

Capital Project Business Case Hastings and Bexhill Movement and Access Package

Version control	
Document ID	WSP/HBMAP
Version	V2.0
Author	KIH
Document status	Draft
Authorised by	JW
Date authorised	02/08/2023

1. PROJECT OVERVIEW

1.1. Project name:

Hastings and Bexhill Movement and Access Package (HBMAP)

1.2. Project type:

The HBMAP is an integrated transport programme including 4 packages:

1. Cycling/ Walking Infrastructure,
2. Public Transport Infrastructure,
3. Traffic Management,
4. Public Realm Improvements.

1.3. Federated Board Area:

East Sussex

1.4. Lead County Council / Unitary Authority:

East Sussex County Council

1.5. Development location:

The geographic extent of the programme encompasses the town centre areas of Bexhill & Hastings, along with the key corridors of movement providing connectivity into these town centres and between existing residential areas, new housing development coming forward and services, including employment, education and shopping facilities.

1.6. Project Summary:

The Hastings and Bexhill Movement and Access Package (HBMAP) is an integrated package of cycling, walking and bus infrastructure, traffic management and public realm improvements, aimed at supporting economic growth and planned growth across Hastings and Bexhill.

This updated programme will increase the extent of the cycle network supporting greater connectivity between key destinations and the growing appetite for cycling for everyday journeys; provide wayfinding measures along with enhanced and additional pedestrian crossing facilities to support and encourage walkers; and deliver improvements to junction capacity to reduce local congestion.

Due to the delays as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic and increases in construction costs as a result of the war in Ukraine, programme delivery has been split into two phases with the first phase of schemes having been delivered between 2018/19 and 2023/24 and the second phase of schemes planned for delivery between 2023/24 – 2025/26.

Measures to enhance the attractiveness of the two town's public realm will be delivered, which will encourage inward investment, alongside supporting and encouraging more people to walk, by creating safer access and permeability. This will be integrated alongside delivering high quality public transport infrastructure and information on key corridors of movement, supporting greater accessibility and journey comfort.

These works will kick start a much wider programme of change in movement and access across the two towns and set the precedence for future transport infrastructure

improvements. This is crucial as both Hastings and Bexhill move towards embracing greater sustainable development and the growing opportunities to maximise the use of technology and communication to enable ‘smart mobility.’

1.7. Delivery partners:

The key delivery partners for this package are as follows:

Table 1 – Delivery Partners

Partner	Nature of involvement (financial, operational etc.)
East Sussex County Council	Local Accountable Body for LGF and programme promoter.
East Sussex Highways - Balfour Beatty Living Places (BBLP)	Highways Infrastructure Services Contract – will develop and deliver the second phase of the programme on behalf of East Sussex County Council.
Hastings Borough Council	Local Planning Authority and Local CIL Charging Authority – custodian of development contributions and CIL revenues.
Rother District Council	Local Planning Authority and Local CIL Charging Authority – custodian of development contributions and CIL revenues.

1.8. Promoting Body:

East Sussex County Council

1.9. Senior Responsible Owner (SRO):

Team Manager Infrastructure, Planning and Place

1.10. Total project value and funding sources:

Overall Project Value

The overall value of the project costs for the HBMAP is **£9,991,733**. This includes an allowance for risk and contingency for the 3 schemes still to be constructed of between 13% and 40% depending on the scheme.

ESCC has committed £51,000 of their own funds to the programme and there is £671,809 of development contributions available to ESCC to support the delivery of the programme, of which £130,809 is already held by ESCC and the remaining £541,000 will be sought from available contributions during the 2023/24 financial year if this updated business case is approved. A breakdown of the funding is set out in Table 2 overleaf.

Table 2 – HBMAP– Project Value

Funding Source	Amount (£)	Constraints, Dependencies or Risks and Mitigation
Total Project Costs	9,991,733	<i>Includes value of schemes already constructed in Phase 1</i>
Local Growth Funding	9,000,000	<i>A robust and WebTAG compliant business case has been provided. Delivery of the proposed schemes is contingent on the updated business case being approved.</i>
ESCC Funding	51,000	
Development Contributions Held	130,809	<i>Held by ESCC</i>
Development Contributions Available	541,000	<i>To be sought by ESCC in 2023/24 if the business case is successful.</i>

Programme Elements – Project Costs

The programme consists of four packages of schemes, with all but three schemes having already been constructed during Phase 1 between 2017/18 and 2023/24. The total values of each package, shown in Table 3, include the costs of all constructed and yet to be constructed schemes. A breakdown of each of the package schemes and their associated costs in out-turn values, including risk and contingency, is provided in Tables 32 to 35 in Section 5.3.

Table 3 – Package Values

Package	Estimated Cost in out-turn values including risk and contingency (£)
Walking and Cycling Infrastructure	3,663,548
Public Transport	1,085,609
Traffic Management	663,121
Public Realm	4,579,454
Total	9,991,733

Constraints/Dependencies/Risks

Risks associated with the spend of the construction for Phase 2 South East Local Enterprise Partnership (SELEP) funding have been identified as part of the risk assessment including any mitigation required. These risks potentially may affect the delivery of the remaining three Phase 2 schemes. These risks are outlined in Section 2.11 and **Appendix B**.

1.11. SELEP funding request, including type (LGF, GPF etc.):

ESCC was allocated £9m of Local Growth Funding (LGF) monies from the SELEP to deliver the HBMAP packages of schemes supported by its original December 2017 business case, see **Appendix G**. Three schemes are yet to be constructed, and so this business case seeks to support the delivery of these remaining three schemes.

The project specifically involves the provision of general infrastructure and so this will be adopted by the County Council. It was confirmed that, on this basis, the public sector investment of £9m in this infrastructure provision would not in itself constitute State Aid. This is because the infrastructure will be available to users on an open, transparent and non-discriminatory basis.

The HBMAP was the first tranche of a wider programme of measures to kick start the delivery of a comprehensive integrated transport package that would support movement and access within both Hastings and Bexhill, as identified in the SELEP Local Growth Deal, Round 1.

1.12. Exemptions:

ESCC confirms that this business case is not subject to any Value for Money exemptions, as the Benefit-Cost Ratios (BCR's) of the three Phase 2 schemes awaiting construction and of all Phase 1 and Phase 2 schemes combined remain over 2.0.

1.13. Key dates:

The HBMAP was a large programme of integrated transport infrastructure schemes, which included four packages of schemes, as outlined in Table 3. Initially, delivery of all packages of schemes was scheduled to be undertaken between 2018/19 and 2020/21. However, due to the delays and cost increases across the construction sector as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic and further increases in construction costs as a result of the war in Ukraine, scheme delivery has been split into two phases with the first phase of schemes being delivered between 2018/19 and 2023/24 and the second phase of schemes planned for construction between 2023/24 – 2025/26. Table 4 reflects a summary of each of the key programme delivery dates, associated with the expenditure.

Table 4 – Key Programme Dates

Package	Delivery Phase	Commencement of Expenditure	Construction Start Date	Package Completion Date
Walking and Cycling	1	2017/18	2018/19 – 2022/23	2018/19 – 2022/23
	2	2017/18	2023/24	2025/26
Public Transport	1	2017/18	2019/20	2022/23
Traffic Management	1	2018/19	2019/20	2022/23
Public Realm	1	2017/18	2019/20	2023/24
	2	2018/19	2023/24	2024/25

1.14. Project development stage:

As a result of the scale of the HBMAP (which includes a number of schemes at different stages of development), the project development stages for each of the programmes four packages are clearly summarised below in Tables 5 to 7:

Table 5 – Project Development Stages – Walking and Cycling Package

Project development stages completed to date – Walking and Cycling Package		
Task	Description	Outputs achieved
Feasibility	Feasibility work has been undertaken on previous cycle/walking network development work.	Report developed including more detailed assessment of schemes.
Consultation – Key Stakeholders	Considerable consultation with key local stakeholders including both Rother District Council and Hastings Borough Council was undertaken.	Galvanised local support for the development of a longer term programme of transport improvements to support movement and access within Hastings and Bexhill.
Option Selection	Feasibility reports and consultation information from local stakeholders, used to develop prioritised scheme list.	The list of schemes to be prioritised and included in HBMAP was finalised.
Preliminary Design	Preliminary design work was commissioned for the schemes.	Preliminary designs completed for each scheme, enabling inclusion in ESCC Capital Programme for Transport Improvements 2018/19.
Detailed Design	Detailed design commissioned for some schemes as part of ESCC Capital Programme of Local Transport Improvements.	Detailed designs for some schemes, approved by both stakeholders and ESCC Lead Member for Transport & Environment, enabled some scheme construction to commence in 2018/19.
Procurement	Assessed options and selected to commission East Sussex Highways (a contract with BBLP) to design and deliver the package.	Early contractor involvement in programme detail to ensure available resource to undertake further design and deliver the package.
Business Case Development	The above stages were undertaken to inform the development of the initial business case.	A robust WebTAG compliant business case was produced.
Detailed Design	Detailed design commissioned for the remaining schemes as part of ESCC Capital Programme of Local Transport Improvements.	Detailed designs for all schemes now approved by both stakeholders and ESCC Lead Member for Transport & Environment, enabling scheme construction, where appropriate to commence in 2018/19.
Further Key Stakeholder Consultation and Option Selection	All schemes were consulted on again and re-assessed to take into consideration both potential impacts and the impact of increased construction costs.	Three schemes were recommended for construction, nine were not taken forward to construction and two schemes were rescheduled for further appraisal in Phase 2.
Implementation	Three schemes were scheduled for construction	Construction of the three Phase 1 schemes was completed between 2018/19 and 2022/23.
Further Key Stakeholder Consultation and Option Selection	One of the two remaining schemes was reduced in scope and split into two schemes and then the three remaining schemes were economically appraised and subject to further stakeholder feedback.	Two schemes were not taken forward to construction and one scheme was recommended for construction.
Business Case Development	The final scheme is assessed as part of this updated business case.	Robust WebTAG compliant business case was produced.
Project development stages to be completed – Walking and Cycling Package		
Task	Description	
Detailed Design	Detailed design commissioned for the final scheme as part of ESCC Capital Programme of Local Transport Improvements.	
Implementation	Scheme construction scheduled to be undertaken between 2024/25 and 2025/26, subject to LGF funding.	

Table 6 – Project Development Stages – Public Transport and Traffic Management Packages

Project development stages completed to date – Public Transport and Traffic Management Packages		
Task	Description	Outputs achieved
Feasibility	Feasibility work was undertaken to identify schemes for each package.	Options report developed for each package.
Consultation – Key Stakeholders	Considerable consultation with key local stakeholders at both Rother District Council and Hastings Borough Council was undertaken.	Galvanised local support for the development of a longer term programme of transport improvements to support movement and access within Hastings and Bexhill.
Option Selection	Feasibility reports and consultation information, was used to develop a prioritised list of schemes for each package.	A list of schemes was developed for each package. Both scheme lists could be scaled up or down subject to funding.
Business Case Development	The above stages were undertaken to inform the development of the initial business case.	A robust WebTAG compliant business case was produced.
Detailed Design	Detailed design commissioned as part of ESCC Capital Programme of Local Transport Improvements.	Detailed designs were approved by both stakeholders and ESCC Lead Member for Transport & Environment, enabled some scheme construction to commence in 2019/20.
Further Consultation	All schemes were consulted on again and re-assessed to take into consideration both potential impacts and the impact of increased construction costs.	Three schemes were recommended for construction, nine were not taken forward to construction and two were rescheduled for further appraisal in Phase 2.
Procurement	Selected to commission East Sussex Highways (a contract with BBLP) to design and deliver the package.	Early contractor involvement in programme detail to ensure available resource to undertake further design and deliver the package.
Further Key Stakeholder Consultation and Option Selection	All schemes were consulted on again and re-assessed to take into consideration both potential impacts and the impact of increased construction costs.	The RTPI scheme scaled back to eleven bus stops instead of twenty, Four Traffic Management schemes were not taken forward to construction and two Traffic Management schemes were recommended for construction
Implementation	The three Public Transport and two Traffic Management schemes were scheduled for construction	Construction of all five schemes was completed between 2019/20 and 2022/23.

Table 7 – Project Development Stages – Public Realm Package

Project development stages completed to date – Public Realm Package		
Task	Description	Outputs achieved
Feasibility	Feasibility work identified the schemes as part of the development of Hastings Borough Council's Area Action Plan and work with Bexhill Town Centre Steering Group	Report developed including more detailed assessment of schemes.
Consultation – Key Stakeholders	Considerable consultation with key local stakeholders including both Rother District Council and Hastings Borough Council was undertaken.	Galvanised local support for the development of a longer term programme of transport improvements to support movement and access within Hastings and Bexhill.
Option Selection	Feasibility reports and consultation feedback were used to develop a prioritised list of schemes.	The list of schemes to be prioritised and included in HBMAP was finalised.
Transport Model Development (Hastings)	A transport model for the Hastings Town Centre and White Rock Area was developed to test the transport impacts of potential schemes.	Model outputs confirmed minimal transport impacts of the assessed schemes.
Business Case Development	The above stages were undertaken to inform the development of the initial business case.	A robust WebTAG compliant business case was produced.
Preliminary Design	Preliminary design work was commissioned for the schemes.	Preliminary designs completed for each scheme, enabling inclusion in ESCC Capital Programme for Transport Improvements 2019/20.
Detailed Design	Detailed design commissioned as part of ESCC Capital Programme of Local Transport Improvements.	Detailed designs, approved by both stakeholders and ESCC Lead Member for Transport & Environment, enabled some scheme construction to commence in 2019/20.
Procurement	Assessed options and selected to commission East Sussex Highways (a contract with BBLP) to design and deliver the package.	Early contractor involvement in programme detail to ensure available resource to undertake further design and deliver the package.
Further Option Selection	All schemes were re-assessed to take into consideration both potential impacts and the impact of increased construction costs.	Three schemes were recommended for construction, although one of these schemes was reallocated to another programme. Three schemes were deferred for further appraisal in Phase 2.
Implementation	Three schemes were scheduled for construction	Construction of the two schemes was completed between 2019/20 and 2022/23, with the reallocated scheme scheduled for construction in 2023/24
Further Key Stakeholder Consultation and Option Selection	The three remaining schemes were subject to redesign with two being reduced in scope. They were then economically appraised and subject to further stakeholder feedback.	One scheme was not taken forward to construction and the two reduced scope schemes were recommended for construction.
Business Case Development	The two schemes are assessed as part of this updated business case.	Robust WebTAG compliant business case was produced.
Project development stages to be completed – Public Realm Package		
Task	Description	
Implementation	Construction of the last Phase 1 scheme is scheduled for 2023/24. Construction of the two Phase 2 schemes is scheduled to be undertaken between 2023/24 and 2024/25, subject to LGF funding.	

1.15. Proposed Completion of outputs:

The completed HBMAP will deliver the following outputs:

- New and improved Walking and Cycling infrastructure, including a cycle route and pedestrian crossings.
- Improved public transport infrastructure, including Bus Stop Clearways / High Access Kerbs (bus stop poles) / Bus Shelters and the provision of Real Time Passenger Information on key corridors of movement.
- Improvements to traffic management at key junctions on the road network within Hastings and Bexhill.
- Improvements to the public realm in Hastings and Bexhill.

