

CBC/EB/082

Email and supporting papers from the East of England Regional Assembly to Regional Planning Panel Management Committee Members and local authorities/bodies across the East of England concerning the prioritization of Community Infrastructure Fund2 Projects.

From: Tim Bellamy [mailto:Tim.Bellamy@eera.gov.uk]

Sent: 02 May 2008 13:31

To:

Subject: Community Infrastructure Fund: Second Round

Attachments: Timescales for Community Infrastructure Fund Round 2.doc; 2008-04-23 East of England Scheme List.doc; CIF2 Presentation Table.xls; Community Infrastructure Fund 2 Summary of Priorities 020508.doc; Community Infrastructure Fund - Round 2 paper.doc

All,

As you are probably aware EERA and EEDA have been asked to jointly submit to Communities and Local Government/DfT a list of the schemes being submitted from their region, in order of priority, so that this can be taken into account as part of the process for determining which schemes should be invited to submit a full business case. This will, however, only be a guide and Government reserves the right to re-prioritise schemes which it believes would better meet the aims of the fund. The regional assemblies and regional development agencies were given these roles due to their unique position as being interested, but objective parties – both are able to provide an overview of the needs of the Region; whilst ensuring a fair assessment of the relevant schemes.

Methodology

The East of England Steering Group (EERA, EEDA, Go-East and Norfolk CC [rep of the Regional Transport Forum]) were tasked with developing a methodology and prioritising the local transport schemes across the region. Within the East of England it was decided that the steering group would consist of an officer from Go-East to provide a link to national policy, whilst the representative of the Regional Transport Forum ensured that the views and aspirations of the local transport authorities were embedded within the assessment methodology. The assessment is geographically agnostic with priority ranking being awarded on the merits of the schemes put forward. The assessment was based broadly on the methodology used to carry out the prioritisation of the Thames Gateway CIF schemes (originated by DfT and CLG). The attached document entitled *Community Infrastructure Round 2 paper* outlines the methodology used to prioritise the 49 schemes submitted across the East of England (to be read alongside the spreadsheet *CIF2 Presentation Table* – see below).

Spreadsheet

The spreadsheet entitled *CIF2 Presentation Table* illustrates the scores that each scheme were given by the steering group (with regards the strategic fit of the scheme) and the various scores the schemes got when comparing the quantitative information, such as the housing numbers, houses per £ and the deliverability risks associated with the scheme (as listed on the Expressions of Interest Forms).

The spreadsheet has a number of schemes with purple boxes – these have been used to illustrate where the steering group have analysed the information provided and have changed the information/score accordingly. EERA, EEDA and the wider steering group have requested technical information to clarify the data/scores included within the spreadsheet and any suggested changes will be welcomed (when accompanied by technical analysis).

The spreadsheet also shows some schemes with green boxes – these reflect those areas where the steering group changed the score following a thorough assessment of the Expressions of Interest form and these changes have since being agreed with the relevant local authority's officers. Finally there are a number of yellow boxes that illustrate where local authority officers feel changes were required to the scores given to particular schemes and ultimately the steering group changed the spreadsheet to reflect the additional technical information received.

Priorities

As can be seen from the *Community Infrastructure Fund 2: Summary of Priorities* document, the East of England at this stage (subject to any changes to the information provided) will be bidding for approximately £159 million. This is a significant proportion of the £200m budget available across the UK as the Region feels that it will not be able to fulfil its potential unless significant investments are made in the infrastructure of the East of England. The Region considers that the levels of funding available through the CIF process are grossly inadequate especially in relation to the Region's needs and the Government's aspirations for the East of England, as demonstrated by the total cost of the East of England schemes submitted totalling in excess of £295m.

This prioritised list of £159 million has been banded Gold and Silver so that Government can take into account the priority of the East of England when determining which schemes should be invited to submit a full business case. Please remember that this list of scheme is subject to change – as the additional information and clarification being sought from local authorities may change the scoring and banding accordingly.

Submission to Government and Feedback

The *Timescales for Community Infrastructure Fund Round 2* document was circulated previously and agreed as the appropriate way forward for the Region to meet the strict deadline imposed by central Government – submission to DfT and CLG due by the 16th May. Therefore I am requesting that any feedback is passed to me and the members of the Regional Planning Panel Management Committee by the **1200hrs on the 9th May**. This will enable the RPP Management Committee to reflect on the feedback from RPP and RTF members before making an informed decision when agreeing the priorities for the Region.

