. How much funding are you bidding for? (please tick the relevant box):

Small project bids (requiring DfT funding of between £2m and £5m)

Large project bids (requiring DfT funding of between £5m and £10m)

A5. Has any Equality Analysis been undertaken in line with the Equality Duty?

Yes No

Please see Appendix C

A6. If you are planning to work with partnership bodies on this project (such as Development Corporations, National Parks Authorities, private sector bodies and transport operators) please include a short description below of how they will be involved.

The county council intends to work with City Deal partners to ensure that the proposal is aligned to City Deal objectives and deliverables and construction is programmed in conjunction with the City Deal project plan. Additionally, the county council will work with transport operators in relation to construction arrangements and timeframes.

Please see the link to: [City Deal Business and Delivery Plan](#)

A7. Combined Authority (CA) Involvement

Have you appended a letter from the Combined Authority supporting this bid? Yes No

A8. Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) Involvement and support for housing delivery

Have you appended a letter from the LEP supporting this bid? Yes No

Please see Appendix D

For proposed projects which encourage the delivery of housing, have you appended supporting evidence from the housebuilder/developer?

Yes No

NOT APPLICABLE

SECTION B – The Business Case**B1: Project Summary**

Please select what the project is trying to achieve (select all categories that apply)

Essential

- Ease urban congestion
- Unlock economic growth and job creation opportunities
- Enable the delivery of housing development

Desirable

- Improve Air Quality and /or Reduce CO2 emissions
- Incentivising skills and apprentices
- Other(s), Please specify -

B2 : Please provide evidence on the following questions (max 100 words for each question):

a) What is the problem that is being addressed?

Congestion in the city centre is a growing issue, particularly during peak periods due to high traffic flows and conflicting traffic movements at signalised junctions. This will be exacerbated by additional traffic resulting from delivery of the City Deal, reconfiguration of the University of Central Lancashire's campus to place itself at the heart of the city through its £200m masterplan, expansion of Cardinal Newman College and a series of transformational changes taking place over the next decade including the arrival of HS2 services, the City Centre North retail and leisure developments and emerging Preston City Centre Living Strategy.

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

The county council has already delivered a number of enhancements at various locations along the Ringway corridor aimed at reducing congestion and improving the environment, particularly for pedestrians and cyclists. However, the additional pressure that has resulted from the implementation of schemes elsewhere to reduce traffic from within the city centre has placed additional pressure on the corridor. Ringway provides access to many key facilities including Preston railway station, the University of Central Lancashire, the main city centre retail and leisure areas and the bus station. There are no practical alternative cross-city routes that could be upgraded or improved.

c) What are the expected benefits/outcomes? For example, could include easing urban congestion, job creation, enabling a number of new dwellings, facilitating increased GVA.

- **Reduced congestion and improved journey time reliability across the city centre**
- **Improved reliability for all buses entering and leaving Preston city centre**
- **Improved connectivity between Enterprise Zone sites, the Preston and South Ribble Western Distributors and planned and existing employment and housing sites**
- **Long term GVA uplift through improved commercial investment opportunities**
- **Potential removal or reduction in designated Air Quality Management Areas**
- **Reduction in casualties and improved perception of safety**
- **Enhanced provision for pedestrians and cyclists**
- **Potential reduction in carbon emissions**
- **Development and application of UTMC traffic engineering skills**

d) Are there any related activities that the success of this project relies upon? For example, land acquisition, other transport interventions requiring separate funding or consents?

None

e) What will happen if funding for this project is not secured - would an alternative (lower cost) solution be implemented (if yes, please describe this alternative and how it differs from the proposed project)?

Without NPIF funding, at best improvements to this critical city centre corridor will be delivered in stages over a number of financial years extending beyond 2020. Congestion and journey time reliability will worsen in the short to medium term, impacting negatively on benefits/outcomes realisation. Alternative funding sources could include:

- **Reallocating funding in the county council's approved Capital programme**
- **Utilising unallocated 2018/19 Integrated Transport Block funds (£2.599m)**
- **Utilising indicative post 2018/19 Integrated Transport Block funds (£3.554m)**
- **Additional county council borrowing**

Use of these resources will have a negative impact on delivery of improvement programmes elsewhere in Lancashire.

f) What is the impact of the project – and any associated mitigation works – on any statutory environmental constraints? For example, Local Air Quality Management Zones.