Linkages to existing LGF Projects

The package will augment the investment in existing LGF projects, these include:

- **North Bexhill Access Road (NBAR) –costing £18.6m**
NBAR comprises a 2.4km single carriageway road link between the A269 Ninfield Road and the Bexhill-Hastings Link Road (BHLR) with a roundabout at each end and further central roundabout. The road was completed and opened to traffic in March 2019; in doing so, it unlocked planned employment growth in North Bexhill identified under Policy BX3 of the 2006 Rother District Local Plan, with capacity for circa 38,000m² of employment-generating floor space. This scheme also includes facilities for pedestrians and cyclists, which will link with the proposed Walking and Cycling network in Bexhill.
- **East Sussex Strategic Growth Package – costing £8.2m**
This package is aligned with identified growth areas and capitalises on existing and programmed infrastructure investment for which it also makes the business case. It is intended to develop this flexible ‘pipeline’ funding through the use and re-use of LGF funds enabling the development of quality sites and employment space for existing companies as well as offering quality bespoke developments for companies wishing to relocate to East Sussex. This funding has been spent and delivered 218.75 jobs and 2,375 square metres of commercial floorspace across East Sussex, including in Hastings and Rother.

The key elements of this package are:

- **Priory Quarter in Hastings**
- **Bexhill Enterprise Park in Rother**
- Sovereign Harbour Innovation Park, Eastbourne
- South Wealden (Polegate Business Park)

The HBMAP will link with this programme by supporting greater movement and access and enhancing sustainable travel options for access to employment across both Hastings and Bexhill.

2. STRATEGIC CASE

2.1. Scope / Scheme Description:

The Hastings and Bexhill Movement and Access Package (HBMAP) will kick start a package of cycling, walking and bus infrastructure, traffic management and public realm improvements. These will maximise opportunities to improve junction capacity and deliver and enable greater access to high quality integrated sustainable transport infrastructure, with the overarching aim of supporting planned growth and local economic growth. This programme sets the precedence for the future development of these types of infrastructure measures across the two towns.

Why do we need the HBMAP?

The full delivery of the HBMAP is being integrated alongside wider programmes of work to overcome some of the fundamental issues which are currently inhibiting economic growth and quality of life within the two towns. These include congestion on the strategic and local road network, poor connectivity between residential areas and key local services by Walking and Cycling, limited and inconsistent public transport infrastructure provision, high levels of deprivation and unemployment, combined with issues around affordability of private or public transport and the availability of transport choices inhibiting access to education and employment. The identification of the current issues provides a demonstration of the need for the delivery of the programme, and evidence to support this is outlined in Table 10.

There is also an opportunity to embrace the programme as part of the wider work to move the towns towards greater sustainable development. This area of the County is on the 'cusp of change' economically, as the area is moving towards becoming more of a regional shopping and cultural destination, with plans for High Speed Rail from Bexhill & Hastings to London via Ashford, significant commercial and residential development and the growing desire to maximise the use of technology and communication to enable 'smart mobility' for both drivers and those using public transport.

Key issues

There is local congestion on key sections of the road network in the A21 / A259 growth area, with a number of junctions under stress from current traffic levels. This contributes to the area's local and strategic connectivity problems and will only be exacerbated by the transport demand generated by the housing and employment growth proposed through the respective Local Plans for the Hastings and Bexhill areas.

Congestion on the road network in this part of the county has economic, environmental and social implications, including constrained economic growth, increased carbon emissions, poor journey times and detrimental health implications. ESCC has tried to tackle this with the investment secured that has delivered the Bexhill to Hastings Link Road (Combe Valley Way – opened December 2015), and the North Bexhill Access Road (opened March 2019), to improve the efficient movement of people and goods.

Improvements to bus, walking and cycling infrastructure in Hastings and Bexhill will support economic growth, and thereby improve access to jobs, training, education, and leisure services.

High levels of deprivation in Hastings and Bexhill leads to high unemployment and many of those who are unemployed do not have access to a car. This, coupled with poor public and sustainable transport options, inhibits ease of accessibility to employment and education.

Key Opportunities

Alongside a number of key issues identified above there are a number of opportunities associated with the delivery of the HBMAP, these particularly relate to the desire by ESCC, Rother District Council and Hastings Borough Council to deliver transport infrastructure and measures to create a ‘step change’ in people choosing to walk, cycle and use public transport and to embrace the use of technology and data to move towards smart mobility, to mitigate the planned growth within these area, but to also dovetail the HBMAP wider strategic programmes to deliver long term economic growth, including the potential delivery of high speed rail, and changes to the town centres.

These longer term strategies are outlined by the SELEP, and also in Rother’s Local Plan and their Public Realm Strategy. In Hastings this is outlined in their updated Local Plan.

Table 8 – Summary of schemes already constructed or planned to be constructed

Package	Overview of Package Measure
Walking and Cycling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On and off road cycle route with improved signage and markings Pedestrian crossings to provide safer crossing areas
Public Transport	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bus Accessibility Improvements – including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ Bus Stop Clearways ➢ Real Time Passenger Information ➢ High access kerbs and bus shelter improvements
Traffic Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Junction Improvements improving safety and reducing congestion Traffic Signals improving safety and reducing congestions
Public Realm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shared space Improvements to pedestrian and cycle access to key destinations including the town centre and station Improved wayfinding in Hastings Streetscape improvements including upgraded street furniture

These improvements address the following key issues as identified in section 2.1, and result in the specific intended benefits detailed in Table 9

Table 9 – Issues and Benefits of HBMAP

Issues Addressed	Intended Benefits
Climate emergency	Increase shift to active modes and public transport
Restricted growth and inward investment	Release growth
Congestion	Enable and encourage inward investment
Constrained access to jobs, training, education and leisure services	Reduce congestion
Poor journey times and journey comfort	Increase and improve transport choices for a range of different journeys and distances
Poor health and wellbeing	Improve accessibility to jobs, training, education & leisure
	Improve journey times and comfort
	Increase physical activity

Intended benefits of the HBMAP

Implementing these transport measures in Hastings and Bexhill will release the opportunity for, and contribute to, local economic growth by enabling efficient connections to neighbouring settlements and would support sustainable access to key local services including employment, education, health services, shopping and recreational facilities in these areas, alongside supporting the tourist economy.

Walking and cycling has the opportunity to make a significant contribution to supporting the local economy in Hastings and Bexhill alongside the larger infrastructure projects that are being developed, by tackling congestion on the local road network and unlocking development sites by supporting access by active travel.

More reliable journey times and less congestion would attract inward investment from the business community, thus releasing growth opportunities for the Hastings and Bexhill areas.

Improved connectivity and capacity, by introducing this package of sustainable transport measures, would improve existing, and provide new, sustainable travel choices. This will in turn reduce reliance on the private car and improve and increase access and the number of people using the bus, walking and cycling. These measures would also improve accessibility to jobs, training, education and leisure services for those who do not have access to a car, therefore reducing social exclusion, and improving health and well-being.

Sustainable travel choices, which are safe, attractive and smart, can be integrated alongside the growing tourist and cultural offer in the two towns, to maximise sustainable tourism.

A fundamental intended benefit of delivering the HBMAP is to launch an initial tranche of transport infrastructure measures to create a 'step change' in people choosing to walk, cycle and use public transport, whilst moving towards the effective use of communications and technology, to develop Hastings and Bexhill into 'Smart Towns'.

The overall intention will be to reduce car journeys in towns by providing smarter and sustainable choices (e.g. through improved walking and cycling infrastructure) and improving technology to encourage greater use of sustainable transport (e.g. through the provision of Real Time Passenger Information RTPI, and the use of data to inform smart ticketing.)

2.2. Location description:

Hastings is a community of around 91,000 people (2021 census), with 8 miles of coastline, extensive natural and formal open space and surrounded by the mainly rural district of Rother, of which the main town is Bexhill which has a population of around 43,000 people (2021 census).

Hastings and Bexhill are connected to the strategic road network by the A259 and A21, and are within close proximity of Brighton, Gatwick Airport, London, High Speed rail services at Ashford International, Eurostar services and the channel ports. These connections provide access to major regional, national and international markets.

Table 10 – Key Characteristics

Economic factors

- Hastings has high levels of unemployment, and areas with significant pockets of deprivation; 14th most deprived authority nationally, and the most deprived in the South East.
- Hastings and Bexhill are constrained by their poor strategic road and rail connections.
- The introduction of High Speed One and trunk road improvements elsewhere have left Hastings relatively isolated.
- Hastings and Bexhill have been identified in our LTP 2011 - 2026 and as one of the three areas needing greater investment, and where there is greatest capacity to unlock major new development.
- Over recent years there has been significant regeneration and major investment in the Hastings and Bexhill. The A21 / A259 Hastings / Bexhill Growth Corridor has seen recent developments including the Bexhill Hastings Link Road (BHLR) and its package of complementary transport measures– junction improvements on The Ridge and bus priority/bus infrastructure measures on the A259 between Glynde Gap and Filsham Road.
- There are a number of recently completed schemes and land with development potential for employment, including sites around North East Bexhill, and in Hastings at North Queensway, Churchfields and Ivyhouse Lane, and Priory Quarter.
- In Hastings the seafront is central to the town’s identity and economy and investment in its development will have a positive catalytic effect on the wider regeneration of the town.
- Improvements to the public open spaces along the seafront stimulate private investment in property and business activity and the year-round visitor economy.
- Improvements to the green infrastructure, such as the investment of approximately £0.5m in the new interpretive centre in the Combe Valley Countryside Park, are attracting more visitors and enhance the appeal of Hastings as a good place to live and invest.

Social factors

- Rail journey times are slow, with 60 miles to London taking over 90 minutes from Hastings and around 2 hours from Bexhill.
- ESCC and partners are awaiting to hear the outcome of proposals to introduce high speed rail services from Ashford to Eastbourne stopping at stations including Rye, Hastings, St Leonards Warrior Square and Bexhill, with a decision expected imminently.
- Both Hastings and Bexhill are key tourist / cultural attractors, not only for being coastal towns, but for being home to the De La Warr Pavilion in Bexhill and the Hastings Contemporary (formerly known as Jerwood) gallery in Hastings.
- In Bexhill, Rother District Council has invested £5.1 million to improve the seafront environment on the promenade, transforming the area and increasing footfall by raising its profile.

Environmental factors

- The Combe Valley Countryside Park provides, and addresses, the deficiency of significant green space between Hastings and Bexhill. It provides opportunities for walking and cycling and helps generate new commercial opportunities enhancing the local environment and economy.
- Hastings Borough Council has upgraded paving and improved open spaces in the town centres of Hastings and St Leonards, in conjunction with measures to animate the public realm and increase retail activity in these centres.

Access constraints and opportunities in Hastings:

- The public realm and pedestrian experience is in need of improvement.
- There is a need to create better physical and economic connections between the pedestrian routes at the lower level along the seafront with the higher level land and uses on the upper level of the White Rock and Bohemia Road area.

- There is poor pedestrian access across main roads, with traffic and car parks dominating the seafront. Prioritising pedestrian and cycle movement in the Town Centre, ensuring access for all, and ensuring busier roads are easy for pedestrians to cross in key strategic locations is therefore sought.
- A significant increase in footfall along the seafront has resulted following the re-opening of Hastings Pier and this will increase with the proposed White Rock area regeneration proposals.

Access constraints and opportunities in Bexhill:

- Access to Bexhill town centre by foot or cycling is not an obvious option as there are little or poor facilities.
- Traffic flows, particularly on the northern section of London Road are regularly impeded by cars illegally parked on yellow-lined sections, and some mounting the kerb, which limits the footway width.
- Traffic queues regularly form in London Road from the traffic lights at the A259, while the lack of a right-hand turn lane into Beeching Road also causes queueing at the junction with the A259.
- The separation of the town by the A259 and the railway line mean that a key aspiration is to improve accessibility by sustainable modes of transport to key destinations in the town.

2.3. Policy context:

NATIONAL POLICIES

NICE Public Health Guidance 41 – Walking and cycling: local measures to promote walking and cycling as forms of travel or recreation, November 2012

The main purpose of this guidance is to support commissioners involved in physical activity promotion or who work in public health, transport planning and leisure sectors, to integrate walking and cycling into policies and projects.

DfT Gear Change, July 2020

This document highlights the once in a generation chance to accelerate active travel by embedding the change in people’s travel behaviour during the COVID-19 pandemic which led to a rise in the popularity of walking and cycling. It states the vision of increased cycling and walking leading to healthier, happier and greener communities; fare streets; convenient and accessible travel; and being at the heart of transport decision making.

DfT Build Back Better: Our Plan for Growth, March 2021

This plan describes a transformational approach to deliver growth, levelling up the whole of the UK and supporting the transition to net zero. Infrastructure is identified as one of the three core pillars of growth with the aim to stimulate short-term economic activity and drive long-term productivity improvements through record investment in broadband, roads, rails and cities. To accelerate progress to net zero, investment will be made in local authority and private sector infrastructure projects.

DfT – The Second Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy, March 2023

This reaffirms the Government’s ambition to making walking, wheeling and cycling the natural choices for shorter journeys, or as part of a longer journey by 2040. It includes

objectives of 55% of primary school-aged children walking to school by 2025; increasing the percentage of short journeys that are walked or cycled to 46% by 2025; doubling cycling by 2025; and 50% of all journeys in towns and cities being walked or cycled by 2030. These objectives are also supported by the Decarbonising Transport A Better Greener Britain, released in July 2021 and the DfT Net Zero Strategy Build Back Greener, released in October 2021.

REGIONAL POLICIES

Transport for the South East: Mobility Strategy, July 2021

This strategy highlights the need to break the historic link between economic growth and carbon emissions resulting from a continued policy and behaviour that prioritises the private car over more sustainable modes. It recognises that, on its own, the conversion of the vehicle fleet to clean fuels will not deliver the reductions in carbon emissions needed. Its vision is that by 2035, the South East of England will have a globally leading sustainable mobility ecosystem accelerating the move to net zero and one of its three objectives states that active travel will be the first choice for local journeys, for those who are able, supporting better air quality and the improved wellbeing of communities.

Transport for the South East (TfSE): A Strategic Investment Plan for the South East, March 2023

This Strategic Investment Plan, which follows the adoption of TfSE's Transport Strategy in October 2020, highlights the need to focus interventions which support decarbonisation and the environment with the priority being to support the delivery of a transport network with greater use of public transport and active travel. It also highlights the need for levelling up left behind communities by delivering a more affordable and accessible transport network addressing deprivation, promoting social inclusion, improving public health and individual wellbeing, and reducing barriers to employment, learning, social, leisure, physical and cultural activity.

LOCAL POLICIES

East Sussex

ESCC Local Transport Plan 2011 – 2026, June 2011

Investment in sustainable transport measures will support improvements to accessibility to key services. Hastings and Bexhill are identified as priority areas for investment. The approach for both towns is to focus on key walking routes, to develop and implement the cycle route networks into the town centre, along the seafront and to existing and future residential and employment areas and focus on improving bus infrastructure including Real Time Passenger Information (RTPI). The LTP is currently being updated ahead of consultation on the draft strategy in autumn 2023 and adoption in spring 2024.

ESCC Cultural Strategy 2013 - 2025

The Strategy proposes to create an environment which enables the cultural and creative economy to expand, including further enhancements to the county's tourism offer. The scheme will enhance public access to Hastings and Bexhill' key tourist attractions/businesses.

Active Sussex Strategy 2018 - 2023

This strategy seeks to reduce the percentage of inactive people in Sussex by 2028 by, in part, embedding physical activity into transport policy and infrastructure design.

ESCC Local Walking and Cycling Investment Plan, September 2021

The Local Walking and Cycling Investment Plan (LCWIP) will help develop a strategic network of Walking and Cycling routes and measures across the county focussing on areas of the County where there are the greatest opportunities to increase levels of cycling and walking, with an emphasis on delivering infrastructure improvements which supports people who do not cycle or walk. These walking and cycling networks will provide a critical element of the wider approach for tackling traffic congestion in the county, supporting sustainable economic growth and health and wellbeing.

