

**BRISTOL CITY COUNCIL
CABINET
3rd November 2015**

REPORT TITLE: Cycling Ambition Fund

Ward(s) affected by this report: Citywide

Strategic Director: Barra Mac Ruairi - Place

Report author: Ed Plowden – Sustainable Transport Service Manager

Contact telephone no. & e-mail address: 0117 9036568
ed.plowden@bristol.gov.uk

Purpose of the report:

1. To agree to a change of scope to the Cycling Ambition Fund (CAF) programme
2. To formally safeguard match funding as conditioned by the DfT

RECOMMENDATION for the Mayor's approval:

1. That the current Cycling Ambition Fund (CAF1) Programme is re-scoped to include projects currently being delivered through the Council's Transport Capital Programme, enabling a full grant claim to be submitted to the Department for Transport (DfT).
2. That the resulting capital funding released is formally committed to cycling projects as match funding for the second phase of the CAF programme in accordance with the requirements of the DfT.
3. To reaffirm the current delegations for CAF2, that the Service Director for Transport, in consultation with the Assistant Mayor, Place, be given delegated authority - within the legal agreement with the other Unitary Authorities - to implement the option best suited to the local circumstances to encourage more people to use a bicycle more often.

The proposal:

1. Cycling is a Bristol success story. The share of people cycling to work is larger than any other major city in Britain; indeed from a high baseline we doubled the number of people who cycle to work between 2001 and 2011, which gave us the highest growth of any local authority outside London.
2. In partnership with Sustrans we recently published the Bike Life Bristol report (www.betterbybike.info/bikelife), which identifies the significant economic benefits of cycling to the city and continued local support for cycling investment:

- a. A £531 million health benefit over a 30 year period based on current levels of 18 million bike trips per year.
- b. For every mile cycled there is a 67p saving to individuals and the economy.
- c. 83% of occasional bike riders would cycle more often if there were better protected cycle facilities.
- d. 70% of people would like to see more spent on cycling.

3. Our Cycle Strategy (www.betterbybike.info/News/bristol-cycle-strategy/) aims to “normalise cycling: progressing delivery of an attractive, safe, 8-80 cycle network”. Since the strategy was published we have now identified a detailed map-based aspirational network so as to make sure we have a long term vision we can work towards. It is important to recognise that the vision for the network will develop and that the funding required to fully complete this is not currently in place. The aim of releasing this network map now is to
 - a) Ensure we have a vision in place to help us work towards it;
 - b) Enable the public and local Neighbourhood Partnerships to help to shape the network – we recognise that this is only the first version and we hope to work collaboratively to develop the vision in the medium term;
 - c) Help us prioritise our investment now and over the next 20 years to continue to achieve success;
 - d) Guide developers and other planners to enable them to help develop the network;
 - e) Guide our own decision making in maintaining and upgrading the highway network.
4. In 2013 the West of England submitted a £7.76m bid to Government for the Cycle Ambition Fund (CAF1) to deliver enhancements in the city environment to make cycling more convenient and a realistic choice for more people. The announcement that our bid was successful was made in August 2013, and authorisation to proceed was agreed by Cabinet in September 2013.
5. In December 2014 the Government invited all Cities that received CAF1 funding to submit proposals to extend the scope and duration of the programme through to 2018. Proposals from the West of England were approved by the Government and this was subject to a Cabinet report in April for a second phase (CAF2).
6. It was noted in the CAF1 report that we had an ambitious programme to deliver in a short timescale. For this reason at times design and consultation processes were run in parallel and the programme was recast of necessity. The main focus of CAF1 became the proposed cycle bridges over the Avon from Camden Road in Southville to the Chocolate Path and at Junction Lock Bridge on Merchants Road.
7. Both of these bridges had obtained full planning approval by December 2014 and there are now detailed designs in place and construction contracts ready for the Camden Road bridge. However, further investigation work and site assessment, as well as contractor market conditions, have meant that costs have escalated so that both projects would significantly exceed the available budget and now cannot be delivered as part of the current programme. However, the Camden Road bridge is a transformational project on a key desire line and will remain on the aspirational network with the business case kept under review. In the area around Junction Lock

Bridge it is prudent to review the business case for adapting the bridge to see if an alternative solution might be more cost effective.

