UK Government

Levelling Up Fund Application Form

This form is for bidding entities, applying for funding from the Levelling Up Fund (LUF) across the UK. Prior to completing the application form, applicants should read the LUF Technical Note.

The Levelling Up Fund Prospectus is available here.

The level of detail you provide in the Application Form should be in proportion to the amount of funding that you are requesting. For example, bids for more than £10m should provide considerably more information than bids for less than £10m.

Specifically, for larger transport projects requesting between £20m and £50m, bidding entities may submit the Application Form or if available an Outline Business Case (OBC) or Full Business Case (FBC). Further detail on requirements for larger transport projects is provided in the Technical Note.

One application form should be completed per bid.

Applicant & Bid Information

Local authority name / Applicant name(s)*: Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council

**If the bid is a joint bid, please enter the names of all participating local authorities / organisations and specify the lead authority*

Bid Manager Name and position:

Name and position of officer with day-today responsibility for delivering the proposed scheme.

Contact telephone number

Email address:

Postal address: Prosperity, Development and Frontline Services,
Cyngor Rhondda Cynon Taf Council, Tŷ Sardis House, Pontypridd, CF37 1DU

Nominated Local Authority Single Point of Contact:

Senior Responsible Officer contact details:

Chief Finance Officer contact details:

Country:

☐ **England**

☐ **Scotland**

☒ **Wales**

☐ **Northern Ireland**

Please provide the name of any consultancy companies involved in the preparation of the bid**:**

~~For bids from **Northern Ireland applicants** please confirm type of organisation~~

☐ ~~Northern Ireland Executive~~	☐ ~~Third Sector~~
☐ ~~Public Sector Body~~	☐ ~~Private Sector~~
☐ ~~District Council~~	~~**Other (please state)**~~

PART 1 GATEWAY CRITERIA Failure to meet the criteria below will result in an application not being taken forward in this funding round	
1a Gateway Criteria for **all bids** Please tick the box to confirm that your bid includes plans for some LUF expenditure in 2021-22 *Please ensure that you evidenced this in the financial case / profile.*	☒ Yes ☐ No
~~1b Gateway Criteria for private and third sector organisations in **Northern Ireland bids only**~~ ~~(i) Please confirm that you have attached last two years of audited accounts.~~	☐ ~~Yes~~ ☐ ~~No~~
~~(ii) **Northern Ireland bids only** Please provide evidence of the delivery team having experience of delivering two capital projects of similar size and scale in the last five years. (Limit 250 words)~~	

PART 2 EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

2a Please describe how equalities impacts of your proposal have been considered, the relevant affected groups based on protected characteristics, and any measures you propose to implement in response to these impacts. (500 words) 376 words

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council's (RCTCBC's) Equality Impact Assessment Form has been completed for the A4119 Coed-ely Dualling proposal and associated Active Travel route (latest revision April 2020). The Equality Impact Assessment Form required the impact of the project on groups with protected characteristics to be assessed.

The first stage of the process involves screening to establish whether the project has a high or medium impact on any of the protected groups and would therefore require a full Equalities Impact Assessment.

The project was assessed as having a low impact on groups with the protected characteristics of age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation. The project was also assessed as having a low impact on groups with the following characteristics – Welsh language, carers, Armed Forces community.

The project was assessed as having a low impact on all the groups with protected characteristics. Therefore, following the screening exercise it was determined that a full Equalities Impact Assessment was not required for the project.

Overall, it is considered that the construction of the A4119 Coed-ely Dualling scheme and associated Active Travel improvements will not have any significant adverse impact on the residents of Rhondda Cynon Taf (RCT). Once completed, the dualling will provide a number of benefits for the economy of RCT, which will in turn benefit all the above groups with protected characteristics.

The project will aim to encourage economic growth, improve access to employment and reduce social disparities between communities, which will have a positive impact from an equalities perspective. The project will reduce congestion, encourage healthier lifestyles and provide better access for communities along the A4119 corridor and the surrounding areas. It will enhance transport links for a range of modes i.e. highway, bus services, walking and cycling.

The project will improve transport options for those without access to a car, by improving the journey time reliability of bus services and improving options for walking and cycling for local journeys. The provision of an Active Travel route will encourage more walking and cycling, which are low cost travel options that will positively impact many of those groups that may not have access to a car e.g. improving travel options for young people.

When authorities submit a bid for funding to the UKG, 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 five working days of the announcement of successful bids by UKG. UKG reserves the right to deem the bid as non-compliant if this is not adhered to.
Please specify the weblink where this bid will be published: www.rctcbc.gov.uk

PART 3 BID SUMMARY

3a Please specify the type of bid you are submitting	☒ Single Bid (one project) ☐ Package Bid (up to 3 multiple complimentary projects)

3b Please provide an overview of the bid proposal. Where bids have multiple components (package bids) you should clearly explain how the component elements are aligned with each other and represent a coherent set of interventions (Limit 500 words). 494 words

The bid proposal is to deliver the A4119 Coed-ely Dualling scheme, an associated Active Travel route alongside and an Active Travel bridge at the Coed-ely roundabout. This major improvement, to dual an existing 1.3km section of the A4119 from the South Wales Fire and Rescue Service Headquarters Roundabout to the Coed-ely Roundabout, will further extend the dualling of this strategic transport corridor that provides an important link between the M4 at Junction 34 and the Rhondda Valleys.

The A4119 was recognised by the Welsh Government as an important sub corridor off the M4 during their WelTAG study to aid in relieving pinch points / issues on the M4.

At present the A4119 from J34 of the M4 to the entrance to Llantrisant Business Park is a high-standard dual carriageway, whereas the final link of the A4119 to Coed-ely is a single carriageway section of road. The reduced capacity along the single carriageway section of the A4119 results in significant delays and congestion, with reduced vehicle speeds and extended queuing occurring to the north and south of it during peak hours.

At the north of the proposed scheme, the Coed-ely roundabout provides access to the strategic development site at Coed-ely. Development of the site commenced during 2019/20 via a joint venture between Welsh Government and RCTCBC. At present, the volume of north/south traffic flow results in problems on both the single carriageway section of the A4119 to the south of Coed-ely roundabout and at the roundabout itself. The current sub-standard single carriageway leads to the perception amongst potential developers that there is poor access to the site.

The proposed scheme will dual the existing section of the A4119 from the South Wales Fire and Rescue Service Headquarters Roundabout to the Coed-ely Roundabout. The scheme is 1.3km in length and will create two 3.65m lanes in both directions with a central reserve. The project will include improvements to Active Travel provision through the addition of a 3-metre wide Active Travel route alongside the proposed dualling scheme and an Active Travel bridge at the Coed-ely roundabout, linking into the local network.

Dualling this section of the A4119 will improve capacity and resilience of the strategic route at this location, reducing incidences of congestion and delays. It will enhance the access to the Coed-ely strategic development site and the attractiveness of the site to developers by reducing traffic congestion. Nearby sites such as Llantrisant Business Park and Ynysmaerdy are experiencing high demand and are already served by the A4119 dual carriageway. The scheme will not only improve connectivity along this key corridor, but has the potential to act as a catalyst for development of this strategic site.

The proposed improvement is not only integral to the regional strategic highway network; it is also linked to part of the “Strategic Opportunity Area (SOA) The A4119 Corridor: The Regional Rhondda Gateway” and to the wider economic opportunities for the western area of the County Borough and the Cardiff Capital Region.

3c Please set out the value of capital grant being requested from UK Government (UKG) (£). This should align with the financial case:		£
3d Please specify the proportion of funding requested for each of the Fund’s three investment themes	Regeneration and town centre	%
	Cultural	%
	Transport	100%

PART 4 STRATEGIC FIT

4.1 Member of Parliament Endorsement (GB Only)

See technical note section 5 for Role of MP in bidding and Table 1 for further guidance.

4.1a Have any MPs formally endorsed this bid? If so confirm name and constituency. Please ensure you have attached the MP's endorsement letter.	☐ Yes ☒ No

4.2 Stakeholder Engagement and Support

See technical note Table 1 for further guidance.

4.2a Describe what engagement you have undertaken with local stakeholders and the community (communities, civic society, private sector and local businesses) to inform your bid and what support you have from them**.** (Limit 500 words) 484 words

Stakeholder engagement / consultation has been undertaken and will continue with the stakeholders and parties affected by the proposals. This includes stakeholders within the Council's departments, statutory bodies, statutory undertakers and third parties whose land is required for the proposals. A summary of the stakeholder and community engagement that has been undertaken to date is as follows:

- Stakeholder engagement with officers from RCTCBC was undertaken at WelTAG Stage 1 (in September 2017) to inform:
  - The identification of problems, opportunities and constraints affecting the study area;
  - The development of study objectives against which potential solutions to the identified problems could be appraised; and
  - The development of a long-list of proposed solutions or options.
- Engagement with officers of RCTCBC also took place as part of the Review Group meetings held at the end of the WelTAG Stages 1, 2 and 3. The purpose of the Review Group is to consider the content and recommendations of the WelTAG Stage report and agree the way forward.
- Consultation has been undertaken with the landowners that will be affected by the proposals, which includes agreement on accommodation works, land purchase and matters affecting construction of the scheme. These include Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (DCWW) who have a sewage works that is located on both sides of the A4119, The Royal Mint who access their pumping station off the scheme and the business' using Common Siding yard. It is intended that consultation will continue as the scheme progresses.
- Two public consultation exhibitions were held in February 2019 at locations in Ynysmaerdy and Coed-ely. The exhibitions presented the A4119 Dualling proposals and enabled members of the public to comment on the proposals. A

website was also live during the week of the exhibition with a comments box to allow feedback on the consultation information. The public consultation indicated strong support for the proposals from local communities. Over 140 people attended the two exhibitions, with the vast majority expressing support verbally. There were 59 formal responses from the public via the exhibition and website. 35 of the formal responses were in favour and 7 did not indicate a preference. The remaining 17 were opposed for various reasons ranging from creating more congestion, speeding and pedestrian safety. The detailed design will consider the responses and where appropriate and reasonable, mitigation measures will be incorporated. Further public consultation will be held towards the end of the detailed design stage for the proposals.

- A website continues to be maintained for the scheme giving details and documents relating to the project's progress, along with the Compulsory Purchase and Side Roads Order that is currently ongoing.
- Other consultation activities have included consultation with equestrians regarding the crossing at Coed-ely Roundabout and meetings between RCTCBC officers and representatives of the South Wales Fire & Rescue Service Headquarters.
- Council Members have been updated on project progress via Cabinet reports. Consultation will be ongoing with RCTCBC Council Members.

4.2b Are any aspects of your proposal controversial or not supported by the whole community? Please provide a brief summary, including any campaigns or particular groups in support or opposition? (Limit 250 words) 129 words

No, the public consultation has shown strong support for the proposed scheme within the local community. In addition, issues raised through the public consultation have been considered and addressed in the development of the scheme as follows:

- Speed on Ynys Maerdy roundabout was a problem raised during the consultation – work was undertaken during the Summer in 2019 to reduce speeds at this location and allow vehicles safer access into and out of Royal Glamorgan Hospital and Ynys Maerdy village.
- Safe crossing at the northern end of scheme – An Active Travel bridge is to be installed to allow pedestrians and cyclists to safely cross the road,linking into the local network.
- Concern from equestrians over horses using the Coed-ely roundabout for crossing – after consultation an alternative crossing location is being investigated.

