

**BRISTOL CITY COUNCIL
CABINET
1 September 2011**

REPORT TITLE: Rapid Transit Major Transport Schemes – Local Funding Options

Ward(s) affected by this report: Citywide

Strategic Director: Graham Sims – Strategic Director, Neighbourhoods and City Development

Report author: Alistair Cox – Service Manager, City Transport

Contact telephone no. 0117 922 2940 alistair.cox@bristol.gov.uk

**Report signed off by
Executive Member:** Cllr Tim Kent

Purpose of the report:

This report outlines the local funding options that are available for the Rapid Transit Schemes that have to be presented to Department for Transport on 9 September 2011.

RECOMMENDATIONS for Cabinet approval:

1. To commit to funding the £42 million local contribution to the three major transport schemes consisting of Ashton Vale to Temple Meads and City Centre Bus Rapid Transit Scheme, North Fringe to Hengrove Package and South Bristol Link and to enter into a joint partnership with North Somerset and South Gloucestershire to deliver these projects.
2. That Bristol City Council contributes £5 million towards the local contribution from a combination of its own Local Transport Plan and Community Infrastructure Levy resources and over the period of the funding commits to use all reasonable endeavours to identify other funding to minimise the overall requirement.
3. That either a Business Rate Supplement or a Workplace Parking Levy focused on central Bristol be used to raise the balance of the local contribution.
4. That a steering group comprising significant business representation is established to oversee further investigatory work on both Business Rate Supplement and Workplace Parking Levy, following submission of the Best and Final Bids to Government in September 2011.

The proposal:

1. The Joint Local Transport Plan (JLTP3) identified that a package of integrated transport measures were required to address the loss of productivity from congestion presently experienced in the sub-region (estimated to cost £300m per annum). Without these interventions the congestion situation in Bristol would get far worse by 2026, leading to the city losing its competitiveness.
2. Working within the West of England Partnership the proposal for the Bristol urban area is for three schemes that include a majority element of guided and on road bus routes, alongside improved pedestrian and cycle routes. Ashton Vale to Temple Meads (AVTM) will provide a new access route from the existing Ashton Vale Park & Ride site to the city centre. North Fringe to Hengrove Package (NFHP) will provide routes from Cribbs Causeway, Aztec West and Emersons Green into the city centre and then beyond to the new developments at Hengrove Park. South Bristol Link (SBL) includes a bus rapid transit route from Hengrove Park to Ashton Vale (linking in to AVTM) alongside a new road connecting the more deprived suburbs of South Bristol to the existing road network at the A38 and A370. The total cost of these three schemes is £197m.
3. The Government's Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) in October 2010 identified £900 million of funding for major transport schemes. All three rapid transit schemes are eligible for this funding having been taken forward into the final bidding stage at the beginning of 2011. In July 2011 Cabinet approved the schemes for submission of Best and Final Bids to the Department for Transport (DfT) by 9 September 2011.
4. The CSR required the local contribution for all major schemes to be increased. The Bristol contribution was therefore revised to £42m of local investment to support £114m of DfT funding and £41m from the other local authorities jointly promoting these projects (North Somerset and South Gloucestershire Councils). Bristol City Council will also enter into a joint partnership agreement with these authorities to deliver the projects.
5. The Council does not have sufficient capital resources available to cover the full local contribution and therefore will need to use prudential borrowing to secure this, requiring a regular income stream to finance this over the longer term. Investigations have been undertaken into various local funding options that could be used to service this borrowing. The majority of these options are not viable for a range of reasons set out in the 'other options considered' section within this report. Only two funding possibilities appear viable options for the bulk of the local funding requirement are Business Rates Supplements (BRS) and Workplace Parking Levy (WPL). Further detail on these two options is set out below.
6. Because of the impact either of these options might have on businesses in the city early discussions were held with business representatives and some initial feedback was sought from the business sector by way of seminars arranged to explain the funding position and options being explored. It is clear from this that further work is needed to establish the impact on different kinds of business in various parts of the city for both BRS and WPL options, but the most significant challenge from business is that it shouldn't be charged with finding all the £42m Bristol contribution but that the Council should look again to allocating more of its

own resources to the major schemes.