8. As a result of this we have renegotiated the scope of the CAF1 programme with the DfT and they have agreed to fund alternative schemes that are part of our overall Cycle Strategy and to bring forward CAF2 schemes already being delivered (Appendix 1). Our programme of works across the City that benefit cycling means we have sufficient locally funded projects already completed or in progress to account for the use of the CAF1 grant. This is thanks to the flexibility of the DfT and our record of working in partnership with them to deliver growth in cycling, but is conditioned on the released Transport Capital Programme Funds and the original CAF1 match funds being ringfenced to fund additional works to promote cycling. This will be through increasing the quality and/or scope of the CAF2 programme
9. The DfT accepts that the match funds can be invested after the formal period of the CAF2 grant funding (which ends in March 2018), so these funds do not necessarily need to be fully invested until 2018-20. It may also be prudent for some of these match funds to be invested in scheme development to ensure we have a pipeline of projects ready for future funding decisions in support of the aspirational network.

Consultation and scrutiny input:

Guidance:

* List the people / organisations consulted on the proposal, including scrutiny commissions.

* In relation to scrutiny input, please liaise with the relevant scrutiny officer. If scrutiny input was not sought, or was not considered necessary, you should explain why.

* Summarise relevant points and issues raised, and, where relevant, address / respond to issues raised by consultees (including scrutiny commissions).

a. Internal consultation:

- Mayor and Assistant Mayor periodically throughout the programme
- Legal – Joanne Mansfield
- Finance – Mike Allen
- Transport Management Team
- Place Leadership Team
- City Design Group
- Equalities – Anne James
- Energy Service – Steve Ransom

b. External consultation

- Via the statutory planning and TRO processes
- Local informal consultation
- Local formal consultation showed support for both bridges and no objections were received to TRO for the proposed Southville Highways works
- Ongoing consultation via Bristol Bike Forum and other stakeholders
- DfT

Other options considered:

Option 1 – Do Nothing

A number of the proposed change of scope schemes would not be built as part of CAF2. A proportion of the CAF1 grant would be returned to DfT.

Option 2 – Utilise the grant to deliver Camden Road Bridge

There is currently insufficient funding to deliver this scheme. Further transport capital programme funding would need to be identified. In the future the costs and/or benefits will be kept under review to keep the business case up to date as this remains a key desire line that will open up South West Bristol to the City Centre for walking and cycling

Risk management / assessment:

Guidance:

* Ensure a full risk assessment is completed and insert the details here. It must be an honest and open appraisal of the risks. It is never justifiable to set out the risks in private to the Executive but not include them in the report. Responsibility for undertaking the risk assessment lies with the report author. Advice and guidance can be sought from the Directorate Risk Champion.

FIGURE 1							
The risks associated with the implementation of the (subject) decision :							
No.	RISK Threat to achievement of the key objectives of the report	INHERENT RISK		RISK CONTROL MEASURES Mitigation (ie controls) and Evaluation (ie effectiveness of mitigation).	CURRENT RISK		RISK OWNER
		(Before controls)			(After controls)		
		Impact	Probability		Impact	Probability	
1	Failure to secure DfT funding due to delays in programme.	High	High	Reduce ; commitment made to DfT, regular liaison with DfT.	High	Low	Service Manager
2	Underestimation/inflation of scheme costs.	High	High	Reduce : Use additional match to establish a suitable risk budget. Work with contractors to manage potential risks.	High	Medium	Programme Manager
3	Failure to deliver or account for local authority funding.	Medium	Medium	Reduce : Ensure budgets loaded to correct cost codes following approval of this report and ensure clear audit trails in place	Low	Low	Service Director
4	Disappointment with decision to de-scope the bridges from current programme	Med	Med	Accept :: Keep economic case under review Exploit : Invest in schemes with a better economic return			

