

Highways Maintenance Challenge Fund Tranche 2A Value for Money Pro-Forma

Blackburn with Darwen Borough Council

The pro-forma should be filled in with as much of the 'specific data' as possible - with supporting data / information included where possible. Not all elements will be relevant for every bid - however we would expect for most bids 'specific data' will be available for at least rows 1 and 2. In the 'Specific Data' Column - please supply the information in the units/format requested.

The 'Other Supporting Data' column should be used to provide salient details not captured under 'Specific Data' and/or further supporting information. Please add any further information on scheme benefits either at the end of this pro-forma or within the body of the main bid (or annexes)

Input data	Specific Data	Other Supporting Data / Information (either input directly or provide reference to supporting information reported elsewhere)	Information requested																																																																																								
Length of Scheme	4.236	Comprising: Preston New Road, Blackburn, 778 m Whalley New Road, Wilpshire, 811 m Whalley New Road, Roe Lee, 625m Whalley New Road, Whalley Range, 643m Eanam & Higher Enanam, 463m A666 Duckworth Street, Borough Road, Bolton Road, 916m	Provide length of route covered by the scheme - if an area wide scheme then provide total route length covered by scheme.																																																																																								
Number of vehicles (or users) on affected section (split by vehicle type if possible)	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Site</th> <th>1</th> <th>2</th> <th>3</th> <th>4</th> <th>5</th> <th>6</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>(Total Vehs - Average Annual Daily Traffic)</td> <td>13404</td> <td>12953</td> <td>9898</td> <td>9800</td> <td>18840</td> <td>18135</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(Cars - AADT)</td> <td>11905</td> <td>11230</td> <td>8447</td> <td>8400</td> <td>15807</td> <td>13481</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(LGV - AADT)</td> <td>1318</td> <td>1382</td> <td>1019</td> <td>1000</td> <td>1977</td> <td>2702</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(HGV - AADT)</td> <td>148</td> <td>180</td> <td>180</td> <td>180</td> <td>270</td> <td>1478</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Site	1	2	3	4	5	6	(Total Vehs - Average Annual Daily Traffic)	13404	12953	9898	9800	18840	18135	(Cars - AADT)	11905	11230	8447	8400	15807	13481	(LGV - AADT)	1318	1382	1019	1000	1977	2702	(HGV - AADT)	148	180	180	180	270	1478	Sites: Data from DfT Transport Statistics 2015, except site 4. 1. Preston New Road, Beardwood, CP47472 2. Whalley New Road, Wilpshire, CP73068 3. Whalley New Road, Roe Lee, CP7429 4. Whalley New Road, Whalley Range, Estimate 5. Enanam & Higher Enanam, CP 81191 6. A666, Duckworth Street, CP 74496	Provide an estimate of the traffic flow on the section of route covered by the scheme - also provide details of the data used to support that estimate (e.g. age, type and duration of count, etc.).																																																					
Site	1	2	3	4	5	6																																																																																					
(Total Vehs - Average Annual Daily Traffic)	13404	12953	9898	9800	18840	18135																																																																																					
(Cars - AADT)	11905	11230	8447	8400	15807	13481																																																																																					
(LGV - AADT)	1318	1382	1019	1000	1977	2702																																																																																					
(HGV - AADT)	148	180	180	180	270	1478																																																																																					
Details of required restrictions/closures if funding not provided (e.g. type of restrictions; timing/duration of restrictions; etc.)	(restriction type - text description) (start date of restriction - MMYY)	Not applicable	Provide details of any future restrictions. E.g. If restrictions to particular vehicle types will be needed in the do minimum (i.e. without funding) provide details of why they are required, what vehicle types are covered and when such restrictions will come into place.																																																																																								
Length of any diversion route, if closure is required (over and above existing route)	(Km)	Not applicable	Provide estimate of the length of diversion route over and above existing route. It would be helpful to support this with some mapping to demonstrate this.																																																																																								
Average extra time per vehicle on diversion route (over and above existing route)	(mins)	Not applicable	Provide estimate of the average extra time vehicles would spend on the diversion route over and above existing route. It would be helpful to support this with details of any data used/assumptions made (e.g. source of speed data used in any calculations).																																																																																								
