



Application Form (for Tranche 2A)

The level of information provided should be proportionate to the size and complexity of the scheme proposed. Note that DfT funding is a maximum of £5 million per scheme. An individual local authority may apply only for one scheme.

For schemes submitted by components of a Combined Authority a separate application form should be completed for each scheme, then the CA should rank them in order of preference.

Applicant Information

Local authority name: City of York Council

Bid Manager Name and position: Steve Wragg, Flood Risk & Asset Manager

Name and position of officer with day to day responsibility for delivering the proposed scheme.

Contact telephone number: 01904 553401 **Email address:** steve.wragg@york.gov.uk

Postal address: City of York Council
Directorate of Economy & Place
Hazel Court
James Street
York
YO10 3DS

When authorities submit a bid for funding to the Department, as part of the Government's commitment to greater openness in the public sector under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and the Environmental Information Regulations 2004, they must also publish a version excluding any commercially sensitive information on their own website within two working days of submitting the final bid to the Department. The Department reserves the right to deem the business case as non-compliant if this is not adhered to.

Please specify the weblink where this bid will be published:

https://www.york.gov.uk/info/20113/roadworks_closures_and_diversions/1309/roadworks

SECTION A - Scheme description

A1. Scheme name: York NCN65 Cycle Route Reinvigoration

A2. Headline description:

Please enter a brief description of the proposed scheme and its timetable including the completion date (in no more than 50 words)

In York 15% of people cycle to work, 18% walk, Route 65 of the National Cycle Network is vital for our sustainable transport plans. Renewal works will deliver resilience improvements, sustainable modern infrastructure linking wider funding programmes - Scarborough Bridge cycleway replacement and the Environment Agency five year flood plan.

Annex 1 City of York Cycle Route Map

Annex 4 MS Project Work Programme

A3. Geographical area:

Please provide a short description of area covered by the bid (in no more than 50 words)

Route 65 runs north/south through the city, the mainly off-road cycle and pedestrian greenway runs alongside the River Ouse for part of its length and floods as a result. It connects the city centre and tourist attractions with homes, businesses and schools. This project will deliver improvements throughout the route.

OS Grid Reference: **SE 60348 51264 (York centre)**

Postcode: **YO1 6GA**

Please append a map showing the location (and route) of the proposed scheme, existing transport infrastructure and other points of particular interest to the bid e.g. development sites, areas of existing employment, constraints on land use, planning etc.

Annex 2 Geographic and Demographic Work Programme Associations

A4. Type of scheme (please tick relevant box):

Small project bids (requiring DfT funding of **up to £5 million**)

Major maintenance, strengthening or renewal of bridges, tunnels, retaining walls or other structures

Major maintenance or renewal of carriageways (roads)

Major maintenance or renewal of footways or cycleways

Major maintenance or renewal of drainage assets

SECTION B – The Business Case

B1. The Financial Case – Project Costs and Profile

Before preparing a scheme proposal for submission, bid promoters should ensure they understand the financial implications of developing the scheme (including any implications for future resource spend and ongoing costs relating to maintaining and operating the asset), and the need to secure and underwrite any necessary funding outside the Department's maximum contribution.

Please complete the following tables. **Figures should be entered in £000s** (i.e. £10,000 = 10).

Table A: Funding profile (Nominal terms)

£000s	2017-18
<i>DfT Funding Sought</i>	918.178 See Annex 3 NCN65 Priced Measures
<i>LA Contribution</i>	200
<p>The scheme compliments the Scarborough Bridge footbridge replacement scheme. The below funding has been secured to deliver a wheelchair-accessible, shared use bridge carrying pedestrians and cyclists. The bridge forms a vital part of NCN 65 as the route crosses the River Ouse at this point. The improvement and delivery of the bridge will complete the package of Route 65 improvements included within this bid.</p> <p>The new bridge will be over twice the width of the current footbridge and will incorporate ramped approaches at either end to greatly improve access for pedestrians, cyclists, pushchairs and wheelchair users. Even with the existing footbridge, the desire line here is clear, with close to 500 cyclists carrying their bikes up steep stairs and across the existing footbridge on a daily basis due to the very limited number of available river crossings in the vicinity of the city centre and its proximity to York Station. The current footbridge is not accessible to residents or visitors with mobility issues.</p> <p>The existing footbridge is unavailable during floods as the access steps are on the river side of the city's flood defences. This can potentially sever this crucial north-south link in both the cycle and pedestrian networks for several weeks per year. The new bridge will ramp down to the 'dry side' of the flood defences and will be available for use 365 days a year.</p> <p>The proposals will greatly improve the connectivity of the National Cycle Network (routes 65 and 658) as well as providing a traffic-free and direct link for residents, commuters and tourists, by foot or bike, between York station and the city centre and residential suburbs located on the opposite side of the river. The bridge and ramps will also provide an improved traffic free route to the York Central site to the west of the station.</p>	
<i>Other Third Party Funding</i>	<p>Scarborough Bridge Replacement</p> <p>£2m Cycling Ambition Grant – West Yorkshire Combined Authority £1m York, North Yorkshire and East Riding Local Enterprise Partnership £1m City of York Council</p>