7. From the other options considered, a combination of funding from the Council's own Local Transport Plan and future anticipated Community Infrastructure Levy resources to the tune of £5 million would be realistic to set aside. Over the period of the funding the Council will use all reasonable endeavours to identify other funding to minimise the overall requirement.
8. It is proposed that the balance of the local contribution is raised from either Business Rate Supplement (BRS) or a Workplace Parking Levy (WPL). Based on £37m being required this equates to 19% of the total project costs for the three schemes and 45% of the £83m local contribution for the three major schemes across the West of England.
9. Indicative figures from the Public Works Loans Board indicate that around £2.6m per annum would be required to repay this amount over a 25 year period. Repayments over 20 and 15 years would require annual repayments of £3m & £3.6m respectively. The earliest that any BRS or WPL would be levied is 2015.

Business Rates Supplement (BRS)

10. The powers for local authorities to instigate BRS were introduced in 2009. They allow a local authority to apply an additional level of business rates to raise money for specific projects that will promote economic development. There are a number of key stipulations that need to be considered:
 - Any BRS can only be to a maximum of 2p in the £ on a rateable value;
 - Properties with rateable values of below £50,000 are not eligible for BRS;
 - A banded charging structure could be used, for example 0.5p in the £ for properties between £50,000 and £100,000, 1p in the £ for properties between £100,000 and £500,000 and 1.5p in the £ for properties over £500,000;
 - Before any BRS is introduced an initial prospectus setting out the reasons for a BRS and the charging structure will need to be sent out for consultation to businesses who will be affected, including businesses that could potentially be affected in future years;
 - Comments received from this consultation would then be used to produce a final prospectus, which would have to be agreed upon by full Council before any charge could be enforceable.
11. There are currently estimated to be 1,848 premises in Bristol that would be eligible to pay any BRS. For an indicative rate of 1p in the £ for all business this would release approximately £3.76 million per annum. Current business rates have a loss of yield of 13% due to relief and exemptions, which would result in a forecast £3.27 million per annum.
12. There would be set up costs for any BRS. This would include the production of the prospectus, carrying out consultation and an amended and re-produced prospectus. It could also add an extra burden of work to the existing Business Rates team. This would include having to deal with additional collections and dealing with queries. No other local authority in the UK has implemented a BRS so it is difficult to ascertain accurate costs but these will be approximately £50,000.

Workplace Parking Levy (WPL)

13. The other option under consideration is a WPL scheme, the powers for which were introduced in the Transport Act 2000 and which needs permission to set up from the Secretary of State for Transport. A WPL scheme imposes a charge for each workplace parking place, provided by an employer, within a defined area. Workplace parking is defined as including any parking provided by an organisation for its employees or for persons visiting for business reasons. It also includes students at educational establishments. The definition excludes parking by persons not attending work or on business (for example shoppers), residential parking and people using leisure facilities.
14. A WPL scheme would operate by requiring organisations to obtain a licence covering the maximum number of workplace parking places they provide, with the charges paid on that licence levied according to the number of places. The charge applies to the organisation, not the employee; however the organisation is free to pass the charge on, in full or in part, to employees.
15. Whilst legislation states that revenues from a WPL scheme must be re-invested in the transport network, there is significant flexibility in the design of the scheme, including area of coverage, exemptions and charges.
16. Discussion within the Council has led to the conclusion that a charge equivalent to £1 per workplace parking space per day would be the maximum amount appropriate, equivalent to around £300 per annum per space.
17. The previous scoping study estimated an annual operating cost of approximately £0.5 million per annum: in order to deliver net revenue of £3.5 million per annum, it would be necessary to apply the levy to approximately 12 - 14,000 workplace parking places.
18. It has been calculated that implementation costs for a WPL would be in the region of £1 to £2 million depending on the complexity of legal support required at any Examination in Public. This would cover a variety of research work, including an audit of parking levels, business research and an economic impact report.
19. A Workplace Parking Levy scheme could be tailored to focus on the areas that would benefit from the major schemes. It is anticipated that a scheme could be designed to ensure the majority of businesses subject to Levy are located within a 10 minute walk of a proposed rapid transit stop in the central area.