4.2c Where the bidding local authority does not have the statutory responsibility for the delivery of projects, have you appended a letter from the responsible authority or body confirming their support?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A
~~For Northern Ireland transport bids, have you appended a letter of support from the relevant district council~~	~~☐ Yes~~

	☐ ~~No~~ ☐ ~~N/A~~

4.3 The Case for Investment

See technical note Table 1 for further guidance.

4.3a Please provide evidence of the local challenges/barriers to growth and context that the bid is seeking to respond to. (Limit 500 words) 499 words

RCTCBC is challenged with removing barriers to development and regeneration in the north, whilst tackling pressures of substantial development and traffic congestion in the south. Transport has an important role to play in 'levelling up' these economic and social disparities.

Census (2011) data shows the contrast between communities along the A4119 corridor. In the Llantrisant area, at the southern end of the A4119 corridor, only 15% of households do not have a car or van, compared to 25.3%% of households in the Tonyrefail area, just to the north of the scheme. This compares with the Wales average of 22.9%. Variations in economic and employment data between communities along the A4119 corridor are also evident. Census (2011) data shows that in the Llantrisant area 71.3%% of the resident population aged 16-74 is economically active. This declines to 60.8% in the Tonyrefail area. The Wales-wide equivalent figure is 65.8%. Welsh Index of Multiple Deprivation (WIMD) data also provides evidence of high levels of deprivation in the Tonyrefail area, as detailed in Section 2.3 of the FBC.

The A4119 strategic transport corridor provides an important link between the M4 at Junction 34 and the Rhondda Valleys. The reduced capacity along the single carriageway section of the A4119 results in significant delay and congestion, with reduced vehicle speeds and extended queuing occuring to the north and south of it during the peak hours. The two roundabouts on this section of the A4119 are currently operating near or over capacity, and peak traffic is forecast to worsen here in the future. These issues are evidenced in the *A4119 Corridor Assessment, Traffic Forecast and Capacity Assessment Report*, which is included as Appendix C of the FBC.

In addition to the A4119 being a strategic route, the Coed-ely roundabout provides access to the 14.32ha strategic development site at Coed-ely, which has the potential to become a major employment site and a gateway to the Rhondda Fawr. However, at present, the volume of north/south traffic results in problems on both the single carriageway section of the A4119 to the south of Coed-ely roundabout and at the roundabout itself. The current standard of the A4119 leads to the perception amongst potential developers that access and transport links to the site are poor, hindering economic regeneration and new employment opportunities. Nearby sites such as Llantrisant Business Park and Ynysmaerdy, which are already served by the A4119 dual carriageway are experiencing high demand.

The current constraints of the A4119 Coed-ely single carriageway at this location negatively impact all road users, including buses. It is the only north/south link into the

Rhondda Valleys from the Talbot Green area and is used by all bus services. Bus delays due to congestion between Coed-ely and Talbot Green were highlighted at the Stakeholders' Workshop during WelTAG Stage 1.

The only current cycling option is on-highway, which is not attractive for less experienced cyclists. The pedestrian footpath alongside is also narrow, overgrown and not suitable to be promoted as an Active Travel route for all.

4.3b Explain why Government investment is needed (what is the market failure)? (Limit 250 words) 247 words

RCTCBC is challenged with removing barriers to development and regeneration in the northern part of the county borough, whilst tackling pressures of substantial development and traffic congestion in the south. Transport has an important role to play in 'levelling up' these economic and social disparities. Variations between communities along the A4119 corridor are evident. Census (2011) data shows that in the Llantrisant area (at the southern end of the A4119 corridor), 71.3%% of the resident population aged 16-74 is economically active. This declines to 60.8% in the Tonyrefail area (to the north of the proposed scheme).

Delivering economic growth to the northern areas of Rhondda Cynon Taf will require Government investment, to act as a catalyst to wider development and attract inward investment. The need for Government funding to stimulate development in this area is evidenced by the Coed-ely development plateaux, where development commenced with EU funding during 2019/20 through a joint venture between Welsh Government and RCTCBC. Grant funding similarly will be needed to fund the A4119 improvements that are important to increase accessibility to the site and attract developers.

The A4119 Coed-ely dualling scheme would remove the perception amongst potential developers that there is poor access to the Coed-ely development site and will assist in bringing this strategic employment site forward. Through Government investment, the A4119 Coed-ely dualling scheme has the potential to unlock key sites for residential and commercial development and lever private sector investment into areas in the north of the county borough.

4.3c Please set out a clear explanation on what you are proposing to invest in and why the proposed interventions in the bid will address those challenges and barriers with evidence to support that explanation. As part of this, we would expect to understand the rationale for the location. (Limit 500 words) 496 words

The detailed scope of the scheme is detailed in Section 2.7 of the FBC. The project will deliver the following key elements:

- A 1.3km long, two-way, dual carriageway along the A4119 between the South Wales Fire and Rescue Service Headquarters Roundabout and the Coed-ely Roundabout, to replace the existing single carriageway road.

- A 3-metre wide shared-use, Active Travel community route along the western side of the dual carriageway, connecting the Llantrisant Business Park Roundabout to the existing cyclepath at the Coed-ely Roundabout.
- An Active Travel bridge will be installed south of the Coed-ely Roundabout to allow pedestrians and cyclists to cross from the new shared-use community route into Coed-ely.

The importance of the A4119 strategic route to communities in the Rhondda Fawr, along with the siting of the Coed-ely strategic development site, explains the rationale for the proposed scheme. Transportation and regeneration benefits of the project include:

- Improve capacity and resilience of this section of the A4119;
- Improve connectivity to Tonyrefail and surrounding areas;
- Facilitate and further unlock development of the strategically important Coed-ely site (approximately 14.32 ha) and encourage investment in the wider area;
- Improve access to existing and new businesses at Llantrisant Business Park, the Royal Glamorgan Hospital and the wider areas;
- Improve bus reliability and journey times, which will enhance the viability of local and regional services using the route; and
- Encourage more active travel and healthier lifestyles by improving walking and cycling opportunities.

The proposed transport intervention along this section of the A4119 will benefit the attractiveness of the Coed-ely strategic site to developers, reducing traffic congestion and improving journey times. Following delivery, the site will benefit from excellent transport links, with a high-quality dual carriageway linking the strategic development site directly with the M4. Evidence has shown that the scheme will improve journey times and connectivity along the A4119 for all users, and has the potential to be a catalyst for development of this strategic site.

The scheme will positively impact communities to the north, improving connectivity and accessibility to employment opportunities, both at the Coed-ely development site) and further afield. Dualling this section of the A4119 will improve the overall route to the Rhondda Valleys and encourage development opportunities further to the north. Through enhanced transport links, improved connectivity and the potential for economic development, the scheme will make a positive contribution to ‘levelling up’ the economic and social disparities that currently exist.

Reduced congestion and delays will result in more reliable journey times and increase the attractiveness of buses using the A4119. There are no rail connections from the local railway stations at Llanharan and Pontyclun to the Rhondda Valley and therefore a reliable and efficient bus network is crucial to encouraging a shift to public transport.

The proposed scheme will greatly improve the infrastructure for walking and cycling journeys, increasing the attractiveness of sustainable transport and Active Travel

options local journeys. Increased levels of walking and cycling will have physical activity, health and wellbeing benefits for local communities.	
4.3d For Transport Bids: Have you provided an Option Assessment Report (OAR)	☒ Yes ☐ No
4.3e Please explain how you will deliver the outputs and confirm how results are likely to flow from the interventions. This should be demonstrated through a well-evidenced *Theory of Change*. Further guidance on producing a Theory of Change can be found within HM Treasury's Magenta Book (page 24, section 2.2.1) and MHCLG's appraisal guidance. (Limit 500 words) 496 words	

The following is based on the Theory of Change diagram in Section 2.2.1 of the HM Treasury's Magenta Book.

Project Inputs

The project inputs include:

- Staff resources required to develop and deliver the proposed scheme have been committed by RCTCBC.
- Investment to date by RCTCBC and the Welsh Government has enabled the scheme to be progressed to the detailed design stage.
- A full funding commitment will enable the scheme to progress to construction.

Project Outputs

The project outputs will be the delivery of the A4119 Coed-ely Dualling scheme, to include:

- A 1.3km long, two-way dual carriageway along the A4119 between the South Wales Fire and Rescue Service Headquarters and the Coed-ely Roundabouts.
- A 3-metre wide shared-use, Active Travel community route will follow the western side of the carriageway connecting the Llantrisant Business Park Roundabout to the existing cyclepath at the Coed-ely Roundabout.
- An Active Travel bridge will be provided south of the Coed-ely Roundabout to allow pedestrians and cyclists to cross from the new shared-use community route into Coed-ely.

Project Outcomes (i.e. early or medium-term results)

Project outcomes that will become evident in the early or medium-term include:

- Reduced journey times for traffic using the A4119 – journey time reductions will become evident following the opening of the dualled A4119.

- Increased bus service reliability for services using the A4119 – expected reliability improvements will become evident in the short-term, as bus services will benefit from reduced journey times following the opening of the scheme.
- Increased levels of walking and cycling along the Active Travel community route and bridge – expected increases in Active Travel will become evident in the short-term, due to the facilities being more attractive, direct and safer than the existing provision.

Project Impacts (i.e. long-term results)
Project impacts that will become evident in the longer-term include:

- Development of the Coed-ely development site and a large number of FTE jobs created – a longer-term impact of the A4119 Coed-ely Dualling scheme will be its impact on encouraging economic development due to improved accessibility. Supporting activities to bring about these longer-term changes will include marketing of the Coed-ely site to potential developers.
- Increased bus service patronage – this is likely to be a longer-term impact as behaviour change will take some time to establish following the bus service reliability improvements. Supporting activities to bring about these longer-term changes will include promotion of services by bus companies.
- Increased levels of walking and cycling for journeys to work – longer-term increases in Active Travel for journeys to work will be linked to the development of the Coed-ely site and an increase in local employment opportunities, which will enable the Active Travel route to be used for commuting journeys. Supporting activities to bring about these changes could include the use of Travel Plans by employers and incentives to encourage sustainable travel to work.

The outcomes and results identified in the Theory of Change have been incorporated into the Monitoring and Evaluation Plan for the project, which is included as Appendix D of the FBC.

4.4 Alignment with the local and national context

See technical note Table 1 for further guidance.

4.4a Explain how your bid aligns to and supports relevant local strategies (such as Local Plans, local economic strategies or Local Transport Plans) and local objectives for investment, improving infrastructure and levelling up. (Limit 500 words) 498 words

Local Development Plan
RCTCBC's LDP Core Policy CS8 – Transportation includes specific reference to the A4119/A473 corridor as a strategic transport corridor and because the linear geography of the valleys and communities constrain the existing road network, identifies that highway improvements along the corridor are necessary to enable the delivery of allocated LDP sites.