FIGURE 2							
The risks associated with <u>not</u> implementing the (subject) decision:							
No.	RISK Threat to achievement of the key objectives of the report	INHERENT RISK		RISK CONTROL MEASURES Mitigation (ie controls) and Evaluation (ie effectiveness of mitigation).	CURRENT RISK		RISK OWNER
		(Before controls)			(After controls)		
		Impact	Probability		Impact	Probability	
1	Loss of funding of grant awarded by DfT.	High	High	Reduce/Share : Ongoing communication and partnership working with DfT	Medium	Medium	Service Director
2	Loss of reputation with DfT which may impact on the ability to	High	High	Reduce : Ensure that any required explanation to DfT is specific and does	Med	Medium	Service Director

	successfully bid for future funds			not impact on other funds			
3	Loss of momentum of rates of growth in cycling which may impact the ability to realise the benefits of cycling and achieve the aspirations of the Cycle Strategy	Medium	Medium	Avoid: Carry out recommendations of this report	Low	Low	SRO
4	Loss of ability to successfully deliver Local Transport Plan (LTP) aspirations	Med	Low	Accept Ensure LTP delivery continues	Low	Low	Service Director

Public sector equality duties:

The decision to reallocate funding from CAF1 to CAF 2 has low relevance for equalities. CAF1 and CAF2 undertook EQIAs and individual schemes continue to do so. Many of the proposals involve segregated or delineated routes which also improve the situation for other road/pavement users.

Anne James Equality and Community Cohesion Manager 20.10.2015

Eco impact assessment (Appendix 2)

Guidance:

The significant impacts of this proposal are...

- Long-term positive impacts: Investment in, and promotion of sustainable transport providing for a reduction in car journeys and associated emissions.
- Short term negative impacts: the use of fuels and materials for construction of capital projects, and associated production of waste.
-

The proposals include the following measures to mitigate the impacts ...

- Individual engineering and construction projects will be subject to the appropriate controls, including Environmental Impact Assessments, procurement, planning and waste management.
- It is noted that any new planning permissions will need to comply with the following policies from the Core Strategy:
 - BCS 13- Climate change – mitigation and adaptation.
 - BCS 14 – Sustainable energy
 - BCS 15 - Sustainable design and construction
 - BCS 16 – Flood risk and water management
 - BCS 21 – Quality Urban Design.

There will still be a net environmental benefit but less than originally envisaged

Resource and legal implications:

Finance

Guidance:

* Ensure this section is written by / signed off by the relevant Finance Business Partner.

* Finance should be involved as early as possible in the preparation of a report. At minimum, the Finance Business Partner must have the report for review 5 working days before despatch to the Cabinet agenda conference.

* Be concise and ensure the report clearly shows: what the decision is going to cost the Council, how it is going to be paid for, and if the Council will save money.

* State any assumptions made in the calculations and where appropriate perform sensitivity analysis and include an assessment of: the accuracy of the data; payback

period calculations; and cost comparisons with other organisations.

a. Financial (revenue) implications:

Guidance:

Not applicable as this relates to capital budgets

Advice given by Mike Allen: Finance Business Partner

Date 23/10/2015

b. Financial (capital) implications:

The total CAF 1 grant awarded to the West of England totalled £7.766m, of which £4.957m was to be directed towards Bristol City Council projects. Due to a number of factors involving increases in costs and difficulties in securing contractors, two key Bristol projects involving bridges did not take place. This left £3.41m of CAF 1 grant unspent.

Negotiations with the Department for Transport have meant that Bristol City Council has the opportunity to retain this unallocated grant. The mechanism for retaining the CAF 1 grant requires Bristol City Council to find schemes that fall within the definition of schemes that are in line with Bristol's Cycle Strategy and its primary objective of doubling cycling and allocate CAF 1 grant to those schemes. In return for doing this exercise and therefore being able to make a claim for all of the West of England's allocation of CAF 1, the Council will need formally to set aside capital equal to the net claim and spend that on CAF 2 eligible schemes in addition to the £9.648m of CAF 2 grant allocated to Bristol City Council.