Regards,

Tim

Tim Bellamy

Regional Planning/Transport Officer

East of England Regional Assembly
Flempton House
Flempton
Bury St. Edmunds
Suffolk
IP28 6EG

Tel no. (01284) 729439

Email. Tim.Bellamy@eera.gov.uk

Website. www.eera.gov.uk

The information in this email is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee. If you receive this email by mistake please notify the sender and delete it immediately. Opinions expressed are those of the individual and do not necessarily represent the opinion of East of England Regional Assembly.

This message has been scanned for viruses by MailControl, a service from BlackSpider Technologies.

Community Infrastructure Fund: Round 2

Introduction

The Housing Green Paper, *Homes for the future: more affordable, more sustainable* (July 2007), announced £300m would be available for a second round of the Community Infrastructure Fund (CIF2) in the Growth Areas, Growth Points and Eco-towns. CIF is a joint Communities and Local Government and Department for Transport fund.

CIF is designed to complement mainstream transport funding, uniquely linking the provision of funding for transport infrastructure to the delivery of housing. The Government announced in the *Thames Gateway Delivery Plan* (November 2007), an allocation from CIF2 to invest in 13 proposed local transport schemes in the Gateway, with the £200m available to the other Growth Areas, Growth Points and Eco-towns. There will be no apportionment of funds between Growth Areas, Growth Points or Eco-towns. Funds will be awarded on the merits of the schemes put forward.

CIF is a capital grant allocation. No revenue is available through CIF.

Funding will be awarded for a fixed amount and will be a time limited period. Funding will be available during the period 1st April 2008-31st March 2011, but given the appraisal timetable we anticipate that most projects will be funded during 2009/10 to 2010/11. Therefore one of the key criterion against which the East of England schemes were assessed was the deliverability of a scheme and any potential risks.

Government is currently considering bids for second round Growth Points and expects to make an announcement on successful bids shortly. At that stage successful second round Growth Points will be invited to submit Expressions of Interest. Government will also considering bids from those local authorities containing eco-towns.

Bids were welcomed from those places in the East of England (Chelmsford, St.Edmundsbury, Dacorum, Welwyn Hatfield and St.Albans) where Communities and Local Government proposes to bring them into the Growth Areas programme, subject to the final East of England RSS.

Prioritisation of Schemes

Regional Assemblies and Regional Development Agencies have been asked to jointly submit to Communities and Local Government/DfT a list of the schemes being submitted from their region, in order of priority, so that this can be taken into account as part of the process for determining which schemes should be invited to submit a full business case. This will, however, only be a guide and Government reserves the right to re-prioritise schemes which it believes would better meet the aims of the fund.

The rest of the paper outlines the process by which EERA and EEDA have prioritised the list of 49 schemes (totalling in excess of £290m) submitted for CIF2 funding from the East of England local authorities. The full list of scheme is attached in the Appendix.

Indicative Timetable

March 2008	Launch of CIF2 bidding guidance
21 April 2008	Deadline for receipt of Expressions of Interest for Growth Areas and Growth Points
16 May 2008	Deadline for receipt of prioritisation of schemes by Regional Assemblies/Regional Development Agencies
July 2008	Announcement of selected schemes to be taken forward to full business case
October 2008	Deadline for submission of full business case
February 2009	Announcement of successful schemes

Prioritisation Methodology

The East of England Steering Group (EERA, EEDA, Go-East and Norfolk CC [rep of the Regional Transport Forum]) were tasked with developing a methodology and prioritising the local transport schemes across the region. The assessment is geographically agnostic with prioritise ranking being be awarded on the merits of the schemes put forward.

The assessment is based broadly on the methodology used to carry out the prioritisation of the Thames Gateway CIF schemes (originated by DfT and CLG). Three generic categories were used to assess the 49 schemes, namely:

- Supporting Housing;
- Deliverability; and
- Strategic Fit

The assessment of the questions on the Expressions of Interest Form, were measured in two ways:

- 1) Answers to quantitative questions (such as housing numbers and houses per £) were plotted on a scatter diagram to assess each scheme across the region – banded into categories.
- 2) Answers to qualitative questions (e.g. how far a particular scheme support economic development) were assessed with a score of high (3), medium (2) and low (1), following unanimous decisions by the steering group.

The schemes to have scores against each question, totalled for each of the three categories (housing, deliverability and strategic fit) and then to be plotted on scatter diagrams and banded into three categories (1-3: minimum to maximum).