ESCC Council Plan 2022/23

The HBMAP aligns with this plan by supporting a key priority of driving sustainable economic growth, particularly in relation to improving accessibility for pedestrians and cyclists and public transport users.

ESCC Climate Emergency Plan 2023 - 2025

The plan states that the aim is for County Council to become both net zero as fast as possible and resilient to climate changes already happening. It identifies the need to shift journeys to modes that generate very little to no carbon, including walking cycling and public transport.

Hastings

The Hastings Planning Strategy 2011 – 2028 (Hastings Local Plan), February 2014

The adopted Local Plan provides a framework outlining sustainable development opportunities in the town over the next 15 years. The proposed walking and cycle routes focus on short local journeys to key destinations of less than five miles. The routes aim to improve access for pedestrians and cyclists to places of study, work and leisure, integrating with the other forms of sustainable transport. The accompanying Infrastructure Delivery Plan sets out the infrastructure requirements, including transport, needed to support sustainable growth in the town which includes measures in the HBMAP. The Borough Council have been updating their Local Plan and undertook a Regulation 18 consultation on their consultation draft in early 2021. The Borough Council are proposing to consult on their Regulation 19 (pre-submission version) Plan in autumn 2023.

Hastings Development Management Plan, September 2015

The plan delivers the strategic policies and proposals set out in the adopted Hastings Planning Strategy. It looks towards measures that efficiently manage movement within the town as well as supporting local access by walking, cycling and public transport, to move Hastings towards a more sustainable transport future. The accompanying Infrastructure Delivery Plan sets out the infrastructure requirements, including transport, needed to support sustainable growth in the town which includes measures in the HBMAP.

Rother

Rother Local Plan Adopted Core Strategy, September 2014

Measures aim to foster more sustainable travel patterns. Overall strategy objectives include improving road, rail, bus and cycling access within Bexhill and between the town and Hastings, via an integrated sustainable local transport strategy, and a cycle network that focuses on 'utility' routes to the town centre, schools, colleges and workplaces, and recreational routes into the Countryside Park and along the seafront. The accompanying Infrastructure Delivery Plan sets out the infrastructure requirements, including transport, needed to support sustainable growth in the town which includes measures in the HBMAP.

Active Rother: Rother Sport and Physical Activity Strategy, 2018 - 2022

This strategy seeks to promote physical activity in Rother by facilitating flexible, attractive and sustainable opportunities to participate. It seeks to utilise behaviour change approaches to help support inactive individuals into sport and physical activity opportunities.

2.4. Need for intervention:

The HBMAP packages include walking and cycling infrastructure improvements; bus infrastructure improvements, including Real Time Passenger Information; traffic management measures including pedestrian crossings, junction improvements and school safety zones; and public realm improvements.

There are no negative externalities associated with the implementation of the proposed HBMAP packages. This is because the packages of schemes proposed would help to achieve the ambitions of Government, SELEP, ESCC and other key partners, as set out in the policy documents outlined above as follows:

- **Address the climate emergency**

To help achieve the ESCC Climate Emergency Plan aim of becoming net zero by 2050 at the latest, there is a need to drive modal shift by bringing forward schemes, such as those within HBMAP, to improve accessibility and journey quality for pedestrians and cyclists and public transport users. Making junctions easier to navigate for active mode users will also attract additional users who perceived junction safety as a barrier to modal shift.

- **Increase local economic growth**

There is a need to facilitate and enable sustainable growth to the local economy. This need is clearly reflected in key policy documents including the Hastings Planning Strategy (and emerging Local Plan) and ESCC Council Plan which both highlight the need to deliver key sustainable transport infrastructure projects to support business growth, create jobs and enable the delivery of new homes. The Government is also clear on the need to encourage sustainable local travel and economic growth by making walking, cycling and public transport more attractive and effective, which will reduce reliance on the private car, thus promoting lower carbon transport and tackling local road congestion.

- **Increase physical activity and improve health and well-being**

Positive externalities experienced would be through improved public health associated with the implementation of the package of measures, and the provision of independent mobility for those who cannot drive, choose not to drive, or do not have access to a car.

- **Improve safety and reduce casualties**

Providing improved access would improve safety (such as through pedestrian crossings) which would not only give people the confidence to change the way they travel but would reduce the negative human and health costs associated with accidents.

- **Reduce road congestion and emissions**

Improvements proposed would reduce negative externalities, such as air pollution; improving and enabling more people to travel in a sustainable manner would reduce car usage and lessen carbon emissions and their associated negative health implications.

- **Improve connectivity and access to jobs, education, training and leisure**

The growing popularity of walking and cycling, alongside the positive changes taking place in the towns and the proven health benefits that walking and cycling provides, means this a timely opportunity to work with partners to embed walking and cycling improvements and initiatives into the daily lives of local communities and for visitors to the towns.

2.5. Sources of funding:

There are no other available funding sources for the schemes proposed at this time apart from the £9,000,000 LGF funding already awarded and £671,809 of development contributions potentially available. At present, £130,809 is already held by ESCC and the remaining £541,000 will be sought from available contributions during the 2023/24 financial year.

2.6. Impact of non-intervention (do nothing):

Future issues and opportunities

As clearly outlined as part of the strategic case, the packages of schemes form a critical element of the infrastructure required to unlock development and support economic growth in the Hastings and Bexhill area. They also form part of the wider package of infrastructure needed to mitigate future problems and maximise opportunities, arising from planned growth in the Hastings and Bexhill area, as set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plans for the respective Local Plans.

The HBMAP will be contributing towards overcoming some of the key issues identified earlier in Table 9 in Section 2.1, focussed on encouraging modal shift, reducing vehicle congestion and improving connectivity and accessibility.

Section 2.1 also outlines future large scale infrastructure projects, including the plans for High Speed Rail services from Hastings and Bexhill to London via Ashford; significant commercial and residential development; a move towards the area becoming a regional shopping and cultural destination; and the growing desire to maximise the use of technology and communication to enable 'smart mobility' for both drivers and those using public transport.

By not investing in these measures, the likelihood of being able to achieve a step-change in the number of people using sustainable transport modes in the future would be reduced and congestion and the associated impacts (journey times and carbon emissions) could potentially increase, and at the very least will be exacerbated by future growth plans in the area. In addition, the lack of connectivity and accessibility will continue to negatively impact

on access to local employment, training and educational opportunities and reduce health and wellbeing.

Section 3.1 of the original business case in **Appendix G** outlines in more detail the original option assessments for the HBMAP programme and Section 3.1 of this business case outlines the additional options assessments.

2.7. Objectives of intervention:

The HBMAP objectives are outlined below:

1. Help address the climate emergency by encouraging increased modal shift to active modes and public transport.
2. Support economic growth by reducing traffic congestion and improving safety.
3. Support accessibility and enhance social inclusion with access to improved integrated public transport provision and infrastructure.
4. Increase physical activity and improve health and wellbeing by supporting connectivity between key services, enabling an increase in walking and cycling for everyday journeys.
5. Support greater inward investment, particularly the growing cultural and tourism sectors within the town centres, by improving the physical environment and enhancing permeability.
6. Ensure integration of the programme with related key infrastructure projects being delivered to support future sustainable growth and smart mobility.

Problems or opportunities the HBMAP seeks to address

Listed below are the key problems which have been addressed in the 'Need for Intervention' section. These have been numbered and correspond with those in Table 11. It has been decided to focus on the key problems and not the opportunities as comparisons with the scoring of these will be far easier if focusing on one or the other. Also, each problem would have a corresponding opportunity, so the opportunities would also be a (reflective) duplication of the problems.

1. Lack of (inward) investment in the strategic and local highway network is inhibiting sustainable economic growth

- Inefficient movement of people and goods is restricting economic growth.
- More reliable journey times and less congestion would attract inward investment from the business community.
- Difficulty accessing key attractions through poor access would deter people from re-visiting these towns and not improve local economic growth.
- Development sites are 'locked' by poor access to walking and cycling links.

2. Congestion on the local road network is leading to increased journey times and increase in carbon emissions

- Local congestion on key sections of the A21 / A259 Hastings and Bexhill road network.
- Conflicts at key junctions.

3. Poor walking and cycling infrastructure

- Poor accessibility to employment, education and leisure opportunities.

- Poor access by walking and cycling to Bexhill town centre.
- Poor pedestrian access across main roads, with traffic and car parks dominating the seafront.
- Poor pedestrian and cycle access and priority in the Town Centre, limiting access for all.
- Poor accessibility to key services and facilities prohibits take up of walking and cycling.

4. Poor bus infrastructure

- Poor bus infrastructure including absence of more widely available real time information.
- Absence of bus shelters affect quality of waiting times in extreme weather conditions.
- Lack of clear information, including bus time reliability, through the absence of real time information.

5. Unacceptable public realm environment prohibiting/restricting good access

- Unclear signage to direct people where to go to access key services and destinations.
- Poor quality of street furniture.

6. Safety implications associated with the poor local highway network

- Junction Improvements – improving safety and reducing congestion.
- Absence of appropriate traffic signals affect safety and can worsen congestion.

Table 11 – Objectives and how these address each of the problems

Objectives	Problems Identified in Need for Intervention section					
	1 Lack of investment restricting growth	2 Congestion on the local road network	3 Poor walking and cycling infrastructure	4 Poor bus infrastructure	5 Unacceptable public realm environment	6 Safety implications associated with the poor local highway network
Objective 1 - Help address the climate emergency by encouraging increased modal shift to active modes and public transport.	✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓
Objective 2 - Support sustainable economic growth by reducing traffic congestion and improving safety	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓	✓✓✓
Objective 3 - Support accessibility and enhance social inclusion with access to improved integrated public transport provision and infrastructure	✓✓	✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓✓	✓
Objective 4 - Increase physical activity and improve health and wellbeing by supporting connectivity between key services, enabling an increase in walking and cycling for everyday journeys	✓	✓	✓✓✓	✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓
Objective 5 - Support greater inward investment, particularly the growing cultural and tourism sectors within the town centres, by improving physical environment and enhancing permeability	✓✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓✓	✓✓
Objective 6 - Ensure integration of the programme with related key infrastructure projects being delivered to support future sustainable growth and smart mobility	✓✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓

2.8. Constraints:

There are no major constraints, which have been identified, which will affect the remaining delivery of the HBMAP.

2.9. Scheme dependencies:

There are no overall related or dependent activities that would result in the full economic benefits of current HBMAP not being realised.

As outlined in Section 3.1 of the original business case (in **Appendix G**), the packages of schemes were originally selected because they could be delivered independently of other transport infrastructure projects being delivered within this area of the county.

Secondly, the HBMAP is the first tranche of potential future movement and access transport infrastructure programmes, proposed for delivery across both Bexhill & Hastings. In developing the original HBMAP, an assessment was undertaken to identify which schemes could be delivered according to a number of key variables, including:

- maximising the support to local sustainable economic growth;
- delivery within the LGF timescale;
- existing stakeholder approval and support; and
- low level risks, with a proposal for mitigation.

As identified in the Risk Management Strategy (see **Appendix B**), a number of risks have been identified, which have the potential to impact on scheme deliverability.

The overarching key risks that have been identified and which the scheme delivery was, and continues to be, dependent on, include:

- **Stakeholder management / public consultation approval** – Need to continue to support the existing key stakeholder framework to support public consultation with the individual schemes included in the HBMAP to ensure schemes are agreed and approved for delivery within the proposed timescales.
- **Human Resource Availability** – Given the scale of the programme and complexity of some measures, the need for an appropriate level of resource, with the necessary skill set remains paramount. To mitigate this impact on delivery, early contractor involvement has been undertaken with East Sussex Highways, and a governance structure developed as outlined in **Appendix E**.

It is important to note that whilst HBMAP was a large programme of schemes, ESCC is highly experienced in delivering these types of schemes, and many of the schemes will extend existing programmes of works.

2.10. Expected benefits:

Planned Development

The gross job outputs which the package delivered indirectly within the initial 2017/18 to 2020/21 LGF funding period, as well as the employment floor space, are set out in Tables 12 and 13.

Table 12 - Bexhill – Jobs, Commercial Floor Space and Homes

Bexhill	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total	Notes
Jobs	-11	397	144	8	538	Assuming 1 worker per 30sqm of employment floorspace.
Employment Floor space (sqm)	-319	11,921	4,312	250	16,164	This is the total amount of employment floorspace completed over the monitoring period.
Homes	186	255	247	175	863	

Table 13 – Hastings – Jobs, Commercial Floor Space and Homes

Hastings	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Total	Notes
Jobs	46	-42	39	7	50	Assuming 1 worker per 30sqm of employment floorspace.
Employment Floor space (sqm)	1371	-1266	1174	222	1,501	This is the total amount of employment floorspace completed over the monitoring period.
Homes	204	178	86	111	579	

The number of new homes and jobs identified above are set out in the Rother Local Plan and the Hastings Local Plan and the package will indirectly support the delivery of these homes and proposed employment floor space. The programme will serve to improve the capacity across all modes of travel on the key corridors of movement and access across Hastings and Bexhill and will facilitate future development coming forward to support greater accessibility.

Economic Appraisal – Key Outputs

The overall BCR for all four HBMAP packages combined is 3.49 (High), the individual packages have the following BCR's:

- Walking and Cycling – 4.51 (Very High)
- Public Transport – 2.58 (High)
- Traffic Management 4.37 (Very High)
- Public Realm 3.18 (High)

Maximising Programme Benefits

There are a number of projects which have recently been implemented or will be taking place, during the LGF period, which will complement and add value to the HBMAP. These include:

Investment in bus infrastructure and services

Stagecoach, who operate the vast majority of services in the scheme area, have contributed to bus service and infrastructure improvements in the area by:

- Working with ESCC to roll out a countywide RTPI system.
- Supporting smaller bus operators to equip their services with real time technology so as to allow all bus users to benefit.
- Ensuring that all buses are now wheelchair accessible and buggy friendly, although only a small proportion of bus stops in the area can be considered as fully accessible.
- Facilitating contactless payment and app-based ticket sales on all services.

Additional investment in the frequency and timings of bus services in Hastings¹ and Rother² funded through the County Council's successful Bus Service Improvement Plan (BSIP) bid approved in July 2022 will augment the previous investment made by local bus operators.

In addition, capital funding has been used to invest in bus priority measures along the A259 Bexhill Road corridor with Phase 1 (Glyne Gap to Harley Shute Road) completed; Phase 2 (westbound approach to Glyne Gap) due for completion in 2023/24 and Phase 3 (Harley Shute Road to Filsham Road) currently under development.

Active Access for Growth

ESCC was successful in securing DfT Access funding to enable the delivery of ESCC Active Access for Growth Programme between 2017/18 and 2019/20. This focussed on delivering walking and cycling initiatives aimed an inspiring longer term walking and cycling activity across our growth areas which include Hastings and Bexhill for businesses, education providers, those seeking employment, and within local community settings.

2.11. Key risks:

The key risks associated with the HBMAP were summarised in the Table 14 overleaf.

As outlined in Section 6.6, and the Risk Management Strategy outlined in **Appendix B**, the key risks for this programme are focussed on the critical linkage and time scales associated with the engagement with key stakeholders, the preliminary design, public consultation and approval.

The other key risk is associated with the potential to be increased costs to the design and delivery of the programme, given the feasibility stage of the majority of the schemes included within the programme.

