

Local Growth Fund Business Case - Template A

Project Name: Scarborough Bridge upgrade



For each option, identify and quantify the risks and score each risk for each option as follows:

- Low Risk: 2 points**
- Medium Risk: 3 points**
- High Risk: 5 points**

Risk	Option1	Option2	Option3	Option4	Option5
Cost	3	2	5	0	0
Planning Consent	3	3	5	0	0
Capacity of existing structure	5	3	2	0	0
Ground Conditions	3	3	3	0	0
Environmental Impact	3	3	5	0	0
Risk6	0	0	0	0	0
Risk7	0	0	0	0	0
Risk8	0	0	0	0	0
Risk9	0	0	0	0	0
Risk10	0	0	0	0	0
[Insert Other Risks as required]	0	0	0	0	0
Total	17	14	20	0	0

Local Growth Fund Business Case - Template C

Project Name: Scarborough Bridge upgrade

Please clarify the level of investment required along with the budget per year for the life of the proposal

Total Project Funding By Source

Funder	Funding Confirmed	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	Future Years	Total Contributions
Local Growth Fund (YNYER LEP)	N	£0	£50,000	£1,450,000	£0	£0	£1,500,000
City of York Council (capital programme)	Y	£0	£0	£972,000	£0	£0	£972,000
CityConnect (WYCA)	N	£0	£601,026	£1,334,567	£0	£0	£1,935,593
City of York Council (LTP allocation)	Y	£0	£0	£463,837	£0	£0	£463,837
Total		£0	£651,026	£4,220,404	£0	£0	£4,871,430

Total Project Funding By Expenditure Type

Expenditure Type (please provide a more detailed itemised list.)	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	Future Years	Total
Design & project management	£0	£496,623	£803,001	£0	£0	£1,299,624
Construction	£0	£154,403	£2,933,648	£0	£0	£3,088,050
Risk	£0	£0	£483,756	£0	£0	£483,756
Expd4	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Expd5	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Expd6	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Expd7	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Total	£0	£651,026	£4,220,405	£0	£0	£4,871,430

Total Local Growth Funding By Expenditure Type

Expenditure Type	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	Future Years	Total
Construction	£0	£50,000	£1,450,000	£0	£0	£1,500,000
Expd2	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Expd3	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Expd4	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Expd5	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Expd6	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Expd7	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Total	£0	£50,000	£1,450,000	£0	£0	£1,500,000

Prepared By: Tony Clarke

Risk Matrix		← IMPACT →				
		1 Insignificant	2 Minor	3 Moderate	4 Major	5 Catastrophic
↑ LIKELIHOOD	5 Almost Certain	5	10	15	20	25
	4 Likely	4	8	12	16	20
	3 Possible	3	6	9	12	15
	2 Unlikely	2	4	6	8	10
	1 Rare	1	2	3	4	5

5
4
3
2
1

Score	Likelihood (A)	Definition	Impact (B)	Descriptor
5	Is highly likely to occur at some time in normal circumstances.	Very High >80%	Critical long term damage or harm to service users/public Critical reputation impact Intervention by other agencies Huge financial impact	Catastrophic All potential benefits lost
4	Likely to occur at some time in normal circumstances.	High 0-80%	Major damage or harm to service users/public High reputation impact – national press and TV coverage Minor regulatory enforcement Major financial impact	Critical Loss of 80-100% of benefits
3	Likely to occur in some circumstances or at some time.	Medium 40-60%	Noticeable damage or harm to service users/public Extensive reputation impact due to press coverage External criticism likely High financial impact	Significant Loss of 50-80% of benefits
2	Is unlikely to occur in normal circumstances, but could occur at some time.	Low 20-40%	Minor damage or harm to service users/public Minor reputation impact Moderate financial loss	Marginal Loss of 25-50% of benefits
1	May only occur in exceptional circumstances, highly unlikely.	Very low <20%	Insignificant damage or harm to service users/public Little or no loss of front line service No reputation impact	Negligible Loss of <25% of benefits

Local Growth Fund Business Case - Template D

Project Name: Scarborough Bridge upgrade

Risk Register

	HEADLINE RISK	RISK DESCRIPTION	INHERENT RISK RATING	HEADLINE RISK MITIGATION	IS RISK DECREASING, INCREASING OR STATIC?	RESIDUAL RISK RATING	RISK OWNER
8	Funding	One of funding sources not available	15 Likelihood (3) Impact (5)	Gain funding approval at an early stage	↓	10 L (2) I (5)	CYC
1	Ground conditions	Unforeseen ground conditions affect construction (of ramps and/or bridge)	12 Likelihood (3) Impact (4)	Advanced geotech surveys undertaken to ascertain ground conditions in advance	↓	6 L (2) I (3)	CYC / NR
2	Costs	Design and construction costs higher than expected	12 Likelihood (3) Impact (4)	Costs have been prepared using benchmarked rates with a reasonable contingency	↓	8 L (2) I (4)	CYC
4	Planning	Failure to gain planning consent	12 Likelihood (3) Impact (4)	Early liaison with relevant parties	↓	8 L (2) I (4)	CYC / NR
3	Weather	Extended periods of poor weather leads to flooding	9 Likelihood (3) Impact (3)	Programme of work to include phased approach to construction, offering opportunity to construct in areas not affected by flooding if necessary	↔	6 L (3) I (2)	CYC
5	Utilities	Utility diversions affect design / construction	6 Likelihood (2) Impact (3)	Surveys conducted and outline design has taken into account	↓	6 L (1) I (3)	CYC / NR
6	Opposition	Public / political opposition to the project	6 Likelihood (2) Impact (3)	Public consultation undertaken. Almost unanimous support.	↓	3 L (1) I (3)	CYC
7	Environmental	River / embankment environmental concerns	6 Likelihood (2) Impact (3)	Ecological surveys undertaken.	↓	3 L (1) I (3)	CYC
9							
10							
11							
12							