A key aim of the dualling scheme is to improve access to the Coed-ely development site, which is allocated in the LDP (Policy SSA 14.1 for 14.32 hectares of employment land on the former Coed-ely Colliery site, Tonyrefail) and benefits from an outline permission primarily for class B use, of approximately 30,937m^2 of development. The southern end of the main plateau comprises a 2.6 hectare plot (Plot C3), which has recently been developed for 3,065.78m^2 of B1/B2/B8 use buildings and is part of a grant funded scheme. It is hoped that the scheme will be a catalyst for developer interest and investment on the larger part of the site.

There are also a number of LDP residential allocations in Tonyrefail, to the north of the dualling, set out in Policy SSA 10, which will benefit from the resulting improved accessibility.

Strategic Opportunity Areas

The presence of the Cardiff Capital Region City Deal and the Valleys Taskforce makes it more important than ever to identify key strategic opportunities to work with partners to deliver economic growth in RCT. The Council has identified key Strategic Opportunity Areas (SOAs) to maximise the benefit of economic regeneration and ensure success in the global competition for investment. SOAs are geographical areas where resources are focused to provide opportunities for private sector investment and job creation.

In September 2017, RCTCBC approved five SOAs, which included the 'A4119 Corridor: Regional Rhondda Gateway'. In doing so, RCTCBC has committed to developing and delivering projects that will achieve the primary aspirations of this Strategy, namely enabling significant economic growth and jobs. Part of this Strategy identifies Coed-ely and the A4119 as a Development Opportunity, recognising the major impact of developing approximately 14.32 hectares of reclaimed employment land at the Coed-ely former colliery site, accessed by further dualling of the A4119.

RCTCBC's Corporate Plan

Making a Difference: The Council's Corporate Plan 2020-2024 highlights the delivery of 'major road schemes such as the dualling of the A4119' as a way fulfilling its commitment to its Corporate Priorities and to 'Delivering major regeneration and transportation schemes, maximising the impact of the new South Wales Metro, to create better places to live and work, whilst protecting and enhancing the County Borough'.

The further dualling will make a significant contribution towards the following RCTCBC Corporate Priorities/ Well-being Objectives:

- Creating PLACES: where people are proud to live, work and play; and
- Enabling PROSPERITY: creating the opportunity for people and businesses to be innovative, entrepreneurial and fulfil their potential and prosper.

The proposal has a significant impact on improving accessibility and connectivity, which is recognised as a fundamental factor in linking the labour market with employment opportunities and supporting economic activity.

4.4b Explain how the bid aligns to and supports the UK Government policy objectives, legal and statutory commitments, such as delivering Net Zero carbon emissions and improving air quality. Bids for transport projects in particular should clearly explain their carbon benefits. (Limit 250 words) 248 words
The HM Government's Energy White Paper – Powering Our Net Zero Future (December 2020) sets out the priorities for decarbonising the UK's transport system. The proposed scheme will have a positive impact on the priority of 'accelerating modal shift to public and active transport'. An integral part is the provision of a 1.4km shared-use community route and Active Travel bridge, to encourage more walking and cycling for local journeys, including commuting to the Coed-ely development site. Improved journey times along the further dualled section will reduce delays and improve the reliability of bus services, which could positively impact bus patronage and encourage modal shift from car journeys. It will also have a positive impact on the priority of 'place-based solutions', which recognises the need for different solutions at different locations. The A4119 Dualling scheme helps the wider economic development of the area. Facilitating local jobs and reducing disparities between communities will encourage a place-based solution reducing the need to travel to work through the creation of local jobs. An Air Quality Assessment Report (October 2018) has been undertaken to assess the impact of the proposed scheme on local air quality. This has shown it to be good in the vicinity of the A4119 Ely Road and that the proposed development will not lead to negative long-term impacts and may be beneficial by reducing congestion and minimising the interruption of traffic flow. Providing an Active Travel route could also encourage a modal shift from car use, with air quality benefits.
4.4c Where applicable explain how the bid complements / or aligns to and supports other investments from different funding streams. (Limit 250 words) 207 words
The proposed A4119 Dualling scheme will improve accessibility, and complement the ongoing investment in the strategic development site at Coed-ely. The land is owned by Welsh Government and is identified for development in RCTCBC's Local Development Plan. The site has the potential to bring with it a significant economic regeneration and employment boost to the local area. In October 2019, RCTCBC secured funding from the European Regional Development Fund, through the Welsh Government, towards the creation of a quality modern business unit on the former Coed-ely colliery site. In addition to the EU funding, RCTCBC and the Welsh Government have each invested in the project, which brings the total package to. The funding is being used to build a 30,000 sq ft business unit with offices on a 2.15-acre plot on the Middle Plateau of the wider 15-hectare site. Development of the site commenced during 2019/20 via a joint venture between Welsh Government and RCTCBC. The project will help to develop and provide much needed modern business accommodation in Coed-ely. It will complement the ongoing investment in the A4119

Corridor and Rhondda Gateway, which has been identified by RCTCBC Cabinet Members as a Strategic Opportunity Area with large potential for economic growth and development.

4.4d Please explain how the bid aligns to and supports the Government's expectation that all local road projects will deliver or improve cycling and walking infrastructure and include bus priority measures (unless it can be shown that there is little or no need to do so). Cycling elements of proposals should follow the Government's cycling design guidance which sets out the standards required. (Limit 250 words) 246 words

In Wales, the scheme must comply with Section 9 of the Active Travel (Wales) Act 2013, which states that local authorities must 'take reasonable steps to enhance the provision made for walkers and cyclists' when delivering highway improvement schemes.

The A4119 Coed-ely Dualling will provide the following infrastructure for walking and cycling (Active Travel):

- A 3-metre wide shared-use community route will follow the A4119 along the western side of the carriageway connecting the Llantrisant Business Park roundabout to the existing cycle path at the Coed-ely Roundabout.
- An Active Travel bridge is to be installed south of the Coed-ely Roundabout to allow pedestrians and cyclists to cross from the new shared-use community route into Coed-ely. The footbridge and shared-use path will support walking and cycling to work for local employees of the new Coed-ely development site, reducing car dependency. No public rights of way are affected by the scheme.

The A4119 Coed-ely Dualling scheme will not include bus priority measures in its design, but it will improve the route for bus services as follows:

- At present, high traffic volumes cause congestion and delays to bus services, which increase journey times for passengers.
- The proposed scheme will improve traffic flows, improving bus service reliability and journey time predictability. More reliable services will encourage increased patronage and increase the sustainability of commercial services.
- When developed, there will be the potential to introduce bus routes into the Coed-ely development site, if its size is seen as attractive to bus companies.

PART 5 VALUE FOR MONEY

5.1 Appropriateness of data sources and evidence
See technical note Annex B and Table 1 for further guidance.

All costs and benefits must be compliant or in line with HMT's Green Book, DfT Transport Analysis Guidance and MHCLG Appraisal Guidance.

5.1a Please use up to date evidence to demonstrate the scale and significance of local problems and issues. (Limit 250 words) 249 words

Existing and future capacity issues affecting the operation of the A4119 corridor are set out in the *A4119 Corridor Assessment, Traffic Forecast and Capacity Assessment Report*, which is included as Appendix C of the FBC. In addition, a Transport Assessment (June 2019) and Transport Assessment Addendum (November 2019) have been undertaken and highlight the following:

- The Coed-ely Roundabout (north of the scheme) is near capacity during the AM and PM peaks (2018 base year), with significant queues and congestion on the A4119 approaches to the roundabout. Average base year delay during the PM peak is 17 seconds. Without intervention the junction is forecast to operate over capacity in the forecast years of 2023 and 2037, with average PM peak delays increasing to 35 seconds and 95 seconds respectively.
- The South Wales Fire and Rescue Service Headquarters roundabout (south of the scheme) is operating over capacity during the AM and PM peaks (2018 base year). Average delays are up to 59 seconds.
- Reduced vehicle speeds, extended queues and congestion are identified during the AM and PM peaks. The ANPR survey (January 2018) indicates that the average speed in the PM peak is approximately 20 mph (approximately 30mph/60% below the speed limit). Significantly reduced vehicle speeds occur along this section of the A4119 during peak hours.
- The Transport Assessment reviewed the 5-year collision data and identified 23 slight collisions, with analysis indicating that the vast majority were likely to have occurred because of the congestion, associated queues and resulting driver behaviour.

5.1b Bids should demonstrate the quality assurance of data analysis and evidence for explaining the scale and significance of local problems and issues. Please demonstrate how any data, surveys and evidence is robust, up to date and unbiased. (Limit 500 words) 465 words

The existing operation of the A4119 corridor has been assessed using a combination of junction modelling software and microsimulation software. These have been used to demonstrate local traffic problems and issues along the A4119 corridor and to identify operational issues at junctions and along carriageway links. The use of junction and micro-simulation models has enabled a robust, up-to-date and unbiased analysis of the A4119 corridor, which is demonstrated by the following points:

- The A4119 Corridor Paramics Micro-simulation Model was specifically developed for the assessment of schemes located along the A4119 in Rhondda Cynon Taf. It has been used to analyse the current operation of the A4119 corridor and assess the impact of future development.
- The model has been calibrated and validated using surveyed turning movements and journey times in accordance with WebTAG.
- Each of the junctions along the corridor have been modelled in junction modelling packages and validated using queue data.
- The traffic surveys used in the development and calibration of the model were undertaken between November 2017 and January 2018 i.e. within the last 5 years. These include manual classified count (MCC) and queue surveys at 13 junctions within the A4119 corridor and an Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) survey to provide Origin-Destination (O-D) trip routing information and journey time information.
- The micro-simulation model is validated to a base year of 2018.
- Forecast models have been produced for two future years, with 2022, which is near the anticipated opening year of the scheme, and a forecast year of 2037 being assessed.
- The operation of the model has been reviewed in order to understand how the A4119 corridor will operate in 2022 (base + 5 years) and 2037 (base + 20 years).
- Two sets of models have been produced, namely ‘do-minimum’ and ‘do-something’. The ‘do-minimum’ represents the future model with additional trips added for planned employment and housing development sites, as well as network changes made to represent planned highway improvements, but without the scheme.
- The ‘preferred option’ model has been modelled to simulate the future year with the addition of the proposed A4119 Coed-ely Dualling scheme and associated improvements. The impact of the proposed preferred option is presented by comparison of the Do Minimum and Do Something models.

Full details about the development and validation of the model are provided in the *A4119 Corridor Assessment, Traffic Forecast and Capacity Assessment Report*, which is included as Appendix C of the FBC.

Other well-established, national data sources have been used to provide evidence of social disparities in the local area, e.g. Census 2011 data, Wales Index of Multiple Deprivation 2019, and CrashMap to provide evidence of the occurrence of collisions in the study area. In each case, the most recent available data has been used when providing evidence of problems and issues within the study area.

5.1c Please demonstrate that data and evidence chosen is appropriate to the area of influence of the interventions. (Limit 250 words) 245 words

Local area data and evidence has been used to evidence problems and issues.

The existing and future operation of the A4119 corridor was assessed using a combination of junction modelling and microsimulation software. The A4119 Corridor Paramics Micro-simulation Model was specifically developed for the assessment of schemes along the A4119 in Rhondda Cynon Taf and covers the A4119 from Junction 34 of the M4 to the A4119/A4233 roundabout in Tonyrefail.

