Local Pinch Point Fund Application

Kimpton Road / Windmill Road junction improvement

February 2013
Local Pinch Point Fund
Application Form

Guidance on the Application Process is available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/department-for-transport/series/local-pinch-point-fund

Please include the Checklist with your completed application form (see Appendix A).

The level of information provided should be proportionate to the size and complexity of the scheme proposed. As a guide, for a small scheme we would suggest around 25-35 pages including annexes would be appropriate.

One application form should be completed per project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local authority name(s)*: Luton Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*If the bid is a joint proposal, please enter the names of all participating local authorities and specify the lead authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bid Manager Name and position: Keith Dove Transportation Strategy &amp; Regulation Mgr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and position of officer with day to day responsibility for delivering the proposed scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact telephone number: 01582 547211 Email address: <a href="mailto:keith.dove@luton.gov.uk">keith.dove@luton.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal address: 4th Floor Town Hall LUTON LU1 2BQ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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: www.luton.gov.uk
SECTION A - Project description and funding profile

A1. Project name: Kimpton Road / Windmill Road junction improvement

A2. Headline description:

Please enter a brief description of the proposed scheme (in no more than 100 words)

The Kimpton Road / Windmill Road junction is currently a mini-roundabout, which is overcapacity at peak times; congestion is expected to worsen as a result of increased traffic following the Napier Park/Stirling Place development on the old Vauxhall motors estate off Kimpton Road. An assessment of various options indicated that the preferred solution is to realign the south part of Windmill Road and create a new 4 leg roundabout with the Busway (see Plan at Appendix B).

A3. Geographical area:

Please provide a short description of area covered by the bid (in no more than 100 words)

The junction of Kimpton Road / Windmill Road is currently a non-standard mini-roundabout, with a single lane entry and exit at each arm. The junction is located on the A505 at its southern approach to the town centre. The existing junction is constrained on all sides by private land. Luton Borough Council own an area of land on the east side of Gipsy Lane, designated as public allotments, together with the disused railway corridor between Kimpton Road and the retail park on Gipsy Lane.

OS Grid Reference: 510064,220838

Postcode: LU2 0

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 etc.

A4. Type of bid (please tick relevant box):

**Small project bids** (requiring DfT funding of between £1m and £5m)
- Scheme Bid [x]
- Structure Maintenance Bid

**Large project bids** (requiring DfT funding of between £5m and £20m)
- Scheme Bid
- Structure Maintenance Bid

Note: Scheme and Structure Maintenance bids will be assessed using the same criteria.

A5. Equality Analysis

Has any Equality Analysis been undertaken in line with the Equality Duty? [x] Yes [ ] No
(see Council’s Integrated Impact Assessment at Appendix C)
A6. Partnership bodies

Please provide details of the partnership bodies (if any) you plan to work within the design and delivery of the proposed scheme. This should include a short description of the role and responsibilities of the partnership bodies (which may include Development Corporations, National Parks Authorities, private sector bodies and transport operators) with confirmatory evidence of their willingness to participate in delivering the bid proposals.

Augur Investments (developer of Napier Park/Stirling Place sites on Kimpton Road)
Bedfordshire Chamber of Commerce
London Luton Airport (Dunstable Road is main route between the airport and the north & west of the conurbation)
Main bus operators
(see Appendix D for letters of support)
Volker Highways (the Councils highway maintenance partner)
Utility companies

A7. Local Enterprise Partnership / Local Transport Body Involvement

It would be beneficial (though not essential) if the relevant LEP or LTB (or shadow(s)) have considered the bid and, if necessary, prioritised it against other bids from the same area. If possible, please include a letter from the LEP / LTB confirming their support and, if more than one bid is being submitted from the area, the priority ranking in order of growth significance.

Have you appended a letter from the LEP / LTB to support this case? ☒ Yes ☐ No

SECTION B – The Business Case

You may find the following DfT tools useful in preparing your business case:

- Transport Business Cases
- Behavioural Insights Toolkit
- Logic Mapping Hints and Tips

B1. The Scheme - Summary

Please select what the scheme is trying to achieve (this will need to be supported by evidence in the Business Case). Please select all categories that apply.

☒ Improve access to a development site that has the potential to create housing
☒ Improve access to a development site that has the potential to create jobs
☐ Improve access to urban employment centres
☐ Improve access to Enterprise Zones
☐ Maintain accessibility by addressing the condition of structures
☒ Ease congestion / bottlenecks
☐ Other(s), Please specify -
B2. The Strategic Case

This section should set out the rationale for making the investment and evidence on the strategic fit of the proposal. It should also contain an analysis of the existing transport problems, identify the barriers that are preventing growth, explain how the preferred scheme was selected and explain what the predicted impacts will be. The impact of the scheme on releasing growth potential in Enterprise Zones, key development sites and urban employment centres will be an important factor in the assessment process.

In particular please provide evidence on the following questions (where applicable):

a) What is the problem that is being addressed, making specific reference to barriers to growth and why this has not been addressed previously?

   The Kimpton Road / Windmill Road junction is already congested at peak times, and this is expected to worsen as a result of increased traffic following the Napier Park/Stirling Place development on the old Vauxhall motors site off Kimpton Road.

   The Luton Dunstable Busway has a junction with Kimpton Road close to the Windmill Road junction. The Stage 2 Road Safety Audit for the Busway junction raised issues of restricted visibility of traffic approaching from the Windmill Road junction. Whilst changes to the signing and lining are being made to resolve this issue, incorporating the Busway into the re-design of the Kimpton Road / Windmill road junction is a more appropriate longer term solution.

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

   A study was undertaken by consultants URS in 2007/8 to examine various options to improve the junction. Indicative designs for 11 options in three main categories (roundabouts, traffic signals, and gyratory systems) were sketched, tested using appropriate traffic modelling techniques and assessed for safety (see Appendix E). The study concluded that a 35m roundabout at the junction of Kimpton Road / Windmill Road and the Busway was the preferred solution. With this option the southern approach on Windmill Road is diverted to follow the old railway line, which is land owned by the Council. This option will require the acquisition of the Windmill Inn PH, which is currently unoccupied.

c) What are the expected benefits / outcomes? For example, job creation, housing numbers and GVA and the basis on which these have been estimated.

   The Napier Park/Stirling Place development sites on Kimpton Road were originally pursued as two sites, with Planning Applications submitted and approved in 2008/9. These sites are now being combined as one, and pre-application discussions are almost complete with a Planning Application expected in the next few months. The revised development will include 600 homes (mix of types), 32051 m² of office space, 6794 m² retail space and 16500 m² of light industry.

d) What is the project’s scope and is there potential to reduce costs and still achieve the desired outcomes? For example, using value engineering.

   The roundabout scheme requires the acquisition of the Windmill Inn PH, a former pub/restaurant on the south side of Kimpton Road. If a traffic signalised junction on a similar arrangement to the roundabout is implemented, it may be possible to reduce the costs.
e) Are there any related activities, that if not successfully concluded would mean the full economic benefits of the scheme may not be realised. For example, this could relate to land acquisition, other transport interventions being required or a need for additional consents?

The roundabout solution requires the acquisition of the Windmill Inn PH, although even a traffic signalised junction on a similar arrangement to the roundabout would require some of that land to be acquired.

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)?

If the Council had to deliver the improvements to this junction without other funding, given the cost of these improvements (see response B3A/B below) and the constraints imposed by the need to undertake these works after the completion of the eastern section of the town centre relief road, the cost of these junction improvements would use up all of the Councils current Integrated Transport grant in one year, meaning that no other transport improvements could be delivered.

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

The old rail bridge at Kimpton Road was removed in 2008. The disused railway line to be used as the southern approach to the new roundabout is designated as a County Wildlife Site, and there may be flora or fauna along this section of the route that needs to be translocated. Surveys were carried out in 2003 in preparing the Environmental Statement (ES) for the Busway scheme; an extract from the ES (see Appendix F) describes the habitat in this area. Given the time lapsed since the ecological surveys were last done, a new survey of this section of route will be undertaken prior to construction.

B3. The Financial Case – Project Costs

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>2013-14</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
<th>2015-16</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DfT funding sought</td>
<td>£56</td>
<td>£1,571</td>
<td><strong>£1,627</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Authority contribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Party contribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£697</td>
<td>£697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>£56</strong></td>
<td><strong>£1,571</strong></td>
<td><strong>£697</strong></td>
<td><strong>£2,324</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table B: Cost estimates (Nominal terms)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost heading</th>
<th>Cost (£000s)</th>
<th>Date estimated</th>
<th>Status (e.g. target price)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utilities works</td>
<td>£554</td>
<td>February 2013</td>
<td>Supervision - 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Price inflation – 3% / year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>£230</td>
<td>February 2013</td>
<td>Valuation plus 10% loss payments &amp; 10% contingency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of new junction</td>
<td>£1,400</td>
<td>February 2013</td>
<td>Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Price inflation – 3% / year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and Supervision of construction</td>
<td>£140</td>
<td>February 2013</td>
<td>Supervision - 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Design work - 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Price inflation – 3% / year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>£2,324</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1) Department for Transport funding must not go beyond 2014-15 financial year.
2) A minimum local contribution of 30% (local authority and/or third party) of the project costs is required.
3) Costs in Table B should be presented in outturn prices and must match the total amount of funding indicated in Table A.

B4. The Financial Case - 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. If the scheme improves transport links to a new development, we would expect to see a significant contribution from the developer. 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.

A contribution of £697,000 from the Section 106 money already secured in advance for the original Napier Park development (see Augur Investments letter in Appendix C).

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) The Department may accept the provision of land in the local contribution towards scheme costs. Please provide evidence in the form of a letter from an independent valuer to verify the true market value of the land. (see Appendix G)

Have you appended a letter to support this case? ☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
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.

None.

**B5. The Financial Case – Affordability and Financial Risk**

This section should provide a narrative setting out how you will mitigate any financial risks associated with the scheme (you should refer to the Risk Register / QRA – see Section B11).

*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.*

Please provide evidence on the following points (where applicable):

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

There is a lot of utility company apparatus in the vicinity of the junction, and a cost of £554,000 has been included (see response B3A/B above) for this work, which will need to be undertaken in advance of the roundabout construction.

Risks will be managed in accordance with the Council’s Corporate Strategy for the Effective Management of Risks and Opportunities (2010), which embeds risk management into its culture, process and structure to ensure that opportunities are maximised and objectives are met. In particular the risk management seeks to assess the probability of an event happening and its consequences. Each risk is assessed (from 1 to 9) using the Risk Assessment Matrix which combines the Impact (Critical, Significant, Noticeable) and the Likelihood of Occurrence (Low, Medium, High).

b) How will cost overruns be dealt with?