¹ [Hastings Borough Bus Service Improvements | East Sussex County Council](#) – information as at 7 August 2023

² [Rother District Bus Service Improvements | East Sussex County Council](#) – information as at 7 August 2023

Table 14 – Summary of Risks

Key Risk Area	Risk
Financial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design/build costs of scheme exceed estimated costs due to significant increases in prices as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic and the war in Ukraine, resulting in a reduction to programme delivery. • Costs could increase - as a result of delay and unknown issues arising on site when construction commences, due to feasibility stage of schemes included within the programme.
Commercial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negative or low public response rate to consultation on programme design proposals. • Major objections to the schemes within the programme on issues not previously raised or foreseen affecting delivery.
Economic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Growth in walking, cycling and public transport use is not achieved, impacting on local economic benefits as congestion on the road network increases thereby affecting road time reliability as well as health/wellbeing benefits. • Planned development does not come forward, reducing the economic benefits of the proposed transport infrastructure measures.
Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of resources available to design and deliver the programme, due in part to the COVID-19 pandemic, will cause delays. • Conflict of opinion between key stakeholders on the programme may delay anticipated timescales. • Objections / issues may arise during and post implementation of the programme. • Any identified environmental impacts may delay the delivery of the programme. • The measures during and post construction may have a negative impact on the general public.
Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced safety implications from not introducing some of the measures to support cycling and pedestrian safety.

3. ECONOMIC CASE

3.1. Options assessment:

Section 3.1 of the original business case (in **Appendix G**) details the options assessment originally undertaken that selected the full scheme option for the HBMAP.

Following approval of the original business case, all schemes were subject to further stakeholder consultation and review. This, coupled with the original economic appraisal, resulted in some schemes not being taken forward and therefore discounted; some schemes being constructed or scheduled for construction (the Phase 1 schemes); and some schemes being deferred and subject to reassessment to consider any demand, design and cost changes since the original 2017 appraisal (the Phase 2 schemes).

In total thirteen schemes were discounted, and eleven schemes were classified as Phase 1 schemes, with ten constructed between 2017/18 and 2022/23 and one scheme to be constructed in 2023/24.

Five schemes were classified as Phase 2 schemes and deferred, subject to reassessment:

- WC 1 - Hastings Western Pedestrian and Cycle Route
- WC 4 - East & North Bexhill Cycle Routes
- PR 1 - Hastings - Gateway from Town Centre and Seafront
- PR 2 - Hastings - Gateway Transport Hub to Town Centre
- PR 5b - Bexhill London Road Corridor Improvement Scheme (Buckhurst Place)

During the initial reassessment process, three of the schemes were reduced in scope:

- Scheme WC 4 was split into two reduced length sections of cycle route known as WC 4a - Bexhill Cycle Route A and WC 4b - Bexhill Cycle Route B.
- Scheme PR 1 was reduced in scope to cover only the Albert Road / Denmark Place junction.
- Scheme PR 2 was reduced in scope to cover only the Station Approach / Cornwallis Terrace / Devonshire Road / Havelock Road junction.

With WC4 split into two separate schemes making six in total, these Phase 2 schemes were then subject to a further economic appraisal and the results of this appraisal were presented to key stakeholders during an additional consultation.

Based on the outcome of the additional economic appraisal and stakeholder consultation, and taking into consideration budgetary constraints, schemes WC 1, WC 4b and PR 5b were discounted, and **schemes WC 4a, PR1 and PR2 were recommended for construction and so were included in the final Phase 1 and Phase 2 preferred scheme list for each package.**

Tables 15 to 18 show the status of all original HBMAP schemes.

Table 15 - Walking and Cycling Package Options Assessment Outcomes

Scheme No	Scheme Description	Outcome
WC 1	Hastings Western Pedestrian and Cycle Route	Discounted in Phase 2 due to stakeholder feedback and budgetary considerations.
WC 2	Alexandra Park Cycle Route	Not taken forward due to a decision by Hastings Borough Council not to support the route running through the park which is in their ownership.
WC 3	Alexandra Park to Conquest Hospital Cycle Route	Not taken forward due to a decision in December 2022 by Hastings Borough Council to not allow the cycling through Alexandra Park, and therefore this route will not have the wider links utilising the park.
WC 4a	Bexhill Cycle Route A	Recommended for construction in Phase 2 review.
WC 4b	Bexhill Cycle Route B	Discounted in Phase 2 due to deliverability risk.
WC 5	Collington Avenue pedestrian crossing	Constructed in Phase 1.
WC 8	Improving /rationalising signing and marking for NCN Route 2	Not taken forward due to insufficient footway width.
WC 9	Pedestrian crossing at Cambridge Road / Cornwallis Gardens junction	Not taken forward as junction too wide to introduce pedestrian facilities while still facilitating the necessary vehicular movements.
WC 12	Pedestrian crossing on Gillsmans Hill plus traffic calming	Not taken forward as traffic calming measures were not favoured by emergency services or local groups.
WC 13	Havelock Road pedestrian crossing and taxi rank access	Not taken forward as Police and taxi objected to obstructing the existing taxi bays, as part of wider localised social factors within the area.
WC 14	Pedestrian crossing near The Ridge in the vicinity of the cemetery	Constructed in Phase 1.
WC 15	Pedestrian Crossing near Sandown Primary School	Constructed in Phase 1.
WC 16	Cycle Parking Hastings	Not taken forward as concentrating resources on longer cycle route options above.
WC 17	Cycle Parking Bexhill Package	Not taken forward as concentrating resources on longer cycle route options above.
WC 18	Cycle Counter – Bexhill & Hastings	Not taken forward as concentrating resources on longer cycle route options above.

Table 16 – Public Transport Package Options Assessment Outcomes

Scheme No	Scheme Description	Outcome
PT 1	Real Time Passenger Information (RTPI) at bus stops across Hastings and Bexhill	Constructed in Phase 1.
PT 2	Bus Stop Accessibility Improvements - Bus Stop Clearways / High Access Kerbs (bus stop poles) / Bus Shelters	Constructed in Phase 1.
PT 3	The Ridge Bus Stop Improvements	Constructed in Phase 1.

Table 17 – Traffic Management Package Options Assessment Outcomes

Scheme No	Scheme Description	Outcome
TM 1	Variable message parking signs (VMS) in Hastings	Not taken forward as, although the study was completed, the technology had progressed.
TM 2	Improvement of pedestrian crossings over segregated left turns of Dorset Road in Bexhill	Not taken forward as outline review concluded pedestrian safety could not be achieved with the road widths associated with the turning movements at the junction.
TM 3	Redesign the junction with Bethune Way and Elphinstone Road in Hastings	Not taken forward as roundabout performing as well in existing layout.
TM 4	Pedestrian crossing along Hastings Battle Road near Old Harrow Road	Constructed in Phase 1.
TM 5	Introduction of traffic signals at the junction of Cooden Drive / Westcourt Drive	Constructed in Phase 1.
TM 6	A269 junction improvements	Not taken forward as junction improvements would cause over-capacity issues on the road network which were not deemed acceptable.

Table 18 – Public Realm Package Options Assessment Outcomes

Scheme No	Scheme Description	Outcome
PR 1	Hastings - Gateway from Town Centre and Seafront (Albert Road)	Recommended for construction in Phase 2 review.
PR 2	Hastings - Gateway Transport Hub to Town Centre (Station Approach)	Recommended for construction in Phase 2 review.
PR 3	Hastings - Extension of shared space and pedestrian crossing facilities in the town centre	Scheme fund reallocated to the Hastings Public Realm and Green Connections scheme (Hastings Town Deal funded) and to be constructed in 2026.
PR 4	Hastings - Wayfinding Signs	Constructed in Phase 1.
PR 5a	Bexhill - London Road Corridor Improvement Scheme (Sackville Road and Beeching Road junction improvements)	Constructed in Phase 1.
PR 5b	Bexhill - London Road Corridor Improvement Scheme (Buckhurst Place roundabout improvement)	Discounted in Phase 2 due to budgetary considerations.

3.2. Preferred option:

As a result of the options assessment process the preferred option was selected for each package of schemes and the selected schemes in each package are detailed in Tables 19 to 22 overleaf.

Table 19 - Walking and Cycling Preferred Scheme Package

Scheme No	Scheme Description	Status
WC 4a	Bexhill Cycle Route A	Planned for construction 2023/24 to 2025/26.
WC 5	Collington Avenue pedestrian crossing	Constructed in Phase 1.
WC 14	Pedestrian crossing near The Ridge in the vicinity of the cemetery	Constructed in Phase 1.
WC 15	Pedestrian Crossing near Sandown Primary School	Constructed in Phase 1.

Table 20 – Public Transport Package Preferred Scheme Package

Scheme No	Scheme Description	Outcome
PT 1	Real Time Passenger Information (RTPI) at bus stops across Hastings and Bexhill	Constructed in Phase 1.
PT 2	Bus Stop Accessibility Improvements - Bus Stop Clearways / High Access Kerbs (bus stop poles) / Bus Shelters	Constructed in Phase 1.
PT 3	The Ridge Bus Stop Improvements	Constructed in Phase 1.

Table 21 – Traffic Management Preferred Scheme Package

Scheme No	Scheme Description	Outcome
TM 4	Pedestrian crossing along Hastings Battle Road near Old Harrow Road	Constructed in Phase 1.
TM 5	Introduction of traffic signals at the junction of Cooden Drive / Westcourt Drive	Constructed in Phase 1.

Table 22 – Public Realm Package Preferred Scheme Package

Scheme No	Scheme Description	Outcome
PR 1	Hastings - Gateway from Town Centre and Seafront (Albert Road)	Planned for construction 2023/24 to 2024/25.
PR 2	Hastings - Gateway Transport Hub to Town Centre (Station Approach)	Planned for construction 2023/24 to 2024/25.
PR 3	Hastings - Extension of shared space and pedestrian crossing facilities in the town centre	Scheme fund reallocated to the Hastings Public Realm and Green Connections Programme and to be constructed in 2026
PR 4	Hastings - Wayfinding Signs	Constructed in Phase 1.
PR 5a	Bexhill - London Road Corridor Improvement Scheme (Sackville Road and Beeching Road junction improvements)	Constructed in Phase 1.

3.3. Assessment approach:

Overall approach to assessment

The Phase 1 and preferred Phase 2 schemes within the packages have each been assessed individually and the resultant outputs combined to produce a total value cost and benefits assessment for each package. The present values of benefits and costs for the combined packages have also been considered to provide a holistic picture of the value for money offered by the package of schemes as a whole.

The preferred scheme options forming each package (the “Do Something”) were considered against a “Do Nothing” scenario in which no schemes are implemented. Further details on the approach to the Phase 1 and 2 assessments are set out below.

The benefits and costs are all calculated in terms of relative changes to the “Do Nothing” scenario. In this way, the assessment takes account of all foreseeable impacts of the proposed schemes. By setting these against the predicted costs of delivering the scheme, an assessment is then made of the value for money. This makes it possible to compare different schemes in a fair and objective way.

The expected impacts of the scheme have been assessed and, where possible, expressed in monetary terms. These include:

- Construction costs
- Road user time (the effects of congestion, delay and route availability);
- Vehicle operating costs (fuel etc.);
- Accident costs;
- Value of health and other benefits from use of active travel modes;
- Noise;
- Local Air Quality;
- Greenhouse Gases;
- Journey Quality; and
- Indirect taxation;

Where it has not been possible to quantify impacts in monetary terms, the benefits have been described in qualitative terms.

Approach to reliability assessment

A reliability assessment has not been completed for this business case as – whilst the combined packages represent a total cost of £9.36m – the individual schemes making up the packages are smaller than £2m, except for Scheme WC 4a - Bexhill Cycle Route A which has a cost estimate of £2.47m in out-turn prices, including risk and contingency.

Scheme impacts would be expected to accrue across the Hastings and Bexhill area, but the impacts are expected to be dispersed rather than in measurable concentrations in a few locations.

Approach to individual scheme value for money assessment

To determine an appropriate quantification and monetisation of scheme impacts for each scheme in the Walking and Cycling, Traffic Management and Public Realm packages the same methodology was adopted:

- Utilising the Propensity to Cycle Tool and National Travel Survey data to understand current cycling and walking demand, based on spatial analysis in a Geographical Information System.
- Following the ATF Tranche 4 Value for Money Guidance, the base demands and scheme costs were input into the DfT Uplifts Tool and Cost Benchmarks (2023) which generated estimates of with scheme demands based on the type of intervention. As recommended by the Tool guidance, the Central growth scenario was adopted.
- Transport for London's (TfL) ABC tool was then utilised to assess the total journey ambience benefits of each scheme.
- The DfT's AMAT (November 2022) was then used to appraise each of the proposed schemes.
- For schemes with the potential to accrue additional accident savings beyond those captured within the AMAT mode shift benefits, STATS19 data was interrogated to obtain the number of accidents and casualties at that location. The accident saving benefits from introducing the scheme were quantified based on based on a DfT commissioned study on the Interim Evaluation of the Implementation of 20 mph Speed Limits in Portsmouth³ which highlighted that previous research had suggested average speed reductions of about 1mph result in accident reductions of about 5% for roads with similar traffic flows.

To determine an appropriate quantification and monetisation of scheme impacts for each scheme in the Public Transport package the following methodology was adopted:

- Annual bus passenger numbers in 2016/17 were obtained from the local bus company for a selection of bus stops.
- Due to the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic, zero growth in passenger numbers was assumed between 2016/17 and 2023/24 when the scheme opened.
- The increase in public transport patronage was estimated based on a growth of a quarter of 3% (to account for the fact that not all the bus stops were being upgraded with RTPI).
- The total user quality benefits related to the introduction of RTPI were then calculated, based on Table M3.2.1 of TAG Databook (May 2023).

It should also be noted that it is not usual practice to appraise schemes after construction, however, for HBMAP it was important to appraise all schemes taken forward in each package and many of the schemes included in each package in the original economic appraisal were either not taken forward; taken forward in part; amended in their design; subject to cost changes or construction delays; or now have additional information available to enable quantitative assessment.

³ <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+/http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/roadsafety/research/rsrr/theme4/interimeval20mphspeedlimits.pdf>

For all schemes already constructed, the reappraisal assumed the appraisal year was still 2017 to be consistent with the original assessment. The AMAT, however, only allows appraisal years of 2018 or later and so, as no schemes opened before 2018, 2018 was set to be the appraisal year and discounted costs were calculated outside of the toolkit and added back in.

There will also be a very minor increase in health benefits as they should be fixed at 1.5% per annum from the year of appraisal and not one year after.

Sensitivity tests

For the Walking and Cycling, Traffic Management and Public Realm package sensitivity tests, the Low, Medium and High scenarios from the DfT’s ATF Tranche 4 Uplifts Tool and Cost Benchmarks (2023) were all appraised.

For the Public Transport package, sensitivity tests were undertaken based on the following assumptions:

- Low – Assume only 50% of the assessed benefits from RTP1 implementation occur
- High – Assume a 30-year appraisal period instead of 20 years.

3.4. Economic appraisal inputs:

The appraisal used TAG Databook (May 2023) and the assessment periods for all schemes, regardless of phase, are set out in Table 23.

Table 23 – Assessment Periods

Package	Appraisal period	Rationale
Walking and Cycling Schemes	20	Consistent with Cycle City Ambition bids.
Public Transport Schemes	20	Maximum asset lifetime
Traffic Management Schemes	20	Whilst WebTAG recommends a 60-year appraisal, a conservative 20-year appraisal was used to enable consistent comparison between the four packages
Public Realm Schemes	20	Consistent with other schemes and asset lifetime

Optimum bias and risk

For all Phase 2 schemes, during the cost estimation process, a risk adjustment uplift was applied to account for risk and contingency depending on level of scheme design. This uplift was calculated by Quantity Surveyors within WSP and Costain to be:

- 40% for schemes WC 4 - East & North Bexhill Cycle Routes (Routes 1 – 9) and PR 5b - Bexhill - London Road Corridor Improvement Scheme (Buckhurst Place roundabout improvement);
- 30% for Schemes WC 1 - Hastings Western Pedestrian and Cycle Route and PR 2 - Hastings - Gateway Transport Hub to Town Centre; and
- 13% for Scheme PR 1 - Hastings - Gateway from Town Centre and Seafront.