The development of the model involved the following local area data:

- Local traffic surveys to develop and validate the micro-simulation model. Manual Classified Count (MCC), queue surveys at thirteen junctions within the A4119 corridor and an ANPR survey to provide Origin-Destination (O-D) trip routing information and journey time information.
- The A4119 corridor network within the micro-simulation model was coded, using an Ordinance Survey CAD layer to trace carriageway extent.
- Signal controlled junctions were coded using staging arrangement and signal timings from RCTCBC.
- Site visits were undertaken during the peaks to confirm queues and delay locations and that the network layout and structure matched that on the ground.

Evidence provided from national data sources has focused on local area data. Using 2011 Census data enabled a comparison to be provided between the Llantrisant area, (southern end of the A4119 corridor), and Tonyrefail, to the north of the proposed improvement scheme. A comparison with national Wales-wide data has been provided where relevant. Collision data has focussed on those collisions of direct relevance to the A4119 study area.

5.2 Effectiveness of proposal in addressing problems

5.2a Please provide analysis and evidence to demonstrate how the proposal will address existing or anticipated future problems. Quantifiable impacts should usually be forecasted using a suitable model. (Limit 500 words) 499 words (excluding table)

A Transport Assessment (June 2019) and Transport Assessment Addendum (November 2019) have been undertaken for the scheme using the micro-simulation model. The studies assessed the scheme's impact on the A4119 corridor and found that the proposed dualling provide local highway network benefits - capacity, delay reductions and improved average speeds.

The proposed improvements were found to have a positive impact on the operation of the Coed-ely Roundabout. Without intervention, it is forecast to operate over capacity in the forecast years of 2023 and 2037. In the Do Something scenario, with the dualling, it is forecast to operate within capacity in the 2023 opening year and marginally over capacity by the 2037 design year. This is a significant improvement on the forecast operation of the existing layout.

A large reduction in average delays at the Coed-ely Roundabout are forecast with the scheme, with average PM peak delays in 2023 reducing from 35 seconds (do minimum) to 4 seconds (do something), and in 2037 from 95 seconds to 7 seconds. The scheme is considered to significantly improve the operational performance of the roundabout with opening year (2023) delay and queues forecast to be less than existing, with design year (2037) delay and queues similar to existing. Further detail about the positive impact of the scheme on the operation of the South Wales Fire and Rescue Service Headquarters roundabout (to the south of the study area) is provided in the OAR.

The proposed scheme is forecast to have a positive impact on vehicle speeds in the forecast years of 2023 and 2037, when compared with the Do Minimum scenario. Average speed forecasts are detailed within the OAR. The impact of reduced delays and congestion and an increase in average speeds are forecast to have a positive impact on journey times (see tables below). These show the average journey time (seconds) along the A4119 between Ynysmaerdy and Coed-ely, in scenarios with the proposed scheme (Do Something) and without the proposed scheme (Do Minimum). In the opening year scenario (2023), the average journey time for AM peak southbound journeys will reduce by more than 2.5 minutes against the do minimum scenario.

Average Speed (seconds) 2023

Time Period	Do Minimum		Do Something	
	Northbound	Southbound	Northbound	Southbound
AM	163	321	147	166
PM	236	168	179	143
IP	155	158	144	141

Average Speed (seconds) 2037

Time Period	Do Minimum		Do Something	
	Northbound	Southbound	Northbound	Southbound
AM	165	326	148	235
PM	418	215	335	160
IP	156	161	145	142

Collision data analysed for the Transport Assessment indicated that the majority of collisions are likely to have occurred as a result of the congestion and driver behaviour at this location. 57% of the 23 collisions were rear-shunt type collisions, which may be considered attributable to extended vehicle queuing. The data also indicated that a significant number of the collisions occurred during peaks, when congestion is most evident. The proposed scheme will improve the carriageway standard along this section of the A4119, the capacity of the roundabouts and reduce the number of collisions that occur at this location.

The provision of an Active Travel route and bridge has quantifiable benefits. Quality benefits for walkers and cyclists, physical benefits and wider economic benefits. These quantifiable impacts have been included within the economic assessment of the scheme and are detailed within Section 3.4 of the FBC.

5.2b Please describe the robustness of the forecast assumptions, methodology and model outputs. Key factors to be covered include the quality of the analysis or model (in terms of its accuracy and functionality) (Limit 500 words) 500 words

Modelling Approach

The A4119 Corridor Paramics Micro-simulation Model was the basis for forecasting. Full details of the validation of the model and forecasting are provided in the *A4119 Corridor Assessment Report* (Appendix C of the FBC). In summary:

- The A4119 Corridor Model covers the highway between Junction 34 of the M4 to the A4119/A4233 roundabout in Tonyrefail.
- The micro-simulation model has been developed using Ordnance Survey CAD data and signal time information from RCTCBC.
- The model is validated to a base year of 2018 and developed for the assessment and appraisal of schemes along the A4119 in RCT.
- The model has been calibrated and validated using surveyed turning movements and journey times in accordance with WebTAG.
- Each of the junctions along the corridor have been modelled in junction modelling packages and validated using queue data.
- The model considers the AM peak period (07:00–10:00), the average inter peak (IP) (10:00–16:00) and the PM peak period (16:00–19:00).
- Cars, Light goods vehicles and Heavy goods vehicles are included within the model.
- As no traffic assignment model was available at the time of appraisal, and due to the limited alternative routes, the corridor based micro-simulation model is considered suitable for the appraisal of the proposed dualling.
- In accordance with WebTAG Unit M2.1, variable demand modelling was not undertaken, as the scheme is modest in terms of spatial impact, particularly with regard to traffic route reassignment.

Forecasting Methodology

- The forecast scenarios for the dualling scheme consider AM, Inter-peak and PM peaks for two future years.
- Forecast models have been prepared for two years – 2022 (five years after the base year inclusive and very near the anticipated opening year of 2023); and a design year of 2037 (20 years after the base year inclusive and 14 years after anticipated opening year).
- These models have been prepared for Do Minimum (without) and Do Something scenarios (with the scheme).
- The modelled years are considered to be suitable for appraisal as they are very near to the typical opening year and design year (opening year +15 years) assessed, and the Coronavirus pandemic has reduced traffic growth forecasts, particularly in the immediate future, thereby making the application of a small uplift in traffic demand illogical. Modelled years are referred to as 2023 and 2037.
- The future year scenarios include developments along the A4119. Those considered to be 'near certain' and/or 'more than likely' were coded into the Core Scenario models.
- In relation to the forecast matrix development, the traffic growth in the forecast scenarios has been derived from two fundamental sources. Firstly, growth factors were calculated from the National Trip End Model (NTEM) and TEMPro software, and secondly, by directly including new developments and their predicted traffic forecasts into the Paramics Micro-simulation models.
- Predicted traffic forecasts from new developments were taken from the corresponding Transport Assessments (TA) prepared to support the planning applications for the developments. Where trip generation rates were not directly available from a TA report, trip generation figures were calculated using the TRICS database.

5.3 Economic costs of proposal

5.3a Please explain the economic costs of the bid. Costs should be consistent with the costs in the financial case, but adjusted for the economic case. This should include but not be limited to providing evidence of costs having been adjusted to an appropriate base year and that inflation has been included or taken into account. In addition, please provide detail that cost risks and uncertainty have been considered and adequately quantified. Optimism bias must also be included in the cost estimates in the economic case. (Limit 500 words) 500 words

Within the FBC, the scheme cost estimate and whole life costs are in Section 4.2 and the economic assessment is in Chapter 3. A detailed breakdown is included as Appendix I. A summary of economic costs is below.

Base Cost Estimate

- The scheme's estimated capital cost is
- The cost estimate includes construction, land, scheme preparation, design, project management, ecology and an allowance for risk.
- Detailed design and scheme development has enabled a robust cost estimate to be calculated.
- A Quantified Risk Assessment (QRA) of scheme costs has been carried out appropriate to the level of scheme development, enabling a risk-adjusted cost estimate to be obtained. This ensures the cost estimate takes account of uncertainties, reflecting the stage of project development.
- The table below shows a summary of the capital cost estimate in 2021 prices, correct as of May 2021.

A4119 Coed-ely Dualling Cost Estimate (£'000s)

Cost element	Cost estimate
Retrospective costs to end March 2021	
Design/ Scheme Development	
Project Management (including site supervision and cost consultant)	
Construction	
Land	
Ecology	
Risk allowance	
Total	

- In addition to the capital cost estimate, on-going operating (maintenance) costs have been prepared for the proposed scheme. Ongoing highway maintenance will be met by RCTCBC.

Economic Assessment

- The CBA of the scheme has been undertaken in accordance with WebTAG Unit A1.1 Cost-benefit analysis, and quantifies costs and benefits of a scheme in monetised terms over a 60-year appraisal period.

- Monetised costs include construction, land, preparation and supervision costs adjusted for risk and optimism bias. Indirect tax revenues are also quantified as a cost in the assessment.
- The scheme cost estimates have been derived based on the design work being undertaken and follows guidance in TAG Unit A1.2 Scheme costs.
- The Public Accounts table has been used to calculate the Present Value of Cost (PVC) to Public Accounts. Costs are expressed in present year prices enabling a fair and consistent comparison of all government funded projects. The present year is currently 2010 and all costs are discounted to the present value.
- On-going operating (maintenance) costs for the scheme have been apportioned over the 60-year economic assessment period to account for general maintenance, surfacing or renewals as required.

5.4 Analysis of monetised costs and benefits

5.4a Please describe how the economic benefits have been estimated. These must be categorised according to different impact. Depending on the nature of intervention, there could be land value uplift, air quality benefits, reduce journey times, support economic growth, support employment, or reduce carbon emissions. (Limit 750 words) 750 words

The FBC (Section 3.4) contains the economic benefits assessment methodology. A summary is below.

The assessment of economic impacts considered the scheme impacts on journey times and vehicle operating costs, as well as accidents, physical activity and induced investment in the spreadsheet model. The economic appraisal was undertaken using DfT software packages TUBA and COBALT.

Business users, transport providers, commuting and other users

- TUBA used to assess the scheme's economic benefits and considered the impact of journey times on business and commuting and other users from the transport model.
- 60-year assessment period was used.
- The appraisal followed guidance in TAG Unit A1.3 User and provider impacts.
- The three vehicle type matrices in the model were disaggregated into five user classes (Car; LGV Personal; LGV Freight; OGV1; and OGV2). The proportions of LGV personal and LGV freight were based on average WebTAG values and OGV1 and OGV2 proportions were taken from local traffic count data. A factor was applied to account for the three-hour AM and PM peak period and the six-hour Inter-peak vehicle matrices from the model.

- Applied an annualization factor of 253 (total weekdays in a year) to the benefits per time slice to uplift to an annual benefit.
- Trip purpose and vehicle type have not been included within the model and therefore the standard purpose splits defined within the economics file have been used.
- The Value of Time Method 3, where an average value for all distances is applied to value of time benefits, has been used within the assessment.

