

**Decision Session – Executive Member for
Transport**

14 February 2022

Report of the Director of Environment, Transport and Planning

Active Travel Programme – Project Scopes

Summary

1. The Active Travel Programme consists of 24 individual projects focussed on improvements to pedestrian and cycling provision in the city, as part of the Council’s wider commitment to enhancing sustainable travel in the city and addressing the climate emergency. A copy of the current programme summary is attached as Annex 1. Significant progress has been made on the Tadcaster Road scheme and the Navigation Road scheme has been implemented.
2. The Government has recently announced the creation of a new body, Active Travel England, to oversee the implementation of walking and cycling schemes across the country. This is extremely positive news, especially considering the fact that this body will be located in York, bringing employment and skills in sustainable transport projects to the city.
3. City of York Council takes this opportunity seriously and has put measures in place to accelerate the delivery of the Active Travel Programme. This is an exciting time for the city and we look forward to working closely with Active Travel England to achieve local and national objectives around the promotion of walking and cycling. This report supports that aim by providing further clarity on the Council’s own Active Travel Programme.
4. Many projects in the programme originates from a bid to the government for ‘Active Travel Fund’ support. This bid was successful and the submitted bid is attached as background document 1.
5. Throughout 2020 and 2021, as part of the Government’s Emergency Active Travel Fund (EATF) the council implemented a range of

temporary measures to support active travel throughout the pandemic. The work identified in this report will build on this by developing and introducing new, permanent infrastructure that will enable more convenient and safer walking and cycling across the city of York.

6. Other projects in the programme originates from a Budget allocation for walking and cycling in July 2019 allocated through a Director Decision and accompanying annex approved in May 2020. This report and annex are attached as background documents 2 and 3.
7. Officers started work on these projects and undertook activities to pursue delivery alongside work on priority projects arising from the pandemic.
8. In order to deliver the programme effectively, it is important that there is a shared understanding of the objectives for each of the active travel programme.
9. This report seeks a decision to approve the proposed project outlines, such that officers can proceed with confidence, reducing abortive work and supporting a more expeditious delivery of schemes.
10. A decision is also sought to approve procurement approaches for individual projects.
11. A decision is also sought to prioritise projects on the programme, including overall programme budget prioritisation.
12. This report does not replace further public decision sessions on individual scheme design at the relevant stages, where appropriate.

Recommendations

13. The Executive Member is asked to:

- 1) Approve the proposed project outlines attached as annexes to this report.

Reason: To enable officers to progress projects effectively within the Active Travel Programme.

- 2) Delegate to the Director of Environment, Transport and Planning in consultation with Director of Governance and Chief Finance Officer

the procurement of design resource for the 'A19 Cycle Scheme' and the A1237 section over the River Ouse' scheme.

Reason: To support progress of the identified projects.

- 3) Confirm and approve the proposed prioritisation of projects within the programme.

Reason: To support the creation of more accurate programme timescales and allow more effective assignment of resource.

- 4) Confirm and approve the budget allocation follows the above prioritisation in recommendation 3. This approach being one that assigns funding to projects as and when the necessary feasibility information becomes available, rather than waiting for information on all projects within the programme.

Reason: To ensure an appropriate balance is reached between obtaining value for money and the expeditious delivery of schemes.

Consultation

14. All schemes which impact on residents and businesses will be subject to public consultation prior to progressing the scheme. This consultation on individual schemes within the programme will happen, when sufficient information is available and in any case, prior to a decision being made to proceed to construction.
15. Officers have supported the Executive Member in meeting ward Councillors to discuss the scope of some project outlines attached to this report in order to refine the parameters for design options.

Options

16. Option A (Recommended) – To approve the presented project scope outlines attached to this report. Refer to section 24 of this report.
17. Option B – Do not approve the presented project scope outlines. Alter or adjust the scope of works for one or more projects. Refer to section 28 of this report.

18. Option C (Recommended) – To approve the proposed procurement approach described within section 31 of this report.
19. Option D – Do not approve the proposed procurement approach. Refer to section 38 of this report.
20. Option E (Recommended) – To approve the proposed project prioritisation list described in section 40 of this report.
21. Option F – Do not approve the proposed project prioritisation list. Refer to section 50 of this report.
22. Option G (Recommended) – To approve the proposed programme budget prioritisation approach described in section 54 of this report.
23. Option H – Do not approve the proposed programme budget prioritisation approach. Refer to section 60 of this report.

Analysis

Project Scope Outlines (Option A - Recommended)

24. Attached as annexes to this report are 'Project Outline' documents for 18 projects on the programme. These documents highlight key elements for each scheme, including the currently proposed scope of works.
25. These scopes were created by officers and have been refined taking account Council Plan objectives, existing strategies and local knowledge.
26. The project outlines attached to this report reflect the current understanding of officers as to what is expected for any given scheme. Some projects have progressed further than others along the lines defined in these documents.
27. It is recommended to approve the project outlines (Option A) attached to this report, such that officers can proceed. This will also allow certain procurements to progress, as per Option C.