Advice given by Mike Allen: Finance Business Partner

Date 23/10/2015

Comments from the Corporate Capital Programme Board:

N/a

c. Legal implications:

There are no specific legal implications arising from the re-scoping of works outlined in this report to allow the retention of the CAF1 grant monies as the DfT funding will be retained so long as the grant conditions outlined in the capital financial implications section (above) are met.

Advice given by Joanne Mansfield - Lawyer

Date 23rd October 2015

d. Land / property implications:

The condition of our highways assets is likely to be improved and if there is a need for additional land this will go through due process

Advice given by Steve Matthews / Project Strategy Service

Date 23/10/2015

e. Human resources implications:

Not relevant

Advice given by Mark Williams / HR Business Partner

Date 23/10/2015

Appendices:

Appendix 1 – Proposed re-scope

Appendix 2 – Eco Impact assessment

Access to information (background papers):*Guidance:*

List background papers which include facts / matters on which the report is based, or which have been materially used in preparing the report (do not though include any published works or papers including information which is exempt or confidential).

You also need to supply a copy of any background papers (or the web link) as these must be published alongside the Cabinet reports.

Appendix 1

20MPH: Complete the Citywide roll out of 20MPH that was piloted by Cycling City.	Reducing speed is a key plank of the Cycling Strategy and this completes the Citywide coverage
Easton Way: 5m segregated route; the proposed additional match funding would enable the third and final phase to be completed, connecting the Frome Greenway to the Bristol Bath Railway Path	Connects a key gap in the strategic network
Old Market: complete a scheme to provide alternative to busy roundabout	Useful in its own right and CAF2 continues this route to existing Greenways
Cattle Market Road: Complete the scheme already on site	Part of CAF2 now being delivered through CAF; continues the continuous route along the river that has been CAF1 focus. Directly benefits the Local Enterprise Zone.
Cattle Market: Complete additional works to tie into CAF1 delivered schemes	Direct link to CAF and LEZ Schemes that aim to provide 4.5km of continuous infrastructure along the river
Bedminster roundabout – contribute to overall improvements led by Metrobus	Existing match funded CAF scheme
Clarence Road: Snagging required	Part of CAF scheme
Baldwin Street: complete scheme mostly funded by Cycle Safety Fund	CAF2 schemes to tie in with both ends of this segregated route
City Centre: Additional scope of City Centre remodelling (Metrobus) now includes a delineated cycle route which has resulted in budget pressure on Metrobus, which was funded from the risk budget, now is now needed for other elements of the Metrobus programme	CAF1 already aligned with Metrobus; this is at the Centre of CAF2 North/South route and at the end of the CAF2 East/West Route
Old City Filtered permeability ; traffic calming on Corn Street	Directly adjacent to CAF1, CAF2 and Metrobus projects. Builds on and improves Cycling City Old City pinchpoint projects. Will free up funds for Phase 2 feasibility and implementation

Appendix 2

Eco Impact Checklist

Title of report: Cycling Ambition Fund Project 2015 - 2018				
Report author: Ed Plowden				
Anticipated date of key decision: Cabinet 7 April 2015				
Summary of proposals:				
<p>The report summarises the key areas of the Cycling Ambition Fund investment in 2015 to 2018 and seek approval for the delivery of the project in Bristol.</p> <p>There are five main areas recommended for cabinet approval which are;</p>				
<p>1. That the Mayor endorses the Cycle Ambition Fund and notes the wider programme of spend for delivery between 2015 and 2018 (as detailed in Table 1) and agrees to proceed with the proposals contained in this report.</p>				
<p>2. That the Mayor agrees that Bristol City Council will deliver the project in collaboration through a formal legal agreement with Bath and North East Somerset and South Gloucestershire Councils and agrees that Bristol City Council will be the accountable body in reporting to Government on behalf of the partnership authorities.</p>				
<p>3. That the Service Director for Transport, in consultation with the Assistant Mayor, Place, be given delegated authority within the legal agreement with the other Unitary Authorities to proceed with the proposed project (listed in Table 1) and is authorised to implement the option best suited to the local circumstances to encourage more people to use a bicycle more often.</p>				
<p>4. That the Service Director Legal Services be authorised to negotiate and complete an extension to the existing agreement, dated 29th August 2014, with Bath and North East Somerset and South Gloucestershire to enable implementation of the Cycle Ambition Fund from 1st April 2015 to 31st March 2018.</p>				
<p>5. To agree to use as match funding £4.5m from the capital programme in 15/16 (£3.2m) and 16/17 (£1.2), which are already committed to qualifying projects.</p>				
Will the proposal impact on...	Yes/No	+ive or -ive	If yes...	
			Briefly describe impact	Briefly describe Mitigation measures
Emission of Climate Changing Gases?	Y	+ve	Enhancements to walking and cycling infrastructure and encouragement for the uptake of such modes of transport will provide for a	See overall environmental mitigation measures in the summary.