The project is expected to positively impact on air quality and is expected to lead to a potential removal or reduction in designated Air Quality Management Areas in the vicinity of the London Road / New Hall Lane / Queen Street and Ringway / Church Street / Ribblesdale

Lane (Prison) junctions. The project will also encourage an increase in sustainable travel through the provision of enhanced infrastructure for pedestrians and cyclists.

B3 : Please complete the following table. **Figures should be entered in £000s**
(i.e. £10,000 = 10).

Table A: Funding profile (Nominal terms)

£000s	2018-19	2019-20
DfT funding sought	4000	1000
Local Authority contribution	120	3000
Third Party contribution	180	
TOTAL	4300	4000

Notes:

- 1) Department for Transport funding must not go beyond 2019-20 financial year.
- 2) Bidders are asked to consider making a local contribution to the total cost. It is indicated that this might be around 30%, although this is not mandatory.

B4 : Local Contribution & Third Party Funding : Please provide information on the following questions (max 100 words on items a and b):

- a) Provide an outline of all non-DfT funding contributions to the project costs, the level of commitment, and when the contributions will become available.

On 15th June 2017 the county council approved a local contribution to the project of £3,120,000, subject to NPIF funding being secured. It is proposed that this contribution is spent in financial year 2019/20.

A Section 106 contribution of £180,000 has been secured from Preston City Council in relation to the London Road / New Hall Lane / Queen Street junction (confirmation attached at Appendix E). This makes the total local contribution £3.3 million, which equates to 39.76% of the total cost.

- b) List any other funding applications you have made for this project or variants thereof and the outcome of these applications, including any reasons for rejection.

A bid for an element of the latest proposal was made to the Local Pinch Point Fund in February 2013 comprising improvements to the London Road / New Hall Lane / Queen Street and the Ringway / Church Street / Ribblesdale Lane (Prison) junctions. It was ranked 165th out of 174 schemes due to the lack of evidence provided. Subsequently the county council has invested considerable resources into the development of a suite of highways and transport masterplans to provide a robust evidence base that has underpinned recent successful submissions for funding including the City Deal and Lancashire Growth Deals.

B5 Economic Case

This section should set out the range of impacts – both beneficial and adverse – of the project. The scope of information requested (and in the supporting annexes) will vary, including according to whether the application is for a small or large project.

A) Requirements for small project bids (i.e. DfT contribution of less than £5m)

a) Please provide a description of your assessment of the impact of the project to include:

- Significant positive and negative impacts (quantified where possible) including in relation to air quality and CO₂ emissions.
- A description of the key risks and uncertainties;
- If any modelling has been used to forecast the impact of the project please set out the methods used to determine that it is fit for purpose

The proposed improvements would include benefits to transport users from:

- **Reduced congestion and improved journey time reliability across the city centre**
- **Improved reliability for all buses entering and leaving Preston city centre**
- **Improved connectivity between Enterprise Zone sites, the Preston and South Ribble Western Distributors and planned and existing employment and housing sites**
- **Potential removal or reduction in designated Air Quality Management Areas**
- **Reduction in casualties and improved perception of safety**
- **Enhanced provision for pedestrians and cyclists**
- **Potential reduction in carbon emissions**

An economic assessment of these benefits has been undertaken. This is based on the principles set out in WebTAG, using the best available data from existing datasets including a recently developed traffic model of Preston.

Full details of the appraisal methodology and results are provided in the Economic Assessment Note at Appendix F. A summary is provided below.

Methodology – Benefits from Reductions in Delay

Based on a review of historical studies on the implementation of traffic signal optimisation schemes, an anticipated reduction in delay of 10%-13% has been assumed for the proposed scheme.

Using a recently developed SATURN traffic model of Preston City Centre, forecast delays for 2019 and 2034 were extracted. The anticipated reductions in delay were used to calculate the expected journey time saving per vehicle due to the proposed scheme. These journey time savings were monetised using the principles set out in WebTAG, using annualisation factors calculated as part of the traffic model development. An appraisal period of 15 years was assumed.