Regularity/duration of closures due to flooding; (e.g. number of closures per year; average duration of closure (hrs); etc.)	(number of closures/year) (duration of closure - hrs) (length of diversion - Km) (extra time in using diversion - mins)	Not applicable	Provide estimates of closures / durations /delay and provide details of the data used to support those estimates (e.g. number of years of data, etc.).																																																																																								
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 the scheme)	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Site</th> <th>1</th> <th>2</th> <th>3</th> <th>4</th> <th>5</th> <th>6</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>(DM Total Accidents/vr)</td> <td>0.6</td> <td>3.2</td> <td>1.6</td> <td>4.2</td> <td>2.8</td> <td>5.4</td> <td>17.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(DM Slight Accidents/vr)</td> <td>0.6</td> <td>2.8</td> <td>1.6</td> <td>3.2</td> <td>2.6</td> <td>4.0</td> <td>14.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(DM Serious Accidents/vr)</td> <td>0</td> <td>0.4</td> <td>0</td> <td>1.0</td> <td>0.2</td> <td>1.4</td> <td>3.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(DM Fatal Accidents/vr)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(DM Accident Rate - PIA/M/Km)</td> <td>0.16</td> <td>0.83</td> <td>0.71</td> <td>1.83</td> <td>0.88</td> <td>0.89</td> <td>0.83</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(DS Total Accidents/vr)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(DS Slight Accidents/vr)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(DS Serious Accidents/vr)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(DS Fatal Accidents/vr)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(DS Accident Rate - PIA/M/Km)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Site	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	(DM Total Accidents/vr)	0.6	3.2	1.6	4.2	2.8	5.4	17.8	(DM Slight Accidents/vr)	0.6	2.8	1.6	3.2	2.6	4.0	14.8	(DM Serious Accidents/vr)	0	0.4	0	1.0	0.2	1.4	3.0	(DM Fatal Accidents/vr)								(DM Accident Rate - PIA/M/Km)	0.16	0.83	0.71	1.83	0.88	0.89	0.83	(DS Total Accidents/vr)							12	(DS Slight Accidents/vr)							10	(DS Serious Accidents/vr)							2	(DS Fatal Accidents/vr)							0	(DS Accident Rate - PIA/M/Km)								Although this scheme does not specifically include traffic management measures we do expect the accident rate to reduce as a direct result of improved surfacing.	Provide estimates of accidents (split by severity if possible) or accident rates for the without scheme (DM) case and the with scheme case (DS). Provide details of the data and assumptions/analysis used to support these estimates (e.g. number of years of data, etc.).
Site	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total																																																																																				
(DM Total Accidents/vr)	0.6	3.2	1.6	4.2	2.8	5.4	17.8																																																																																				
(DM Slight Accidents/vr)	0.6	2.8	1.6	3.2	2.6	4.0	14.8																																																																																				
(DM Serious Accidents/vr)	0	0.4	0	1.0	0.2	1.4	3.0																																																																																				
(DM Fatal Accidents/vr)																																																																																											
(DM Accident Rate - PIA/M/Km)	0.16	0.83	0.71	1.83	0.88	0.89	0.83																																																																																				
(DS Total Accidents/vr)							12																																																																																				
(DS Slight Accidents/vr)							10																																																																																				
(DS Serious Accidents/vr)							2																																																																																				
(DS Fatal Accidents/vr)							0																																																																																				
(DS Accident Rate - PIA/M/Km)																																																																																											
Number of existing cyclists; forecasts of cycling usage with and without the scheme (and if available length of journey)	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Site</th> <th>1</th> <th>2</th> <th>3</th> <th>4</th> <th>5</th> <th>6</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>(DM cyclists/day)</td> <td>23</td> <td>38</td> <td>59</td> <td>58</td> <td>61</td> <td>120</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(DM av trip length - Km)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(DS cyclists/day)</td> <td>33</td> <td>48</td> <td>69</td> <td>60</td> <td>63</td> <td>135</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(DS av trip length - Km)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Site	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	(DM cyclists/day)	23	38	59	58	61	120		(DM av trip length - Km)								(DS cyclists/day)	33	48	69	60	63	135		(DS av trip length - Km)								Trip lengths are unavailable. The recently completed Weavers wheel will see an increase in cyclist on Preston New Road & Whalley New Road at Wilpshire and Roe Lee. Other sites will see an increase in cyclists due to the improved road surface and edge of carriageway cycle lanes.	Provide estimates of the number of cyclists (and if possible trip length) for the without scheme (DM) case and the with scheme case (DS). Provide details of the data and assumptions/analysis used to support these estimates.																																																