Notes:

- 1) Department for Transport funding is only for the 2017-18 financial year.
2) A minimum local contribution of 10% (by the local authority and/or third party) of the project costs is required.

B2 Local Contribution / Third Party Funding

Please provide information on the following points (where applicable):

- a) The non-DfT contribution may include funding from organisations other than the scheme promoter. Please provide details of all non-DfT funding contributions to the scheme costs. This should include evidence to show how any third party contributions are being secured, the level of commitment and when they will become available.

Non-DfT funding is not directly linked to the Challenge Fund Bid, details are provided in Section B1 of the funding secured for the linked Scarborough Bridge Replacement scheme. Details of secured funding can be made available if required.

- b) Where the contribution is from external sources, please provide a letter confirming the body's commitment to contribute to the cost of the scheme. The Department is unlikely to fund any scheme where significant financial contributions from other sources have not been secured or appear to be at risk.

Have you appended a letter(s) to support this case? Yes No N/A

- c) Please list any other funding applications you have made for this scheme or variants thereof and the outcome of these applications, including any reasons for rejection (e.g. through the Access Fund or similar competition).

N/A

B3. Strategic Case (Maximum 50 words for each section a) to g)

This section should briefly set out the rationale for making the investment and evidence of the existing situation, set out the history of the asset and why it is needs to be repaired or renewed. It should also include how the scheme it fits into the overall asset management strategy for the authority **and why it cannot be funded through the annual Highways Maintenance Block Funding grant.**

- a) What are the current problems to be addressed by your scheme? (Describe economic, environmental, social problems or opportunities which will be addressed by the scheme).
Many sections of the routes are between 20 and 30 years old and are deteriorating due to wear and tear, floods or damage by adjacent vegetation. This will discourage some cyclists from using them. The alternative routes using the parallel road network running are heavily trafficked in places.

See also Annex 10 Photo Evidence

- b) Why the asset is in need of urgent funding?

Damage has now reached a level where intervention is required to return the route to good working order thus preventing cyclists considering switching to motorised modes. An improved route will also attract new cyclists. Provision of good information about route availability during floods gives cyclists more flexible route choice.

- c) What options have been considered and why have alternatives have been rejected?

Patching to sections of route have been considered but tend to be ineffective on paths which flood regularly. Lack of available funding has also delayed repairs to sections of the route.

d) What are the expected benefits / outcomes?

Provision of a consistent quality route will encourage and retain cycle trips both for leisure and utility purposes for local users. It will also encourage cycle tourism in a city where tourism is now a major contributor to the local economy and one of the main sources of employment.

e) Please provide information on the geographical areas that will benefit from your scheme.

NCN65 passes through 7 of the City's 21 Wards and links villages on the outskirts of the city (Skelton and Bishopthorpe) through the suburban areas to the city centre.

See Annexes 1 & 2

f) What will happen if funding for this scheme is not secured - would an alternative (lower cost) solution be implemented (if yes, please describe this alternative and how it differs from the proposed scheme)?

On many of the sections of the route the repair or improvement work would be delayed (potentially by a significant time with reduced levels of revenue funding available). Works would need to be considered alongside improvements to other types of highway infrastructure which could be deemed a higher priority.

g) What is the impact of the scheme?

This will provide a consistent, attractive route suitable for families to use for leisure purposes and also commuters and pupils to get to and from work or school. Safe routes away from busy arterial roads make cycling a realistic option for many trips in a small city such as York.

B4. Affordability and Financial Risk (maximum 50 words for each of a) to c)

What is your Authority's most recent total outturn annual capital spending on highways maintenance (Year 16/17) **£4027 figures should be entered in £000s** (i.e. £10,000 = 10)

What is the DfT contribution sought as a % and that annual total **22.800 %** (to 3 decimal places)

This section should provide a narrative setting out how you will mitigate any financial risks associated with the scheme

Please provide evidence on the following points (where applicable):

a) What risk allowance has been applied to the project cost?