Induced Investment

- TAG Unit 2.2 explains how a 10% uplift may be applied to the business and freight benefits forecast in TUBA, where there is evidence that business output would increase in response to the transport investment.
- The Strategic Case has demonstrated that the current A4119 has a negative impact on existing business activities, constraining prospects for growth, particularly at strategic development site SSA14 in Coed-ely. It was considered appropriate that this additional 10% be applied in the form of an adjusted BCR.

Environmental Assessment

- TUBA used to assess and quantify key impacts on greenhouses gases.

Accidents – COBALT Assessment

- COBALT used to compare the estimated cost of accidents on the existing A4119 over the 60-year appraisal period with the estimated cost of accidents with the proposed improvement.
- The assumption that a dual carriageway is safer than a single carriageway (fewer accidents) is based on the Transport Appraisal Guidance Data Book, Table COBALT 3.
- A simplistic COBALT network has been developed where accident costs on the northbound and southbound carriageway have been assessed in a Do Minimum scenario (existing carriageway standard) and a Do Something scenario (improved carriageway under the scheme). No junctions have been assessed within the analysis.

Active Travel Benefits

- The economic benefits generated by the active travel component, improved journey quality and physical benefits, have been quantified.
- The forecast demand is based on guidance provided in the WebTAG Unit A5-1 on active mode appraisal. No assessment of the forecast benefit to be experienced by existing active travel users has been undertaken due to very low existing demand. The economic Rule of Half has been applied to benefits experienced by new users.

Forecast Active Travel Demand - Pedestrians

- The forecast pedestrian demand is based on a comparison of National Trip End Model (NTEM) local area data.
- An average trip length of one kilometre has been used for each walking trip, based on the National Travel Survey 2018.

Forecast Active Travel Demand – Cyclists

- The sketch plan method specified in WebTAG Unit A5.1 has been used to forecast the increase in cycle trips. The WebTAG method recommends an elasticity value of 0.05 for improved cycle facilities such as cycle lanes and bus lanes.
- The forecast cycling demand is based on NTEM data, but assessed a larger area, due to the longer distances associated with cycling.
- An average trip length of 3.3 miles has been used for each cycle trip based on the National Travel Survey 2018.

Active Travel Transport Benefits

- Journey quality – Calculated for existing walking trips using the WebTAG databook journey quality values.
- Physical benefits – Calculated for new walking and cycling trips using the World Health Organisation (WHO) Health Economic Assessment Tool (HEAT).
- Wider economic benefits – Research undertaken by the London School of Economics suggests that each cyclist contributes £230 per year to the local economy, due to increased cycle and accessories sales, improved work performance and reduced absenteeism. The Gross Cycle Product (GCP) value was applied to the forecast cycle demand to obtain a wider economic benefit.

5.4b Please complete Tab A and B on the **appended excel spreadsheet** to demonstrate your:

Tab A - Discounted total costs by funding source (£m)
Tab B – Discounted benefits by category (£m)

5.5 Value for money of proposal

5.5a Please provide a summary of the overall Value for Money of the proposal. This should include reporting of Benefit Cost Ratios. If a Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) has been estimated there should be a clear explanation of how this is estimated ie a methodology note. Benefit Cost Ratios should be calculated in a way that is consistent with HMT's Green Book. For non-transport bids it should be consistent with MHCLG's appraisal guidance. For bids requesting funding for transport

projects this should be consistent with DfT Transport Analysis Guidance. (Limit 500 words) 495 words

The FBC contains the Value for Money assessment (Section 3.10) and the Value for Money Statement (Section 3.11), as summarised below.

Value for Money Statement

- The scheme's initial Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) only includes impacts with established methods of monetising benefits. The Central Case BCR is 2.27 (high value for money).
- A revised GDP sensitivity test of the Central Case under a lower GDP growth scenario gave a BCR of 1.97 (medium value for money, although only marginally lower than high).
- An Adjusted Value for Money assessment was based on the more reliable monetised impacts included within the initial VfM assessment, and wider economic benefits that have greater uncertainty. The BCR for the Adjusted Central Case is 2.42 (high value for money). A revised GDP sensitivity test scenario gave a BCR of 2.11 (high value for money).

The BCRs above were calculated as follows:

Central Case Initial BCR

- The Public Accounts Table (3.7 in the FBC) is used to calculate the Present Value of Cost (PVC) to Public Accounts. The present year is currently 2010 and all costs are discounted to the present value.
- The Transport Economic Efficiency Table (TEE) (3.8 in the FBC) for the central case summarises transport user benefits, presenting net user benefits disaggregated by group (consumers and business) and by impact (time, vehicle operating costs). The table shows the change brought about by the option relative to the do-minimum case.
- The Analysis of Monetised Costs and Benefits Table (AMCB) (3.9 in the FBC) summarises all reliable monetised costs and benefits calculated from established techniques. In addition to the TEE benefits, accident, air quality and noise benefits are included for the Core Scenario/Central Case. The AMCB presents a Net Present Value (NPV) for each option and a Benefit to Cost Ratio (BCR), to measure overall value for money.

Central Case (Sensitivity Test) BCR

A sensitivity test BCR was calculated for the Central Case but with the revised GDP forecasts and other appraisal values contained within the Sensitivity Test Databook (Tables 3.10 to 3.12 in the FBC).

Adjusted Central Case BCR and Sensitivity Test

The Adjusted BCR includes benefits subject to greater uncertainty, but with evidence to support monetary value calculations. These include induced investment and active travel physical and economic benefits (Gross Cycle Product) (Tables 3.13 to 3.15 in the FBC).

A sensitivity test was undertaken on the Adjusted Central Case using the revised GDP forecasts and other appraisal values contained within the Sensitivity Test Databook (Tables 3.16 to 3.18 in the FBC).

5.5b Please describe what other non-monetised impacts the bid will have, and provide a summary of how these have been assessed. (Limit 250 words) 246 words

Non-monetised impacts have been assessed qualitatively, recorded in the Appraisal Summary Table (Section 3.12 of the FBC) and summarised below.

Economic Criteria

The scheme is important for local regeneration and economic development, increasing the area's attractiveness for inward investment and extending economic prosperity to the northern parts of the County Borough. The non-monetarised economic criteria of 'Regeneration' and 'Wider Impacts' were therefore appraised as moderately beneficial.

Environmental Criteria

The following were analysed qualitatively:

- Noise
- Air Quality
- Landscape
- Townscape
- Historic Landscape
- Biodiversity
- Water Environment

The appraisal benefitted from a number of environmental, ecological and geotechnical studies from between 2018 and 2020. The studies that informed the qualitative appraisal of environmental impacts are included in Section 3.9 of the FBC.

Overall, the scheme has a slight beneficial impact on air quality, biodiversity and water environment, partly due to the positive impact of mitigation measures that will be implemented. The scheme was assessed as having a slight adverse impact on landscape, due to the visual impacts of tree removal and the new Active Travel bridge. A neutral impact overall was recorded for noise, townscape and historic landscape.

Social Criteria

In terms of non-monetarised impacts, the scheme has a moderately beneficial impact on:

- Reliability Impact on Commuting and Other Users
- Physical Activity

The scheme has a slight beneficial impact on:

- Security
- Access to Services

The social criteria appraisal reflects the benefits offered by the improved strategic route, with more reliable journey times and provision of a dedicated Active Travel route.

5.5c Please provide a summary assessment of risks and uncertainties that could affect the overall Value for Money of the bid. (Limit 250 words) 250 words

A summary of risks and uncertainties is provided below, with further detail in Sections 3.7 and 3.8 of the FBC.

- A number of inherent economic assumptions are within WebTAG such as GDP growth, fuel cost forecasts and changes in vehicle fuel consumption.
- A Quantified Risk Assessment (QRA) of scheme costs, appropriate to the level of scheme development, has enabled a risk-adjusted cost estimate to be obtained.
- The TUBA analysis is based on an average AM peak, Inter-peak and PM peak hour values, annualised, interpolated and extrapolated over a 60-year period to provide a cost benefit. It is assumed that the impact of the scheme outside of these hours is minimal.
- An uncertainty log, developed for the economic appraisal process, summarises all known assumptions and uncertainties in the forecasting approach and assesses the likelihood for future changes. This is based upon guidance within TAG Unit M4 Forecasting and Uncertainty. The uncertainty log includes relevant developments that are likely to generate traffic and impact on the A4119 corridor. The log is broken down into 'supply' (transport schemes that alter network capacity) and 'demand' (new developments that have the potential to generate new trips on the network). In the uncertainty log, each development is categorised in terms of the probability of development happening. Only developments considered to be near certain or more than likely are included in the Core Scenario.

5.5d For transport bids, we would expect the Appraisal Summary Table, to be completed to enable a full range of transport impacts to be considered. Other material supporting the assessment of the scheme described in this section should be appended to your bid.

Appraisal Summary Table included in Section 3.12 of the FBC.

PART 6 DELIVERABILITY	
6.1 Financial See technical note Table 1 for further guidance**.**	
6.1a Please summarise below your financial ask of the LUF, and what if any local and third party contributions have been secured (please note that a minimum local (public or private sector) contribution of 10% of the bid costs is encouraged). Please also note that a contribution will be expected from private sector stakeholders, such as developers, if they stand to benefit from a specific bid (Limit 250 words) 214 words	
Full details of the proposal's Financial Case is set out in Chapter 4 of the FBC. Up to the end of March 2021, scheme development has been funded by both the Welsh Government and Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council This has enabled the proposal to be fully developed to detailed design and a FBC for the proposal to be produced. The total cost of the proposed scheme is. The proposal requires funding through the LUF. This will enable advanced works to begin in 2021/22, with construction commencing in early 2022 and being completed by the end of 2023. The remaining balance of funding of is comprised of of funding spent to date in developing the scheme, in future committed funding from Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council's capital budget and of WG funding that has been allocated to the scheme in 2021/22. This represents a 41% contribution to the total project cost. Ongoing highway maintenance costs following completion of the scheme will be met by Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council's annual maintenance budget and are not included in the cost estimate or funding profiles that are detailed in this application form. Further detail about maintenance costs are provided in Section 4.2 of the FBC.	
6.1b Please also complete Tabs C and D in the **appended excel spreadsheet**, setting out details of the costs and spend profile at the project and bid level in the format requested within the excel sheet. The funding detail should be as accurate as possible as it will form the basis for funding agreements. Please note that we would expect all funding provided from the Fund to be spent by 31 March 2024, and, exceptionally, into 2024-25 for larger schemes.	
6.1c Please confirm if the bid will be part funded through other third-party funding (public or private sector). If so, please include evidence (i.e.	☐ Yes ☒ No

letters, contractual commitments) to show how any third-party contributions are being secured, the level of commitment and when they will become available. The UKG may accept the provision of land from third parties as part of the local contribution towards scheme costs. Where relevant, bidders should provide evidence in the form of an attached letter from an independent valuer to verify the true market value of the land.	

6.1d Please explain what if any funding gaps there are, or what further work needs to be done to secure third party funding contributions. (Limit 250 words) 132 words

The funding package for the proposed scheme is based on the scheme being fully funded through a combination of UK Government and Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council funding, with no funding gaps. The Council's future funding contribution to the scheme of is fully committed and will come from the local authority's capital budget.