Next Steps – Best and Final Bid Submissions

20. It is proposed that BRS and WPL are cited within our Best and Final Bid submissions for the three major schemes alongside a local contribution of £5m taken from Local Transport Plan and Community Infrastructure Levy resources.
21. Significant research work is still required to determine the exact form of the funding options. It is proposed that further work is commenced immediately on confirmation from DfT that our business case submissions have been successful.

Consultation and scrutiny input:

a. Internal consultation:

The rapid transit schemes and the potential local funding options have been consulted on widely. Many different areas of the Council have been involved including:

- Legal
- Finance
- City Transport
- Parking Services
- Marketing and Communications
- Economic Development

The Rapid Transit Schemes have been through SD&T Scrutiny Commission and approved for submission to the Department for Transport by Cabinet on 21st July 2011.

b. External consultation:

The rapid transit schemes have been through a full programme of public consultation.

The local funding options have been presented to business across the city with the opportunity for some feedback. If WPL is taken forward as the most suitable method of funding, public consultation and an examination in public will take place during 2012. If BRS is selected as the preferred option a consultation with all affected businesses will also take place during 2012.

Other options considered:

Several options for funding the local contribution have been considered. Apart from BRS and WPL, the other options have significant drawbacks that prevent them from delivering the full amount of funding required, although, as discussed previously, two in particular would be able to make up an element of the funding and reduce the overall borrowing. The options examined are as follows.

1. Increases of 2% per annum on **council tax** for all households in Bristol over the repayment period of the prudential borrowing would realise around £3.8m, an amount that could provide the annual repayments anticipated. The mandate to raise this additional amount would be part of annual budget, consultation and determination of Council tax. It would be subject to any Central Government Capping.
2. **Local Transport Plan** funding for transport improvements amounts to approximately £3m per annum for the remaining CSR period. This is presently allocated to support major scheme development, public transport, road safety, walking and cycling schemes, all in line with the JLTP3 programme. It would be possible to allocate a proportion of funding for the remaining CSR period to major scheme development accepting that this would reduce funding for other transport improvements.
3. The Council's **capital receipts** could, if available, be applied to provide a contribution towards the match-funding target. However the limited availability and

level of capital receipts in these uncertain times, and competing priorities makes this an unviable option.

4. **s106/Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)** monies from new developments could possibly amount to £3.5 million per annum. This figure could be significantly higher if development returns to some of the rates seen during the first part of this century. However, this is not guaranteed and is open to the fluctuations of the market so it would not be appropriate to commit to using this source for a lengthy time period. It could however, assist with the reduction in the headline borrowing requirement. The purpose of CIL is to fund infrastructure to support growth and its use towards major transport scheme investment would therefore be legitimate and appropriate.
5. **Congestion charging** has previously been investigated as a possible solution to congestion in Bristol. Latest estimates are that it would cost £20 million to implement any scheme. This would add significantly to required borrowing. It is also estimated that somewhere up to 40% of any revenues would be required to operate the scheme.

Risk management / assessment:

RISK ASSESSMENT							
The risks associated with the implementation of the <i>Rapid Transit Funding Options decision</i> :							
No.	RISK	INHERENT RISK		RISK CONTROL MEASURES	CURRENT RISK		RISK OWNER
		(Before controls)			(After controls)		
		Impact	Probability		Impact	Probability	
	Threat to achievement of the key objectives of the report			Mitigation (ie controls) and Evaluation (ie effectiveness of mitigation).			
1	Both main funding options are subject to change following consultation with the business sector and therefore may be less effective in delivering the funding required.	High	High	Local business will play a key role in determining the funding method to be used/ Economic impacts will continue to be carefully considered as part of ongoing work.	High	Medium	AC
2	Funding sought from local business may have a negative impact on the local economy.	Low	Low	The three major schemes are designed to deliver significant benefits to the local economy. Full engagement with business including further detailed survey work to be carried out to ensure that actual funding liability is understood. A recommendation for this has been added to the report.	Low	Low	AC
3	Overspend on capital costs	High	High	Robustness of cost estimates and advanced work with third parties.	High	Medium	AO
4	Insufficient patronage to achieve revenue neutral scheme	High	Medium	Deliver high quality reliable rapid transit scheme as set out in the business case. This will ensure sufficient patronage for revenue neutral operation.	Medium	Low	AO