In May 2022, TAG Unit A1-2 (Scheme Costs) was updated with a revised approach to risk and optimism bias in economic appraisal. The updated guidance advised that a comparison

should be made between the risk-adjusted cost and optimism-bias adjusted cost, with the larger of the two values being used within the economic appraisal.

TAG Unit A1-2 suggests an optimism bias uplift of 23% for schemes of this nature at the Outline Business Case stage and so, for schemes WC 1, WC 4, PR 2 and PR 5b, the larger of the two is the risk adjustment uplift and so this was used to inform the economic appraisal of these schemes. For Scheme PR 1, the optimism bias uplift is the larger of the two and so the optimism bias uplift was used in the economic appraisal of this scheme.

For all Phase 1 schemes, no optimism bias, risk or contingency uplift has been applied as the scheme costs represent the actual construction out-turn costs that were spent by ESCC during each scheme's construction period.

Maintenance costs

Based on appraisals undertaken for similar schemes, maintenance costs have been assumed to be 5% of the total scheme cost (excluding optimism bias) every 10 years of the scheme appraisal period. All maintenance costs will be met as part of the maintenance regime operated by ESCC.

Out-turn price adjustment

The cost estimates (based on market price) assume a price base of 2023. For the Phase 2 schemes, an allowance was made for expected inflation between the date of the estimate and the date when the expenditure is expected to occur. In addition, a further 3% inflation contingency has been added per annum to account for the extreme volatility in construction inflation at present.

Scheme cost assumptions

The scheme costs of each of the preferred packages of schemes were calculated in 2023 prices and are shown in Table 24 below. It should be noted that no sunk costs have been included. For Phase 1 schemes, all costs prior to 2017/18 were assumed to be sunk costs and for Phase 2 schemes all costs prior to 2023/24 have been assumed to be sunk costs.

Table 24 – Scheme Costs

	Walking and Cycling	Public Transport	Traffic Management	Public Realm	All Four Packages
Preparation and construction cost – excluding Risk and Optimism Bias (2023 prices)	£1,923,850	£1,085,609	£485,166	£3,456,790	£6,951,415
Preparation and construction cost – including larger of Risk or Optimism Bias (2023 prices)	£2,396,250	£1,085,609	£485,166	£3,926,343	£7,893,368
Private sector contributions (2023 prices)	£459,000	£0	£110,809	£102,000	£671,809
Preparation and construction cost (2010 prices and values, taking into account private sector contributions)	£1,156,801	£778,141	£240,931	£2,258,487	£4,434,360
Maintenance Costs (2010 prices and values)	£42,316	£18,124	£8,456	£59,707	£128,603
Total scheme cost (2010 prices and values, taking into account private sector contributions)	£1,199,117	£796,265	£249,387	£2,318,194	£4,562,962

3.5. Economic appraisal assumptions and results:

For the Walking and Cycling, Traffic Management and Public Realm packages, the key assumptions applied in the appraisal were:

- Current cycling and walking demands were derived from spatial analysis of the Propensity to Cycle Tool and National Travel Survey data.
- Following the ATF Tranche 4 Value for Money Guidance, the DfT Uplifts Tool and Cost Benchmarks (2023) was used to generate estimates of with scheme demands based on the type of intervention and as recommended by the Tool guidance, the Central growth scenario was adopted.
- Accident benefits were calculated by applying low (12.5%) / medium (25%) / high (50%) accident savings against average annual accidents determined from observed Personal Injury Accidents (PIAs) in the study area in the five years prior to construction.
- Scheme benefits were calculated using a combination of the DfT Active Model Appraisal Toolkit (November 2022) and the Transport for London Ambience Benefit Calculator.
- The average value of prevention per casualty by severity and element of cost was taken from Table A4.1.1 of the TAG Data Book (May 2023)
- A 20-year appraisal period was assumed.

For the Public Transport package, the key assumptions applied in the appraisal were:

- Annual bus passenger numbers in 2016/17 obtained from the local bus company were representative;
- Due to the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic, zero growth in passenger numbers was assumed between 2016/17 and 2023/24 when the scheme opened;
- The increase in public transport patronage was estimated based on a growth of a quarter of 3% (to account for the fact that not all the bus stops were being upgraded with RTPI);
- The total user quality benefits related to the introduction of RTPI were calculated based on Table M3.2.1 of TAG Databook (May 2023); and
- A 20-year appraisal period was assumed.

In addition, for Phase 1 schemes, all costs prior to 2017/18 were assumed to be sunk costs and for Phase 2 schemes all costs prior to 2023/24 have been assumed to be sunk costs.

Table 25 overleaf summarises the appraisal results.

The appraisal results show that the Public Transport and Public Realm packages both represent **High** value for money and the Walking and Cycling and Traffic Management packages both represent **Very High** value for money. All four packages combined also represents **High** value for money.

Table 25 – Appraisal Results

Benefits and Costs (in £'000s)	Walking and Cycling	Public Transport	Traffic Management	Public Realm	All Four Packages
Congestion benefit	85.03	0.00	23.31	190.78	299.12
Infrastructure	0.42	0.00	0.12	0.95	1.49
Accident	384.42	0.00	256.62	137.07	778.11
Local Air Quality	0.65	0.00	0.18	1.42	2.24
Noise	0.91	0.00	0.25	2.04	3.20
Greenhouse Gases	6.60	0.00	1.79	14.17	22.56
Reduced risk of premature death	1451.05	0.00	438.87	3309.56	5199.48
Absenteeism	344.81	0.00	113.70	781.31	1239.83
Journey Ambience	3398.73	0.00	339.15	2992.81	6730.69
Indirect Taxation	-1.63	0.00	-0.42	-2.75	-4.79
Investment costs	1156.81	778.14	241.30	2258.49	4434.73
Operating costs	42.32	18.12	8.46	59.71	128.60
Private contributions	263.81	0.00	83.15	58.22	405.19
Present Value of Benefits (PVB)	5406.76	2054.27	1090.29	7368.18	15919.50
Present Value of Costs (PVC)	1198.70	796.27	249.64	2317.24	4561.84
Net Present Value (NPV)	4208.06	1258.00	840.66	5050.94	11357.66
Benefit-Cost Ratio (BCR)	4.51	2.58	4.37	3.18	3.49
Value for Money (VfM) Category	Very High	High	Very High	High	High

3.6. Sensitivity tests:

For the Walking and Cycling, Traffic Management and Public Realm package sensitivity tests, the Low, Medium and High scenarios from the DfT's ATF Tranche 4 Uplifts Tool and Cost Benchmarks (2023) were all appraised.

For the Public Transport package, sensitivity tests were undertaken based on the following assumptions:

- Low - Assume that only 50% of the assessed benefits from RTPi implementation occur
- High - Assume a 30-year appraisal period instead of 20 years.

The sensitivity test results are summarised overleaf in Table 26.

The sensitivity tests indicated that all four packages combined represent between **High** (2.89) and **Very High** (5.15) value for money

Table 26 – Sensitivity Tests

		Walking and Cycling	Public Transport	Traffic Management	Public Realm	All Four Packages
Low	PVB	4906.11	1027.14	1021.42	6242.25	13196.92
	PVC	1198.79	796.27	249.65	2317.49	4562.19
	NPV	3707.32	230.87	771.77	3924.76	8634.73
	BCR	4.09	1.29	4.09	2.69	2.89
Medium	PVB	5764.73	2054.27	1308.01	7959.07	17086.08
	PVC	1198.57	796.27	249.59	2317.12	4561.55
	NPV	4566.16	1258.00	1058.42	5641.95	12524.53
	BCR	4.81	2.58	5.24	3.43	3.75
High	PVB	7570.05	2954.34	1834.11	11108.77	23467.27
	PVC	1198.10	796.27	249.49	2316.44	4560.31
	NPV	6371.95	2158.07	1584.61	8792.33	18906.96
	BCR	6.32	3.71	7.35	4.80	5.15

Sunk Cost Sensitivity Test

As highlighted earlier, initially, delivery of all the package of schemes was scheduled to be between 2018/19 and 2020/21. However, due to the delays as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic and increases in construction costs as a result of the war in Ukraine, scheme delivery was delayed and was split into two phases with the first phase of schemes being delivered between 2018/19 and 2023/24 and the second phase of schemes planned for delivery between 2023/24 – 2025/26.

These delays have resulted in additional costs due to schemes needing to be redesigned. These costs are above the normal costs typically accrued during the scheme scoping and design process.

The delays and increases in construction costs have also led to a higher proportion of schemes not being taken forward as costs have become prohibitive and these schemes have mostly already accrued what are now abortive costs.

All these additional scheme costs for the aborted schemes and schemes delayed until Phase 2 have not impacted the value for money appraisal as these costs are all considered to be aborted scheme sunk costs.

In total, ten of the schemes not taken forward incurred sunk costs of £806,234 in 2023 prices and the three schemes delayed until Phase 2 have incurred sunk costs of £1,158,289 in 2023 prices.

As an additional test, the appraisal of all four packages combined was undertaken again for all growth scenarios, with all aborted and delayed scheme sunk costs being included rather than excluded within the overall combined package scheme costs.

The results of this revised appraisal are summarised in Table 27 and show that all scenarios still represent **High** value for money.

Table 27 – Sunk Cost Test

		Central	Low	Medium	High
All Four Packages	PVB	15919.50	13196.92	17086.08	23467.27
	PVC	5984.10	5984.43	5983.81	5982.56
	NPV	9935.41	7212.49	11102.28	17484.71
	BCR	2.66	2.21	2.86	3.92

3.7. Environmental impacts:

The qualitative environmental impacts are outlined in Table 28.

Table 28 – Environmental Impacts

Environmental Impact	Walking and Cycling	Public Transport	Traffic Management	Public Realm
Noise	Slight beneficial	Neutral	Slight beneficial	Slight beneficial
Air Quality	Slight beneficial	Neutral	Slight beneficial	Slight beneficial
Greenhouse Gases	Slight beneficial	Neutral	Slight beneficial	Slight beneficial
Landscape	Slight adverse	Neutral	Slight adverse	Neutral
Townscape	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Slight beneficial
Heritage	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
Biodiversity	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
Water Environment	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Slight adverse

3.8. Social impacts:

The qualitative social impacts are outlined in Table 29.

Table 29 – Social Impacts

Social Impact	Walking and Cycling	Public Transport	Traffic Management	Public Realm
Accidents	Neutral	Slight Beneficial	Moderate Beneficial	Slight Beneficial
Physical Activity	Moderate Beneficial	Neutral	Neutral	Moderate Beneficial
Security	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Slight Beneficial
Severance	Neutral	Slight Beneficial	Moderate Beneficial	Neutral
Journey Quality	Moderate Beneficial	Slight Beneficial	Slight Beneficial	Slight Beneficial
Option values and non-use values	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Moderate Beneficial
Accessibility	Moderate Beneficial	Slight Beneficial	Slight Beneficial	Slight Beneficial
Personal Affordability	Slight Beneficial	Slight Beneficial	Neutral	Neutral

3.9. Distributional impacts:

Distributional impacts have not been completed for this business case as, whilst the combined packages represent a total cost of £9.36m, the individual schemes making up the packages are smaller than £2m, except for Scheme WC 4a - Bexhill Cycle Route A which has a cost estimate of £2.47m is out-turn prices, including risk and contingency.

Positive wider impacts would be expected to accrue across the Hastings and Bexhill area, but the impacts are expected to be dispersed rather than in measurable concentrations in a few locations. A qualitative score of “**Slight Beneficial**” has been assumed on this basis.

3.10. Wider impacts:

A wider impacts assessment has not been completed for this business case as, whilst the combined packages represent a total cost of £9.36m, the individual schemes making up the packages are smaller than £2m, except for Scheme WC 4a - Bexhill Cycle Route A which has a cost estimate of £2.47m is out-turn prices, including risk and contingency.

In qualitative terms, the packages are aimed at increasing the use of sustainable modes, including walking, cycling and public transport. This will provide some congestion relief which could be expected to provide economic benefits across the wider network, although of a small scale. Positive wider impacts would be expected to accrue across the Hastings and Bexhill area, but the impacts are expected to be dispersed rather than in measurable concentrations in a few locations. A qualitative score of “**Slight Beneficial**” has been assumed on this basis.

3.11. Value for money:

Table 30 represents a summary of the implications of the scheme.

Table 30 – Value for Money Summary

	Walking and Cycling	Public Transport	Traffic Management	Public Realm	All Four Packages
Economic	Very High VfM (BCR is 4.51)	High VfM (BCR is 2.58)	Very High VfM (BCR is 4.37)	High VfM (BCR is 3.18)	High VfM (BCR is 3.49)
Environmental	Slight Beneficial	Neutral	Slight Beneficial	Slight Beneficial	Slight Beneficial
Social	Slight Beneficial	Slight Beneficial	Slight Beneficial	Slight / Moderate Beneficial	Slight Beneficial
Distributional	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
Wider Impacts	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral

The TEE, PA and AMCB tables, along with the Appraisal Summary Table, for each of the packages are included in the DRAFT Economic Appraisal Report (July 2023) in **Appendix F**.

All four packages individually and combined represent **High** or **Very High** value for money with BCR’s between 2.58 and 4.51.

The sensitivity tests also indicated that all four packages combined represent between **High** (2.89) and **Very High** (5.15) value for money.

4. COMMERCIAL CASE

4.1. Procurement options:

As a result of the original scale of funding being sought through the original business case, a **standard approach** to project delivery was, and continues to be, taken to deliver the HBMAP packages of schemes. This means that ESCC will use the East Sussex Highways Infrastructure Services Contract with Balfour Beatty Living Places (BBLP) to undertake both the design and construction of Phase 2 of the programme.

In order to inform this decision, the ESCC Officers from the HBMAP project team have engaged with the Council's Procurement Category Specialist and East Sussex Highways Commercial Team to assess the commercial viability of this project. This included:

- An appraisal of the current market conditions for the delivery of all aspects of the programme.
- Consultation with project and performance management consultants for additional guidance on scheme procurement and best contracting methods.
- An examination of the costs and benefits of each scheme. The results of this analysis, which provide more specific details on the commercial viability and cost benefits of the project, are set out in Section 3.

With the scale of funding available, the programme could be designed and delivered by a consultant and contractor, which would typically been procured through a competitive tender.

However, ESCC has the option to directly commission East Sussex Highways to undertake these works, through a new seven-year contract between ESCC and Balfour Beatty Living Places (BBLP) which commenced in May 2023 with an option to extend to a maximum of 14 years, meaning the contract could run up to 2037. The contract includes the options to procure professional services, including highway design (feasibility, preliminary and detailed design) and infrastructure delivery.

Given the timescales associated with the previous and current delivery of this programme, the use of the existing East Sussex Highways Contract has been assessed as the most cost effective and efficient route to deliver the remainder of this programme. They hold knowledge the programme and the contracts adheres to the council's Contract Standing Orders for transport infrastructure projects as well as wider contractual processes.

This procurement option has been selected for other ESCC LGF Transport package projects, and this is proving an effective method in mobilising projects towards design and delivery.

4.2. Preferred procurement and contracting strategy:

Standard Approach to Delivery (Design and Construct)

As outlined in Section 4.1, and as a result of the scale of the HBMAP, a standard approach to project delivery was, and continues to be, taken.