Methodology – Journey Time Reliability Benefits

An assessment of observed journey time data from the DfT's TrafficMaster dataset showed significant unreliability in journey times, with PM journey times along the assessed route ranging from 15 minutes to 33 minutes.

Based on DfT guidance, journey time reliability time were estimated as 10% of the total journey time benefits of the scheme.

Methodology – Road Safety Benefits

A review of accident records along the corridor of improvements has shown that there was a total of 129 personal injury accidents between 2012 and 2016. A detailed review of causation factors showed that 31 of these were related to heavy queuing, or were cycle collisions where new/improved facilities are proposed as part of the scheme.

Analysis by road safety engineers predicted that up to 13 of these accidents would have been avoided with the proposed scheme in place (10% of the total accidents).

The baseline number of accidents on the route in the 15 years after scheme opening was calculated. It was assumed that the scheme would result in 10% of these accidents being

avoided, which represents 36 accidents. The monetary benefits from these accident savings were calculated in line with guidance.

Results – Present Value of Benefits

The Present Value of Benefits (PVB) are shown in the table below. All benefits are in 2010 prices, discounted to 2010, and calculated over a 15-year appraisal period.

Reductions in Delay - £16.7m

Journey Time Reliability Benefits - £1.7m

Road Safety Benefits – £2.3m

Total Benefits - £20.7m

Scheme Costs

In line with appraisal guidance, the scheme costs were converted to a Present Value of Costs (PVC), in 2010 market prices discounted to 2010.

Present Value of Costs (PVC) - £6.5m

Benefit to Cost Ratio

The Benefit to Cost Ratio (BCR) is derived simply by dividing the scheme benefits by the scheme costs.

BCR (excluding Journey Time Reliability) – 2.9

BCR (including Journey Time Reliability) – 3.2

In addition to the monetised benefits, the scheme is also predicted to provide Air Quality benefits.

Overall, the scheme would represent **High Value for Money**.

Risks and Sensitivities

In order to reduce the BCR to below 2 (i.e. 'medium' value for money rather than 'high'), the PVB would have to reduce by one third, or approximately £6m. Even if the scheme provided no safety improvements and no journey time reliability improvements, the scheme would need to deliver a percentage reduction in delays that is considerably lower than shown in the review of historic studies in order to bring the BCR down to this level. Given the additional sources of benefits expected through the provision of VMS, and the conservative 15-year appraisal period, this is considered highly unlikely.

Alternatively, if the level of benefits stayed constant, the cost of the scheme would have to increase by 50% to produce a BCR of below 2. Given the 44% optimism bias already included in the scheme costs, this is also considered to be highly unlikely.

Full details on the derivation of these benefits, and the risks and uncertainties involved, are provided in Appendix F. An Appraisal Summary Table is also provided in Appendix G.

** Small projects bids are not required to produce a Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) but may want to include this here if available.*

b) Small project bidders should provide the following in annexes as supporting material:

Has a **Project Impacts Pro Forma** been appended? Yes No N/A
Please see Appendix H

Has a description of data sources / forecasts been appended? Yes No N/A
Please see Appendix F

Has an **Appraisal Summary Table** been appended? Yes No N/A
Please see Appendix G

Other material supporting your assessment of the project described in this section should be appended to the bid.

Please see the Evidence of Congestion and Unreliability Note at Appendix I

** This list is not necessarily exhaustive and it is the responsibility of bidders to provide sufficient information to demonstrate the analysis supporting the economic case is fit-for-purpose.*

B) Additional requirements for large project bids (i.e. DfT contribution of more than £5m)

c) Please provide a short description (max 500 words) of your assessment of the value for money of the project including your estimate of the Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) to include:

- Significant monetised and non-monetised costs and benefits
- Description of the key risks and uncertainties and the impact these have on the BCR;
- Key assumptions including: appraisal period, forecast years, optimism bias applied; and
- Description of the modelling approach used to forecast the impact of the project and the checks that have been undertaken to determine that it is fit-for-purpose.

d) Additionally detailed evidence supporting your assessment, including the completed [Appraisal Summary Table](#), should be attached as annexes to this bid. **A checklist of material to be submitted in support of large project bids has been provided.**

Has an Appraisal Summary Table been appended? Yes No N/A

- Please append any additional supporting information (as set out in the Checklist).
- *It is the responsibility of bidders to provide sufficient information for DfT to undertake a full review of the analysis.*

B6 Economic Case: For all bids the following questions relating to **desirable criteria** should be answered.

