



Bristol City Council
Schedule 1 – Project Brief

Project Brief

Commission Reference No	A01
Commission Title	Cumberland Basin feasibility study
BCC Commission Manager	Adam Crowther
BCC Commission Department	Strategic City Transport
Date of Issue	05/01/18
Approx. Value	£50,000

Description of Works: *(Please describe Background, Objectives and Desired Outcomes)*

Building on previous ARUP work developing options for the Cumberland Basin and BCC thinking, we would like to commission a feasibility study to look at detailed options for realigning traffic movement across the basin, while also freeing up land for potential development.

Background:

There is a need to spend significant funding on maintenance of the highway structures in and around the Cumberland Basin. The main costs relate to the elevated, grade separated structures but all elements require some degree of expenditure. The estimated cost for these works is around £30m. This money would ensure that the structures remained in place and operational for a further 30-60 years. If this funding is not provided the structures will gradually decline over the next 10-15 years until they can no longer be used. There is therefore an opportunity to spend this maintenance funding in an alternative way to design a highway network that provides similar transport benefits but has less impact on the surrounding environment. This then presents the opportunity to free up land to pay for the works as there is currently no identified budget for the necessary maintenance works. Dependent on the scheme proposed and the land freed up, additional budget may be released to deliver the scheme.

Arups and Alec French examined opportunities at this location and presented them to the council. These revolved mainly around removing some elements of the elevated structures to free up parcels of land. The council subsequently examined more extensive options, including removal of all the raised structures. The purpose of this commission is



to examine these options and provide options for further development

Objectives:

The contractor is to examine the BCC proposal, re-evaluate previous Arup/Alec French works and propose any further options that may be deliverable. All options should be evaluated in a simplified fashion and presented to the project board as an interim report for evaluation with recommendations as to which options should be explored further. This report should be largely qualitative and the contractor should propose the parameters for assessment to the board, early on in the process. The parameters should enable assessment of the following issues:

- Likely cost of highway works – broad brush
- Buildability of highway scheme – levels of disruption, must maintain working harbour etc
- Operation of harbour in final scheme
- Likely highway capacity – similar, less, higher etc
- Impact on public transport routes
- Impact on cycling and walking
- Impact on environment – existing residents, wildlife, air quality, noise, views etc
- Potential development opportunity – volume of units, residential/office split etc
- Potential net cost/income to council – broad brush

The board will then approve no more than three options for further development. The final report should evaluate the three options and offer recommendations as to which option should be developed further should the council pursue the scheme. Outputs for the final report would be expected to be a more detailed version of the outputs detailed above.

Outputs:

- Initial report detailing options for sifting with recommendation for no more than three schemes to be progressed
- Final report detailing viable options for further consideration, where viable relates to capacity, buildability and the ability to be self-funding. Preferred option should be highlighted

The main purpose of the commission is to determine whether there is a feasible way to deliver the improvement works in a manner that can both be built with limited disruption and be self-funding. It is not intended at this stage that the commission provides consultation documentation or detailed design works and the value of the commission reflects this.

Stakeholders involvement: Business West, Homes and Communities Agency

Key Risks: Project to remain confidential and should not be seen as competing with housing allocations identified in the Joint Spatial Plan. Aim of the project is to test feasibility of realigning the highway rather than maintaining existing infrastructure, housing potential is an additional benefit.



Provide initial estimate of fees by:	ASAP
<p>Programme and Timescale for Provision of Services by Stages/Outcomes and Billing Schedule (to be expanded as necessary for Commission Managers): Inception meeting to take place as soon as possible after commission – agree scope of works and parameters for assessing options. Initial report and final report submission dates to be agreed following agreement of schedule 1. Payment 50% on receipt of initial options report, 50% on receipt of final report.</p>	
<p>Reporting and outputs: Initial options report to be presented to board Final options report provided at end of project Informal progress reports as required</p>	
<p>Special requirements: <i>(e.g. specific working arrangements / Performance Bond)</i> N/A</p>	
<p>Commission Scope, Boundaries, Assumptions and Exclusions:</p> <p>Project is to consider the highway network encompassing the A4 Portway (south of suspension bridge), A370 (north of Winterstoke Road and west of B3170), Cumberland Rd (west of Vauxhall Bridge), Hotwells Gyratory and Cumberland Basin road network, Hotwell Rd (west of Mardyke)</p> <p>A report has been produced on flood risk along the river Avon, including the New Cut and the Harbour. This project is not expected to carry out detailed flood assessment works however any proposed development opportunities and highway works must deliver necessary flood protection. While no detailed work is expected on this point, reference is required in the report as to the suitability of designs for delivering the flood mitigation measures and how highway and development works will deliver the necessary flood prevention infrastructure. Suitable extracts of the flood risk report will be made available as required.</p>	
<p>Other Comments:</p> <p>Board make up is as follows:</p> <p>Head of Strategic Transport (Chair), Policy Strategy and Bidding Manager, Head of Strategic Planning, City Design Manager, Service Manager Economic Development, Highway Maintenance Group Manager, Sustainable Transport Projects and Infrastructure Group Manager</p>	