This includes the design and delivery (build) being undertaken through our East Sussex Highways contract with BBLP. The remaining schemes identified for inclusion in the

programme will be designed and delivered through the East Sussex Highways Infrastructure Design team located within the Ringmer office in East Sussex.

This team comprises of an overall Programme Manager alongside Scheme Project Managers, employed by BBLP, who lead the community engagement for the projects and who are responsible for undertaking the construction of the schemes. They will work with the Scheme Designers, employed by WSP who are the professional services partner in the BBLP contract, who undertake the scheme design. Collectively the scheme project managers and scheme designers all have extensive experience in delivering these types of schemes within East Sussex. If additional resource is required, due to the nature of the contract, BBLP are able to source other staff from other offices from within their supply chain including WSP.

Scheme Implementation – East Sussex Highways

By using the East Sussex Highways Infrastructure Services Contract, ESCC can ensure we are using an existing and effective procurement strategy, which will enable the following:

- Full project mobilisation within the funding period. As outlined in Tables 5 to 7 in Section 1.14, the scheme has already been programmed into the contractor's overall work programme for the financial years as set out in the Client Service Requirement Plan which is formally approved by ESCC. This has enabled early engagement with BBLP about the scheme types and the likely resource requirements, for both design and build of the scheme.
- Clearly defined financial implications, which will be reviewed;
- Clearly defined risk allocations, which will be reviewed regularly throughout the design and delivery of the scheme; and
- Specific project timescales including implementation timeframes.

Programme and Financial Monitoring

As part of the BBLP Quality Management System, there is ongoing dialogue between the professional services element and construction element of the joint venture, and as the client ESCC are an integral element of this. This process enables the discussion of issues such as construction methodology, traffic management, value engineering approaches, and communications with stakeholders before and during construction, to ensure effective programme management.

The contract has been let on a target cost basis. Therefore, the risk allocation throughout the scheme will be costed partially upfront, based on the potential risks. As the detailed design process progresses a target cost will be agreed, in response to the Client Service Requirement Plan.

A fully costed risk register will be prepared by the contractor as part of the overall project management process, and reviewed alongside the programme budget, by the ESCC HBMAP project team and East Sussex Highways, who meet on a monthly basis. If it is identified that there are likely to be any future scheme cost overruns, the programme management approach will ensure that these are identified early and can be met by appropriate mitigation measures.

The County Council's HBMAP project team will oversee the overall programme and all associated monitoring and evaluation requirements and East Sussex Highways, will

manage the design and delivery of the package. The Management and Governance Arrangements set out in **Appendix E**, provides additional detail on the various roles in the structure, to support programme management.

4.3. Procurement experience:

ESCC has an experienced Procurement Team, who are part of the Orbis Initiative, which is a formal shared business services collaboration between East Sussex, Surrey and Brighton & Hove Councils. With specified procurement resource for the Communities, Environment and Transport (CET) Directorate, this ensures that the ESCC HBMAP project team is supported by Procurement Specialists who understand the procurement options and requirements related to the design and delivery of transport infrastructure schemes.

As outlined in Section 6.1, ESCC has considerable experience of delivering similar programmes of works, particularly LGF type programmes of schemes, using the procurement approach of East Sussex Highways Infrastructure Services Contract with BBLP, in undertaking both the design and delivery of transport infrastructure schemes. This was the recommended procurement approach, by ESCC Procurement Specialists, supporting the CET Directorate.

The Highways Infrastructure Services Contract is managed by a dedicated ESCC Contracts Management Team, who were created to oversee the management of the new contract including commercial management, compliance and performance, asset management and service development. The contract management team is led by a Contract Manager and has a dedicated Senior Cost Controller who supports on the contract management of ESCC local transport infrastructure projects such as those included in the HBMAP.

The ability to scrutinise this contract was paramount for ESCC, and therefore a robust client commercial and performance regime has been developed. This includes an ESCC Scrutiny panel where BBLP has to report against specific performance measures.

This clearly demonstrates that a robust approach has been selected to deliver the HBMAP programme.

In terms of lessons learned; this procurement option has been selected for other ESCC SELEP LGF Transport Infrastructure Projects and is proving an effective method in mobilising projects towards delivery during the LGF programme period.

4.4. Competition issues:

There are no competition issues with the supply chain due to the procurement approach that has been adopted.

4.5. Human resources issues:

ESCC recognises the importance of having a multi skilled team of staff at both ESCC and East Sussex Highways Infrastructure Services Contract, to deliver a large programme of small to medium sized local transport infrastructure projects, such as the HBMAP. Following the development of the HBMAP programme it was identified that, due to the size of the original programme, the availability of staff and having staff with the required skillset

during the programme period would be essential to ensure the deliverability of the programme.

As outlined above and within Section 6.1, the human resource associated with the delivery of the programme will include a dedicated project team from ESCC who will oversee the programme management and monitoring of the HBMAP, alongside scheme design and delivery staff located within East Sussex Highways Infrastructure Services Contract. The monitoring of the overall East Sussex LGF programme and outputs as well as reported back to SE LEP is undertaken by the Project Manager- East Sussex Growth.

To mitigate any issues associated with the availability of staff resource within East Sussex Highways, early contractor involvement with East Sussex Highways Infrastructure Services Contract is being undertaken by the ESCC project team during the further development of the Phase 2 of the HBMAP for inclusion in this updated SE LEP Business Case. This has ensured that East Sussex Highways Infrastructure Services Contract are aware of the proposed scheme types to enable them to mobilise an appropriate level of staff resource with the correct skill set during the programme period.

This has also resulted in the HBMAP schemes being included in the 2023/24 Capital Programme of Local Transport Improvements and the 2023/24 Client Service Requirement Plan issued by ESCC to East Sussex Highways with scheme briefs being written and submitted to East Sussex Highways by the ESCC project team.

As outlined above and within Section 6.1, the ESCC project team have extensive experience of managing capital programmes of local transport improvement schemes, which are similar to the type of measures within the HBMAP, which will ensure that the LGF schemes are monitored using ESCC rigorous project management framework. In addition to this, the principal cohort of staff resource from East Sussex Highways, are based locally, and these staff bring considerable local knowledge on scheme delivery.

4.6. Risks and mitigation:

As outlined in paragraph 4.3, the delivery of the remainder of the HBMAP programme will be undertaken by East Sussex Highways Infrastructure Services Contract, with the ESCC project team as, Scheme Promoter.

The initial commercial risks are with ESCC, until the scheme is included on East Sussex Highways 'Client Service Requirements Plan' (CSRP). This process allows the programme to pass through the design/consultation phases with progress and review of risks reported back to Scheme Promoters via the Monthly Progress Meetings attended by members of the ESCC project team (MPG), East Sussex Highways, and ESCC's Contract Management Group (CMG). Once the final scheme design has been approved by MPG and a satisfactory target cost for construction provided by East Sussex Highways, MPG will formally instruct (via CMG) East Sussex Highways to proceed with construction.

At all of the above stages, East Sussex Highways is responsible for delivery and the risks associated with this, and they are required to report this to the CMG, who use a range of KPI's to determine performance. Under the terms of the contract, under-performance is subject to penalties.

4.7. Maximising social value:

ESCC is fully aware of the Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012 and the obligation that this places on the authority to ensure that the procurement of services over the European Union (EU) threshold provides an opportunity to improve the economic, social and environmental well-being of our area.

The selected procurement approach of using East Sussex Highways Infrastructure Services Contract, to deliver the HBMAP provides the greatest opportunity to deliver far reaching social value, because this is an integral element of the East Sussex Highways contract.

A community benefits plan, identifying the benefits the contractor will deliver during the course of the contract has been developed. The monitoring and reporting of all benefits will be achieved through the performance of this contract.

The plan has focussed on acting as a catalyst for delivering non-statutory services which ESCC would like to fund but can no-longer support, resulting in wider community benefit. These are often low cost measures but provide great added value to ESCC.

Some examples of specific measures which have been developed to date include:

- The development of an apprenticeship programme at East Sussex Highways
- Offering local business small contracts to support the delivery of highway maintenance and transport infrastructure delivery
- Community Match Scheme – provide funding to parishes to deliver small scale infrastructure improvements within their locality.

Therefore, as part of the delivery of the HBMAP, there may be the opportunity to provide contracts to local businesses to support the delivery of the transport infrastructure measures.

5. FINANCIAL CASE

5.1. Total project value and funding sources:

The overall cost of the HBMAP is £9,991,733, in out-turn prices. This includes an allowance for risk and contingency for the 3 schemes still to be constructed (13%, 30% or 40% depending on the scheme).

ESCC has committed £51,000 of their own funds to the programme and there is £671,809 of development contributions available to ESCC to support the delivery of the programme, of which £130,809 is already held by ESCC and the remaining £541,000 will be sought from available contributions during the 2023/24 financial year if this updated business case is approved.

A breakdown of the funding is set out in Table 31.

Table 31 – HBMAP– Project Value

Funding Source	Amount (£)	Constraints, Dependencies or Risks and Mitigation
Total Project Costs	9,991,733	<i>Includes value of schemes already constructed in Phase 1</i>
Local Growth Funding	9,000,000	<i>A robust and WebTAG compliant business case has been provided. Delivery of the proposed schemes is contingent on the updated business case being approved.</i>
ESCC Funding	51,000	
Development Contributions Held	130,809	<i>Held by ESCC</i>
Development Contributions Available	541,000	<i>To be sought by ESCC in 2023/24 if the business case is successful.</i>

The funding profile for the HBMAP is shown in Table 32.

Table 32 – Funding Profile

Financial Year	Total Out-turn Costs	SELEP Local Growth Funding (LGF) Received	ESCC Funding	Development Contributions 'Held'	Development Contributions Potentially Available
2017/18	£361,295	£384,000	£0	£0	£0
2018/19	£757,492	£888,000	£0	£0	£0
2019/20	£1,386,204	£1,345,000	£0	£110,809	£0
2020/21	£1,033,961	£6,383,000	£51,000	£0	£0
2021/22	£783,571	£0	£0	£20,000	£0
2022/23	£1,096,387	£0	£0	£0	£0
2023/24	£728,402	£0	£0	£0	£541,000
2024/25	£2,477,637	£0	£0	£0	£0
2025/26	£1,366,783	£0	£0	£0	£0
Total	£9,991,733	£9,000,000	£51,000	£130,809	£541,000

The development contributions identified as ‘Held’ were managed by ESCC and were used during the programme period to support the delivery of 2 specific schemes. The breakdown of ‘Held’ and ‘Available’ development contributions is shown overleaf in as follows:

- A £20,000 contribution in 2021/22 was held from Hastings Direct towards Scheme WC 5 – Collington Avenue.
- A £439,000 Section 106 contribution is potentially available in 2023/24 towards Scheme WC 4a – Bexhill Cycle Route A.
- A £110,809 Section 106 contribution in 2020/21 was held towards Scheme TM 4 – Battle Road.
- A £51,000 Section 106 contribution is potentially available in 2023/24 towards Scheme PR 1 – Albert Road
- A £51,000 Section 106 contribution is potentially available in 2023/24 towards Scheme PR 2 – Station Approach

As detailed above, the total programme costs are £9,991,733 and the total available funds to ESCC for HBMAP are £9,722,809. This gives a funding deficit of £268,924.

Any cost over-runs during the programme period will be met from the County Council’s Local Transport Capital Programme.

5.2. SELEP funding request, including type (LGF, GPF, etc.):

£9m of Local Growth Fund capital was awarded from SELEP. This will help the HBMAP to kick start the delivery of a comprehensive integrated transport package, which will support movement and access across both Hastings and Bexhill, as identified in the South East Local Enterprise Partnership (SELEP) Local Growth Deal, Round 1.

5.3. Costs by type:

Table 33 outlines the cost estimates of the programme by year. These are based on the most recent rates from East Sussex Highways, including utilities, given the current concept status of the programme. The cost estimates exclude land costs and exceptional utilities costs.

Table 33 – Whole Programme Costs by Year

Financial Year	Scheme Cost – Excluding Risk (2023 prices)	Scheme Cost – Including Risk (2023 prices)	Adjustment to Out-turn (Inflation)	Total Scheme Cost (Out-turn prices)
2017/18	£361,295	£361,295	£0	£361,295
2018/19	£757,492	£757,492	£0	£757,492
2019/20	£1,386,204	£1,386,204	£0	£1,386,204
2020/21	£1,033,961	£1,033,961	£0	£1,033,961
2021/22	£783,571	£783,571	£0	£783,571
2022/23	£1,096,387	£1,096,387	£0	£1,096,387
2023/24	£635,317	£698,183	£30,220	£728,402
2024/25	£1,800,215	£2,247,901	£229,736	£2,477,637
2025/26	£885,750	£1,240,050	£126,733	£1,366,783
Total	£8,740,192	£9,605,044	£386,689	£9,991,733

A more detailed breakdown of the programme costs, by scheme element is outlined in Tables 34 to 37.

Table 34 - Walking and Cycling Preferred Scheme Package Costs

Scheme No	Scheme Description	Total Scheme Cost (Out-turn prices)
WC 4a	Bexhill Cycle Route A	£2,468,165
WC 5	Collington Avenue pedestrian crossing	£116,836
WC 14	Pedestrian crossing near The Ridge in the vicinity of the cemetery	£372,727
WC 15	Pedestrian Crossing near Sandown Primary School	£253,287
Other WC Schemes	Work related to potential re-classifying of existing capital assets for Schemes WC1, WC3, WC8, WC12, WC13, WC16	£452,533

Table 35 – Public Transport Package Preferred Scheme Package

Scheme No	Scheme Description	Total Scheme Cost (Out-turn prices)
PT 1	Real Time Passenger Information (RTPI) at bus stops across Hastings and Bexhill	£1,085,609
PT 2	Bus Stop Accessibility Improvements - Bus Stop Clearways / High Access Kerbs (bus stop poles) / Bus Shelters	
PT 3	The Ridge Bus Stop Improvements	

Table 36 – Traffic Management Preferred Scheme Package

Scheme No	Scheme Description	Total Scheme Cost (Out-turn prices)
TM 4	Pedestrian crossing along Hastings Battle Road near Old Harrow Road	£110,809
TM 5	Introduction of traffic signals at the junction of Cooden Drive / Westcourt Drive	£374,357
Other TM Schemes	Work related to potential re-classifying of existing capital assets for Schemes TM1, TM3 and TM6	£177,955

Table 37 – Public Realm Package Preferred Scheme Package

Scheme No	Scheme Description	Total Scheme Cost (Out-turn prices)
PR 1	Hastings - Gateway from Town Centre and Seafront (Albert Road)	£1,244,204
PR 2	Hastings - Gateway Transport Hub to Town Centre (Station Approach)	£1,616,254
PR 3	Hastings - Extension of shared space and pedestrian crossing facilities in the town centre	£400,000
PR 4	Hastings - Wayfinding Signs	£216,193
PR 5a	Bexhill - London Road Corridor Improvement Scheme (Sackville Road and Beeching Road junction improvements)	£1,102,803

It should be noted that the £175,746 out-turn scheme cost for Scheme WC2 - Alexandra Park Cycle Route, not taken forward, is not included in the above costs as it has already been paid back by ESCC.

With regard to non-capital costs, these have not been included, but from our perspective relate to the revenue costs for ESCC staff salaries, associated with the programme development and delivery. These amount to £100,000 per year, during the programme period, but they have not been included in the overall ask for funding as they will be funded by ESCC.

In addition to this, the small additional cost of monitoring and evaluation, where spend will commence following the completion of all construction, has been excluded but is expected to amount to circa £5,000 per year and this will be funded by ESCC.

5.4. Quantitative Risk Assessment (QRA):

A quantified risk assessment was undertaken as part of the original business case and it identified that a 26% uplift for risk and contingency should be added to the budget to allow for the accommodation of factors that are unknown or uncertain and so cannot be estimated accurately, based on the stage of a programme.