RISK ASSESSMENT

The risks associated with **not implementing** the *Rapid Transit Funding Options decision* :

No.	RISK	INHERENT RISK		RISK CONTROL MEASURES	CURRENT RISK		RISK OWNER
		(Before controls)			(After controls)		
		Impact	Probability	Mitigation (ie controls) and Evaluation (ie effectiveness of mitigation).	Impact	Probability	
1	Rapid Transit Schemes not deliverable due to lack of funding – transport problems continue for the city undermining economic investment and future growth aspirations.	High	High	Continuing substantial involvement of business sector in the development of appropriate solution, keeping DfT informed along with local and national cross party political representatives.	High	Medium	AC

Public sector equality duties:

Before making a decision, section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 requires that each decision-maker considers the need to promote equality for persons with the following “protected characteristics”: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation. Each decision-maker must, therefore, have due regard to the need to:

i) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct prohibited under the Equality Act 2010.

ii) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and those do not share it. This involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to:

- remove or minimise disadvantage suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic.

- take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of people who do not share it (in relation to disabled people, this includes, in particular, steps to take account of disabled persons' disabilities);

- encourage persons who share a protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.

iii) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not share it. This involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to tackle prejudice and promote understanding.

Screening EqIA's have been completed on the three potential schemes, North Fringe to Hengrove Package, South Bristol Link and the Ashton Vale to Temple Meads and Bristol City Centre Rapid Transit but these did not include elements of how the schemes would be funded. A draft screening Equalities Impact Assessment has been completed for the local funding options proposed in this report (building on work carried out by Nottingham in their Assessment for the Workplace Parking Levy) and this has identified that a full impact assessment will also need to be completed as soon as possible so that any potential impacts that could be relevant to equality groups can be understood.

Further equalities work with stakeholders will need to be progressed as the project moves forward and research will need to be undertaken with regard to the possible negative and or positive impacts that might arise from these funding options. We also need to make sure that any decision taken promotes equality for individuals that have a protected

characteristic. Due regard will need to be given to both of the proposed options of the Business Rates Supplement and the Workplace Parking Levy as it is not currently known what the implications of these options are from an equalities perspective.

It is possible that the impact from an equality perspective is not only relevant for individuals or equality groups but could also have an impact on organisations that provide services to these groups as further charges may be levied to them through the funding option proposal.

A full equalities impact assessment will need to be undertaken prior to the implementation of any agreed funding option and not completed retrospectively.

Environmental checklist / eco impact assessment - attached

There are no environmental impacts arising directly from this proposal, which only considers potential funding options. Any impacts arising from a subsequent decision (for example, implementation of a WPL) will be considered separately.

Resource and legal implications:

Finance

a. Financial (revenue) implications:

The income streams generated from either BRS or WLP will be sufficient to meet the repayment of £37m prudential borrowing over a 15 -25 year period.

The remaining £5m cost will need to be set-aside from LTP and CIL over the course of the next five years.

South Gloucestershire and North Somerset Councils, the other participating scheme authorities, also have funding contribution targets to meet of £30.3m and £11.5m respectively

Advice given by Mike Harding, Finance Business Partner
Date 16 August 2011

b. Financial (capital) implications:

The capital costs of the schemes are set out in the table below. This includes the local costs for Bristol City Council.

Scheme	Major Scheme Business Case (£m)			Current Target (£m)				Bristol Contribution (£m)
	DfT	Local	Total	DfT	Local	Total	% Local	
Bath Transportation Package	56	12	68	36	23	59	38%	0
Ashton Vale to Bristol City Centre Rapid Transit	44	8	52	35	15	50	30%	12
Weston Package	12	4	16	11	5	15	30%	0
Sub total	112	24	136	82	43	124		12
North Fringe to Hengrove Package	170	24	194	51	51	102	50%	21
South Bristol Link	50	7	57	28	17	45	38%	9
Sub total	220	31	251	79	68	147		30
Overall Total	332	55	387	161	111	271		42

The contributing councils bear the full financial risks of the schemes, i.e. any cost over-run will be borne by the councils, not the DfT whose contributions are fixed. To mitigate this risk an appropriate risk layer has been included within the total scheme cost. This remains under continual review and will be subject to a further Quantitative Risk Assessment before submission of the Best and Final Bids.