Given that a contribution will be provided from the Section 106 monies associated with the previous application for the Napier Park site, any additional cost will be funded through Council budgets.

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

Plans of the utility company apparatus in the vicinity of the junction are included in Appendix H, some of which will have to be moved to accommodate the junction. To mitigate these impacts, the Council and its contractor will, where practical, work in partnership with the utility companies in order to mitigate these impacts and minimise costs.

The other main area of risk is that the Compulsory Purchase Order is not secured.

d) How will cost overruns be shared between non-DfT funding partners (DfT funding will be capped and will not be able to fund any overruns)?

Given that a contribution will be provided from the Section 106 monies associated with the previous application for the Napier Park site, any additional cost will be funded through Council budgets.
B6. The Economic Case – Value for Money

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

Small project bids (i.e. DfT contribution of less than £5m)

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

- Significant positive and negative impacts (quantified where possible);
- A description of the key risks and uncertainties;
- A short description of the modelling approach used to forecast the impact of the scheme and the checks that have been undertaken to determine that it is fit-for-purpose.

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

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

- A completed Scheme Impacts Pro Forma which summarises the impact of proposals against a number of metrics relevant to the scheme objectives. It is important that bidders complete as much of this table as possible as this will be used by DfT – along with other centrally sourced data – to form an estimate of the BCR of the scheme. Not all sections of the pro forma are relevant for all types of scheme (this is indicated in the pro forma).

- A description of the sources of data and forecasts used to complete the Scheme Impacts Pro Forma. This should include descriptions of the checks that have been undertaken to verify the accuracy of data or forecasts relied upon. Further details on the minimum supporting information required are presented against each entry within the pro forma.

Has a Scheme Impacts Pro Forma been appended? ☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Has a description of data sources / forecasts been appended? ☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

- A completed Appraisal Summary Table. Bidders are required to provide their assessment of all the impacts included within the table and highlight any significant Social or Distributional Impacts (SDIs). Quantitative and monetary estimates should be provided where available but are not mandatory. The level of detail provided in the table should be proportionate to the scale of expected impact with particular emphasis placed on the assessment of carbon, air quality, bus usage, sustainable modes, accessibility and road safety. The source of evidence used to assess impacts should be clearly stated within the table and (where appropriate) further details on the methods or data used to inform the assessment should be attached as notes to the table.

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

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

Appraisal Summary Table and Scheme Impacts Pro Forma are included in Appendix I but also supplied as separate unmodified Excel files as requested.

A note on the traffic modelling work undertaken is included in Appendix J.
Large project bids (i.e. DfT contribution of more than £5m)

c) Please provide a short description of your assessment of the value for money of the scheme including your estimate of the BCR. This should include:

- Significant monetised and non-monetised costs and benefits;
- A description of the key risks and uncertainties and the impact these have on the BCR;
- Key assumptions including (but not limited to): appraisal period, forecast years, level of optimism bias applied; and
- A description of the modelling approach used to forecast the impact of the scheme and the checks that have been undertaken to determine that it is fit-for-purpose.

d) Detailed evidence supporting your assessment – including a 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.

B7. The Commercial Case

This section should set out the procurement strategy that will be used to select a contractor and, importantly for this fund, set out the timescales involved in the procurement process to show that delivery can proceed quickly.

a) Please provide evidence to show the risk allocation and transfer between the promoter and contractor, contract timescales and implementation timescales (this can be cross-referenced to your Risk Management Strategy).

Information on risks is in response B5 and on implementation timescale in response B8.

b) What is the preferred procurement route for the scheme and how and why was this identified as the preferred procurement route? For example, if it is proposed to use existing framework agreements or contracts, the contract must be appropriate in terms of scale and scope.

It is envisaged that the design work will be completed by the Councils in-house design team. The procurement of the construction will either be through Volker Highways (the Councils term maintenance contractor) or the Eastern Highways Alliance (EHA). If the EHA is used this will through an NEC contract, although the precise form of contract will be reviewed to ensure it is the most appropriate for this project.

c) A procurement strategy will not need to form part of the bid documentation submitted to DfT. Instead, the Department will require the bid to include a joint letter from the local authority’s Section 151 Officer and Head of Procurement confirming that a strategy is in place that is legally compliant and is likely to achieve the best value for money outcome.
Has a joint letter been appended to your bid? ☒ Yes ☐ No
(See Appendix K)

*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.

B8. Management Case - Delivery

Deliverability is one of the essential criteria for this Fund and as such any bid should set out any necessary statutory procedures that are needed before it can be constructed.

a) A detailed project plan (typically in Gantt chart form) with milestones should be included, covering the period from submission of the bid to scheme completion. The definition of the key milestones should be clear and explained. The critical path should be identifiable and any key dependencies (internal or external) should be explained. Resource requirements, task durations, contingency and float should be detailed and easily identifiable. Dependencies and interfaces should be clearly outlined and plans for management detailed.

Has a project plan been appended to your bid? ☒ Yes ☐ No
(See Appendix L)

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 in order 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
(but refer to Appendix G for independent Valuation)

c) Please provide summary details of your construction milestones (at least one but no more than 5 or 6) between start and completion of works:

**Table C: Construction milestones**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Period of utilities works August – December 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start of roundabout construction January 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening date           June 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of works (if different)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d) Please list any major transport schemes 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)

The East Luton Corridor (ELC) scheme was constructed between June 2006 and April 2009. The initial budget was around £22m but the final out-turn cost was almost £30m. The Section 151 officer took a report to Executive on 18th August 2010 about lessons learnt from the ELC scheme project management, and major construction projects since
that time have been benchmarked against that guidance. The main point of relevance to this Local Pinchpoint bid is that companies running large-scale contracts operate in a very different way to the smaller scale contracts that the Council is more used to dealing with.

**B9. Management Case – Statutory Powers and Consents**

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

Luton Dunstable Translink TWA 2006.
General Vesting Declaration Numbers 1 (14th May 2010) and 2 (8th June 2010).

b) Please list separately any outstanding statutory powers / consents etc, including the timetable for obtaining them.

Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) is required for Windmill Inn. Based on recent experience of CPO process, and taking account of fact that only one site is to be acquired, the Council’s Legal services advise that 9-12 months should be allowed.

**B10. Management Case – Governance**

Please name who is responsible for delivering the scheme, the roles (Project Manager, SRO etc.) and responsibilities of those involved, and how key decisions are/will be made. An organogram may be useful here. Details around the organisation of the project including Board accountabilities, contract management arrangements, tolerances, and decision making authorities should be clearly documented and fully agreed.

The Council’s Corporate Project Management Framework sets out the processes and procedures to be followed throughout a project lifecycle using standard document templates and working practices. Given the scale of this project, together with its location on the southern approaches to the Town Centre, the following Governance arrangements will apply:
- Progress reports to Council’s Corporate Major Projects Board (bi-monthly)
- Updates to Members at the Engineering & Street Services Portfolio Holders meeting (monthly)

The Project Leader/Sponsor is the Head of Engineering & Street Services (Alex Constantinides) supported by the Engineering Services Manager (Graham Turner) and the Council’s Major Projects’ team. The Project Manager is Derek Wright.

Internal support is provided by the Council’s finance, legal and property (Capital & Asset Management) services. Further external support (including legal, property services and contractual support) is readily available through existing arrangements/contracts.
B11. Management Case - Risk Management

All schemes will be expected to undertake a thorough Quantified Risk Assessment (QRA) and a detailed risk register should be included in the bid. The QRA should be proportionate to the nature and complexity of the scheme. A Risk Management Strategy should be developed and should outline on 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
(but see Response B5 for more details about risk)

Has a Risk Management Strategy been appended to your bid?  ☐ Yes ☒ No
(but see Response B5 for more details about risk)

B12. Management Case - Stakeholder Management

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 Agency, 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 of your strategy for managing stakeholders, with details of the key stakeholders together with a brief analysis of their influences and interests.

A Communication Strategy/Plan will be prepared with input from the Council’s Communications section, setting out the stakeholder and public engagement throughout the project and includes an action list. This is regularly reviewed by the Project Board and is kept as a ‘live’ document. Regular contact is maintained with a number of key stakeholders including:

The developers of Napier Park / Stirling Place
Other affected land owners and leaseholders
Council Members and MPs
Emergency services (Police, Ambulance, Fire Service)
Bus Operators
Utility companies

b) Can the scheme 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 scheme?

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

d) For large schemes 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 schemes 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

B13. Management Case - Assurance

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

For large schemes please provide evidence of an integrated assurance and approval plan. This should include details around planned health checks or gateway reviews.

SECTION C – Monitoring, Evaluation and Benefits Realisation

C1. Benefits Realisation

Please provide details on the profile and baseline benefits and their ownership. This should be proportionate to the size of the proposed scheme.

The main benefits will be reduced congestion and improved peak period journey times on the local road network.

C2. Monitoring and Evaluation

Evaluation is an essential part of scheme development and should be considered and built into the planning of a scheme from the earliest stages. Evaluating the outcomes and impacts of schemes is important to show if a scheme has been successful.

Please set out how you plan to measure and report on the benefits identified in Section C1, alongside any other outcomes and impacts of the scheme.

As part of its regular monitoring of travel within Luton, the Council already carries out extensive monitoring of travel on all routes in and around the town centre. Journey time information on approaches to and around the Town Centre is available from Trafficmaster data. Costs of all these surveys, and any reporting, together with any other required surveys will be covered by the Council’s annual monitoring programme budget.

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

SECTION D: Declarations

D1. Senior Responsible Owner Declaration

As Senior Responsible Owner for the Kimpton Road / Windmill Road junction improvement I hereby submit this request for approval to DfT on behalf of Luton Borough Council and confirm that I have the necessary authority to do so.