The total “ranking” level for each scheme could be formed of the sum of the three category ‘band’ levels, meaning a maximum possible mark of 9 and a minimum of 3.

Example of Methodology: Harlow First Avenue

Supporting Housing:

1. The First Avenue scheme supports the delivery of 8,850 houses and when compared against the other 49 schemes (having been plotted on a scatter diagram) this was seen to be in the second 2nd highest band of 5 and therefore scored 4 out of 5 (available scores 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5).
2. The houses delivered per £m was assessed and the First Avenue scheme in Harlow is estimated to deliver to 2628 homes/£m. Again this was plotted on a scatter diagram and the scheme was seen to be in the 3rd highest band of 5 and therefore scored 3 (available scores of 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5).
3. This therefore gave the First Avenue scheme a total housing score of 7 out of a possible 10 (housing numbers + houses per £m). This total score of 7 was then compared against other schemes and was seen as a high category ‘band’ (high, medium or low ranking) and therefore received a **TOTAL CATEGORY BAND LEVEL OF 3 (HIGH)**.

Deliverability:

1. Deliverability was assessed against the information contained in Section 5 of the Expressions of Interest Form. If no planning consent or other powers were required and no other risks to project funding or timely delivery of the scheme were known at this stage the scheme scored **3 (HIGH)** (as First Avenue in Harlow did).

Notes on deliverability:

- Where risks have been identified by the scheme promoter, but were seen to be low – a score of 2 was allocated.
- Where risks have been identified by the scheme promoter and were seen to be of a medium level of magnitude a score of 1 was allocated.
- The steering group assessed each scheme’s perceived deliverability risks and some scores were adjusted if these were seen to be optimistic. For example, the Essex Regiment Way scheme stated it had low risks to deliverability and using the methodology above should have scored a 2 out of 3; however the steering group believed that the land acquisition required to secure this scheme’s delivery would

increase the risk to deliverability and therefore the score was adjusted to 1 out of 3¹.

Strategic Fit:

1. Each of the 49 schemes were assessed as to their assistance in delivering the wider objectives of the RSS and RES, namely:
 - a. Wider transport benefits²;
 - b. Wider social benefits³;
 - c. Wider economic benefits⁴;
 - d. Wider non-transport related environmental benefits⁵; and
 - e. Sustainability⁶.
2. As stated previously answers to the qualitative questions in relation to the 5 stated objectives above were assessed with a score of high (3), medium (2) and low (1), following unanimous decisions by the steering group.
3. The First Avenue scheme scored 2 for transport benefits, 2 for social benefits, 2 for economic benefits, 1 for non-transport related environmental benefits; and 3 for sustainability – giving the total of 10 out of a possible 15. This total score of 10 was then compared against other schemes (using a scatter diagram) and was seen to be in the medium 'band' (high, medium or low ranking) and therefore received a **TOTAL CATEGORY BAND LEVEL OF 2 (MEDIUM)**.

Total Ranking and Comparison:

1. The total score for the First Avenue in Harlow was 8 out of a possible 9 (3+3+2) – calculating the three categories. As can be seen from the list of East of England CIF2 prioritises a score of 8 out of 9 was seen to be in the top band alongside other schemes such as Cowbridge Area Mitigation Measures and Parkway Station, to name a couple.

Notes

- The attached spreadsheet outlines the score given for each of the scheme against the 3 categories (supporting housing, deliverability and strategic fit).
- Those schemes that have purple boxes, is where the steering group have assessed the information provided and have changed accordingly (reduced by one band). Until the issues below have been resolved the scores will remain the same.
- Those schemes that have green boxes are where the steering group capped/changed the banding of a particular category (therefore had a purple box) to reflect concerns over the information received on the

¹ NB: Land acquisition in general resulted in a score of 1 out of 3, as in practise the delivery of such schemes were extremely tight (within the CIF2 timescales).

² Including congestion, travel time reduction and connectivity etc.

³ Including community accessibility, healthcare access, leisure access, safety and obesity etc.

⁴ Including access to employment – floorspace and jobs, and access to training

⁵ Including townscape, landscape, heritage and green spaces etc.

⁶ Including modal shift, reducing CO₂ emissions and reducing the need to travel

Expressions of Interest forms. Following the circulation of this information to officers, the appropriateness of these scores have been confirmed by the scheme promoter – agreement with the scores given by the steering group.

- Those schemes that have yellow boxes are where following discussions with officers the spreadsheet scoring has been increased/alterd to reflect additional technical information received. These changes were agreed by the officers and the steering group welcomed the changes suggested by the local authorities/scheme promoter.