Project Scope Outlines (Option B – Not Recommended)

28. A decision to not approve the presented project outlines, or to adjust the scope of works for any given project, will potentially have an impact upon

delivery.

29. Depending on the proposed alterations, projects could be affected in terms of timescales, costs, quality, risk, or other factors. These effects would likely vary significantly depending on the projects that are to be altered.
30. Should a change of scope be proposed, officers will work to understand the impacts that these changes would cause, and would come back to a future decision session with a revised project outline.

Project Support Procurement Approach (Option C - Recommended)

31. Included in the project outline documents is a short section laying out the proposed approach to procuring design resource for each project (where relevant)
32. 11 Projects have a contract in place for design resource, or use in house design resource, and no decision is required. The procurement approach for each project is outlined within the relevant project outline document, attached as annexes to this report.
33. 5 projects do not yet have design resource in place and advice from procurement is that a tender process needs to be followed to obtain the required resource. This process will start when the project outlines are approved (Option A), such that we can give clarity to the tenderers on what they are expected to deliver. The procurement approach for each project is outlined within the relevant project outline document, attached as annexes to this report.
34. 2 projects have a provider lined up via a framework agreement and a quotation has been received. A decision is required to proceed with the award of preliminary design services. The procurement approach for each project is outlined within the relevant project outline document, attached as annexes to this report.
35. A quotation for preliminary design services has been received for the 'A19 Cycle Scheme' and the 'A1237 section over the River Ouse' scheme. The quoted costs are £69,125 and £18,267 respectively.
36. Following the preliminary design work, further detailed design work would be required if the scheme were progressed to construction. Cost estimates for this stage are dependant upon the outcome of the

preliminary design stage.

37. It is recommended (Option C) to make a decision to proceed to award this work. Note that this can only occur if the proposed project outlines are also approved (Option A) to ensure we are commissioning the correct work.

Project Support Procurement Approach (Option D – Not Recommended)

38. An alternative approach would be to instead include these 2 schemes into the tender process described in para 33. This approach would potentially result in reduced costs, but would increase timescales significantly and is therefore not recommended.
39. Should a decision be made to explore another procurement route, then this approach would be evaluated by officers with a further decision coming back to a future decision session to agree on how to proceed. This would have timescale implications.

Project Prioritisation (Option E - Recommended)

40. Many projects within the programme require input from some of the same professional resources. Some of these resources have limited capacity, and it is therefore necessary to prioritise the projects within the programme.
41. Prioritising the projects will enable Project Managers to produce more reliable project plan timescales.
42. The programme timescales shown in Annex A will be revised following the outcomes of the decisions presented within this report.
43. There are effectively 3 'teams' of available resource working on the programme. The following lists provide an indication of the priority schemes for each team.
44. This list does not mean that officers will wait to complete each scheme before starting on the next. When all possible actions have been completed at any given point in time, the resource will move onto the next prioritised scheme until further actions become due on the higher priority schemes again. Based on resulting design work and consultation, the list can be revised in the future to ensure the right

priorities continue to be worked on.

45. Analysis of deliverability and engagement with the Executive Member has resulted in prioritisation of resources as per the lists in the following paragraphs. A decision is sought to approve these proposed prioritisations.
46. The University Road Minor Pedestrian Works scheme is not shown on this priority list, however it is a safety related scheme and shall therefore be progressed with a priority commensurate with this aim.
47. Team 1 Project List:
 - Very High Priority - A19 Cycle Scheme
 - Very High Priority - A1237 section over the River Ouse
48. Team 2 Project List:
 - Very High Priority - St Georges Field Crossing
 - Very High Priority - City Centre Bridges
 - Very High Priority - People Streets
 - Very High Priority - Hospital Fields Road Cycle Improvements
 - High Priority - Tang Hall Lane / Foss Islands Path Access
 - High Priority - Manor Lane / Shipton Road Improvements
 - High Priority - Orbital Cycle Route – Lawrence / James / Regent St
 - High Priority - Skeldergate – Cycle Improvements at Buildout
 - High Priority - Rougier St / Tanners Moat Gap
 - Medium: Nunthorpe Grove / Southlands Road Improvements
 - Medium: Nunnery Lane / Victor St – Puffin to Toucan
 - Medium: Chocolate Works Riverside Path Improvements (S106 funded)
49. Team 3 Project List:
 - Very High Priority - Fishergate Gyrotory Cycle Scheme
 - Very High Priority - Wheldrake / Heslington Path
 - Very High Priority - Acomb Road Cycle Scheme
 - High Priority - City Centre North South Cycle Route
 - High Priority - Fulford Road / Frederick House Scheme (S106 funded)
 - High Priority - University East West Campus Link

Project Prioritisation (Option F – Not Recommended)

50. Deciding to not approve the proposed project prioritisation list will mean that teams will continue to work on projects based on those tasks that most immediately present themselves at any given time.