I confirm that Luton Borough Council will have all the necessary statutory powers in place to ensure the planned timescales in the application can be realised.
**D2. Section 151 Officer Declaration**

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

- has allocated sufficient budget to deliver this scheme 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 scheme
- accepts that no further increase in DfT funding will be considered beyond the maximum contribution requested and that no DfT funding will be provided after 2014/15
- confirms that the authority has the necessary governance / assurance arrangements in place and, for smaller scheme bids, the authority can provide, if required, evidence of a stakeholder analysis and communications plan in place

**Submission of bids:**

For both small bids and large bids the deadline is 5pm, **21 February 2013**

One hard copy and a CD version of each bid and supporting material should be submitted to:

Steve Berry  
Local Transport Funding, Growth & Delivery Division  
Department for Transport  
Great Minster House  
33 Horseferry Road  
London  
SW1P 4DR  

An electronic copy should also be submitted to steve.berry@dft.gsi.gov.uk
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APPENDIX A

Checklist
## Local Pinch Point Fund
Application Form Checklist

**Scheme:** Kimpton Road / Windmill Road Junction improvement  
**Lead authority:** Luton Borough Council

### SECTION A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section / page</th>
<th>Guidance Ref</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A3. Have you appended a map?</td>
<td>Appendix B N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6. Have you included supporting evidence of partnership bodies’ willingness to participate in delivering the bid proposals?</td>
<td>Appendix D Para 10-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7. Have you appended a letter from the relevant LTB(s) / LEP(s) confirming the priority of the proposed scheme? [Optional]</td>
<td>Appendix D Para 10-14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SECTION B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section / page</th>
<th>Guidance Ref</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B4. Have you enclosed a letter from an independent valuer to verify the market value land if land is being included as part of the non-DfT contribution towards scheme costs?</td>
<td>Appendix G Para 40-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4. Have you enclosed a letter confirming the commitment of external sources to contribute to the cost of the scheme will be required?</td>
<td>See Augur letter in Appendix D Para 40-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6. Have you provided a completed <a href="#">Appraisal Summary Table</a> in a format readable by Excel 2003?</td>
<td>YES Para 35-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6. Have you provided a completed <a href="#">Scheme Impacts Pro Forma</a> in a format readable by Excel 2003? [Small projects only]</td>
<td>YES Para 35-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6. Have you provided relevant supporting material – and for large schemes – a WebTAG compliant bid?</td>
<td>YES N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7. Have you attached a joint letter from the local authority’s Section 151 Officer and Head of Procurement confirming that a procurement strategy is in place that is legally compliant and is likely to achieve the best value for money outcome?</td>
<td>YES Para 43-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8. Has a letter been appended to demonstrate that arrangements are in place to secure the land to meet the construction milestones?</td>
<td>YES N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8. Has a Project Plan been appended to your bid?</td>
<td>YES Para 43-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B11. Has a QRA been appended to your bid?</td>
<td>NO -but see response B5 Para 40-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B11. Has a Risk Management Strategy been appended to your bid?</td>
<td>NO -but see response B5 Para 40-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B12. Have you appended evidence of Stakeholder Analysis? [Large projects only]</td>
<td>N/A Para 40-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B12. Have you appended a Communications Plan? [Large projects]</td>
<td>N/A N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B13. Have you provided evidence of an integrated assurance and approval plan?  **[Large projects only]**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Guidance Ref</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Para 40-42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION D**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section / page</th>
<th>Guidance Ref</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1. Has the SRO declaration been signed?</td>
<td>YES N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2. Has the Section 151 Officer declaration been signed?</td>
<td>YES N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ECONOMIC CASE CHECKLIST (Large Projects Only)**

Schemes seeking more than £5 million in support from the Department are required to submit a full appraisal of the scheme in line with WebTAG guidance. These bids should include sufficient supporting information and material for the Department to undertake a full review of the modeling and appraisal. Large project bidders are required to submit the checklist indicating where key modeling and appraisal information is presented with the bid and supporting annexes.

**Note:** Given the remainder of the checklist related only to cost benefit analysis, economic case assessment and modelling/forecasting that are only required for Large projects, the remainder of the Local Pinchpoint Fund Application Form checklist has been truncated beyond this point.
APPENDIX B

Plan of scheme
APPENDIX C

Luton Borough Council Integrated Impact Assessment
This form replaces the previous Equality Impact Assessment form used by LBC. The key aim of an impact assessment is to ensure that all Council policies, plans and strategies support the corporate mission statement that

‘The needs of Luton’s people will be first in everything we do’.

The aim of this impact assessment process is to:
• Embed Social Justice principles and practice into the Council’s decision making process
• Ensure adherence to the Equality Act 2010 and associated Public Sector Duty
• Minimise duplication of initial impact assessments with regards to Environment and Health
• Ensure Officers have access to the necessary specialist support with regards to all of the above

The table on the first page of this form will enable you to make early consideration of the potential impacts of your proposal with regards to individuals, areas, cohesion, inclusion, the environment and health. You will need to review the impact table once you have completed your assessment to ensure that all impacts are clearly highlighted in the final document.

Once you have completed the table the form will guide you to explain your judgements and then, as appropriate, identify in the action plan how you will be able to enhance and maintain any positive, and mitigate any negative, impacts of your proposal in line with the council’s mission and values.

This form will also help you to identify if you need further specialist advice or whether a more detailed Environmental or Health Impact Assessment may be required.

For your convenience, please see links to key Corporate and Partnership documents that may help you as you complete this IIA.

Corporate Plan
http://intranet/SupportServices/Document%20library/Corporate%20plan%20July%202011.doc

Equality Charter

Social Justice Framework

Family Poverty Strategy

Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA)
http://www.luton.gov.uk/Council_government_and_democracy/Lists/LutonDocuments/PDF/Consultation/Reports/Final%20JSNA%202011.pdf

Community Involvement Strategy
Proposal Title: Local Pinch Point Fund  
Application for improvements to Kimpton Road  
Date of IIA: Feb 2013

Lead Officer Name: Keith Dove

See By:  
SJU (Name/Date)

Signed Off By:  
Bundle Lead/Head of Service  
(Name/Date)

Please provide an outline description of your proposal:

The Kimpton Road / Windmill Road junction is currently a mini-roundabout, which is overcapacity at peak times; congestion is expected to worsen as a result of increased traffic following the Napier Park/Stirling Place development on the old Vauxhall motors estate off Kimpton Road. An assessment of various options indicated that the preferred solution is to realign the south part of Windmill Road and create a new 4 leg roundabout with the Busway.

Please list other contributors and stakeholders involved in the preparing of this assessment:

Volker Highways  
BWB : Building, Infrastructure & Environmental Consultancy  
Pell Frischmann Consulting Engineers  
Luton Borough Council Highways Services  
Luton Borough Council Major Projects Team  
Luton Borough Council Strategy and Sustainability Team

If there is any potential impact on staffing you must invite trade union involvement in the preparation of this assessment:

N/A
The purpose of this table is to consider the potential impact of your proposal against the Equality Act 2010 ‘protected characteristics’ and other key priorities of Community Cohesion, Social Inclusion, Health and Environment. We also ask you to consider potential outcomes against the key priorities of our Corporate Plan (see link).

Once you have completed this process you should have a clearer picture of any potential significant impacts*, positive, negative or neutral, on People or Places as a result of your proposal. The rest of the questions on this form will help you clarify impacts and identify an appropriate action plan. (“Significant impact” means that the proposal is likely to have a noticeable effect on specific section(s) of the community greater than on the general community at large).

In relation to the protected characteristics below, will the proposal have an impact in relation to the outcomes below?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Identified</th>
<th>Outcomes Having identified the impact will it contribute to any of the following Council priorities below?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Empower, support &amp; protect the vulnerable (Equality)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve life &amp; learning opportunities for all (Inclusion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve health &amp; reduce health inequalities (Health)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please fill out this table as much as you can initially. Once you have completed the rest of the form, come back and complete as appropriate.

###PEOPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>delete as applicable from the selection below</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☑ = Positive</td>
<td>☒ = Negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

####Race

- [ ] ☑
- [ ] ☒
- [ ] ☐

####Gender

- [ ] ☑
- [ ] ☒
- [ ] ☐

####Disability

- [ ] ☑
- [ ] ☒
- [ ] ☐

####Sexual Orientation

- [ ] ☑
- [ ] ☒
- [ ] ☐

####Age

- [ ] ☑
- [ ] ☒
- [ ] ☐

####Religion/Belief

- [ ] ☑
- [ ] ☒
- [ ] ☐

####Gender Reassignment

- [ ] ☑
- [ ] ☒
- [ ] ☐

####Pregnancy/Maternity

- [ ] ☑
- [ ] ☒
- [ ] ☐

####Marriage/Civil Partnership (HR issues only)

- [ ] ☑
- [ ] ☒
- [ ] ☐

####Care Responsibilities¹ (HR issues only)

- [ ] ☑
- [ ] ☒
- [ ] ☐

###PLACE

####Strengthen community cohesion

- [ ] ☑
- [ ] ☒
- [ ] ☐

####Tackling poverty/ promoting social inclusion

- [ ] ☑
- [ ] ☒
- [ ] ☐

####Area/Wards affected All Wards

- [ ] ☑
- [ ] ☒
- [ ] ☐

###ENVIRONMENT

####Protect and enhance the

- [ ] ☑ & ☒
- [ ] ☐

---

¹ This is a Luton specific priority added to the 9 protected characteristics covered under the Equality Act.
Please answer the following questions to help you identify any actions you may need to take with regards to impacts of this proposal

1. Consultation
1.1 Have you made use of existing recent research, evidence and/or consultation to inform your proposal? Please insert links to documents as appropriate.

If you would like to know of any potentially relevant research already carried out, please click on the following link below to **LBC Consultation Portal**

For other local statistics and information, click on the following below link for **Luton Observatory**

**Guidance Notes:**
If no use has been made of research, please contact the Consultation and Engagement Team At Communitycon@luton.gov.uk and/or the Research & Intelligence Team at research.intelligence@luton.gov.uk

---

**Click here for LBC Consultation Portal**

**Click here Luton Observatory**

Insert any links to reference websites below. One per space only

\Corporate\engusers\TRAFFIC\Funding (general)\ Local pinchpoint fund

Insert any relevant files in the spaces below. One per space only

For advice and support from Consultation Team click here
1.2 Have you carried out any specific consultation with people likely to be affected by the proposal? (if yes, please insert details, links to documents as appropriate).

**Guidance Notes:** If no, please explain why this has not been done - you may wish to speak to the Consultation Team first as a lack of sufficient consultation could render this IIA invalid and place the Council at risk of Judicial Review.

The following people/organisations, in relation to the improvements outlined in the proposal have been consulted on:

- The Mall (owners of indoor shopping centre)
- British Land (owners of Power Court development site)
- Bedfordshire Chamber of Commerce
- London Luton Airport (Dunstable Road is main route between the airport and the north & west of the conurbation)
- Main bus operators
- Augur Investments (developer of Napier Park/Stirling Place sites on Kimpton Road)
- Main bus operators
- Volker Highways (the Council’s highway maintenance partner)
- Utility companies

---

**For advice & support from the Social Justice Unit click here**

2. Impacts on People

2.1 Where you have identified a **positive** impact please explain the nature of this impact.

**Guidance Notes:**
If you identify positive impacts with regards to one or more groups listed above please outline how these can be enhanced and maintained against each group identified. Specific actions to be detailed in action plan below.