Please describe the air quality situation in the area where the project will be implemented by answering the three questions below.

i) Has Defra's national air quality assessment, as reported to the EU Commission, identified and/or projected an exceedance in the area where the project will be implemented?

Yes No

ii) Is there one or more Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) in the area where the project will be implemented? AQMAs must have been declared on or before the 31 March 2017

Yes No

iii) What is the project's impact on local air quality?

Positive Neutral Negative

The project is expected to lead to a potential removal or reduction in designated Air Quality Management Areas in the vicinity of the London Road / New Hall Lane / Queen Street and Ringway / Church Street / Ribbleton Lane (Prison) junctions.

The Joint County Council and City Council Air Quality Steering Group carried out a number of scenario based modelling exercises on a similar heavily trafficked junction in another area of Preston. Based on this modelled output and the potential reduction in journey time by 10%, it is likely that there will be a reduction in the Nitrogen Dioxide levels of up to 1ug/m³.

The area covered by this project contains three AQMAs that exceed the Nitrogen Dioxide Annual Air Quality Objective. If the reduction of 1ug/m³ is brought into context in relation to the levels that are being experienced in this area, as per the Environmental Protection UK's significance assessment, it would be classed as a moderate improvement.

With this positive outcome, it is likely that Preston City Council will be able to revoke one AQMA, with a second being possible if a reduction of over 1ug/m³ is achieved.

Although we have only modelled the effect on the levels of Nitrogen Dioxide, there will also be reductions in PM2.5s. Therefore in health terms, for every reduction of 10ug/m³ of Nitrogen Dioxide and PM2.5s, it has been reported* that there could be a reduction in mortality rates of 2.5% and 6% respectively. As well as improvements in health for people living in this area, this will also equate to a cost saving to the NHS and wider economy.

*** 'Valuing impacts on air quality: Updates in valuing changes in emissions of Oxides of Nitrogen (NOX) and concentrations of Nitrogen Dioxide (NO2)'. DEFRA (September 2015).**

'The Mortality Effects of Long-Term Exposure to Particulate Air Pollution in the United Kingdom': A report by the Committee on the Medical Effects of Air Pollutants (2010).

iv) Does the project promoter incentivise skills development through its supply chain?

Yes No N/A

- Please supply further details:

The procurement exercise will be undertaken in accordance with the county council's approved Social Value Policy & Framework which complies with the Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012. Ten per cent of the tender evaluation score will be based on Social Value Objectives as set out in the framework, focussing mainly on promoting training and employment opportunities for people in Lancashire and promoting environmental sustainability.

Furthermore, the project will allow for the enhancement of UTC / SCOOT technical knowledge and skills within the county council. This upskilling will in turn allow new technical advancements to be implemented in other parts of the county.

- Please see the link to: [LCC Social Value Policy & Framework](#)

B7. Management Case - Delivery (Essential)

Deliverability is one of the essential criteria for this Fund and as such any bid should set out, with a limit of 100 words for each of a) to b)., any necessary statutory procedures that are needed before it can be constructed.

a) A project plan (typically summarised in Gantt chart form) with milestones should be included, covering the period from submission of the bid to project completion.

Has a project plan been appended to your bid? Yes No

Please see Appendices J and K

b) If delivery of the project is dependent on land acquisition, please include a letter from the respective land owner(s) to demonstrate that arrangements are in place to secure the land to enable the authority to meet its construction milestones.

Has a letter relating to land acquisition been appended? Yes No N/A

c) Please provide in Table C summary details of your construction milestones (at least one but no more than 6) between start and completion of works:

Table C: Construction milestones

	Estimated Date
Start of design works:	01.01.18
Start ITS implementation:	01.01.18
Start ITS procurement:	01.05.18
Start of construction / implementation works:	02.07.18
Opening ceremony:	28.02.20
Completion of works:	13.03.20

- d) Please list any major transport projects costing over £5m in the last 5 years which the authority has delivered, including details of whether these were completed to time and budget (and if not, whether there were any mitigating circumstances)

Bay Gateway (Heysham to M6 Link Road): Approved budget £130.2m.