The identified funding contribution of from the DfT is based on the potential of funding being available to local authorities in Wales through the Levelling Up Fund. The fund is intended to provide capital funding for the delivery of local transport schemes between 2021/22 and 2024/25, 'with at least £800 million invested in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland'.

On-going operating (maintenance) costs will be funded through the Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council's annual maintenance budget.

6.1e 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. (Limit 250 words) 200 words

An annual funding application is submitted by Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council to the Welsh Government's Local Transport Fund for a Major Economic Infrastructure Package, which since 2017/18 has included successful bids for annual funding for the A4119 Coed-ely dualling scheme. This Welsh Government grant has supported scheme design and development and to date, a total of funding has been allocated to the scheme through the Local Transport Fund (including an allocation in 2021/22).

Although the scheme has been receiving Welsh Government grant funding for a number of years, there is no commitment from the Welsh Government to future funding for the scheme beyond the current financial year. Funding is applied for and allocated by Welsh Government on an annual basis. As with all local authority schemes funded through the Welsh Government Local Transport Fund, future

funding will continue to require an annual funding application to be submitted to the Welsh Government.

The support to date shows that there is a recognition by the Welsh Government that the scheme is important to the locality. However, given the nature of the funding conditions, it is not possible to secure a commitment from the Welsh Government for future years' funding.

6.1f Please provide information on margins and contingencies that have been allowed for and the rationale behind them. (Limit 250 words) 249 words

The project's Risk Register is included as Appendix H of the FBC. It identifies risks that may occur during planning, design, and construction. It records any unrealised issues that have the potential to adversely impact the scheme delivery programme or cost.

In developing the Risk Register, a Quantified Risk Assessment (QRA) has been undertaken and the resulting risk allowance of has been included within the scheme cost estimate. This represents the combined risk allowance of all risks identified in the Risk Register. The risk allowance contained within the estimate recognises that the cost of delivering the scheme will not be fully determined until the detailed design has been completed, land interests acquired, and full tender prices received. Construction risks will still be budgeted until construction is complete.

This risk allowance represents the main project contingency that has been allowed for and is included within the project cost. The rationale behind each of the identified risks, probability and impact is detailed within the Risk Register.

The project's delivery plan includes 'float' for certain activities, should there be slippage or delay to elements of the programme. This will allow changes to the timescales of certain activities to be made without impacting on the overall programme. Project progress against key milestones and the impact of any slippage on the overall programme will be monitored closely by the Project Manager and the Project Board.

Scheme construction is currently programmed to be complete by December 2023, which is within the LUF funding timescales.

6.1g Please set out below, what the main financial risks are and how they will be mitigated, including how cost overruns will be dealt with and shared between non-UKG funding partners. (you should cross refer to the Risk Register). (Limit 500 words) 500 words

The project's risk register is included as Appendix H of the FBC. It was fully updated in May 2021 and groups risks as follows:

- Design
- Consents and Approvals
- Construction

- Statutory Authority
- Environmental
- Ground Conditions/ Earthworks
- Commercial/ Political
- Land and Part 1 Claims
- Legal/ Procedures

A Quantified Risk Assessment (QRA) has been undertaken and the resulting risk allowance of has been included within the scheme cost estimate.

Further detail about each of the above risks, including how these risks will be mitigated is included in the risk register.

At present, RCTCBC is the Risk Owner of each of the main financial risks listed above. Risks are specifically assessed depending on who is best placed to manage them. The risk register is being considered as part of the preparation of the works information, and those risks that are best managed by the contractor will be identified and allocated to be priced by the contractor accordingly. Risks best managed by RCTCBC will be retained.

The Quantified Risk Assessment (QRA) has been completed with this in mind and incorporates all client risks associated with this form of contract such as unforeseen ground conditions. The risks managed by the contractor will be priced within the tender price. These risks will be reviewed at contract award stage through a risk workshop and a shared risk register produced to allocate ownership and determine the value of the residual risks to be included within the fixed price.

The construction contract includes suitable clauses to facilitate the transfer of identified appropriate risks from RCTCBC to the contractor and ensures that risk is allocated to the party that is best placed to manage it.

The total project cost includes a risk allowance of, which includes all risks identified on the risk register. Any indication of cost overruns over and above the total project cost, will look to be absorbed by RCTCBC and opportunities for additional funding will be sought through non-UK Government funding partners such as Welsh Government.

6.2 Commercial

See technical note Section 4 and Table 1 for further guidance.

6.2a Please summarise your commercial structure, risk allocation and procurement strategy which sets out the rationale for the strategy selected and other options considered and discounted. The procurement route should also be set out with an explanation as to why it is appropriate for a bid of the scale and nature submitted.

Please note - all procurements must be made in accordance with all relevant legal requirements. Applicants must describe their approach to ensuring full compliance in order to discharge their legal duties. (Limit 500 words) 499 words

Details of the procurement strategy, including risk allocation and details of the type of contract are included in the Commercial Case (Chapter 5) within the FBC and summarised below.

The project is commercially viable with a robust contracting and procurement strategy. It has been developed in full accordance with the Council's procurement systems and procedures, with the Council's Senior Category Procurement Officer agreeing the approach. RCTCBC have confidence that the contractual and commercial arrangements proposed are appropriate.

The value of scheme construction falls above the maximum limit of the South East Wales Highway framework, being over. As such there are no frameworks in place that can be utilised for this value of project.

In addition, all UK works procurements above a specified threshold must be undertaken in accordance with the Public Contracts Regulations 2015. The current UK public procurement threshold for works contracts is £4,733,252 (current as of May 2021). The construction costs estimate for the proposed scheme is and is therefore greater than the current threshold for works.

This means the project will go out to open tender under the Sell2Wales system that has replaced OJEU in Wales. The rationale for the procurement strategy is largely linked to the cost of the project, which requires it to be advertised on Sell2Wales and prohibits the use of existing frameworks for the procurement of the works. The rationale for choosing an open tender process over a restricted tender process is to obtain the benefits of tendering to a wider market, offering the opportunity to a wide range of contractors.

The risks associated with the project have been considered and included in the project risk register. Risks are specifically assessed depending on who is best placed to manage them. The risk register is being considered as part of the preparation of the works information, and those risks that are best managed by the contractor will be identified and allocated to be priced accordingly. Risks best managed by the Council will be retained.

The Quantified Risk Assessment (QRA) has been completed with this in mind and incorporates all client risks associated with this form of contract, such as unforeseen ground conditions. The risks managed by the contractor will be priced within the tender price. These risks will be reviewed at contract award stage through a risk workshop and a shared risk register produced to allocate ownership and determine the value of the residual risks to be included within the fixed price.

The construction contract includes suitable clauses to facilitate the transfer of identified appropriate risks from RCTCBC to the contractor and ensures that risk is allocated to the party best placed to manage it.

The type of contract used for the scheme will be NEC4 Engineering and Construction Contract (ECC) Contract Option A: Fixed price with activity schedule. The NEC form of contract encourages a partnering approach to the delivery of the contract and ensures that risk is allocated to the party that is best placed to manage it.

6.3 Management

See technical note Section 4 and Table 1 for further guidance

Delivery Plan: Places are asked to submit a delivery plan which demonstrates:

- Clear milestones, key dependencies and interfaces, resource requirements, task durations and contingency.
- An understanding of the roles and responsibilities, skills, capability, or capacity needed.
- Arrangements for managing any delivery partners and the plan for benefits realisation.
- Engagement of developers/ occupiers (where needed)
- The strategy for managing stakeholders and considering their interests and influences.
- Confirmation of any powers or consents needed, and statutory approvals eg Planning permission and details of information of ownership or agreements of land/ assets needed to deliver the bid with evidence
- Please also list any powers / consents etc needed/ obtained, details of date acquired, challenge period (if applicable) and date of expiry of powers and conditions attached to them.

6.3a Please summarise the delivery plan, with reference to the above (Limit 500 words) 500 words

Details of delivery plan, roles and responsibilities, stakeholder management, consents and statutory approvals are included in the Management Case (Chapter 6) within the FBC and summarised below.

A detailed project plan is developed for the project up to the start of construction and included in Appendix J of the FBC. This provides details of tasks - detailed design, land acquisition, Statutory Undertakers, procurement and advance works. The programme highlights task durations and dependencies between tasks.

Key milestones for scheme delivery through the design and construction stages are:

Delivery Programme

Milestone	Delivery
Tender documents prepared	August 2021
Completion of detailed design (main works)	October 2021
CPO granted	October 2021*

Tender award	December 2021*
Start construction	February 2022*
Complete construction	December 2023*

* subject to CPO

Key project dependencies are:

- CPO process needs to be completed before the main contract is awarded.
- Potential public inquiry and timing could impact on scheme construction programme.
- Reliance on statutory undertakers to carry out diversionary works requires close liaison with utilities and advance diversion works to be undertaken where possible. DCWW sewer diversion works commenced in May 2021.
- Protection of various ecological species could impact the programme and where possible advance ecological works will be undertaken in the correct season.
- Confirmation of full project funding will be required prior to letting the construction contract.

RCTCBC have set up a governance structure for the delivery of the project, which is detailed in Section 6.3 of the FBC, and includes roles and responsibilities. The governance structure is a tried and tested model that has been effectively used to successfully deliver similar projects by RCTCBC.

An in-house RCTCBC team is leading the project using PRINCE2 principles, with consultancy support in specific technical areas (ecology, geotechnical and structures design). The project is overseen by the Project Board, which includes RCTCBC representatives from a range of disciplines (Planning, Legal and Procurement). Upon commencement of the construction stage, RCTCBC will appoint an NEC Project Manager and Site Supervisor to manage time, testing and defects, payments, compensation events, risks, and insurance.

A Stakeholder Management Strategy and Benefits Realisation Plan are in place for the project and included as Appendices E and K of the FBC.

The following statutory approvals have been obtained or are not required:

- As permitted development, the scheme does not require planning permission. Planning approval for the Active Travel bridge was granted in March 2021.
- An EIA screening opinion has been sought from the Council's planning department and it has been confirmed that the scheme is not likely to have significant effects on the environment and therefore an EIA is not required.

The following statutory approvals and consents or licenses will be required:

- Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) – Temporary TROs will be put in place during the construction period and a permanent TRO for the A4119.

- Ecology – A dormouse license from Natural Resources Wales (NRW).
- Flooding and drainage – Flood Risk Activity Permit (FRAP), Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) and Ordinary Water Consent (OWC).
- Other requirements – Statutory Undertakers' diversions and Traffic Management Orders.

6.3b Has a delivery plan been appended to your bid?	☒ Yes ☐ No
6.3c Can you demonstrate ability to begin delivery on the ground in 2021-22?	☒ Yes ☐ No

6.3e Risk Management: Places are asked to set out a detailed risk assessment which sets out (word limit 500 words not including the risk register): 494 words

- the barriers and level of risk to the delivery of your bid
- appropriate and effective arrangements for managing and mitigating these risk
- a clear understanding on roles / responsibilities for risk

The Risk Management Strategy for the project is detailed in Section 6.9 of the FBC.