*By positive impact we mean, is there likely to be a noticeable improvement experienced by people sharing a characteristic?*

Positive impact for road users. The scheme will reduce frustration of users by improving road layout (creating a better junctions), improve smoothness of the journey from resurfacing of the carriageway, improve progress on route by increasing lane numbers and improving an existing junction which is problematic in terms of congestion. Easing stationary traffic on the road and increasing the speed of traffic movements through improved junctions will reduce the risk smash and grab from vehicles.
2.2 Where you have identified a **negative** impact please explain the nature of this impact.

**Guidance Notes:**
Please use this box to explain why you feel the proposal may be negative and outline what the consequences will be against each group identified. You will need to identify whether mitigation is available, what it is and how it could be implemented. Specific actions to be detailed in action plan below.

*By negative impact we mean is there likely to be a noticeable detrimental effect on people sharing a characteristic?*

If you can identify no mitigation with regards to negative impacts on one or more of the protected groups you must contact the Social Justice Unit – Click the email link box above.

N/A

2.3 Where you have identified a **neutral** impact for any group, please explain why you have made this judgement.

**Guidance Notes:**
You need to be confident that you have provided a sufficient explanation to justify this judgement.

*By neutral impact we mean that there will be no noticeable impact on people sharing a characteristic*
# 4. Impacts on Poverty & Inclusion

If you have identified an impact on tackling poverty/promoting social inclusion, please describe here what you believe this would be and who you believe would be affected.

**Guidance Notes:**

By poverty and inclusion we mean - is the proposal likely to have a noticeable effect on households that are vulnerable to exclusion, e.g. due to poverty, low income and/or in areas of high deprivation.

You need to consider here actions to enhance and maintain positive impacts or mitigate negative impacts.

**Specific actions to be detailed in action plan below**

If you can identify no mitigation to negative impacts on tackling poverty or promoting social inclusion you must contact the Social Justice Unit for advice - Click email link box above

| N/A |
### 5. Health & Wellbeing
If you have identified an impact with regards to promoting Health and Wellbeing please consider the questions below in more detail.

#### 5.1 Please describe what this impact is and who may be specifically affected by the proposal.

**Guidance Notes:**
By impact on health and wellbeing we mean - is there the potential for a positive or negative impact on the physical, mental or social well-being of an individual / group. You need to consider here actions to enhance and maintain positive impacts or mitigate negative impacts.

**Specific actions to be detailed in action plan below**
If you are unable to identify mitigation to questions 5.1 and 5.2 then you must contact the Public Health Team for advice. - Click email link box above

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 5.2 Will the proposal impact positively or negatively on access to, and /or quality of, health and wellbeing services?

**Guidance Notes:**
By Health and Wellbeing services we mean clinical services as well as, for example, health improvement services such as Stop Smoking, weight management, alcohol and drug services, exercise programmes, affordable warmth, falls prevention etc.
You need to consider here actions to enhance and maintain positive impacts or mitigate negative impacts.

**Specific actions to be detailed in action plan below.**
If you are unable to identify mitigation to questions 5.1 and 5.2 then you must contact the Public Health Team for advice. - Click email link box above

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 6. Impacts on the natural & built environment
If you have identified an impact on the natural and built environment please consider the questions below.

Are there aspects of this proposal that may:

- **a)** help in reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, produced by the burning of fossil fuels (i.e. coal, oil), which is likely to add to the effects of climate change.
- **b)** have an effect on conservation of energy, water, minerals and materials.
c) have an impact on the amount of waste that could be generated through the implementation of the proposal
d) impact positively or negatively on access to and the quality of the natural environment (e.g., parks, play areas, green spaces, conservation areas)
e) improve people's or infrastructure's resilience towards extreme weather conditions
f) affect amount of car journeys to/from a particular site

Guidance Notes:
If you identify positive impacts with regards to questions please outline how these can be enhanced and maintained. If you identify negative impacts in response to questions then you will need to explain any actions that you intend to take to mitigate these impacts.

Specific actions to be detailed in action plan below
If you are unable to identify mitigation with regards to questions 6.a-f then you must contact the Strategy and Sustainability Team at myclimate@luton.gov.uk as a more detailed specialist consideration of this proposal will be necessary. Click email link box above

a) For Greenhouse gas emissions (CO2e tonnes) there is likely to be no change from the proposals, in terms of overall assessment there is likely to be no change apart from those projected at a national scale from the transport sector.

d) The old rail bridge at Kimpton Road was removed in 2008. The disused railway line to be used as the southern approach to the new roundabout is designated as a County Wildlife Site, and there may be flora or fauna along this section of the route that needs to be translocated. Surveys were carried out in 2003 in preparing the Environmental Statement (ES) for the Busway scheme; an extract from the ES (see Appendix F) describes the habitat in this area. Given the time lapsed since the ecological surveys were last done, a new survey of this section of route will be undertaken prior to construction.

f) The scheme will be improving road layout and progress on route by increasing lane numbers and ease congestion by increasing the speed of traffic movements through improved junctions.
Please detail all actions that will be taken to enhance and maintain positive impacts and to mitigate any negative impacts relating to this proposal in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Responsible Officer</th>
<th>Intended Outcome</th>
<th>Date Completed/Ongoing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review IIA if bid is successful / post bid submission</td>
<td>April / May 2013</td>
<td>KD</td>
<td>Update impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A review of the action plan will be prompted 6 months after the date of completion of this IIA.

**Key Contacts:**
Keith Dove Transportation Strategy & Regulation Mgr.
Contact telephone number: 01582 547211 Email address: keith.dove@luton.gov.uk

**Summary of Findings and Actions (for publication and to be written by the author)**

The proposals set out will address junctions and roads which have always had ‘pinch point’ issues in terms of congestion, the improvements are also likely to have a much more positive effect on traffic movements than simply those roads within the bid but rather help to improve traffic flows to and through the town itself.
Next Steps

• All Executive Reports must have an IIA attached (where relevant)

• All report authors must complete the IIA section of Executive Reports (equalities, cohesion, inclusion, health, environment)

• All reports are to be forwarded to the Social Justice Unit, Public Health and Strategy & Sustainability Unit for sign off in time for Executive deadline

• Social Justice Unit, Public Health and Strategy & Sustainability Unit to highlight key points of concern from IIA in their sign off comments

• On the rare occasion that the Social Justice Unit are unable to sign off the report, e.g. recommendations are in breach of legislation, a statement will be submitted by Social Justice Unit Manager or Equality and Diversity Policy Manager

• Completed and signed IIA’s will be published on the internet once the democratic process is complete
APPENDIX D

Letters of Support
19 February 2013

Mr Keith Dove
Transport & Strategy Team
Luton Borough Council
Town Hall
George Street
Luton
Bedfordshire LU1 2BQ

Dear Keith

Napier Park and Stirling Place, Luton

The Augur Group, acting as Development Manager on the redevelopment of both Napier Park and Stirling Place sites in Luton, is fully endorsing the Local Pinchpoint funding submissions by Luton Borough Council namely: the improvement of two junctions/sections of road on the A505 corridor that runs east-west through the conurbation; the Windmill Road/Kimpton Road junction and the section of Dunstable Road between the traffic signalised junction with Cardiff Road/Inkerman Street and the offset roundabout at its junction with Hatters Way/Telford Way. We firmly believe that Pinchpoint funding will unlock key development sites around the Borough and will enhance the economic growth potential of the region as whole.

Finally, we confirm that, in respect of a previously approved Planning Application for Napier Park, the Council secured an advance of some of the agreed Section 106 monies. We understand that they intend to use some of this money as the third party contribution towards the improvement of the Kimpton Road/Windmill Road junction and we support the use of this contribution towards this improvement.

Should you wish to discuss any of the aforementioned in more detail, please do not hesitate to contact our offices.

Kind Regards

Yours sincerely

George Adamopoulos
Dear Keith

**Re: Submission by Luton Borough Council for Local Pinchpoint Funding**

I am writing on behalf of Bedfordshire Chamber of Commerce in support of Luton Borough Council’s submission for Local Pinchpoint Funding to improve two junctions/sections of road on the A505 corridor.

Both of the areas proposed for improvements serve areas of significant activity. Bedfordshire Chamber of Commerce strongly believes that the development of Napier Park/Stirling Place represents a pressing need for junction improvements due to expected increased traffic in this area. Already the existing roundabout is unequal to the volume of traffic and this can only become worse when the area is fully developed.

The developments around Napier Park/Stirling Place do not sit in isolation and improvements to the road system around this area benefit not only this area and business around Kimpton Road but also the area around London Luton Airport. Both the Kimpton Road area and the airport are recognised as important centres of employment and enterprise with the potential to build on this advantage if the road network is improved.

The sections of road around Cardiff Road/Inkerman Street and Hatters Way/Telford Way also serve areas of significant employment and enterprise and are connected to important routes through Central Luton and out to further areas of the town, Dunstable and Bedford. Currently movement around this area is severely compromised by traffic congestion, slowing progress along the bypass and creating problems at busy times of day. Improvements will allow greater use of these connecting routes, enabling business to move around more efficiently and allow a great number of individuals to seek employment in Luton from further afield.

As a Chamber of Commerce our main aims are encouraging inward investment and employment into the area and removing obstacles to businesses operating efficiently. We strongly believe these improvements meet these aims and therefore offer our unequivocal support to the proposals.

Yours sincerely

Cheryl Smart MBE
Chief Executive
Mr Keith Dove  
Luton Borough Council  
Town Hall  
George Street  
Luton  
LU1 2BQ  

20 February 2013  

Dear Keith,  

LOCAL PINCHPOINT FUNDING  

I refer to your e-mail requesting a letter of support for Local Pinchpoint funding to improve two junctions/sections of road on the A505 corridor that runs east-west through the conurbation; the Windmill Road/Kimpton Road junction, and the section of Dunstable Road between the traffic signalised junction with Cardiff Road/Inkerman Street and the offset roundabout at its junction with Hatters Way/Telford Way.

In particular Centrebus operates a 12 minute frequency service between Luton and Dunstable and beyond, which pass along the section of Dunstable Road between Cardiff Road/Inkerman Street signals and the Hatters Way/Telford Way roundabout. A reduction in traffic congestion along this section of Dunstable Road and the junctions at either end would therefore improve the journey time reliability for bus services on the north western approach routes to and from the town centre.

The company also operates some buses along Windmill Road, although these are less frequent. Incorporating the Busway into the junction of Kimpton Road / Windmill Road junction will also reduce delays to these services.