There was an unavoidable delay of three months to the start of works due to a legal challenge to the Development Consent Order, which was granted in Spring 2013 after the examination in public held in summer 2012. Adverse weather in December 2015 (Storm Desmond) also impacted on the delivery timescale. The final outturn cost is forecast to be £142.8m.

Burnley Pendle Growth Corridor: Approved budget £13.317m

The scheme is currently under construction and forecast to be delivered on time and within budget.

B8. Management Case – Statutory Powers and Consents (Essential)

- a) Please list if applicable, each power / consent etc. already obtained, details of date acquired, challenge period (if applicable), date of expiry of powers and conditions attached to them. Any key dates should be referenced in your project plan.

Not applicable

- b) Please list if applicable any outstanding statutory powers / consents etc. including the timetable for obtaining them.

None

B9. Management Case – Governance (Essential)

Please name those who will be responsible for delivering the project, their roles (Project Manager, SRO etc.) and responsibilities, and how key decisions are/will be made. An organogram may be useful here.

The Senior Responsible Owner is Mike Kirby, Director of Corporate Commissioning.

Delivery of the project will be overseen by a Project Board chaired by the Director of Programmes and Project Management. The Project Board will be responsible for managing the development and delivery of the project.

The Project Manager is Martin Porter, Principal Network Planning Officer

An Organogram is attached.

Please see Appendix L

B10. Management Case - Risk Management (Essential)

All projects will be expected to undertake a Quantified Risk Assessment (QRA) and a risk register should be included. Both should be proportionate to the nature and complexity of the

project. A Risk Management Strategy should be developed that outlines how risks will be managed.

Please ensure that in the risk / QRA cost that you have not included any risks associated with ongoing operational costs and have used the P50 value.

Has a QRA been appended to your bid? Yes No
Please see Appendix M

Has a Risk Management Strategy been appended to your bid? Yes No
Please see Appendix N

Please provide evidence on the following points (where applicable) with a limit of 50 words for each:

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

Optimism Bias of 44% has been included, consistent with WebTAG for a project at this stage of development for aspects of the scheme for which detail design has not been completed.

20% has been included for ITS and traffic signal equipment because although these costs are based on recent generically tendered prices they remain subject to amendment as part of detailed design

Risk allowance is £185,000

b) How will cost overruns be dealt with?

Efforts will be made to contain any projected cost overruns within the overall project budget. The county council accepts responsibility for meeting any costs over and above the DfT contribution that cannot be mitigated.

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

The main risks comprise;

The scheme is at an early stage of design

Working on busiest dual carriageway in Preston with associated traffic management requirements and statutory undertaker apparatus to consider

Diversion / protection of utility apparatus, this risk could result in an increased cost of £25,000 over and above the expected cost of £25,000

Inability to assess / scope out full design needs at concept stage. This risk could result in an increased cost of £25,000 over and above the expected cost of £25,000

The cost impact of these main risks is reflected in the risk allowance detailed above.

B11. Management Case - Stakeholder Management (Essential)

The bid should demonstrate that the key stakeholders and their interests have been identified and considered as appropriate. These could include other local authorities, the Highways England, statutory consultees, landowners, transport operators, local residents, utilities companies etc. This is particularly important in respect of any bids related to structures that may require support of Network Rail and, possibly, train operating company(ies).

- a) Please provide a summary in no more than 100 words of your strategy for managing stakeholders, with details of the key stakeholders together with a brief analysis of their influences and interests.

Key areas:

- **Engaging with stakeholders who have a vested interest in supporting economic growth and prosperity in Preston – regular briefings for district and county councillors, Lancashire Enterprise Partnership (LEP), MPs, Preston Business Improvement District (BID) local businesses, and educational establishments - University of Central Lancashire.**
- **Engaging with the public (residents/businesses) directly impacted by the scheme – establish continued support for the scheme through briefings and regular updates through existing county council and partner channels.**
- **Engaging with the media – to help communicate benefits and impacts the media will be engaged in a proactive manner through media briefings and news releases.**

- b) Can the project be considered as controversial in any way? Yes No
If yes, please provide a brief summary in no more than 100 words

- c) Have there been any external campaigns either supporting or opposing the project?