The scheme costs identified in Annex 3 have been prepared by CYC Highways, their development have been informed by many years of works delivery in the city and a 15% risk allowance has been applied which is considered commensurate for the scope and extent of the works in this bid.

b) How will cost overruns be dealt with?

Regular review sessions will be carried out throughout the programme (see Annex 4), the completion of each work-stream will be reviewed and efficiencies or delays will be factored across the whole programme to identify corrective measures to bring the programme in to budget, quality and time.

c) What are the main risks to project delivery timescales and what impact this will have on cost?

Works in rivers and the floodplain could have programme impacts, permissions will need to be obtained from partners. Close working relationships and understanding of the impacts on flood risk are already well understood and will minimise their impact. These will have minimal impact on cost through careful works design.

Annex 4 CYC Challenge Fund Bid MS Project Programme

B5. Equality Analysis

Has any Equality Analysis been undertaken in line with the Equality Duty? Yes No

See Annex 11 Community Impact Assessment

B6. Value for Money

a) For all scheme bids, promoters should provide, where available, an estimate of the Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) of the scheme.

Where a BCR is provided please be aware that DfT may wish to scrutinise the data and assumptions used in deriving that BCR.

b) Please provide the following data will form a key part of our assessment:

Note this material should be provided even if a BCR estimate has been supplied and has also to be entered and returned as an MS Excel file in the VfM Annex MS Excel file).

CYC Challenge Fund Tranche 2A VFM pro-forma is included with this bid and compliments the below information

A description of the do-minimum situation (i.e. what would happen without Challenge Fund investment).

A range of defects along the existing fabric of NCN Route 65 are becoming difficult and costly to maintain under routine maintenance funds, renewal and reinvigoration is necessary to improve the route for users and to realise the city's future cycling ambitions. The route suffers during flood risk situations and existing funding cannot deliver a resilient network better able to cope with current and future flood risks.

Details of significant monetised and non-monetised costs and benefits of the scheme (quantified where possible)

See Annex 5.
Benefits - £4.176M
Costs – £918.178k
BCR – 3.73:1
This figure is based only on the direct benefit to cyclists, there are many benefits which have not been monetised which will increase the BCR (The DfT's recent publication "Value for money assessment of the integrated transport block, 2016" suggests that capital spending on cycling schemes varies between a BCR of 5.1:1 and 13.1:1.) The non-monetised benefits of our proposed scheme include:
benefits to motorists on the shared routes
reduction in cycle casualties on the parallel road network through the provision and protection of the safer off-road alternative
increased flood resilience of the route
undertaking the works now will be better value for money than delaying the repairs where

	<p>future costs could be substantially more due to the asset being in a much poorer state there will be less risk to cyclists and pedestrians who use the route as a result of the improvement in quality and removal of hazards</p> <p>the decongestion benefits used in the SQW calculation will be understated due to the city centre of York being very busy and congested due to the historic, constrained nature of the road network, in a similar vein the air pollution benefits will also be understated</p> <p>In addition to the above the works to upgrade Scarborough Bridge and maintain an access to Millennium Bridge have not been taken into direct consideration at this time and will deliver a much stronger BCR when complete. The route will be in very close proximity to the York Central site, a large brownfield development site to the rear of York Station which is ear-marked for a large residential site, employment area and an improved National Railway Museum site. The route will be used by residents, employees and visitors and will help achieve the objectives of reducing the transport impacts of the site.</p>
Length of scheme (km)	7.3km
Number of vehicles on affected section (Average Annual Daily Traffic in vehicles and if possible split by vehicle type) – to include details of data (age etc.) supporting this estimate.	<p>For AADT cycle flows at various points on NCN65 route see Annex 8</p> <p>For on-road section (Skeldergate)</p> <p>AADT(all vehs) – 3837</p> <p>AADT(Cars) – 1543</p> <p>AADT(LGV) – 310</p> <p>AADT(HGV) – 53</p> <p>AADT(PSV) – 282</p> <p>See Annex 8 for cycle flows at various points on the route</p> <p>See Annex 6 for traffic flows and vehicles splits on the alternative on-road sections</p>
c) Other VfM information where relevant - depending on type of scheme bid:	
Details of required restrictions/closures if funding not provided (e.g. type of restrictions; timing/duration of restrictions; etc.)	<p>Under the do minimum scenario the northern section of Route 65 (section ref 1-3 in Annex 3) will become permanently impassable due to riverbank erosion, this is rapidly accelerated with every high river event.</p> <p>It is difficult to state when the start date of the restriction could occur</p> <p>The route would be restricted for usage by all cyclists and pedestrians</p> <p>Ongoing damage to other sections of the route by tree roots, potholes and surface cracking will discourage existing cyclists from using the path if they perceive it is not fit for purpose. Some may transfer their trips to the road</p>