Site	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total																																																																																				
(DM cyclists/day)	23	38	59	58	61	120																																																																																					
(DM av trip length - Km)																																																																																											
(DS cyclists/day)	33	48	69	60	63	135																																																																																					
(DS av trip length - Km)																																																																																											
Other salient information for the VIM Case	Sacrificial inlays would be required for sections of carriageway that require reconstruction. These thin inlays are not expected to last more than four years, due to the failure of underlying layers. Although initially cheaper, thin inlays are a poor long term investment with a BCR less than that of resurface/reconstruct option. Expenditure on these thin inlays would consume funds that could otherwise be used to provide life extending treatments to other assets in the network that are themselves on the brink of failure. If this application for funding is unsuccessful these borderline assets will not receive life extending treatment and will deteriorate rapidly to the point where they require resurfacing/reconstruction, so exacerbating and compounding the spiral of decline.		A description of the do-minimum situation (i.e. what would happen without Challenge Fund investment). Details of significant monetised and non-monetised costs and benefits of the scheme.																																																																																								
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item</th> <th>With Scheme £000s</th> <th>Without Scheme £000s</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Scheme Costs</td> <td>£ 1,782</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sacrificial surfacing</td> <td>-</td> <td>£ 400</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Associated traffic delays</td> <td>£ 1,059</td> <td>£3,079</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Maintenance regime</td> <td>£735</td> <td>£2,157</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Associated traffic delays</td> <td>£250</td> <td>£2,635</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>£ 3,826</td> <td>£ 8,271</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Benefit to Cost Ratio</td> <td></td> <td>2.16</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Item	With Scheme £000s	Without Scheme £000s	Scheme Costs	£ 1,782	-	Sacrificial surfacing	-	£ 400	Associated traffic delays	£ 1,059	£3,079	Maintenance regime	£735	£2,157	Associated traffic delays	£250	£2,635	Total	£ 3,826	£ 8,271	Benefit to Cost Ratio		2.16																																																																		
Item	With Scheme £000s	Without Scheme £000s																																																																																									
Scheme Costs	£ 1,782	-																																																																																									
Sacrificial surfacing	-	£ 400																																																																																									
Associated traffic delays	£ 1,059	£3,079																																																																																									
Maintenance regime	£735	£2,157																																																																																									
Associated traffic delays	£250	£2,635																																																																																									
Total	£ 3,826	£ 8,271																																																																																									
Benefit to Cost Ratio		2.16																																																																																									
	Non-monetised benefits Reduced carbon emissions. Reduced and more reliable journey times. Public satisfaction. Positive publicity. Potentially reduced accidents. Incidental improvements to pedestrian crossing points within the reconstructed sections and improvements to adjacent footways. Opportunity to incorporate/maintain carriageway cycle lanes. Positive benefits across all protected characteristic sectors. EIA link. Positive health and community impacts. HIA Link.																																																																																										