The QRA was not repeated for this updated business case, however a 13% to 40% uplift was applied to the outstanding cost estimates to account for risk and contingency depending on level of scheme design and so this revised approach is considered robust and proportionate to the number of schemes remaining to be constructed.

5.5. Funding commitment:

A signed assurance by ESCC Section 151 Officer is included in Appendix A.

The SELEP funding of £9m was approved at the SELEP Accountability Board on 23 February 2018.

5.6. Risk and constraints:

The key project and funding risks and constraints associated with the HBMAP have been identified as part of the Risk Strategy, as outlined in **Appendix B**. The Risk Management Strategy clearly outlines the mitigation measures, which can be delivered to reduce the likelihood and impact of these occurring.

6. MANAGEMENT CASE

6.1. Governance:

The HBMAP Programme Governance structure is outlined in **Appendix E**.

As outlined in the attached appendix, the **Project Sponsor** for the HBMAP Programme is the Director for Communities, Economy and Transport.

The governance structure is divided into three key elements, including:

- **Financial Management**
- **Programme & Project Management**
- **Programme Scheme Delivery**

Whilst these elements are listed individually, they are intrinsically linked to ensure that a robust framework is in place to undertake financial monitoring, management of risks, any programme dependencies, alongside available resource to deliver the programme.

In order to ensure that the programme will be delivered within the required timescales, please see Tables 38 and 39 that provide a clear outline of the key resources available at ESCC and within East Sussex Highways, and their individual responsibilities.

Table 38 – Staff Resource ESCC

Staff Resource – ESCC	Responsibility
Project Manager Scheme Delivery – Major Projects and Growth	HBMAP Programme Management
Team Manager Infrastructure, Planning and Place	Senior Responsible Officer for policy, LGF Transport Scheme Business Case Sign Off
Team Manager Major Projects and Growth	Senior Responsible Officer for Delivery, Scheme Delivery Management in liaison with East Sussex Highways
Local Transport Schemes Manager	LGF Transport Scheme Business Case Sign Off & Scheme Delivery Management in liaison – East Sussex Highways
Project Manager LGF Schemes	Scheme Delivery Management in liaison – East Sussex Highways

Table 39 – East Sussex Highways Staff Resource

Staff Resource – East Sussex Highways	Responsibility
Design Manager	Manage design and commission delivery of HBMAP schemes in liaison with ESCC Senior Responsible Officer, Scheme Delivery Management
Project Managers – x3	x3 - Project manage scheme design and delivery and stakeholder management, in liaison with ESCC Project Manager -Scheme Delivery
Major Projects Manager	Manage major project delivery
Highway Design Engineers x5	x5 - lead on developing scheme designs
CAD Technician x1	x1 - support Highway Design Engineers

Further details on how the programme will be managed is outlined Section 4.6

6.2. Approvals and escalation procedures:

Please see Table 40 below for a comprehensive table outlining ESCC robust reporting and approval process for LGF projects.

Table 40 – Approvals Process

Responsible group or officer	Responsibility
Cabinet	Member group that manages council business and meets monthly Lead Cabinet Member sits on Team East Sussex.
Lead Member for Economy	Lead Cabinet Member – representation at South East Local Enterprise Partnership (SELEP) and delivery of the Local Growth Fund schemes.
Team East Sussex	East Sussex ‘sub-board’ of SELEP and aims to drive forward economic growth and prosperity in the county of East Sussex.
LGF Project Board	ESCC Senior officer project management team responsible for all LGF projects. The Board is responsible for the strategic management of the project and has authority to commit resources to the project in accordance with the Council’s Constitution and meets every 4 to 6 weeks.
Project Sponsor	Independent of the project and provides challenge to ensure project is delivered on time, within budget and achieving the anticipated benefits. This is the Director for Communities, Economy and Transport.
Project Manager	Responsible for delivering the project on behalf of the project board.
Economic Development, Skills, Culture and Infrastructure service	Leads on the delivery of the County Council’s economic growth and regeneration priorities, strategic infrastructure planning - including transport, skills and culture. The service is responsible for the delivery of the LGF projects and for facilitating TES and its engagement with SELEP.
HBMAP project team	Responsible for the development of the business cases required to unlock LGF funding and the overall management of transport infrastructure LGF projects delivered through the East Sussex Highways Joint Venture.
East Sussex Highways BBLP	This joint venture is the term contractor for the East Sussex Highways Infrastructure Contract. BBLP/WSP provide professional design and project management services whilst BBLP provide scheme construction services.
Section 151 Officer	Responsible for signing acceptance of the grant and its attached conditions, overseeing financial transactions and challenging where necessary, and sign off of financial statements requested from SELEP.
Senior Category Specialist - Environment, Transport & Waste	Responsible for providing contract and procurement advice and assistance including matters relating to Contract Standing Orders, contract frameworks and other local, national or European legislation in relation to procurement.

6.3. Contract management:

As outlined in Sections 4.3 and 4.6, a robust procurement strategy has been selected to enable the delivery of the HBMAP, which is closely monitored, to ensure factors, including outputs are delivered in line with the contract scope.

To ensure that the scheme outputs are delivered in line with the contract, according to a specified timescale and of an agreed quality, scheme briefs are developed for each scheme element included in the HBMAP.

The scheme briefs clearly outline the scheme context, aims, scheme scope, identifies any local or political issues, design considerations, constraints, key outputs, timescales and requirements around consultation. This ensures that East Sussex Highways are aware from the outset of schemes key outputs, and this supports the inclusion of the schemes within ESCC Capital Programme for Local Transport Improvements.

The ESCC project team developed the original scheme briefs for this programme and submitted them to East Sussex Highways by October 2017. By using this approach, it ensures that the scheme outputs for each of the individual schemes are identified at an early stage and are reflected throughout each stage of the project management framework.

6.4. Key stakeholders:

The key stakeholders for the HBMAP are clearly outlined below within Table 41.

Table 41 – Stakeholder Engagement

Stakeholder	Engagement
ESCC Councillors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updates through correspondence by email and meetings, as appropriate.
Hastings Borough Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarterly - Hastings and Rother Transport Action Group – to support local programme support • Quarterly – Team East Sussex Board
Rother District Council (Bexhill Town Centre Steering Group)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarterly - Hastings and Rother Transport Action Group – to support local programme support • Quarterly – Team East Sussex Board
Stagecoach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2017/18 – Hastings Quality Bus Partnership – to support local programme support and integrate this alongside proposed investment in bus fleets and services during the programme period. • At key milestones as appropriate
Hastings Urban Bikes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2017/18 – Quarterly – ESCC Walking and Cycling Forum – provided detailed comments on proposed schemes to support scheme prioritisation
Hastings Ramblers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2017/18 – Quarterly – ESCC Walking and Cycling Forum – provided detailed comments on proposed schemes to support scheme prioritisation
Bexhill Wheelers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2017/18 – Quarterly – ESCC Walking and Cycling Forum – provided detailed comments on proposed schemes to support scheme prioritisation
Rother Ramblers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2017/18 – Quarterly – ESCC Walking and Cycling Forum – provided detailed comments on proposed schemes to support scheme prioritisation

The ESCC project team engages with these stakeholders on a regular basis, through established forums and meetings.

Therefore, considerable engagement has already been undertaken to date to support the prioritisation of schemes included in the programme. In order to ensure that stakeholder views have been incorporated into the development of the original programme, a series of meetings were held between ESCC and Senior Officers and Local Members within both Hastings Borough Council and Rother District Council during 2016/17 and 2017/18. This has ensured, particularly at a strategic level, that the programme integrates alongside the wider plans to support economic development and planned housing and employment growth across Hastings and Bexhill. Further engagement has been undertaken with the

Borough Council and District Council in assessing and refining the Phase 2 preferred package of schemes.

At a more localised level, considerable engagement with representatives from local walking and cycling groups has been undertaken by ESCC, through meetings and site visits to scheme locations, to provide ESCC with a greater understanding of individual schemes and their localised benefits. This has enabled local group representatives and their wider group members the opportunity to provide direct input into the consideration of schemes for inclusion into the programme.

A strong existing working relationship through an existing and effective engagement framework will support the timely delivery of the programme.

In addition to this, public consultation has been undertaken on Phase 1 and Phase 2 schemes included within the HBMAP. The public consultation has involved public consultation events and public information letter drops as well as online engagement via the County Council's consultation hub, particularly during the Covid pandemic when in-person events were not possible, to help gauge views on the proposals and shape the final designs.

6.5. Equality Impact:

The key audiences that will be both affected and positively benefit from this package of measures include the local community travelling for everyday journeys to key services, including for employment, education, health and leisure, the business sector and visitors. The scheme will provide the following benefits:

- providing greater journey reliability, including through the provision of real time information;
- improvements to highway capacity, resulting in improvements to journey times and road safety;
- improved provision for walking and cycling and public transport infrastructure;
- enabling greater travel choices; and
- improving access to key destinations and services in this towns.

The HBMAP will improve the local highway and mobility for people choosing to walk, cycle or use public transport.

The completion of the original business case and this updated business case demonstrate that consultation with key stakeholders has already been undertaken on a number of the elements of the programme. This emphasises that considerable work has been and is continuing to be done to ensure local participation in the scheme design of the different elements of the programme, to ensure that the needs of the local community in improving local access and connectivity have influenced the design of the scheme.

The ESCC project team engages with key stakeholders on a regular basis, through established forums and meetings. Considerable engagement has been undertaken to date to support the prioritisation of schemes included in the programme, to ensure that the programme integrates alongside the wider programme to support economic development

across Hastings and Bexhill. A strong existing working relationship through the existing and effective engagement framework will support the timely delivery of the programme.

The analysis demonstrates that the policy / strategy is robust, and that the evidence shows no potential for discrimination and all appropriate opportunities to advance equality and foster good relations between groups has been or will be undertaken.

6.6. Risk management strategy:

Appendix B outlines in detail ESCC Risk Management Strategy.

The overarching key risks associated with this programme are in relation to the potential for the costs of the schemes included within the programme to increase; the availability of resource to design and deliver a large programme of schemes within a short timescale; and obtaining stakeholder and public support for the delivery of the schemes within the programme.

The monitoring of the overall risks associated with the programme will be the responsibility of ESCC Project Manager Scheme Delivery - Major Projects and Growth. This officer will ensure that the Risk Register is updated, and the risks are being managed by the risk owners. ESCC has focussed on undertaking early mitigation measures to reduce the likelihood and impacts of these risks, and this is outlined in more detail in **Appendix B**.

Powers and Consents

There are no powers or consents identified, as part of this programme at this stage.

6.7. Work programme:

As a result of the scale of the remaining HBMAP programme, Gantt charts have not been developed.

To support the development of these tasks, staff from the ESCC project team will work alongside East Sussex Highways BBLP staff, to ensure previous knowledge, experience and existing working relationships are maintained, and used effectively, during these tasks.

In terms of overall resource availability, to support the delivery of the HBMAP, this has been clearly demonstrated within Section 6.1.

6.8. Previous project experience:

The ESCC project team has extensive experience in managing multi-million programmes of local transport improvements schemes, such as the schemes identified in the HBMAP. Similar types of projects include:

- Eastbourne Town Centre Movement and Access Package Phase One – In conjunction with Eastbourne Borough Council, ESCC developed Terminus Road between Station roundabout and its junction with Cornfield Road, Cornfield Road and Gildredge Road to support the extension of The Beacon shopping centre. This package included:
 - Improved public realm with new surface materials, street furniture and soft landscaping throughout

- Widened footways on Terminus Road
- Introduction of one way bus lane
- Relocation of bus stops with new shelters and real time passenger information
- Improved pedestrian crossing facilities
- Improved taxi rank space at Eastbourne station.
- New cycle parking provision.

The cost of this package was £9.13m.

- Kings Road project, St Leonards – The County Council, in conjunction with Hastings Borough Council, developed proposals to support the regeneration of St Leonards town centre. A key element of this was the enhancement of Kings Road, the main retail street in the town centre, for pedestrians using high quality materials. The scheme comprised widening the footways and removing parking along one side of the road, raised gateway features at the junction with London Road and on Kings Road at the bottom of the Kings Steps and the closure of Cross Street to create a public space near the Kings Road/London Road junction. The cost of the scheme was £890,000.
- Pelham Footway Widening – As part of a package of improvements to enhance pedestrian accessibility between Hastings town centre and Hastings Old Town, the County Council in partnership with Hastings Borough Council doubled the width of the footway between Breeds Place and George Street. The cost of the scheme was £300,000.
- Bulverhythe coastal pedestrian and cycle link – Using monies secured by Sustrans through the Big Lottery, the County Council implemented an off road footway/cycleway along the coast between Hastings and Bexhill. With the connection in place, there is now an 11 mile off road route along the coast through Hastings and Bexhill which as a consequence has seen a significant increase in cycle use. The cost of the scheme was £560,000.

6.9. Monitoring and evaluation:

Inputs

The inputs invested in the HBMAP relate to the staff resource from both ESCC and East Sussex Highways. This is clearly highlighted in Section 6.1, along with the staff employment roles, to provide an indication of their skill set.

In relation to this, the staff will invest time in undertaking the various activities required to enable the delivery of the HBMAP, these are highlighted in Section 1.14.

Outputs (delivering the scheme/project)

The delivery of the HBMAP will deliver the following outputs shown overleaf in Table 42 which are linked to the programme objectives.

Table 42 - Outputs

Programme Objectives	Outputs
<p>1. Support economic growth by reducing traffic congestion and improving safety</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Walking and cycling infrastructure – cycle route and signing and pedestrian crossings. • Bus stop infrastructure - including shelters, accessible bus stops and real time passenger information signs • Attractive environment - public realm improvements, including footways flush with highway, high quality street furniture and extended public spaces. • Traffic management measures – traffic signals, junction improvements
<p>2. Support accessibility and enhance social inclusion with access to improved integrated public transport provision and infrastructure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Walking and cycling infrastructure – cycle route and signing and pedestrian crossings. • Bus stop infrastructure - including shelters, accessible bus stops and real time passenger information signs • Improvements to the main pedestrian crossings providing access to Hastings Rail Station and Travel Interchange. • Wayfinding – town centres
<p>3. Improve health and wellbeing by supporting connectivity between key services, enabling an increase in Walking and Cycling for everyday journeys</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Walking and Cycling infrastructure – cycle routes and signing, pedestrian crossings. • Attractive environment - public realm improvements, including footways flush with highway, high quality street furniture and extended public spaces. • Wayfinding – town centres
<p>4. Support greater inward investment, particularly the growing cultural and tourism sectors within the town centres, by improving the physical environment and enhancing permeability</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Walking and cycling infrastructure – cycle route and signing and pedestrian crossings. • Bus stop infrastructure - including shelters, accessible bus stops and real time passenger information signs • Attractive environment - public realm improvements, including footways flush with highway, high quality street furniture and extended public spaces. • Traffic management measures – traffic signals, junction improvements • Wayfinding – town centres
<p>5. Ensure integration of the programme with related key infrastructure projects being delivered to support future sustainable growth and smart mobility</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Walking and cycling infrastructure – cycle route and signing and pedestrian crossings • Bus stop infrastructure - including shelters, accessible bus stops and real time passenger information signs

Outcomes (monitoring)

Appendix D outlines some of the key indicators that will be used to collect data to monitor some of the key outcomes which predominantly relate the monitoring of housing completions and employment space occupied along with jobs created. The HBMAP will help indirectly deliver these. This data will be collected by Rother District Council and Hastings Borough Council and will be available one year after all schemes are constructed and again five years after.