Appendix A

East of England Scheme List: Community Infrastructure Fund Rd2

SCHEME	COST (£m)
South Bank Rail and River Bridges	16.98
Crescent Bridge/Bourges Boulevard Enhancements	17.77
East Luton Corridor – phase2	9
Gateway Link Road (Inner Ring Road)	4
M1 Junction 10a improvements	18.5
Parkway Station – New Northern Entrance	1
Sundon Arch Subway – Cycle and Pedestrian Facility	0.7
Bedford Western Bypass – Phase 2 (A6-A428 Link)	7.5
A421 Dualling M1 (J13) – Milton Keynes	27
Cycle/footbridge by Bromham Road Rail Bridge, Bedford	0.80
Bedford Traffic Management System	5
The Access for All ‘421’ Project	13.15
Bedford Station Quarter - Junction Improvements	0.85
Cowbridge area mitigation measures (as a result of A421 Dualling from M1 to Bedford)	0.95
A602 Broadhall Way	1.75
A602 Improvements South of Stevenage	3.65
Proposed cycle routes in Hitchin, Letchworth and Baldock	0.5
Dunmow Road	1.68
Hatfield Station Interchange	1
Royston Railway Crossing	2.22
Variable Message Signs	1.484
A12/A1214 Sustainable Transport Corridors	2.325
A12 Cyclebridge	1.65
Duke Street Land Raising	0.71
Elton Park Bridge	2
Felixstowe to Trimley Cycle Route	0.21
Ipswich Central Area	3.2
New Stoke (Foot and Cycle) Bridge	1.5
Rose Hill Bridge	1.8
Tayfen Corridor	1.43
Haverhill North Western Corridor	6.5
Chelmsford Town Centre Sustainable Access Package	3.95
Essex Regiment Way Park and Ride	3.75
Harlow First Avenue	3.37
A414 Dualling from M11 J7 to A1169	9.63
New A12 Junction (Cuckoo Farm)	10.2
A133 Improvements	4.35
Postwick Hub	20.98
Western Quadrant Package	19.32
North East Quadrant	1.2
King's Lynn South Transport	5.33

Thetford Bus Interchange	1.6
Thetford Growth Junction Improvements	12.1
Cambridge Gateway	3
Cambridge Guided Busway – Chesterton Link	2.5
Huntingdon Western Link Road	3.8
Cambridge Guided Busway and PT Enhancements	8.65
St Ives to Huntingdon On-Street Bus Priority Measures	9.95
Northstowe – A14 Parallel Link Road	11.85
TOTAL COST OF SCHEMES (EAST OF ENGLAND)	299.8

Community Infrastructure Fund 2 Summary of Priorities

SCHEME	RANKING (/9)	COST (£m)	TOTAL COST (£m)
A133 Improvements	8	4.4	82
Chelmsford Town Centre Sustainable Access Package	8	4.0	
Cowbridge area mitigation measures (as a result of A421 Dualling from M1 to Bedford)	8	1.0	
Harlow First Avenue	8	3.4	
Parkway Station – New Northern Entrance	8	1	
A414 Dualling from M11 J7 to A1169	7	9.6	
A602 Improvements South of Stevenage	7	3.7	
Bedford Traffic Management System	7	5	
Cambridge Gateway	7	3	
Essex Regiment Way Park and Ride	7	3.8	
Hatfield Station Interchange	7	1	
Ipswich Central Area	7	3.2	
King's Lynn South Transport	7	5.3	
New A12 Junction (Cuckoo Farm)	7	10.2	
North East Quadrant	7	1.2	
Postwick Hub	7	21.0	
Variable Message Signs	7	1.5	
A602 Broadhall Way	6	1.8	77
Bedford Station Quarter - Junction Improvements	6	0.9	
Cambridge Guided Busway - Chesterton Link	6	2.5	
Crescent Bridge/Bourges Boulevard Enhancements	6	17.8	
Cycle/footbridge by Bromham Road Rail Bridge, Bedford	6	0.8	
M1 Junction 10a improvements	6	18.5	
Proposed cycle routes in Hitchin, Letchworth and Baldock	6	0.5	
Rose Hill Bridge	6	1.8	
The Access for All '421' Project	6	13.2	
Western Quadrant Package	6	19.3	

TOTAL COST OF THE BID FROM THE EAST OF ENGLAND: £159m

NB: Schemes have been listed by their ranking.