		-ve	reduction in emissions. Construction and engineering of capital measures requires combustion of fossil fuels.	Contractors will submit a method statement detailing how construction impacts will be minimised.
		-ve	while emissions overall may be reduced, changes may sometimes lead to very localised increases in emissions on particular junctions or roads.	It is likely that longer-term benefits will outweigh these short-term impacts.
Bristol's vulnerability to the effects of climate change?	Y	+ve	Providing for use of alternative modes of travel improves resilience.	See overall environmental mitigation measures in the summary.
		-ve	Specific capital schemes may have a negative impact. For example increasing impermeable surfaces.	Specific schemes will comply with the principles for assessing the vulnerability of transport options, as set out in the JLTP3.
Consumption of non-renewable resources?	Y	+ve	Enhancements to walking and cycling infrastructure and encouragement for the uptake of such modes of transport will provide for a reduction in consumption of fossil fuels.	See overall environmental mitigation measures in the summary. Contractors will submit a method statement detailing how construction impacts will be minimised.
		-ve	Construction of new infrastructure consumes materials and fuels.	It is likely that longer-term benefits will outweigh these short-term impacts.
Production, recycling or disposal of waste	y	-ve	Waste will be produced through infrastructure and engineering works.	Projects in excess of £300k are required to produce a Site Waste Management Plan, which

				will detail the types of waste generated, and how they will be managed.
The appearance of the city?	y	?	New infrastructure will alter the appearance of the city. These alterations may be positive or negative.	See overall environmental mitigation measures in the summary. To be considered as part of the planning process with appropriate mitigation measures.
Pollution to land, water, or air?	y	+ve	As set out in the JLTP, in terms of promoting sustainable travel and reducing car trips, the proposal is predicted to deliver a small improvement in local air quality, though this is not quantifiable.	Construction sites will be registered to the considerate contractors scheme.
		-ve	It is likely that any engineering and construction works will create noise and dust. There is also the possibility of accidental releases of fuels and chemicals or water.	Contractors will be required to submit method statements, detailing how they will manage site-based environmental risks.
Wildlife and habitats?	y	-ve	Development of infrastructure may harm wildlife and habitats.	With the advice of the Council's natural environment team, mitigation measures will be implemented. There should be no net loss to biodiversity/habitats and opportunities for enhancement should be explored.

Consulted with:
Steve Ransom, Energy Service

Summary of impacts and Mitigation - to go into the main Cabinet/ Council Report

The significant impacts of this proposal are...

- Long-term positive impacts: Investment in, and promotion of sustainable transport providing for a reduction in car journeys and associated emissions.
- Short term negative impacts: the use of fuels and materials for construction of capital projects, and associated production of waste.
-

The proposals include the following measures to mitigate the impacts ...

- Individual engineering and construction projects will be subject to the appropriate controls, including Environmental Impact Assessments, procurement, planning and waste management.
- It is noted that any new planning permissions will need to comply with the following policies from the Core Strategy:
 - BCS 13- Climate change – mitigation and adaptation.
 - BCS 14 – Sustainable energy
 - BCS 15 - Sustainable design and construction
 - BCS 16 – Flood risk and water management
 - BCS 21 – Quality Urban Design.

The net effects of the proposals are positive

Checklist completed by:

Name:	Andrew Whitehead
Dept.:	Place
Extension:	x36371
Date:	10/2/2015
Verified by Energy Service	13/10/15