In addition to the high level outputs and indicators outlined in **Appendix D**, the HBMAP will provide additional transport outputs and the method in monitoring these and the timescale associated with the availability of the data is outlined in Table 43 below:

Table 43 - Outcomes

Outcomes	Method (Description)	Timescale
Increased levels of walking and cycling	ESCC - Transport Monitoring – Routine Based Monitoring Programme – from local automatic cycle/pedestrian counters & manual counts	Annual
Increased levels of bus patronage	Bus Patronage – Ticket sales data Bus Operators	Annual
Improved bus punctuality	Bus Punctuality Data Reports – Bus Operators	Annual
Improvements to road safety	ESCC KSI data – Sussex Safer Roads Partnership	Annual
Improvements to congestion at key junctions	ESCC - Transport Monitoring – Routine Based Monitoring Programme - from local automatic traffic counters & manual counts	Annual

The collection of this data will be supplemented by DfT collated transport data, which is reported on an annual basis, along with the Active Travel Survey, which is reported at a local level.

To capture some of the qualitative outputs of user experiences of any new infrastructure delivered as part of the HBMAP, ESCC will utilise surveys which will be commissioned as part of East Sussex Active Access for Growth Programme.

The outputs will also be monitored by the County Council's Programme Manager – East Sussex Growth. The scheme monitoring will be reported on a regular basis to SE LEP and Team East Sussex. This is the local federated board for the South East Local Enterprise Partnership.

Impacts (evaluation)

As outlined above, ESCC has clearly outlined the programme outputs linked to the objectives, the resulting outcomes and how these will be monitored. This information will be utilised to develop a benefits realisation plan, which will be monitored quarterly, with detailed monitoring data available on an annual basis. This will provide a framework to evaluate the impacts over the longer term, particularly as some of the data collection forms part of routine monitoring.

6.10. Benefits realisation plan:

A benefits realisation plan will be the responsibility of the ESCC project team and will form part of the monitoring of the HBMAP.

The first phase of the development of the benefits realisation plan will involve outlining the strategic scheme objectives, as outlined in Section 2.16. These will be used to support the development of desired outputs and outcomes of the programme.

The desired outputs are the actual benefits that are expected to be derived from the scheme and will be directly linked to the objectives. Some work has already been undertaken on this, as outlined in Chapters 2 and 3 and Sections 6.1 and 6.9.

In order to establish whether the benefits of the schemes are being realised, ESCC will develop measurable indicators, some high level indicators are outlined in **Appendix D**, but programme specific indicators will be developed, alongside an indication of when the benefits will appear or are likely to be realised.

Using the programme specific indicators, ESCC will undertake a benefit review, to compare the expected benefits against the actual benefits, and whether there are any new benefits, which were not expected one year and five years after all construction is completed.

This will be undertaken through the monitoring of the programme and the individual scheme elements and will entail the collection of quantitative data and comparing pre and post scheme data. Alongside this, we will also liaise with key stakeholders to undertake qualitative monitoring and the development of programme case studies.

This will help inform a post implementation evaluation report, which will outline whether the package of measures has achieved the specified objectives, outputs and outcomes.

7. DECLARATIONS

<i>Has any director/partner ever been disqualified from being a company director under the Company Directors Disqualification Act (1986) or ever been the proprietor, partner or director of a business that has been subject to an investigation (completed, current or pending) undertaken under the Companies, Financial Services or Banking Acts?</i>	No
<i>Has any director/partner ever been bankrupt or subject to an arrangement with creditors or ever been the proprietor, partner or director of a business subject to any formal insolvency procedure such as receivership, liquidation, or administration, or subject to an arrangement with its creditors</i>	No
<i>Has any director/partner ever been the proprietor, partner or director of a business that has been requested to repay a grant under any government scheme?</i>	No

If the answer is “yes” to any of these questions, please give details on a separate sheet of paper of the person(s) and business(es) and details of the circumstances. This does not necessarily affect your chances of being awarded SELEP funding.

I am content for information supplied here to be stored electronically, shared with the South East Local Enterprise Partnerships Independent Technical Evaluator, Steer, and other public sector bodies who may be involved in considering the business case.

I understand that a copy of the main Business Case document will be made available on the South East Local Enterprise Partnership website one month in advance of the funding decision by SELEP Accountability Board. The Business Case supporting appendices will not be uploaded onto the website. Redactions to the main Business Case document will only be acceptable where they fall within a category for exemption.

Where scheme promoters consider information to fall within the categories for exemption, they should provide a separate version of the main Business Case document to SELEP 6 weeks in advance of the SELEP Accountability Board meeting at which the funding decision is being taken, which highlights the proposed Business Case redactions.

I understand that if I give information that is incorrect or incomplete, funding may be withheld or reclaimed, and action taken against me. I declare that the information I have given on this form is correct and complete. Any expenditure defrayed in advance of project approval is at risk of not being reimbursed and all spend of Local Growth Fund must be compliant with the Grant Conditions.

I understand that any offer may be publicised by means of a press release giving brief details of the project and the grant amount.

<i>Signature of applicant</i>	
<i>Print full name</i>	
<i>Designation</i>	<i>Team Manager – Infrastructure, Planning and Place (Senior Responsible Owner – LGF Business Case sign off)</i>

8. APPENDIX A - FUNDING COMMITMENT

Draft S151 Officer Letter to support Business Case submission

Dear Colleague

In submitting this project Business Case, I confirm on behalf of East Sussex County Council that:

- *The information presented in this Business Case is accurate and correct as at the time of writing.*
- *The funding has been identified to deliver the project and project benefits, as specified within the Business Case. Where sufficient funding has not been identified to deliver the project, this risk has been identified within the Business Case and brought to the attention of the SELEP Secretariat through the SELEP quarterly reporting process.*
- *The risk assessment included in the project Business Case identifies all substantial project risks known at the time of Business Case submission.*
- *The delivery body has considered the public-sector equality duty and has had regard to the requirements under s. 149 of the Equality Act 2010 throughout their decision-making process. This should include the development of an Equality Impact Assessment which will remain as a live document through the project's development and delivery stages.*
- *The delivery body has access to the skills, expertise and resource to support the delivery of the project*
- *Adequate revenue budget has been or will be allocated to support the post scheme completion monitoring and benefit realisation reporting*
- *The project will be delivered under the conditions in the signed LGF Service Level Agreement with the SELEP Accountable Body.*

I note that the Business Case will be made available on the SELEP website one month in advance of the funding decision being taken, subject to the removal of those parts of the Business Case which are commercially sensitive and confidential as agreed with the SELEP Accountable Body.

Yours Sincerely,

SRO (Director Level)

S151 Officer

9. APPENDIX B – RISK MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

Description of Risk	Impact of Risk	Risk Owner	Risk Manager	Likelihood of occurrence (Very Low/Low/Med/ High/Very High) (1/2/3/4/5) *	Impact (Very Low/Low/Med/High/Very High) (1/2/3/4/5) **	Risk Rating	Risk Mitigation	Residual Likelihood / Impact Scores
Detailed design costs far exceed the current estimated costs	The scale of the programme would be required to be reduced	ESCC Major Projects and Growth	ESCC Major Projects and Growth/East Sussex Highways	4	4	16	Estimated costs as accurate as possible at feasibility stage - based on similar schemes undertaken by East Sussex Highways. HBMAP designed with flexibility to enable reductions or increases in scale dependent on costs. Key stakeholders have also been informed of this to manage their expectations.	3*3=9
Cost increases as a result of unknown issues arising during construction	Increase cost of overall programme	ESCC Major Projects and Growth	ESCC Major Projects and Growth/East Sussex Highways	3	3	9	Costs overruns will be managed by the use of held and potentially available development contributions or the use of ESCC Capital Programme of Local Transport Improvements allocation	3*2=6
Negative or low public response rate to consultation on programme design proposals	Reduce likelihood of ESCC Lead Member for Transport & Environment approving the schemes for construction within the B&H MAP, therefore reducing ESCC ability to spend the LGF.	ESCC Major Projects and Growth	ESCC Major Projects and Growth/East Sussex Highways	2	5	10	ESCC Major Projects & Growth and Infrastructure Planning & Place teams has undertaken considerable key local stakeholder engagement during development of HBMAP and it is being promoted as an integral element of the wider programme of work supporting local economic growth and planned development.	2*2=4
Major objections to a scheme on issues not previously raised or foreseen	Result in ESCC Lead Member for Transport & Environment approving scheme for construction and a revised programme	ESCC Major Projects and Growth	ESCC Major Projects and Growth/East Sussex Highways	1	5	5	ESCC Major Projects & Growth and Infrastructure Planning & Place teams has undertaken considerable key local stakeholder engagement during development	1*2=2

Description of Risk	Impact of Risk	Risk Owner	Risk Manager	Likelihood of occurrence (Very Low/Low/Med/ High/Very High) (1/2/3/4/5) *	Impact (Very Low/Low/Med/High/Very High) (1/2/3/4/5) **	Risk Rating	Risk Mitigation	Residual Likelihood / Impact Scores
affecting delivery	would need developing, delaying scheme delivery.						of HBMAP and it is being promoted as an integral element of the wider programme of work supporting local economic growth and planned development.	
Lack of resources available to design and deliver the programme, will cause delays	Will delay the delivery of the scheme.	ESCC Major Projects and Growth	ESCC Major Projects and Growth/East Sussex Highways	3	5	15	ESCC has undertaken early contractor involvement in scheme development to ensure the availability of an appropriate level of skilled staff at all stages of development and scheme delivery.	1*3=3
Any identified environmental impacts may delay the delivery of the programme	Will delay the delivery of the scheme.	ESCC Major Projects and Growth	ESCC Major Projects and Growth/East Sussex Highways	3	4	12	This will be an integral element of the design process, identified early to mitigate the impact.	3*2=6
Planning permission may be required, causing delay to the delivery of the programme	Will delay the delivery of the scheme.	ESCC Major Projects and Growth	ESCC Major Projects and Growth/East Sussex Highways	3	4	12	This will be an integral element of the design process, identified early to mitigate the impact.	3*2=6
The buildability of some proposed measures may be an issue	Will delay the delivery of the scheme.	ESCC Major Projects and Growth	ESCC Major Projects and Growth/East Sussex Highways	2	4	8	HBMAP designed with flexibility to enable reductions or increases in scale dependent on costs. Key stakeholders have also been informed of this to manage their expectations.	2*2=4

* Likelihood of occurrence scale: Very Low (1) more than 1 chance in 1000; Low (2) more than 1 chance in 100; Medium (3) more than 1 chance in 50; High (4) more than 1 chance in 25; Very High (5) more than 1 chance in 10.

** Impact scale: Very Low (1) likely that impact could be resolved within 2 days; Low (2) potential for a few days' delay; Medium (3) potential for significant delay; High (4) potential for many weeks' delay; Very High (5) potential for many months' delay

10. APPENDIX C – GANTT CHART

Public Realm (Albert Road)

Tasks	Start date	Finish date	2023/24				2024/25				2025/26				2026/27				2027/28			
			Quarter				Quarter				Quarter				Quarter				Quarter			
			1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Design Review	Q4 2023/24	Q4 2023/24				■																
Construction	Q4 2023/24	Q1 2024/25					■	■	■													
Monitoring & Evaluation	Q4 2026/27	Q4 2026/27																				■

Public Realm (Station Approach)

Tasks	Start date	Finish date	2023/24				2024/25				2025/26				2026/27				2027/28			
			Quarter				Quarter				Quarter				Quarter				Quarter			
			1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Detailed Design	Q4 2023/24	Q4 2023/24				■	■															
Construction	Q1 2024/25	Q2 2024/25					■	■	■	■												
Monitoring & Evaluation	Q4 2026/27	Q4 2026/27																				■

Walking and Cycling (Bexhill Cycle Route A)

Tasks	Start date	Finish date	2023/24				2024/25				2025/26				2026/27				2027/28			
			Quarter				Quarter				Quarter				Quarter				Quarter			
			1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Detailed Design	Q4 2023/24	Q3 2024/25				■	■	■	■	■												
Construction	Q4 2024/25	Q2 2025/26								■	■	■	■									
Monitoring & Evaluation	Q4 2026/27	Q4 2026/27																				■

11. APPENDIX D – MONITORING AND EVALUATIONS METRICS

Category	Key Performance Indicators	Description
High-level outcomes	Jobs connected to intervention (permanent, paid FTE)	Local Plan monitoring report of housing completions and employment space occupied, jobs created
	Commercial floorspace planned - please state sqm and class	Local Plan monitoring report of housing completions and employment space occupied, jobs created
	Commercial floorspace constructed to date - please state sqm and class	Local Plan monitoring report of housing completions and employment space occupied, jobs created
	Housing unit starts (forecast over lifetime)	Local Plan monitoring report of housing completions and employment space occupied, jobs created
	Housing unit starts (to date)	Local Plan monitoring report of housing completions and employment space occupied, jobs created
	Housing units completed (forecast over lifetime)	Local Plan monitoring report of housing completions and employment space occupied, jobs created
	Housing units completed (to date)	Local Plan monitoring report of housing completions and employment space occupied, jobs created
Transport (outputs)	Total planned length of resurfaced roads (km)	
	Total completed length of resurfaced roads (km)	
	Total planned length of newly built roads (km)	
	Total completed length of newly built roads (km)	
	Total planned length of new cycle ways (km)	Cycle infrastructure proposed, km TBC
	Total completed length of new cycle ways (km)	Cycle infrastructure proposed, km TBC
	Type of service improvement	
Land, Property and Flood Protection (outputs)	Anticipated area of site reclaimed, (re)developed or assembled (ha)	
	Actual area of site reclaimed, (re)developed or assembled (ha)	
	Length of cabling/piping planned (km) - Please state if electricity, water, sewage, gas, telephone or fibre optic	
	Length of cabling/piping completed (km) - Please state if electricity, water, sewage, gas, telephone or fibre optic	
	Anticipated area of land experiencing a reduction in flooding likelihood (ha)	
	Actual area of land experiencing a reduction in flooding likelihood (ha)	
	Follow-on investment at site (£m) -	



Category	Key Performance Indicators	Description
	Please state whether Local Authority, Other Public Sector, Private Sector or Third Sector	
	Anticipated commercial floorspace refurbished - please state sqm and class	
	Actual commercial floorspace refurbished - please state sqm and class	
	Anticipated commercial floorspace occupied - please state sqm and class	
	Actual commercial floorspace occupied - please state sqm and class	
	Commercial rental values (£/sqm per month, by class)	
		Anticipated number of enterprises receiving non-financial support (#, by type of support)
Actual number of enterprises receiving non-financial support (#, by type of support)		
Anticipated number of new enterprises supported		
Business, Support, Innovation and Broadband (outputs)	Actual number of new enterprises supported	
	Anticipated number of potential entrepreneurs assisted to be enterprise ready	
	Actual number of potential entrepreneurs assisted to be enterprise ready	
	Anticipated number of enterprises receiving grant support	
	Actual number of enterprises receiving grant support	
	Anticipated number of enterprises receiving financial support other than grants	
	Actual number of enterprises receiving financial support other than grants	
	Anticipated no. of additional businesses with broadband access of at least 30mbps	
	Actual no. of additional businesses with broadband access of at least 30mbps	
	Financial return on access to finance schemes (%)	

12. APPENDIX E – GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE



SOUTH EAST
LOCAL ENTERPRISE
PARTNERSHIP

13. APPENDIX F – DRAFT ECONOMIC APPRAISAL REPORT (AUGUST 2023)



SOUTH EAST
LOCAL ENTERPRISE
PARTNERSHIP

14. APPENDIX G – ORIGINAL BUSINESS CASE (DECEMBER 2017)