Centrebus therefore supports both bids being prepared by the Council.

Yours sincerely,  

Dave Shelley  
Commercial Director
18th February 2013

Dear Keith,

LOCAL PINCHPOINT FUNDING

I refer to your e-mail requesting a letter of support for Local Pinchpoint funding to improve two junctions/sections of road on the A505 corridor that runs east-west through the conurbation; the Windmill Road/Kimpton Road junction, and the section of Dunstable Road between the traffic signalised junction with Cardiff Road/Inkerman Street and the offset roundabout at its junction with Hatters Way/Telford Way.

Around two thirds of employees at London Luton Airport and the surrounding Campus live locally; whilst some live in residential areas to the north of the airport site, a large proportion are drawn from the wider Luton Dunstable Houghton Regis conurbation and would use the A505 between the town centre and the airport approach road to get to and from work.

Reducing congestion at both the Kimpton Road / Windmill Road junction improvements and the section of Dunstable Road between the Cardiff Road/Inkerman Street signals and the offset roundabout at its junction with Hatters Way/Telford Way will improve the journey to work and also assist local people who fly from the airport.

Incorporating the Busway into the junction of Kimpton Road / Windmill Road junction will also reduce delays to buses and coaches using the Busway and Kimpton Road to get to and from the airport, which will encourage greater use of the Busway both for passengers and airport employees.

The airport therefore supports both bids being prepared by the Council.

Yours sincerely,

Glyn Jones
Managing Director
Keith Dove,
Transportation Strategy & Regulation Manager
Luton Borough Council,
Town Hall
LUTON

19th February 2013

Dear Keith,

Re: Pinchpoint Fund: Luton Borough Council’s application for improvements to congested junctions on A505

I am writing on behalf of the Board of the South East Midlands Local Enterprise Partnership (SEMLEP) to support the bid for pinchpoint funds for improvements to the A505 to relieve congestion at the junction with Kimpton Road and the section of the Dunstable Road between Inkerman Street and the Hatters Way.

This is a strategic route, which is essential to enable growth in the Dunstable Houghton Regis area north of Luton. These junction improvements are designed to address key congestion points on the network and will also facilitate growth that is of strategic importance for the SEMLEP area.

This scheme fits well with the objectives of SEMLEP, as set out in its Business Plan ‘Getting down to business - Plan for growth April 2012-13 to support growth in homes and jobs.

I am therefore pleased to endorse the application and offer SEMLEP’s full support.

Kind regards

Dr Ann Limb OBE DL, Chair of SEMLEP
Keith Dove  
Transportation Strategy & Regulation Manager  
4th Floor  
Town Hall  
Luton LU1 2BQ  

15th February 2013  

Dear Keith  

LOCAL PINCHPOINT FUNDING  
I write on behalf of the owners and management of The Mall Shopping Centre, Luton. The Mall is the 900,000 sq ft primary retail location for Luton town centre.  

I refer to the Local Pinchpoint funding submissions from Luton Borough Council to improve two junctions/sections of road on the A505 corridor; the Windmill Road/Kimpton Road junction and the section of Dunstable Road between the traffic signalised junction with Cardiff Road/Inkerman Street and the offset roundabout at its junction with Hatters Way/Telford Way.  

We see these improvements as fundamental not only to the immediate retail prosperity of Luton but more importantly to our longer term development plans and prospects for attracting new retailers to the town centre.  

The implementation of the scheme to improve traffic flow into the town centre of Luton is fundamental to building confidence for existing businesses as well as those we are keen to attract in the coming years and not just for The Mall Shopping Centre, but for Luton Town Centre as a whole.  

The current congestion experience by customers and hauliers is detrimental to the image of Luton and therefore has economic consequences on a daily basis. Infrastructure capacity lies at the heart of the regeneration and development of Luton as a whole and as such we are firmly committed to supporting this development.  

Yours sincerely  

Mark Broadhead  
General Manager
20th February 2013

Dear Keith,

LOCAL PINCHPOINT FUNDING

I refer to Luton Borough Council’s Local Pinchpoint funding submissions to improve two junctions/sections of road on the A505 corridor that runs east-west through the conurbation; the Windmill Road/Kimpton Road junction, and the section of Dunstable Road between the traffic signalised junction with Cardiff Road/Inkerman Street and the offset roundabout at its junction with Hatters Way/Telford Way.

VolkerHighways is Luton Borough Council’s term highway maintenance contractor, and in this role also constructs a number of smaller highway and junction improvements for the Council. We have been pleased to provide assistance to the Council in preparing their Local Pinchpoint submissions bids.

Once these bids are approved we would anticipate continuing to work with the Council to develop the proposed design of these schemes and undertake any construction works.

Yours sincerely

NG Wilson
Estimating Director
DD: 01992 305354
Mob: 07931 596 985
e-mail: nick.wilson@volkerhighways.co.uk
APPENDIX E

Alternative junction options considered
(extract from URS report)
Windmill Junction
Option Report

August 2008
Draft

Issue No. 3
44550103 / 07101
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Appendix E - Option Comparison Table
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>R0</td>
<td>Existing mini-roundabout (do nothing)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>60m ICD Including LDB</td>
<td>4 plots</td>
<td>Difficulty with SSD at Windmill Road - Departure required.</td>
<td>Large islands at Gipsy Lane &amp; Windmill Road.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Large islands at Gipsy Lane &amp; Windmill Road.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>50m ICD Including LDB</td>
<td>4 plots</td>
<td>Corner of D. Devine Joiners</td>
<td>Large islands at Gipsy Lane &amp; Windmill Road.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Large islands at Gipsy Lane &amp; Windmill Road.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>R4</td>
<td>30m ICD Including LDB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>30m ICD plus LDB as give-way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Option:**
- **R4:** 30m ICD Including LDB
- **R3:** 30m ICD plus LDB as give-way

**Land-take Required Cost Impact:**
- 3 plots: 1) Corner of Devine Joynes
- 2) The Windmill Inn
- 3) Very small area of EDF
- LBC Land: 1) Allocations
- 2) Old Railway

**Geometry Problems:**
- Tight turning angles induce constraints for: buses turning tight from Kington Road into IBD
- HGVs turning left from the roundabout into the access to Mr. Clutch Auto Centre
- Departure required for forward visibility and SSD along realigned Gipsey Lane.

**Traffic Modelling Problems:**
- 2003 (incl. Vaasahl develop.)
  - a.m.: Max. Vehicles Queuing 2003 - Windmill Road
  - -8sec - Windmill Road
  - -8sec - Windmill Road
  - Max. Delay/Vehicle

**Pedestrian Accessibility Problems:**
- The limited space available between Windmill Road sub-station & Hayward Tyler perimeter wall, prevents the inclusion of a pedestrian footpath throughout the junction. The use of a railing is recommended to deter pedestrian movements along the carriageway.
- Access is available however along the remaining length of Gipsey Lane

**Safety Problems:**
- Accesses to Mr. Clutch from Windmill Road will be done to the roundabout & could introduce a potential hazard between vehicles exiting the roundabout & those turning into & out of the access.

**Buildability Problems:**
- Half of the roundabout can be built off-line allowing traffic to be diverted prior to completing the on-line section.
- The retaining wall alongside C. Devine Joiners will require replanting around the removed corner.

**Implications upon Utilities/Services (stats):**
- Stats around Gipsey Lane should be able to remain in situ & not require diversion along the new Gipsey Lane alignment.
- Stats along Windmill Road will be able to remain in situ & not require diversion along the new Gipsey Lane alignment.

**Construction Cost:**
- Created development potential for remainder of Gipsey Lane & allotment land.
- Some potential safety concerns & geometric restrictions.

**Summary:**
- Improved traffic over "do nothing" but worse than for larger roundabouts.
- High stats diversion required.