The project's Risk Register is included as Appendix H of the FBC. The Risk Register identifies risks that may occur during the planning, design, and construction phases of the project. It records any unrealised issues that have the potential to adversely impact the scheme delivery programme or cost.

The approach to risk management adopted for the project has enabled a robust estimate of the Quantified Risk Assessment (QRA) allowance to be calculated, which has been included within the scheme cost estimate. The current risk allowance within the project cost is. This represents the combined risk allowance of all risks identified in the Risk Register. The risk allowance contained within the estimate recognises that the cost of delivering the scheme will not be fully determined until the detailed design has been completed, land interests acquired, and full tender prices received. Construction risks will still be budgeted for until the construction is complete.

The following is a summary of the Risk Management Strategy and the roles and responsibilities for risk.

The core risk management process, which is ongoing throughout the project's lifecycle, is:

- Risk Identification;
- Qualitative Risk Assessment;
- Quantitative Risk Assessment; and
- Risk Management.

The project team identify all project risks through brainstorming exercises, workshops with key stakeholders, using risk registers from other projects of a similar nature, local expertise and through the knowledge and skill of the project team.

Once a potential risk has been identified, the Project Manager categorises the risk to allow grouping of similar risks and allocates a suitable Risk Manager. The Risk Manager then undertakes the impact analysis, which includes:

- The risk consequence;
- The probability of the risk occurring;
- The impact of the risk if it occurs; and
- The risk factor.

For each identified risk, an estimate is made of the cost of the risk being realised.

Following risk identification and analysis, a mitigation strategy is developed for each risk. Having investigated and treated the risk, a residual risk may remain which will be entered on the Risk Register. The risk following mitigation is evaluated and the residual risk score and cost included within the Risk Register.

Existing and new risks on the Risk Register are regularly reviewed with a focus on the top risks by priority and potential impact. The risks are reviewed by the Project Team on a bi-monthly basis and are actively managed.

The Risk Register allocates a Risk Owner to each identified risk. Due to the stage of project development, RCTCBC is currently identified as the Risk Owner of the majority of risks. The construction contract will include suitable clauses to facilitate the transfer of identified appropriate risks from RCTCBC to the contractor and ensures that risk is allocated to the party that is best placed to manage it. The contract documentation will incentivise the contractor to actively manage risk and to realise opportunities to reduce costs throughout the construction period.

6.3f Has a risk register been appended to your bid?	☒ Yes ☐ No

6.3g Please evidence your track record and past experience of delivering schemes of a similar scale and type (Limit 250 words) 225 words

The RCTCBC project team has experience of successfully delivering similar projects to the A4119 Dualling scheme. This record of successful delivery is evidence that supports the recommended project approach. Examples of recent experience of delivering significant large-scale infrastructure projects completed to time and budget are shown in the table below.

Evidence of Transport Projects Delivered by RCTCBC

Name of project	Description of project	Total project cost	Date of completion

Porth Relief Road	5 mile bypass through urban environment with associated significant structures and an active travel community route		April 2007
Church Village Bypass	7km of bypass with associated structures, roundabouts and an active travel community route alongside		September 2010
Mountain Ash Cross Valley Link	Bridge across a river and railway connecting two major A-roads		October 2020
Talbot Green Roundabout	Roundabout size increased, with more entry lanes and fully traffic signal controlled		September 2017

In addition, the RCTCBC project team is currently progressing the following large-scale transport schemes through the development and design stages:

- Cynon Gateway – Currently at planning stage; construction completion dependent upon funding and completion of statutory procedures;
- Llanharan Bypass – Currently at preliminary design stage; construction completion dependent upon funding and completion of statutory procedures;

The above information is also provided in Section 6.2 of the FBC.

6.3h Assurance: We will require Chief Financial Officer confirmation that adequate assurance systems are in place.

For larger transport projects (between £20m - £50m) please provide evidence of an integrated assurance and approval plan. This should include details around planned health checks or gateway reviews. (Limit 250 words) 246 words

RCTCBC has set up a project governance structure for the delivery of the project, detailed in Section 6.3 of the FBC, with of roles and responsibilities. An in-house RCTCBC team is leading the project using PRINCE2 principles, with consultancy support in specific technical areas. The project is overseen by the Project Board, which includes RCTCBC representatives from a range of disciplines (Planning, Legal and Procurement).

The progression of the scheme has been subject to approvals milestones at key stages of progress (reports to the Local Authority's Cabinet and via the WelTAG Review Group process), as detailed in Section 6.6 of the FBC.

Cabinet Reports

The scheme has been the subject of the following RCTCBC Cabinet reports:

- June 2018. Approval given to apply for planning permission if required and to start land negotiations.
- July 2019. Further approval given to continue to progress the scheme and make a compulsory purchase order if necessary.

WelTAG Review Group – Stage Reviews

The WelTAG process requires an independent Review Group to be appointed for each appraisal. The scheme has been subject to Review Group approval processes following WelTAG Stage 1, 2 and 3 reports. The Review Group is comprised of RCTCBC officers representing a range of disciplines. The Review Group decides on the actions to be taken at the end of each WelTAG Stage and the Review Group's approval is required before progressing to the next stage. This process acts as an independent review of the project at key stages of development.

6.4 Monitoring and Evaluation

See technical note Section 4 and Table 1 for further guidance.

6.4a Monitoring and Evaluation Plan: Please set out proportionate plans for M&E which should include (1000 word limit): 999 words

- Bid level M&E objectives and research questions
- Outline of bid level M&E approach
- Overview of key metrics for M&E (covering inputs, outputs, outcomes and impacts), informed by bid objectives and Theory of Change. Please complete Tabs E and F on the **appended excel spreadsheet**
- Resourcing and governance arrangements for bid level M&E

The project's Monitoring and Evaluation Plan is included as Appendix D of the FBC. It has been developed in accordance with the 'Standard Monitoring' requirements as set out in the DfT's Monitoring and Evaluation Framework for Local Authority Major Schemes (September 2012).

The A4119 Coed-ely Dualling project has six objectives, which are the objectives that will be used for monitoring and evaluation of the project. These are:

- To improve highway journey times on the northbound A4119 corridor and improve access to the M4.
- To improve the economic and employment opportunities in the Ely Valley and the Rhondda and provide employment and social benefits.
- To improve Active Travel routes along the north/south A4119 corridor with the aim of improving the health and well-being of the local community.

- To improve environmental conditions including air quality and noise and to minimise the overall impact on the environment within the north/south A4119 corridor.
- To improve the patronage of public transport and improve public transport reliability within the north/south A4119 corridor.
- To improve safety and reduce the number of collisions and 'Killed or Seriously Injured' on the A4119 between Talbot Green and Coed-ely.

The development of the project's inputs, outputs, outcomes and impacts has been informed by the Theory of Change that has been developed for the project (as detailed in question 4.3d) and also by a logic mapping exercise that was undertaken as part of the Monitoring and Evaluation Plan. Logic mapping was also used to identify the outcomes and impacts that are linked to each of the project objectives.

The DfT's Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (September 2012), sets out the required measures to be monitored for all schemes. These are set out in the table below (refer to 'Measure' column), which also identifies the specific measurable indicators that will be used to monitor the A4119 Coed-ely Dualling scheme. These have been informed by the DfT guidance document where relevant. The table below also sets out timescales for monitoring, which are also in line with the DfT's guidance document.

Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council will be responsible for the delivery of the M&E requirements of the A4119 Coed-ely Dualling Scheme. M&E reports will be submitted to the Project Board, via the governance structure outlined in the FBC (refer to Section 6.3 of FBC). Details of the project's monitoring and evaluation will also be shared in Interim (One Year) and Final (Five Year) reports as set out by the DfT's Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (September 2012).

M&E reports will include the following:

- A quantitative and qualitative analysis of the measures being monitored.
- A quantitative and qualitative analysis of the scheme outcomes and impacts consistent with the scheme objectives.
- Identification and analysis of any differences between forecast and outturn benefits monitored.
- Analysis of the Value for Money of the scheme.
- Identification of the effectiveness/ issues associated with prescribed data collection methods and assumptions.
- Identification of any external factors, which have influenced the monitoring process.
- A summary of key issues relating to the appraisal methods used, to assist in ongoing improvement of appraisal techniques and processes.

- Lessons learnt through the design and construction stages.

A budget of has been included within the project cost for monitoring activities.

Project Monitoring Indicators

Measure	Stage	Data and Assessment Type	Data Collection Timing
Scheme Build	Input	Qualitative assessment of: - Programme/project plan assessment, including measures of delivery at key milestones - Stakeholder management approach and lessons learnt. - Risk management effectiveness, including assessing impacts from the risk register. - Assessment of whether the scheme is on track to deliver the anticipated benefits and details of any benefits realised.	During delivery/ construction, following scheme completion
Delivered Scheme	Output	Qualitative assessment of: - Full description of implemented scheme outputs, including a map of the overall scheme. - Identification of any changes to the scheme since funding approval e.g. changes to design. - Assessment of whether the scheme has reached the intended beneficiaries. - Identification of changes to mitigation measures (e.g. on landscape, noise mitigation, etc,) with a description of the changes and reasons for implementation.	During delivery/ construction, post scheme completion
Costs	Input	Quantitative assessment of: - Outturn costs broken down into elements in a similar form as the funding bid - Analysis of manifestation of identified risk in the elements of investment costs. - Identification of cost elements with savings and overruns and identification of the reasons for these. - Outturn maintenance or other capital costs compared with forecasts and any unanticipated costs identified. - The causes of any variations from forecast costs should be analysed.	During delivery/ construction, post scheme completion. 5 years following scheme opening for maintenance costs.
Scheme Objectives	Output/ Outcome/ Impact	Quantitative assessment of: - Travel times. - Counts of pedestrians and cyclists. - Bus service patronage. - Collision data. - Noise (in relation to Part 1 Claims).	Before construction and 1 and 5 years following scheme opening

Measure	Stage	Data and Assessment Type	Data Collection Timing
Travel Demand	Outcome	Quantitative assessment of: - Road traffic flows. - Bus service patronage. - Counts of pedestrians and cyclists.	Before construction and 1 and 5 years following scheme opening
Travel Times and Reliability	Outcome	Quantitative assessment of: - Travel times, including analysis of the difference between outturn results and scheme forecasts. - Variability of travel times.	Before construction and 1 and 5 years following scheme opening
Impact on the Economy	Impact	Qualitative and quantitative assessment of: - Travel times e.g. improved travel times to access the Coed Ely development site. - Appropriate indicators to monitor the impact of the scheme on the economy to be determined e.g. indicators linked to the development of the Coed Ely development site.	Before construction and 1 and 5 years following scheme opening
Carbon	Impact	Quantitative assessment of: - Appropriate indicators to monitor the impact of the scheme on carbon to be determined. - Air Quality – The operational phase of the proposal is not anticipated to have a significant impact on local air quality and no further assessment is considered necessary.	Before construction and 1 and 5 years following scheme opening

PART 7 DECLARATIONS

7.1 Senior Responsible Owner Declaration

As Senior Responsible Owner for A4119 Coed-ely Dualling I hereby submit this request for approval to UKG on behalf of Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council and confirm that I have the necessary authority to do so.