Advice given by Mike Harding, Finance Business Partner
Date 16 August 2011

c. Legal implications:

The Business Rate Supplement and Workplace Parking Levy have already been described in general terms in this report.

By way of legal background, the Business Rates Supplements Act 2009 permits local authorities to levy an additional supplementary business rate on non-domestic ratepayers of up to two pence in the pound, in order to raise revenue for local projects to support economic development of their area. Local authorities can levy the rate on any business within their jurisdiction. As already indicated, properties liable for business rates, but with a rateable value of less than £50,000 will be exempt from the Business Rates Supplement (BRS). The revenue generated from the BRS will be locally raised and retained and it will only be able to be used on economic development projects - such as transport infrastructure.

The Act sets out detailed requirements in terms of consultation, variations, liability relief as well as possible deductions in respect of any pre-existing Business Improvement District levies. Monies raised must be spent in accordance with the final BRS prospectus. It should be noted that where revenue from the BRS will fund more than a third of the costs of a particular project, then the businesses that are liable to pay the BRS will have to be consulted on the project and the use of their funds. There is always the option of a ballot in all other cases.

Secondly, as already mentioned, the Transport Act 2000 allows for the making of workplace parking levy schemes. A local licensing scheme may only be made if it appears desirable for the purpose of directly or indirectly facilitating the achievement of policies in the licensing authority's local transport plan - in Bristol's case, the JLTP3. Such schemes must be made by order and cannot come into force unless and until confirmed by the Secretary of State for Transport. In addition to setting out the terms of the parking levy regime, the order must set out how the net proceeds are to be spent on specific transport infrastructure projects over a set time frame.

Advice given by Peter Malarby, Senior Solicitor – Highways and Transport
Date 20 July 2011

d. Land / property implications:

Not Applicable

e. Human resources implications:

Not Applicable

Appendices:

EQIA screening

Access to information (background papers):

<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2009/7/contents> - For legal information on BRS
<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2000/38/contents> - For legal information on WPL
Rapid Transit Major Transport Scheme Bids Cabinet Report 21 July 2011 – For information relating to the rapid transit schemes and associated costs



Rapid Transit Major Transport Schemes – Local Funding Options

Bristol City Council Equality Impact Assessment Form

Equalities impact assessments (EqIAs) are used to ensure we are considering the needs of all staff and all service users when planning or changing services, strategies, policies, procedures and/or contracting services, undertaking reviews or planning projects. The process you use to undertake equalities impact assessments enables us to evidence that we are giving **due regard** to the public sector equality duty.

It is best to start your Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) at the beginning of any project, policy revision, strategy change etc. It will then become an integral part of the planning process, ensuring that we, as a council, "get it right first time".

We also recommend that you work through the form using the EqIA guidance and that you contact your directorate equalities officer for support. See the end of this document for a list of equalities officers. The form can be completed electronically and the boxes to complete will have the question highlighted in bold and the space thereafter will expand as you type into it.

Public sector equality duty

We carry out equalities impact assessments as part of our public sector equality duty (Equality Act 2010 section 149). The public sector equality duty requires us give **due regard** to the need to:

- a) Promote equality of opportunity
- b) Eliminate unlawful discrimination
- c) Promote good relations between people who share a 'protected characteristic' and those who do not.

The public sector equality duty requires us consider the effect our policies and practices have on people who share the following **‘protected characteristics’**:

- Age
- Pregnancy & maternity
- Transgender
- Sexual orientation
- Religion and belief
- Ethnicity
- Gender
- Disability

Hereafter we refer to groups of people who share a protected characteristic as ‘equalities communities’.

How the EqIA should be used as part of the decision-making process

Each decision-maker must, therefore, have due regard to the need to:

1) Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct prohibited under the Equality Act 2010.

2) Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not share it. This involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to:

- Remove or minimise disadvantage suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic;
- Take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of people who do not share it. In relation to disabled people, this includes, in particular, steps to take account of disabled persons' impairments (disabilities);
- Encourage persons who share a protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.

3) Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not share it. This involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to --

- Tackle prejudice; and
- Promote understanding.

This EqlA form is structured to assist you to consider the above as you develop your proposal. In order to comply with the public sector equality duty you should set out how you have given due regard to the above issues in reports to decision-makers, particularly in reports to elected members. The EqlA provides evidence of compliance with the public sector equality duty.

Reports to decision-makers must include an equalities impact assessment section where you report how the public sector equality duties are relevant to the proposals and how these duties have been taken into account in developing the proposals. Step 6 of the EqlA can be replicated into the report and we suggest you provide e-link to full document, or include the EqlA as an appendix. Where no equality impact assessment has been undertaken, give reasons why not.

Name of policy, project, service, contract, review or strategy being assessed (from now on called 'the proposal')

Rapid Transit Major Transport Schemes – Local Funding Options

Directorate and Service: Neighbourhoods & City Development, Transport

Lead officer (author of the proposal): Alistair Cox

Additional people completing the form (including job title): Phil Wright, Transport Planning Officer

Start date for EqlA: 11/8/11

Estimated completion date: 12/8/11 (step 1 of the EqlA)

Step 1 – Use the following checklist to consider whether the proposal requires an EqIA

1. What is the purpose of the proposal?

Rapid Transit Major Transport Schemes – Local Funding Options

The purpose of the proposal is consideration of the local options for raising £42m worth of funding to support the 3 major transport schemes proposed for Bristol which are as follows:

- Ashton Vale to Temple Meads and Bristol City Centre Rapid Transit
- South Bristol Link
- North Fringe- Hengrove Package

The plan is to raise £37m of funding to support the 3 major transport schemes using one of the following proposals:

- Business Rates Supplement (BRS)
- Workplace Parking Levy (WPL)

With a balance of £5m from the Councils own resources.

	Yes	No
2. Could this be relevant to our public sector equality duty to: a) Promote equality of opportunity b) Eliminate discrimination	✓	

c) Promote good relations between different equalities communities?		
<p>If you have answered 'no' to question 2, please describe your reasons</p> <p>Any decisions taken and then subsequent implementation could potentially have an impact on the public sector duty especially with reference to the Workplace Parking Levy but it is within the scope of the proposal that businesses will be advised of the way to address this levy and monitoring of the levy will be a factor on an annual basis.</p>		
3. Could the proposal have a positive effect on equalities communities?	✓	
<p>Please describe your initial thoughts as to the proposal's positive impact</p> <p>A positive impact with reference to the two proposals is not known at this point as it is not clear as to which of the two proposals will be agreed.</p> <p>Overall if the funding is agreed and the scheme is implemented then it should have a positive effect on not only equalities communities but also residence and visitors to Bristol.</p>		
4. Could the proposal have a negative effect on equalities communities?	✓	
<p>Please describe your initial thoughts as to the proposal's negative impact –</p> <p>It will depend on which option is agreed and how this is then implemented by businesses especially with reference to the option of Workplace Parking Levy. For example there could be a negative impact for the disabled however there should be scope within the scheme to exempt in certain circumstances.</p>		

If you answer 'yes' to questions 2 or 4 you will need to continue to undertake a full EqIA and complete this form. If not, please sign off now:

Additional comments / recommendations

The draft screening Equalities Impact Assessment for the Rapid Transit Major Transport Schemes – Local Funding Options has been signed off at this stage as it is being presented to Cabinet in September 2011.

Recommendations

Further equalities work with stakeholders will need to be progressed as the project moves forward and research will need to be undertaken with regard to the possible negative / positive impacts that might arise from these funding options.

A full equalities impact assessment will need to be undertaken as soon as possible so that issues / concerns can be addressed and mitigated against if possible.

As this project links potentially into major transport schemes in the Joint Local Transport Plan (JLTP) attention will need to be given so that issues / concerns that overlap are identified and considered specifically around budgets.

The signing of this screening form has been agreed on the basis of the above recommendation.

Strategic Director: Graham Sims

Equalities Adviser: Jane Hamill

Date: 22nd August 2011

Date: 22nd August 2011