**TOTAL SCORE:**
- 2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 S1</td>
<td>Signalised T-Junction (original ELC layout), plus LDB as give-way</td>
<td>Right turning buses will remove stacking length on Kington Road. Right turn into Delphi severely reduces stacking length on Windmill Road.</td>
<td>2007 (incl. Vauxhall develop.) a.m.: Max. Delay/vehicle = 1min 45sec - Windmill Road Remaining Capacity: -19.9% (equivalent to over-capacity by -20%) p.m.: Max. Delay/vehicle = 1min 57sec - Windmill Road Remaining Capacity: -21% (equivalent to over-capacity by -21%)</td>
<td>Timings for pedestrian crossing at the signals have NOT been allowed for as traffic flows are too great &amp; capacity would be reduced too much. A separate pedestrian crossing could be put in on the LDB if necessary.</td>
<td>No crossing facilities. Possibility for queuing traffic to back-up across the existing pedestrian crossing on Windmill Road. Difficulty for vehicles turning right out of Delphi.</td>
<td>New retaining wall required along Delphi boundary.</td>
<td>Widening crosses Gipsy Lane eastern footpath. BT chamber will be affected. Requires section of footpath in front of Frank Ludlow’s land.</td>
<td>Minimal land-take. High state costs. Pedestrian crossing difficult.</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 S2</td>
<td>Signalised T-Junction plus LDB on overbridge (to tie-in at Kington Road)</td>
<td>Insufficient distance between southern abutment &amp; EDF land, for bridge to come down to ground level at an acceptable rate of decline. The required gradient to bring the route to ground level at Kington Road is anticipated to be in excess of 10°. This combined with a tight horizontal radius would result in safety implications &amp; require a departure from standards.</td>
<td>2 As above</td>
<td>Same comments on pedestrian crossing &amp; Delphi turn from above. Implications of bridge geometry.</td>
<td>As above + Bridge more difficult to build.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above + Requires EDF entrance land for LDB. Crosses Electricity supply at southern bridge abutment.</td>
<td>As above + Bridge geometry &amp; safety very poor. Cost of bridge. Additional state affected.</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option</td>
<td>Land-take Required</td>
<td>Geometry</td>
<td>Traffic Modelling Problems</td>
<td>Pedestrian Accessibility Problems</td>
<td>Safety Problems</td>
<td>Buildability Problems</td>
<td>Implications upon Utilities/Services (state)</td>
<td>Construction Cost</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>TOTAL SCORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Opt: Windmill Inn</td>
<td>Band close to signals on Windmill Road - would require a Departure for SSD. LOB had to join Kingston Road close to this band, which makes right turns into LOB difficult &amp; potentially dangerous.</td>
<td>Layout very similar to the “with bus-gate” option.</td>
<td>As above + Reduced SSD around band on Kingston Road, approaching signals. Difficulty of buses turning close to bend.</td>
<td>Realigned Kingston Road section could be built offline, so TM would be easier.</td>
<td>Away from footpath around Frank Ludlow’s land.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>Improved buildability compared to Original Signal Layout.</td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Opt: D. Devine Junction (2) The Windmill Inn (3) Windmill Road Substation (4) Mr. Clutch Auto-Centre (5) LBC Land (6) Old Railway (7) Small strip of Allotments</td>
<td>Stacking length at all arms, but especially Windmill Road, is inadequate. Straight ahead route from Windmill Road to Gipsy Lane is slightly off-line. Very large ‘island’ between 2 lanes on Kingston Road. Band in Kingston Road very close to entrance to EDF - would require a Departure for SSD.</td>
<td>As above + Difficulty crossing bus-gate section.</td>
<td>As above + Possibility for vehicles to turn wrong way up one-way lane.</td>
<td>New route could be built off-line, allowing traffic to travel up here without bus-gate section in built. Lend between D. Devine &amp; Mr. Clutch on different level.</td>
<td>Doesn’t encroach on Gipsy Lane/Windmill Road western footpath. Requires Kingston Road western footpath. Requires Gipsy Lane eastern footpath.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>High end costs. Complex layout for slabs to be diverted around.</td>
<td>-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option</td>
<td>Land-take Required</td>
<td>Cost Impact</td>
<td>Geometry</td>
<td>Traffic Modelling</td>
<td>Pedestrian Accessibility</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Buildability</td>
<td>Utilities/Services</td>
<td>Construction Cost</td>
<td>Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 G1 Triangular Gyratory System: Signalised</td>
<td>The accesses on Kippton Road are a cause for concern, due to their number &amp; proximity, both to each other &amp; to the new section of road (along the EDF access road). Due to one-way movement on Kippton Road, extra space is available for movements from D. Davey; however the turning radius from this access, &amp; from the road leading to the retail park, onto the new road will be very tight. The movement from Heyward Tyers onto the new road would also have safety implications. Vehicle counts for each access would be required to confirm geometric requirements at these. The 'vul-thru' section along the old railway should alleviate the problem of increased journey time caused by the gyratory layout. The designated lane for LDB will prevent it obstructing traffic flow. Restricted SSD around Mr. Clutch onto Gipsey Lane (20).</td>
<td>Is it likely that most traffic from Windmill Road, travelling along the old railway route, will wish to continue straight through onto Gipsey Lane. 2 lanes will therefore be required in this direction, which will result in the scope of work being extended across Osbourne Road. The VISSIM model run for the layout through (option G1) shows no problems from the Gipsey Lane direction to Windmill Road or Kippton Road, but shows excessive queuing from Windmill Road &amp; significant queuing from Kippton Road. This is likely to be similar for this layout.</td>
<td>Proximity of accesses on Kippton Road. Controlled crossing provision will be difficult due to continuous movements on all arms. Pedestrian crossing on LDB arm may be provided if necessary. One-way flow may make crossing easier for pedestrians to judge. Modelling will be required to provide a clearer indication of crossing potential.</td>
<td>Proximity of accesses on Kippton Road. Layout potentially confusing for traffic &amp; pedestrians. Potential for bus headlight dazzle oncoming vehicles (as direction of travel reverses). Can both be mitigated with lighting. Possibility for vehicles to turn wrong-way up one-way lane. &quot;Emergency Use&quot; lane will need fencing off to prevent vehicles using it as an overtaking lane, which would cause dangerous conflicts at accesses. Restricted visibility at turns onto Gipsey Lane.</td>
<td>Regard of land between D. Davey &amp; Mr. Clutch required. Sections along old railway &amp; through EDF land can be built off-line, allowing traffic to use these routes whilst the remaining work is completed.</td>
<td>Requires EDF entrance - several 33kV &amp; LV electricity &amp; personal BT lines etc. along this route.</td>
<td>Crosses Electricity supply at both bridge abutments.</td>
<td>1.5 3 -1 -3 10</td>
<td>Buildability good - relatively simple TM requirements. Modelling &amp; traffic counts required to confirm suitability. Scope of work extends across Osbourne Road.</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 G2 Triangular Gyratory System: with mini-roundabouts</td>
<td>Not enough land available on Kippton Road for a mini-roundabout &amp; the number of accesses would make it inoperable. Proximity to Osbourne Road would prevent an additional roundabout on Gipsey Lane &amp; the Osbourne Road roundabout could not operate if all the right turning traffic from Kippton Road was required to use it. The through traffic from Gipsey Lane would severely reduce the efficiency of the mini-roundabout at Windmill Road. A mini-roundabout between the old railway &amp; the EDF section would not be efficient if disproportionate flows existed on either arm. Higher flows from the railway would prevent movement from the EDF section, &amp; high through traffic flows would be unlikely to stop sufficiently to pose an accident risk.</td>
<td>As above + Uncontrolled crossing at the junctions may be easier at roundabouts than at signals, as drivers may be more willing to wait for pedestrians to cross in front of them.</td>
<td>Layout potentially confusing. Safety implications at Windmill Road &amp; on EDF section, as no opposing flow. Too many arms on Kippton Road - would fall safety audit.</td>
<td>As above + More work required to construct roundabouts than to install signals. Roundabout between accesses on Kippton Road is unbuildable due to lack of land.</td>
<td>As above + Widening around existing for roundabouts may require additional works.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>Mini-roundabouts unsuitable for reasons given.</td>
<td>-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Land-take Required</td>
<td>Cost Impact</td>
<td>Geometry</td>
<td>Traffic Modelling</td>
<td>Pedestrian Accessibility</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Buildability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>LBC Level</td>
<td>Longabout Gyratory System</td>
<td>Removes problems from adjacent accesses.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A basic VISSIM has been run on this layout. There is intensive queuing from Windmill Road, &amp; a lesser, but still very significant queue from Kingston Road. This queue starts early in the peak hours (the warm up period), &amp; then builds up throughout the junction across the peak hour.</td>
<td>As above + Crossing at LDB Junction could be difficult for pedestrians to negotiate.</td>
<td>Restricted visibility from old railway around corner of Mr. Clench &amp; onto Gipsy Lane for both lanes.</td>
<td>Requires less of SDP entrance - electricity diversion may not be necessary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F

2003 ecological surveys (extract from Busway Environmental Statement)
29 Chaul End Lane to Kingsway
Ratcliffe criteria: diversity, typicalness, position in unit and intrinsic appeal.
Indicator species: 21(11C).
Additional factors: range of sub-habitats, good ecotones, availability to people, habitat mosaics.
Status: easily qualifies under strong calcareous indicators and under total calcareous indicators and has a strategically important position and good range of additional factors: County Wildlife Site.

31 Kingsway to Clifton Road (Luton Town FC)
Ratcliffe criteria: diversity, typicalness, position in unit and intrinsic appeal.
Indicator species: 11(6C).
Additional factors: range of sub-habitats, good ecotones, availability to people, habitat mosaics.
Status: qualifies under strong calcareous indicators and has a strategically important position and good range of additional factors: County Wildlife Site.

33 Clifton Road, behind Luton Town FC to Dunstable Road
Ratcliffe criteria: diversity, position in unit and intrinsic appeal.
Indicator species: 5(1C)(1n+1a)
Additional factors: range of sub-habitats, eco-tones (variations in soil pH), availability to people.
Status: species list falls short in calcareous indicators but site has a strategically important position. A functional part of the whole railway corridor and intrinsically of Local Wildlife Importance.

35 Dunstable Road to Telford Way
Short, shady section of disused railway. No habitats of county significance but of strategic importance to the railway corridor. Intrinsically of Local Wildlife Importance.

37 Telford Way to New Bedford Road
Also a rather short section, mostly shaded habitats but with 2 calcareous indicator species and of strategic importance. Intrinsically of Local Wildlife Importance.

39 New Bedford Road to Guildford Street
Also a rather short section, mostly shaded habitats but with 3 calcareous indicator species and 1 neutral indicator species and of strategic importance. Intrinsically of Local Wildlife Importance.

41 Luton Mainline Railway Station Car Park
Includes patches of grassland with 3 calcareous, 1 neutral and 1 acidic grassland indicator species but fails to provide a continuation of the railway corridor. Not of significant wildlife value in existing state but potentially of strategic importance if enhanced.

43 Disused Railway Line again, by Luton Mainline Station to Crawley Green Road
Ratcliffe criteria: diversity, typicalness, position in unit.
Indicator species: 10(7C).
Additional factors: range of sub-habitats, good ecotones, habitat mosaics.
Status: qualifies under strong calcareous indicators and much of area inaccessible and may contain additional species; has a strategically important position and good range of additional factors: County Wildlife Site.

45 Crawley Green Road to Kimpton Road
A shady section with grassland patches which include 3 indicator species. This section is strategically important but only partially accessible to people and not as intrinsically appealing. Has potential to improve with management and contains a reasonable diversity of shaded and open habitats with some mature trees. Considered to be of Local Wildlife Importance.

47 Kimpton Road to Builder's Yard
Dense scrubby section with no grassland. Offers cover for wildlife and is a continuation of the railway corridor but marks the eastern end of this corridor. Of low intrinsic appeal and not accessible to people but with some potential for improvement with management. Considered to be of Local Wildlife Importance in combination with 45.

48+49 Builder’s Yard and adjacent allotments.
+50-52 Urbanised areas - no significant wildlife habitats in these sections.

53+55 Embankment of Airport Way and adjacent flat land
Contains a mixture of tall grassland supporting reasonable insect populations together with planted trees and shrubs but nothing of particular wildlife significance.

54 Crossing of River Lea
South-east of Airport Way the River Lea is a designated County Wildlife Site. On the north-west side of Airport Way, where it is crossed by the route, it is considered to be of Local Wildlife Importance.

56-58 Various Habitats Park Street to M1 Roundabout
These sections include a road crossing with one hedgerow, open fields with semi-improved grassland and road verge and surface but there are no habitats of particular wildlife significance. The proposed route runs adjacent to Kidney Wood County Wildlife Site near the M1 roundabout.

59 Industrial Plot
Of no wildlife significance.

60 Disused Industrial Plot
Much disturbed in recent past but supporting at least 4 indicator species. Only viewed through binoculars. Potentially of some local wildlife importance when considered in conjunction with neighbouring habitats 55 and 56.

61 Disused Plot by Road
Ratcliffe criteria: diversity, typicalness, position in unit, intrinsic appeal.
Indicator species: 16(7C)[1n+1a]
Additional factors: eco-tones (varying pH), accessible to people (at least visibly).
Status: although small it qualifies under strong calcareous indicators: County Wildlife Site particularly in conjunction with neighbouring habitats at 56 and 57.

