## Annex 1 – Summary of Independent Technical Assessment

## Brough Relief Road

East Riding of Yorkshire Council are seeking £3.26m LGF contribution towards the costs of the Brough Relief Road (BRR), which is a piece of infrastructure that links the new Brough South Development with the western side of Brough, providing a new access for the Humber Enterprise Park (HEP) Enterprise Zone site. The LGF contribution sought is 50% of the total scheme cost with the remaining 50% being funded by the Council and Horncastle Group.

This is the last piece of the infrastructure jigsaw to help deliver transport relief to Brough town centre and unlock significant economic growth including: 85 ha of employment land (35 ha of which has EZ status); creating 800 new jobs; accelerating the delivery of 550 housing units; enabling 17,243 sqm of commercial space (A & B class uses); and 4,088 sqm of community space (D1 & D2 uses). The scheme will also deliver improved public realm.

'Brough South' led by the Horncastle Group, and HEP led by Citivale are two employment related projects that have the potential to make a significant contribution to the local and regional economy. To date the developments have been progressed in isolation but share a common infrastructure constraint – access. The Council has taken a lead and forward funded design, planning and feasibility work in order to accelerate and link these two projects via a complementary masterplan.

The Scheme has been appraised by the LEP and Accountable Body's Independent Technical Evaluators, in accordance with the HM Government's Green Book Methodology, and has been rigorously assessed against a number of criteria, with a particular focus on value for money and deliverability, and RAG rated accordingly.

The consultants were satisfied that there was a strong rationale for intervention and reviewed the scheme as an economic development one because the scheme had clear economic development outcomes including employment land, housing units, commercial space, community space and jobs.

Strategic Case	Is there evidence to show that there is a need for intervention?	
	Is the scheme aligned with local, regional and national policy objectives?	
	Have objectives been appropriately defined?	
Economic	Have alternative options been identified?	
Case	Does the case identify other factors affecting the suitability of the preferred	
	option	
	Does the case identify risks affecting delivery of the scheme?	
	General (discount year, appraisal year, opening year, sensitivity testing).	
	Capital cost	
	Other Costs - (inc. operating/maintenance uses)	
	Appraisal Outputs (NPV, BCR, VfM)	
	Contracting strategy, procurement, procurement experience, market	
	maturity, risk, consistency	
	Benefits	

Commercial	Financial Estimates (Capital) (funding requirement, accuracy, inflation	
Case	assumptions, time consistency, overheads & uplifts, risk & uncertainty,	
	contingency & optimism bias)	
Financial Case	Financial Procedures: Funding mechanism, availability of funds, funding	
	commitment, funding risks, funding constraints	
Management	Project sponsor, wider governance, approval procedures, stakeholder	
Case	engagement plan, risk management strategy, availability and suitability of	
	resources, work programme, project/programme management, monitoring	
	& evaluation, benefits realisation	
	Does the case identify risks affecting delivery of the scheme?	

## Accountable Body comments

This Scheme has been reviewed as an economic development scheme and not a transport one. The benefits the scheme will deliver for the LEP are clearly of an economic development nature.

In terms of value for money, the BCR is 18.75. Scheme benefits have been tested to ensure that there is no double counting or duplication of outputs from earlier phases of the scheme. It is apparent that without the scheme, no further benefits can be realised from the development.

Any funding agreement with the project sponsor will include a clause stating that any scheme cost overruns are the responsibility of the project sponsor.