Yes No

If yes, please provide a brief summary (in no more than 100 words)

- d) For large projects only please also provide a Stakeholder Analysis and append this to your application.

Has a Stakeholder Analysis been appended? Yes No N/A

- e) For large projects only please provide a Communications Plan with details of the level of engagement required (depending on their interests and influence), and a description of how and by what means they will be engaged with.

Has a Communications Plan been appended? Yes No N/A

Please see Appendix O

B12. Management Case – Local MP support (Desirable)

- e) Does this proposal have the support of the local MP(s);

Name of MP(s) and Constituency

1 Mark Hendrick – MP for Preston

Yes No

Please see Appendix P

2 Seema Kennedy – MP for South Ribble

Yes No

Please see Appendix Q

Additional letters of support have also been received from:

- Preston City Council (please see Appendix R)
- University of Central Lancashire (UCLAN) (please see Appendix S)
- North & Western Lancashire Chamber of Commerce (please see Appendix T)
- City Deal Executive (please see Appendix U)
- County Councillor Mein (please see Appendix V)
- County Councillor Motala (please see Appendix W)
- County Councillor Oliver (please see Appendix X)
- Preston Bus (please see Appendix Y)
- Transdev Blackburn Bus Company (please see Appendix Z)
- Stagecoach Merseyside and South Lancashire (please see Appendix AA)

B13. Management Case - Assurance (Essential)

We will require Section 151 Officer confirmation (Section D) that adequate assurance systems are in place.

Additionally, for large projects please provide evidence of an integrated assurance and approval plan. This should include details of planned health checks or gateway reviews.

SECTION C – Monitoring, Evaluation and Benefits Realisation

C2. Please set out, in no more than 100 words, how you plan to measure and report on the benefits of this project, alongside any other outcomes and impacts of the project.

A detailed Monitoring, Evaluation and Benefits Realisation plan will be developed in line with Lancashire's Growth Deal Monitoring and Evaluation Framework and appended Logic Map (please see Appendix BB). The same principles were used to develop that for the Burnley Pendle Growth Corridor Programme, of a similar scale and nature.

Please see Appendix C: <http://www.lancashirelep.co.uk/lep-priorities/transport-and-connectivity/burnley-pendle-growth-corridor.aspx>

Traffic movement data collection will use the functionality within the proposed UTM common database to record historical data including, journey times, traffic flows, air quality and traffic incidents. Disseminated through easily accessible dashboards.

An independent Evaluation Manager will ensure consistency in application, use and reporting.

A fuller evaluation for large projects may also be required depending on their size and type.

SECTION D: Declarations

D1. Senior Responsible Owner Declaration	
As Senior Responsible Owner for Preston City Centre Congestion Reduction I hereby submit this request for approval to DfT on behalf of Lancashire County Council and confirm that I have the necessary authority to do so.	
I confirm that Lancashire County Council will have all the necessary statutory powers in place to ensure the planned timescales in the application can be realised.	
Name: Mike Kirby	Signed:
Position: Director of Corporate Commissioning	

D2. Section 151 Officer Declaration	
As Section 151 Officer for Lancashire County Council I declare that the project cost estimates quoted in this bid are accurate to the best of my knowledge and that Lancashire County Council	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - has allocated sufficient budget to deliver this project on the basis of its proposed funding contribution - 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 project - accepts that no further increase in DfT funding will be considered beyond the maximum contribution requested and that no DfT funding will be provided for this bid in 2020/21. - confirms that the authority has the necessary governance / assurance arrangements in place and, for smaller project bids, the authority can provide, if required, evidence of a stakeholder analysis and communications plan in place - confirms that if required a procurement strategy for the project is in place, is legally compliant and is likely to achieve the best value for money outcome 	
Name: Neil Kissock	Signed:
	

HAVE YOU INCLUDED THE FOLLOWING WITH YOUR BID?

Combined Authority multiple bid ranking note (if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Map showing location of the project and its wider context	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Combined Authority support letter (if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
LEP support letter (if applicable)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Housebuilder / developer evidence letter (if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Land acquisition letter (if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Projects impact pro forma (must be a separate MS Excel)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Appraisal summary table	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Project plan/Gantt chart	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A