62 Crossing of Main Railway Line
Railway cutting.
Ratcliffe criteria: diversity, typicalness, position in unit.
Indicator species: 8(3C)[1n+1a]
Additional factors: range of sub-habitats; good eco-tones (varying pH).
Status: species list falls short in indicator species but site could only be viewed by binoculars and additional species probably occur; site evidently supports a significant area of good grassland and is a strategically important part of the railway corridor: County Wildlife Site.

63 Cutting and flat land on west side of Airport Way
Ratcliffe criteria: diversity, typicalness, position in unit, intrinsic appeal.
Additional factors: range of sub-habitats, accessible to public.
Status: easily qualifies under strong calcareous indicators and calcareous indicators, very accessible to the public and in a strategically important position: County Wildlife Site.

64 Cutting on east side of Airport Way
Ratcliffe criteria: diversity, typicalness, position in unit, intrinsic appeal.
Indicator species: 9(4C).
APPENDIX G

Extract from Aitchison Raffety report verifying market value of Windmill Inn site
REPORT & VALUATION
FOR
LUTON BOROUGH COUNCIL

The Windmill
93 Windmill Road
Luton
Bedfordshire
LU1 3XL

3 DIAMOND COURT
OPAL DRIVE
FOX MILNE
MILTON KEYNES
MK15 0DU

TEL 01908 608002
FAX 01908 608670
12.29 Having regard to the business catchment, there is a considerable range of additional pub/restaurant outlets that are addressed within a 2 mile radius from the premises, as listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUSINESS</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>DISTANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Brache</td>
<td>Osborne Road, Luton</td>
<td>0.1 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Chequers</td>
<td>112 Park Street, Luton</td>
<td>0.2 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bat &amp; Barrel</td>
<td>104-106 Park Street, Luton</td>
<td>0.2 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Moulders Arms</td>
<td>2 Chobham Street, Luton</td>
<td>0.2 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Castle Tavern</td>
<td>Castle Street, Luton</td>
<td>0.5 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Compasses</td>
<td>11 Fairley Hill, Luton</td>
<td>0.7 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rising Sun</td>
<td>1 Front Street, Luton</td>
<td>1.9 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hungry Horse</td>
<td>Biscot Road, Luton</td>
<td>1.9 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bird &amp; The Bush</td>
<td>Hancock Drive, Luton</td>
<td>2.3 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicester Arms</td>
<td>531 Dunstable Road, Luton</td>
<td>2.7 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Warden</td>
<td>129 Barton Road, Luton</td>
<td>3.2 miles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12.30 In addition, the Vauxhall Recreation Club is located approximately 0.2 miles from the property on nearby Gypsy Lane.

12.31 In assessing market value, we are mindful that the premises have been closed for trade considerable period of time. Any incoming reasonably competent occupier would have to build up the trade from a very low base. We have therefore taken the hypothetical FNMOP of £40,000 and applied a multiplier of 5 to arrive at the maximum value as a trading entity (£200,000). We have then deducted 3.5 times the maximum value to reflect the value of goodwill, fixtures and fittings (£55,000) to arrive at its hypothetical value for the freehold property. This produces a figure of £190,000.

12.32 We would comment that whilst pub prices are constrained by the volume of trade and ability to service debt, in our experience when there is a strong residential market, pub prices are elevated by hope value for alternative residential use. Subject to obtaining the necessary planning consents etc, the subject unit would create a good quality three bedroom house.

12.33 Local comparables include the following:

(i) A three bedroom detached house addressed as Woodside Road, Luton was recently sold following an asking price of £285,000 (subject to contract). The charming period property which combines immense character with spacious accommodation, which is well suited to modern living. The house was previously a public house before it was converted to a private home. The main reception room has a dual aspect and a feature fireplace. The dining room sits to the front of the property with the well equipped kitchen to the back. A trap door leads to a useful cellar. Upstairs there are three double bedrooms which are served by a white fitted family bathroom and separate shower room with WC. The pretty cottage garden is laid to lawn with patio area adjacent to the rear of the house. A detached single garage sits to the rear of the plot with a parking space to the front.
12.34 These suggest an alternative use value in the order of £290,000 for the property after planning, conversion, professional and finance costs of close to £100,000. We advise that local planning authorities readily permit change of use applications from public houses to alternative community facilities only. Proposals which deviate from evolving national planning policy guidance are to be judged on a case by case basis, and therefore, we recommend that additional consultation with a local planning officer is had, if at all necessary at a future date.

12.35 Therefore, any purchaser proceeding on the basis of alternative use would need to be particularly cautious.

12.36 Furthermore, we also advise that any enhancement in the market value at a future date as a result of the nearby development proposals for Napier Park cannot be reflected in the market value.

**Appropriate Marketing Period**

12.37 The standard definition of Market Value requires the Valuer to assume that full and proper marketing has been undertaken for an appropriate period to achieve the best price. In preparing our valuation we have considered that an appropriate marketing period to have achieved our stated opinion of value would have been 9 to 12 months.

**Recent Transactional History**

12.38 Whilst we understand that the freehold property has been available to purchase on the open market for approximately 1 year subject to an asking price in the region of £250,000. The closing date for offers was 25 January 2012. We have subsequently tried to contact the vendor’s agent on several occasions in order to obtain information concerning the level of offers received but unfortunately answers to our enquiries were not given.

12.39 Should any such information come to light before the loan is finalised the matter must be referred back to us for further consideration.

### 13.0 VALUATION

13.1 The following valuation is in accordance with the definitions contained within our Standard Limitations and Assumptions.

13.2 **Market Value**: In our opinion the Market Value of the freehold interest in the above property in the condition as at 18 February 2013 and with vacant possession is in the sum of:-

£190,000 (One Hundred And Ninety Thousand Pounds)

### 14.0 BUILDING REINSTATEMENT

14.1 The figure below is provided as an informal indication only of the perceived rebuilding costs of the existing buildings and should not be relied on. Please refer to our Standard Limitations and Assumptions.

14.2 The figure below is quoted inclusive of site clearance fees and demolition but specifically excludes consequential loss, fixtures & fittings, stock, loss of rent and VAT on construction costs.

14.3 Building reinstatement figure £450,000 (Four Hundred And Fifty Thousand Pounds).
15.0 CONFIDENTIALITY AND DISCLOSURE

15.1 This report is for the sole use of the addressee for the purpose set out in the beginning of this report and no responsibility is accepted to any third party for the whole or any parts of this report. Neither the whole nor any part of the report may be included in any statement, circular or published document without the prior written consent of Aitchison Raffety.

Yours faithfully

[Signature]

Jimmy James BSc (Hons) MRICS
Commercial Valuer
RICS Registered Valuer
For and on behalf of Aitchison Raffety

Direct: 01908 208932
E-mail: jimmy.james@argroup.co.uk
APPENDIX H

Plans of utility apparatus in the vicinity of the scheme site
APPENDIX I

Appraisal Summary Table and Scheme Impacts
Pro Forma
### Appraisal Summary Table

#### Kimpton Road / Windmill Road improvement Feb-12

**Description of scheme:**
For both noise annoyance and the effect of noise on house prices the scheme is likely to have little, if any, effect. In general, the overall assessment of the scheme is likely to be neutral. For Windmill Road / Kimpton Road scheme the total number of households with 50m of the scheme is 0, 100m in 16, 200 m is 29 and 4000m is 435.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts</th>
<th>Summary of key impacts</th>
<th>Quantitative</th>
<th>Qualitative</th>
<th>Monetary (NPV)</th>
<th>Distributional 70% scale/ transport gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Improve journey time reliability</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>For both noise annoyance and the effect of noise on house prices the scheme is likely to have little, if any, effect. In general, the overall assessment of the scheme is likely to be neutral. For Windmill Road / Kimpton Road scheme the total number of households with 50m of the scheme is 0, 100m in 16, 200 m is 29 and 4000m is 435.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air quality</td>
<td>In terms of overall assessment of air quality, the scheme is likely to have no significant changes or impact.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse gases</td>
<td>For Greenhouse gas emissions (CO2e tonnes), there is likely to be no change from the proposals presented within the bid. In terms of overall assessment, there is likely to be no change apart from those proposed at a national scale from the transport sector.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>The geographical area identified within the bid does not contain any notable landscape characteristics as outlined (TAG Unit 3.3.7); therefore there will be no significant changes or impact on landscape from the proposal. Without any landscape characteristics there is no identified environmental capital within the area, no key concerns or fine inter-relationships between other environmental attributes.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage of Historic resources</td>
<td>The geographical area identified within the bid does not contain any man-made historic character or features of note. Without any notable features within the scheme there is no environmental capital within the area, no feature of importance, little form, few relationships in terms of linking any heritage features within the bid area, poor quality in terms of visual context. For scale, rarity and significance of the scheme we would suggest local, common in nature and of little historic significance.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage</td>
<td>The disused railway line to be used as the southern approach to the new roundabout is designated as a County Wildlife Site, and there may be flora or fauna along this section of the route that needs to be translocated. Surveys were carried out in 2003 in preparing the Environmental Statement (ES) for the Busway scheme, an extract from Table 1 (TAG Unit 3.3.11), the impact of the scheme will have no effect on the quality of water features suggested in the table nor any identifiable attribute / service suggested. In terms of scale of the attribute they are small scale in nature, in considering the impact of the proposals in terms of importance and magnitude is low and negligible.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Demand</td>
<td>The improvements in road layout (including better junctions, roadlayouting of carriageway, better signals and increasing lane numbers will have an intermediate benefit to the quality of the local environment. An overall easing of traffic congestion and improved journey quality will have much wider benefit to the Townscape of Luton.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel time</td>
<td>The improvements in road layout (including better junctions, roadlayouting of carriageway, better signals and increasing lane numbers will have an intermediate benefit to the quality of the local environment. An overall easing of traffic congestion and improved journey quality will have much wider benefit to the Townscape of Luton.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel reliability</td>
<td>The improvements in road layout (including better junctions, roadlayouting of carriageway, better signals and increasing lane numbers will have an intermediate benefit to the quality of the local environment. An overall easing of traffic congestion and improved journey quality will have much wider benefit to the Townscape of Luton.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel stress</td>
<td>The improvements in road layout (including better junctions, roadlayouting of carriageway, better signals and increasing lane numbers will have an intermediate benefit to the quality of the local environment. An overall easing of traffic congestion and improved journey quality will have much wider benefit to the Townscape of Luton.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel cost</td>
<td>The improvements in road layout (including better junctions, roadlayouting of carriageway, better signals and increasing lane numbers will have an intermediate benefit to the quality of the local environment. An overall easing of traffic congestion and improved journey quality will have much wider benefit to the Townscape of Luton.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>An overall assessment of the security impact of the proposals and schemes set out in the bid is one of being neutral as defined in paragraph 1.7 (Unit Tag 3.4.2). The schemes of work do not include removing existing facilities to provide vehicle security such as CCTV or lay bys rather improvements will be made such as easing pedestrian traffic on the road or increasing the speed of traffic movements through improved junctures to reduce the fear of accidents as the works will offer a higher quality journey.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 1 (TAG Unit 3.3.11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Net journey time changes (£)</th>
<th>0 to 2min</th>
<th>2 to 5min</th>
<th>&gt; 5min</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value of journey time changes</td>
<td>£0.2m</td>
<td>£0.2m</td>
<td>£0.2m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Notes