51. This approach makes it very hard to present realistic timescales and project monitoring information, meaning presented timescales will continue to be at a very high level with limited levels of certainty.
52. A decision can be made to change priorities within any given team without significant impact, however an attempt to change priorities by moving projects between teams is more complex due to contractual arrangements.
53. Should a decision be made to move projects between lists, officers will consider the implications and present a further report for a decision.

Programme Budget Prioritisation (Option G - Recommended)

54. Cost estimates for individual projects are refined at progressive stages throughout scheme development. Initial cost estimates are produced at the feasibility stage and then refined during the detailed design process.
55. Because feasibility and detailed design work has not yet been completed for a number of projects on the programme, it is not yet possible to give a significant degree of certainty as to how much it will ultimately cost to implement the entire programme.
56. It is however assumed that the current funding assignment is not likely to be sufficient to take every scheme on the programme through to construction. This presents the need to plan how decisions will be made with respect to approving individual schemes.
57. It is proposed to make decisions on individual schemes as and when the information becomes available, without waiting for cost estimates for all other projects on the programme.
58. This would result in the most timely delivery of schemes, with the downside of this approach being that it is likely that the budget will be fully spent before some projects are considered at a decision session.
59. Should further funding become available in the future, this approach can be reconsidered.

Programme Budget Prioritisation (Option H – Not Recommended)

60. An alternative approach would be to wait for all schemes on the programme to reach the end of feasibility (when initial cost estimates will

be available) before making a decision on individual schemes.

61. This would potentially allow each project to be compared against each other, thus ensuring that funding is spent on those schemes that have the best cost-benefit.
62. This approach is not recommended however as it would mean that all projects would proceed at the pace of the slowest project, introducing significant further delays to delivery.
63. Should the decision be to take an approach other than those presented within this report, officers will evaluate the implications of the decision and report back to a future session.

Council Plan

64. Delivery of the Active Travel Programme supports the following Council Plan key priorities:

- getting around sustainably
- a greener and cleaner city
- safe communities and culture for all
- good health and wellbeing

Implications

65.

- **Financial**
The proposed Active Travel programme is funded from a combination of grant funding and council resources allocated through the capital programme. Once final costs for individual schemes are known the programme of schemes will need to be prioritised, in line with the approach outlined in the report, to fit within both the total budget available and to ensure the terms of any grant funding are met.
- **Human Resources (HR)**
There are no HR implications.
- **Equalities**
Each individual project is subject to its own equalities impact assessment, based on the specifics of the scheme.

- **Legal**
Some schemes on the programme have legal implications. These will be addressed as part of the individual projects processes.
- **Crime and Disorder**
There are no Crime and Disorder implications.
- **Information Technology (IT)**
There are no IT implications.
- **Property**
Some scheme on the programme have property implications, including considerations of land ownership and potential land purchase. These considerations will be considered as part of the individual projects processes.
- **Other**
All other relevant considerations with regards to specific projects will be dealt with individually.

Risk Management

66. Each project on the programme has its own risks associated with it, and these will be managed separately in line with the relevant processes.

Project Managers will maintain risk registers for each project and follow the corporate risk management strategy, as appropriate.

Contact Details

Author:

Christian Wood
Smart Transport Programme
Manager
Transport
01904 551 652

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:

James Gilchrist
Director of Environment, Transport and
Planning

Report **Date** 19/01/2022
Approved

Specialist Implications Officer(s) List information for all

Financial:
Patrick Looker
Finance Manager

Wards Affected:

All Y

For further information please contact the author of the report

Background Papers:

BD1 - EATF T2 Application Submitted Copy
BD2 - Cycling & Walking Prioritisation Report Director DS 070520
BD3 - Cycling & Walking Prioritisation Report Annex A Director DS 070520

Annexes

- 1 - Active Travel Programme Summary
- 2- Project Outline – A19 Cycle Scheme
- 3 - Project Outline – Acomb Road Cycle Scheme
- 4 - Project Outline – University EW Campus Link
- 5 - Project Outline – People Streets
- 6 - Project Outline – A1237 section over the River Ouse
- 7 - Project Outline – City Centre North South Cycle Route
- 8 - Project Outline – City Centre Bridges

- 9 - Project Outline – University Road Minor Pedestrian Works
- 10 - Project Outline – Hospital Fields Road Cycle Improvement
- 11 - Project Outline – Tang Hall Lane / Foss Islands Path Access
- 12 - Project Outline – Manor Lane / Shipton Road Improvements
- 13 - Project Outline – Orbital Cycle Route – Lawrence / James / Regent St
- 14 - Project Outline – Wheldrake Heslington Path
- 15 - Project Outline – Fishergate Gyratory Ped and Cycle Scheme
- 16 - Project Outline – Fulford Road / Frederick House
- 17 - Project Outline – St Georges Field Crossing
- 18 - Project Outline – Rougier St / Tanners Moat Gap
- 19 - Project Outline – Skeldergate – Cycle Improvements at Buildout

List of Abbreviations Used in this Report

- ATF – Active Travel Fund
- EATF – Emergency Active Travel Fund
- DfT – Department for Transport
- ATP – Active Travel Programme
- CYC – City of York Council