I confirm that Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council will have all the necessary statutory powers and other relevant consents in place to ensure the planned timescales in the application can be realised.

Name:	Signed: 17.6.21

7.2 Chief Finance Officer Declaration

As Chief Finance Officer for Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council I declare that the scheme cost estimates quoted in this bid are accurate to the best of my knowledge and that Rhondda Cynon Taf County 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 UKG 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 UKG funding will be considered beyond the maximum contribution requested and that no UKG funding will be provided after 2024-25
- confirm that the authority commits to ensure successful bids will deliver value for money or best value.
- confirms that the authority has the necessary governance / assurance arrangements in place and that all legal and other statutory obligations and consents will be adhered to.

Name:	Signed:

7.3 Data Protection

Please note that the The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) is a data controller for all Levelling Up Fund related personal data collected with the relevant forms submitted to MHCLG, and the control and processing of Personal Data.

The Department, and its contractors where relevant, may process the Personal Data that it collects from you, and use the information provided as part of the application to the Department for funding from the Levelling Up Fund, as well as in accordance with its privacy policies. For the purposes of assessing your bid the Department may need to share your Personal Data with other Government departments and departments in the Devolved Administrations and by submitting this form you are agreeing to your Personal Data being used in this way.

Any information you provide will be kept securely and destroyed within 7 years of the application process completing.

You can find more information about how the Department deals with your data here.

Annex A - Project One Summary (only required for a package bid)

Project 1	
A1. Project Name	
A2. Strategic Linkage to bid: Please enter a brief explanation of how this project links strategically to the overall bid. (in no more than 100 words)	
A3. Geographical area: Please provide a short description of the area covered by the bid (in no more than 100 words)	
A4. OS Grid Reference	
A5. Postcode	
A6. For Counties, Greater London Authority and Combined Authorities/Mayoral Combined Authorities, please provide details of the district council or unitary authority where the bid is located (or predominantly located)	
A7. Please append a map showing the location (and where applicable the 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.	☐ Yes ☐ No
A8. Project theme Please select the project theme	☐ **Transport investment** ☐ **Regeneration and town centre investment** ☐ **Cultural investment**
A9. Value of capital grant being requested for this project (£):	
A10. Value of match funding and sources (£):	
A11. Value for Money	

This section should set out the full range of impacts – both beneficial and adverse – of the project. Where possible, impacts should be described, quantified and also reported in monetary terms. However there may be some impacts where only a qualitative assessment is possible due to limitations in the available analysis. There should be a clear and detailed explanation of how all impacts reported have been identified, considered and analysed. When deciding what are the most significant impacts to consider, bidders should consider what impacts and outcomes the project is intended to achieve, taking into account the strategic case, but should also consider if there are other possible significant positive or negative impacts, to the economy, people, or environment (Limit 250 word
A12. It will be generally expected that an overall Benefit Cost Ratio and Value for Money Assessment will be reported in applications. If this is not possible, then the application should include a clear explanation of why not.

A13. Where available, please provide the BCR for this project	
A14. Does your proposal deliver strong non-monetised benefits? Please set out what these are and evidence them.	

A15. **Deliverability** Deliverability is one of the key criteria for this Fund and as such any bid should set out any necessary statutory procedures that are needed before it can be constructed.
A16. **The Bid – demonstrating investment or ability to begin delivery on the ground in 2021-22** As stated in the prospectus UKG seeks for the first round of the funding that priority will be given to bids that can demonstrate investment and ability to deliver on the ground in 2021-22

A17. Does this project includes plans for some LUF expenditure in 2021-22?	☐ Yes ☐ No
A18. Could this project be delivered as a standalone project or do it require to be part of the overall bid?	☐ Yes ☐ No

A19. Please provide evidence	
A20. Can you demonstrate ability to deliver on the ground in 2021-22.	☐ Yes ☐ No
A21. Please provide evidence	
Statutory Powers and Consents	
A22. 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.	
A23. Please list separately any outstanding statutory powers / consents etc, including the timetable for obtaining them.	

Annex B - Project Two description and funding profile (only required for package bid**)**

Project 2	
B1. Project Name	
B2. Strategic Linkage to bid: Please enter a brief explanation of how this project links strategically to the overall bid. (in no more than 100 words)	
B3. Geographical area: Please provide a short description of the area covered by the bid (in no more than 100 words)	
B4. OS Grid Reference	
B5.Postcode	
B6. For Counties, Greater London Authority and Combined Authorities/Mayoral Combined Authorities, please provide details of the district council or unitary authority where the bid is located (or predominantly located)	
B7. Please append a map showing the location (and where applicable the 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.	
B8. Project theme Please select the project theme	☐ **Transport investment** ☐ **Regeneration and town centre investment** ☐ **Cultural investment**
B9. Value of capital grant being requested for this project (£):	
B10. Value of match funding and sources (£):	
B11. Value for Money	

This section should set out the full range of impacts – both beneficial and adverse – of the project. Where possible, impacts should be described, quantified and also reported in monetary terms. However there may be some impacts where only a qualitative assessment is possible due to limitations in the available analysis. There should be a clear and detailed explanation of how all impacts reported have been identified, considered and analysed. When deciding what are the most significant impacts to consider, bidders should consider what impacts and outcomes the project is intended to achieve, taking into account the strategic case, but should also consider if there are other possible significant positive or negative impacts, to the economy, people, or environment	
B12. It will be generally expected that an overall Benefit Cost Ratio and Value for Money Assessment will be reported in applications. If this is not possible, then the application should include a clear explanation of why not.	
B13. Where available, please provide the BCR for this project	
B14. Does your proposal deliver strong non-monetised benefits? Please set out what these are and evidence them.	
B15. **Deliverability** Deliverability is one of the key criteria for this Fund and as such any bid should set out any necessary statutory procedures that are needed before it can be constructed.	
B16. **The Bid – demonstrating investment or ability to begin delivery on the ground in 2021-22** As stated in the prospectus UKG seeks for the first round of the funding that priority will be given to bids that can demonstrate investment and ability to deliver on the ground in 2021-22	
B17. Does this project includes plans for some LUF expenditure in 2021-22?	☐ Yes ☐ No
B18. Could this project be delivered as a standalone project or do it require to be part of the overall bid?	☐ Yes ☐ No

~~B19. Please provide evidence~~	
~~B20. Can you demonstrate ability to deliver on the ground in 2021-22.~~	☐ ~~Yes~~ ☐ ~~No~~
~~B21. Please provide evidence~~	
~~Statutory Powers and Consents~~	
~~B22. 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.~~	
~~B23. Please list separately any outstanding statutory powers / consents etc, including the timetable for obtaining them.~~	

Annex C – Project Three - description and funding profile (only required for package bid**)**

Project 3	
C1. Project Name	
C2. Strategic Linkage to bid: Please enter a brief explanation of how this project links strategically to the overall bid. (in no more than 100 words)	
C3. Geographical area: Please provide a short description of the area covered by the bid (in no more than 100 words)	
C4. OS Grid Reference	
C5. Postcode	
C6. For Counties, Greater London Authority and Combined Authorities/Mayoral Combined Authorities, please provide details of the district council or unitary authority where the bid is located (or predominantly located)	
C7. Please append a map showing the location (and where applicable the 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.	
C8. Project theme Please select the project theme	☐ **Transport investment** ☐ **Regeneration and town centre investment** ☐ **Cultural investment**
C9. Value of capital grant being requested for this project (£):	
C10. Value of match funding and sources (£):	
C11. Value for Money	

This section should set out the full range of impacts – both beneficial and adverse – of the project. Where possible, impacts should be described, quantified and also reported in monetary terms. However there may be some impacts where only a qualitative assessment is possible due to limitations in the available analysis. There should be a clear and detailed explanation of how all impacts reported have been identified, considered and analysed. When deciding what are the most significant impacts to consider, bidders should consider what impacts and outcomes the project is intended to achieve, taking into account the strategic case, but should also consider if there are other possible significant positive or negative impacts, to the economy, people, or environment
C12. It will be generally expected that an overall Benefit Cost Ratio and Value for Money Assessment will be reported in applications. If this is not possible, then the application should include a clear explanation of why not.

C13. Where available, please provide the BCR for this project	
C14. Does your proposal deliver strong non-monetised benefits? Please set out what these are and evidence them.	

C15. **Deliverability** Deliverability is one of the key criteria for this Fund and as such any bid should set out any necessary statutory procedures that are needed before it can be constructed.
C16. **The Bid – demonstrating investment or ability to begin delivery on the ground in 2021-22** As stated in the prospectus UKG seeks for the first round of the funding that priority will be given to bids that can demonstrate investment and ability to deliver on the ground in 2021-22

C17. Does this project includes plans for some LUF expenditure in 2021-22?	☐ Yes ☐ No
C18. Could this project be delivered as a standalone project or do it require to be part of the overall bid?	☐ Yes ☐ No

~~C19. Please provide evidence~~	
~~C20. Can you demonstrate ability to deliver on the ground in 2021-22.~~	☐ ~~Yes~~ ☐ ~~No~~
~~C21. Please provide evidence~~	
~~Statutory Powers and Consents~~	
~~C22. 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.~~	
~~C23. Please list separately any outstanding statutory powers / consents etc, including the timetable for obtaining them.~~	

ANNEX D - Check List Great Britain Local Authorities

Questions	Y/N	Comments
4.1a Member of Parliament support		
MPs have the option of providing formal written support for one bid which they see as a priority. Have you appended a letter from the MP to support this case?	N/A	
Part 4.2 Stakeholder Engagement and Support		
Where the bidding local authority does not have responsibility for the delivery of projects, have you appended a letter from the responsible authority or body confirming their support?	N/A	
Part 4.3 The Case for Investment		
For Transport Bids: Have you provided an Option Assessment Report (OAR)	Y	Appendix B to the FBC
Part 6.1 Financial		
Have you appended copies of confirmed match funding?	Y	Referenced within FBC – Section 4.3
The UKG may accept the provision of land from third parties as part of 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. Have you appended a letter to support this case?	N/A	
Part 6.3 Management		
Has a delivery plan been appended to your bid?	Y	Appendix J of FBC
Has a letter relating to land acquisition been appended?	N/A	
Have you attached a copy of your Risk Register?	Y	Appendix H of FBC
~~**Annex A-C - Project description Summary (**only required for package bid**)**~~		
~~Have you appended a map showing the location (and where applicable the 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.~~		

Annex E Checklist for Northern Ireland Bidding Entities

Questions	Y/N	Comments
Part 1 Gateway Criteria		
You have attached two years of audited accounts		
You have provided evidence of the delivery team having experience of delivering two capital projects of similar size and in the last five years		
Part 4.2 Stakeholder Engagement and Support		
For transport bids, have you appended a letter of support from the relevant district council		
Part 6.1 Financial		
Have you appended copies of confirmed match funding		
The UKG may accept the provision of land from third parties as part of 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.		
Part 6.3 Management		
Has a delivery plan been appended to your bid?		
Has a letter relating to land acquisition been appended?		
Have you attached a copy of your Risk Register?		
Annex A-C - Project description Summary (only required for package bid**)**		
Have you appended a map showing the location (and where applicable the 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.		