- **Cost to Broad:** £1.275m
- **Direct Tax Revenues:** £2.100m
### Scheme Impact Pro Forma for Small Project Bids - Kimpton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Input Data / Key Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>AM Peak Hr Weekday</th>
<th>PM Peak Hr Weekday</th>
<th>Inter-Peak Hr Weekday</th>
<th>Nights</th>
<th>Sat 19:00-07:00</th>
<th>Sun 07:00-19:00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of highway trips affected</td>
<td>vehicles</td>
<td>2,312</td>
<td>2,507</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do-Minimum</td>
<td>Total vehicle travelled time</td>
<td>vehicle-hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total vehicle travelled distance</td>
<td>vehicle-km</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total network delays</td>
<td>vehicle-hours</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highway peak period conversion factor</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of PT passenger trips on affected routes</td>
<td>passenger trips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bus journey time on affected routes</td>
<td>minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total PT travelled time</td>
<td>passenger-hrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total PT travelled distance</td>
<td>passenger-km</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do-Something</td>
<td>Number of walking and cycling trips</td>
<td>person trips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mode share in affected area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Walking and cycling</td>
<td>person trips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Bus/BRT</td>
<td>person trips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Rail</td>
<td>person trips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Total</td>
<td>person trips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of PT passenger trips on affected routes</td>
<td>passenger trips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bus journey time on affected routes</td>
<td>minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total PT travelled time</td>
<td>passenger-hrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total PT travelled distance</td>
<td>passenger-km</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX J

Note on the traffic modelling work
1 Luton Pinch Point Application-Kimpton Rd/Windmill Rd improvements

1.1 Scheme

1.1.1 The existing Kimpton Road / Windmill Road mini-roundabout is over-capacity at peak times and congestion is expected to worsen as a result of increased traffic following the Napier Park/Stirling Place development off Kimpton Road. Having considered various options, the preferred solution is to move the existing junction eastwards on Kimpton Road and realigning the south part of Windmill Road to create a new 4 leg roundabout with the Busway.

1.2 Modelling

1.2.1 This assessment was undertaken using the SATURN models for the AM and PM peak that were developed for the assessment of the Luton Town Centre Transport Scheme, which entered the DfT’s Development Pool in December 2011 and for which the Full Approval Business Case has recently been submitted to the DfT. Further technical information on this model can be found on www.luton.gov.uk/tcts.

1.2.2 Given the construction of the Town Centre Transport Scheme, which forms the missing link on the eastern side of the town centre, is due to start in mid 2013 (subject to DfT approval), the modelling work undertaken in order to assess the benefits of this pinchpoint submission assumes that the whole town centre ring road is complete.

1.2.3 The base year (2012) ARCADY assessment confirms that the existing mini-roundabout is overcapacity in both the morning and evening peaks, particularly on the Kimpton road and Windmill Road (north) approaches to the junction. ARCADY has been used as it is the appropriate tool for assessing the performance of roundabout junctions; its models queue lengths on each approach and produces outputs of vehicle demand, together with average delays per vehicle and queuing delay (in minutes). This information is included in the table below, although to be consistent with the requirements of the scheme impact proforma, total queuing delay has been converted to hours.

1.2.4 The Table below demonstrates the impact once development of the Napier Park/Stirling Place is complete, through comparison of the performance of the existing mini-roundabout and the new larger roundabout in two scenarios:

- 2022 with natural traffic growth
- 2022 including traffic generated by the completed Napier Park/Stirling Place development

1.2.5 Local factors were obtained from ATC data to factor the AM peak and PM peak hour flows up to 3 hour peak flows. These factors, derived in the modelling work for the Town Centre Transport scheme, are 2.611 for the AM peak and 2.764 for the PM peak periods.
1.3 Results

1.3.1 The following table details the Total Flow (pcus) together with Average Delay (mins/pcu) and Total Delay (pcu-hrs) at peak periods in 2022 with and without the scheme, and with and without the Napier Park/Stirling Place development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Total Flow (pcu’s)</th>
<th>Average Delay (mins/pcu)</th>
<th>Total Delay (pcu-hr)</th>
<th>Total Flow (pcu’s)</th>
<th>Average Delay (mins/pcu)</th>
<th>Total Delay (pcu-hr)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2022 existing mini roundabout</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>2312</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>102.8</td>
<td>2759</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>263.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>2507</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>3112</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>245.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022 with realigned roundabout</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>3170</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3785</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>3438</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4267</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3.2 Comparison of these figures demonstrates that, even without development of the Napier Park/Stirling Place sites, the improvement of the existing Kimpton Road/Windmill Road mini-roundabout to a larger roundabout incorporating the Busway will result in a significant reduction in delays in both the morning and evening peak periods.

1.4 Economic performance

1.4.1 The outputs from ARCADY cannot be fed into TUBA in the same way that SATURN can (see assessment of the Dunstable Road Local Pinchpoint submission). Notwithstanding this, to give an indication of the value of these reductions in delay, we have taken the proportional reduction in delays of the existing mini-roundabout to those with the scheme, and comparing this with the assessment undertaken for the Dunstable Road scheme, could result in an economic efficiency valuation for personal and business users/providers of as much as £80m. However the impact of these journey delay reductions on indirect taxation revenue would be a lot higher.

1.4.2 The Present Value Costs (PVC), based on the out-turn cost (outlined in section B4 of the Application) also discounted to 2002 prices, is £1.275m.

1.4.3 Dividing the PVB by the PVC results in a Benefit:Cost Ratio of 61.18.

Note prepared based on information supplied by:

BWB Consulting Limited
5th Floor, Waterfront House
35 Station Street
NG2 3DQ

Pell Frischmann Consultants Ltd
9-10 Frederick Road
BIRMINGHAM
B15 1JD
APPENDIX K

Joint letter from Section 151 Officer and Head of Procurement
Dear Steve

LUTON BOROUGH COUNCIL APPLICATIONS FOR LOCAL PINCHPOINT FUND

I refer to Luton Borough Council’s Local Pinchpoint funding submissions to improve two junctions/sections of road on the A505 corridor that runs east-west through the conurbation; the Windmill Road/Kimpton Road junction, and the section of Dunstable Road between the traffic signalised junction with Cardiff Road/Inkerman Street and the offset roundabout at its junction with Hatters Way/Telford Way.

I understand that, as part of these submissions, the Council’s Section 151 Officer and Head of Procurement have to write confirming that each of these proposals is legally compliant and is likely to achieve the best value for money outcome.

As indicated in response B7b on the form, it is our intention to carry out any design work in-house, and to either use Volker Highways (the Council’s term maintenance contractor) or one of the contractors in the Eastern Highways Alliance (EHA) framework to construct the scheme.

With regard to Volker Highways they are the Council’s term maintenance contractor until June 2016.

Turning to the EHA framework, 16 Expressions of Interest were received following an OJEU notice published in 2011 from the following contractors:- Osborne, Jackson, Galliford, May Gurney, Balfour, Tarmac, Eurovia, Interserve, Volker, North Midland, Farrans, Lafarge, Breheny, Amey, Aggregate Industries, and Murphy.

Following the prequalification stage of the procurement process, the following contractors were invited to tender; Osborne, Jackson, Galliford, May Gurney, Balfour, Eurovia, Interserve, Tarmac and Farrans. Interserve & Galliford subsequently withdrew from the process.

Having assessed the Tenders, the Eastern Highways Alliance framework contract was then awarded to Osborne, Jackson, Eurovia & Tarmac.
I trust this information meets the requirements in support of the Council’s Local Pinchpoint Fund submissions. In the meantime please do not hesitate to contact me or William Clapp if you need any further information. I am confident that each of the proposals is legally complaint and likely to achieve the best value for money outcome.

Yours sincerely

Dave Kempson
Head of Finance
Section 151 Officer

William Clapp
Head of Procurement & Shared Services
APPENDIX L

Project Plan
| Key Tasks          | 01 January 2013 | 01 February 2013 | 01 March 2013 | 01 April 2013 | 01 May 2013 | 01 June 2013 | 01 July 2013 | 01 August 2013 | 01 September 2013 | 01 October 2013 | 01 November 2013 | 01 December 2013 | 01 January 2014 | 01 February 2014 | 01 March 2014 | 01 April 2014 | 01 May 2014 | 01 June 2014 | 01 July 2014 | 01 August 2014 | 01 September 2014 | 01 October 2014 | 01 November 2014 | 01 December 2014 | 01 January 2015 | 01 February 2015 | 01 March 2015 | 01 April 2015 | 01 May 2015 | 01 June 2015 | 01 July 2015 | 01 August 2015 | 01 September 2015 | 01 October 2015 | 01 November 2015 | 01 December 2015 |
|-------------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Prepare submission |                 |                  |              |              |             |             |             |                 |                  |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |              |              |              |             |             |                  |                  |                  |                 |                 |                 |              |              |              |             |             |                  |                  |                  |                 |
| Review design     |                 |                  |              |              |             |             |             |                 |                  |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |              |              |              |             |             |                  |                  |                  |                 |                 |                 |              |              |              |             |             |                  |                  |                  |                 |
| CPO process       |                 |                  |              |              |             |             |             |                 |                  |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |              |              |              |             |             |                  |                  |                  |                 |                 |                 |              |              |              |             |             |                  |                  |                  |                 |
| Utilities works   |                 |                  |              |              |             |             |             |                 |                  |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |              |              |              |             |             |                  |                  |                  |                 |                 |                 |              |              |              |             |             |                  |                  |                  |                 |
| Roundabout constr. |                 |                  |              |              |             |             |             |                 |                  |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |              |              |              |             |             |                  |                  |                  |                 |                 |                 |              |              |              |             |             |                  |                  |                  |                 |

- Programme in submission
- Latest programme