	network whereas others may decide to use motorised transport instead.
Length of any diversion route, if closure is required (over and above existing route) (km)	A permanent on road diversion of 2.6km would be required for all cyclists and pedestrians. See Annex 7 Box 1 for illustrative mapping
Regularity/duration of closures due to flooding: (e.g. number of closures per year; average length of closure (hrs); etc.)	See Annex 7 Box 2 for illustrative mapping 8 closures per year on average 48hour closure on average (can take a further 48hours on average to cleanse the route of flood water silts for it to safely navigable for all users) Maximum diversion length 6km 22 mins per cycle extra time for diversion 111 mins per pedestrian extra time for diversion The closure removes vehicular access to Rowntree Park for motorists, pedestrians and cyclists. The closure removes access to the Rowntree Park Caravan Park who have to evacuate the park and cancel all bookings following receipt of Environment Agency flood warnings
Number and severity of accidents: both for the do minimum and the forecast impact of the scheme (e.g. existing number of accidents and/or accident rate; forecast number of accidents and or accident rate with and without the scheme)	For do minimum section there were 2 cyclist casualties (both slight injuries) in the past 3 years. For the full diversion route north of the city centre there were 3 serious and 39 slight cyclist casualties For the diversion route south of the city centre using Bishopthorpe Rd there were 3 serious and 25 slight cyclist casualties For the diversion route south of the city centre using Tadcaster Road there were 7 serious and 47 slight cyclist casualties It is difficult to forecast how many cyclists will potentially transfer from the on-road route to the off-road route alternative but it is realistic to assume some casualty savings as a result of the proposed works. Looking at this from the opposite viewpoint if the work isn't done and the off-road route becomes unavailable it is realistic to assume cyclist casualties will rise on the alternative on-road routes. See Annex 12
Number of existing cyclists; forecasts of cycling usage with and without the scheme (and if available length of journey)	2011 census - 15% of York Residents cycle to work, 18% walk (compared to a Yorkshire and Humber average of 2 and 11% respectively). Monitoring following the 2008 Cycling City programme in York has shown cycling numbers increase by 50% in the city. 32% of residents now cycle once a month or more - an 86% increase since October 2011 (Active People's Survey 2014). DM

Cyclists per day - see Annex 8 (and Annex 6) - 699 at the Terry Avenue monitoring point on Route 65
15,144 cyclists per day commuting to work across the city based on the census figure.

DS
The City of York Council iTravel York strategy has an ambition to deliver a doubling of cycle levels and a 15% increase in walking levels across the City of York population. Annex 9 illustrates how the delivery and maintenance of cycle infrastructure will achieve these aims.
c. 1400 cyclists per day at the Route 65 monitoring point at Terry Avenue

B7. The Commercial Case

This section categorizes the procurement strategy that will be used to appoint a contractor and, importantly for this fund, set out the timescales involved in the procurement process to show that delivery can proceed quickly.

What is the preferred procurement route for the scheme? For example, if it is proposed to use existing framework agreements or contracts, the contract must be appropriate in terms of scale and scope.

Framework Contract

Council Contractor

Competitive Tender

**It is the promoting authority's responsibility to decide whether or not their scheme proposal is lawful; and the extent of any new legal powers that need to be sought. Scheme promoters should ensure that any project complies with the Public Contracts Regulations as well as European Union State Aid rules, and should be prepared to provide the Department with confirmation of this, if required. An assurance that a strategy is in place that is legally compliant and is likely to achieve the best value for money outcomes is required from your Section 151 Officer below.*

B8. Delivery (maximum 50 words for a) and 100 words for b)

a) Are any statutory procedures required to deliver the project, if yes please provide details below;

Yes No

Details of statutory procedure (50 words maximum)

Works in rivers consenting is required from the Environment Agency and Canals and Rivers Trust, allocations have been made for both in the programme, good working relations and understanding of the scope of works minimise the risks of none compliant working.

b) Please summarise any lessons your authority has learned from the experience of delivering other DfT funded programmes (such as Challenge Fund tranche 1, pinch point schemes, local majors, Local Sustainable Transport Fund, Better Bus Areas) and what would be different on this project as a result.

Past grant funding schemes have taught us that early engagement and support from key authorities/stakeholders is essential for successful delivery. This was particularly true for the LSTF capital works where a close working relationship with Network Rail was developed to ensure that a new bridge across a railway line was delivered. For the proposed challenge fund bid we have worked closely with the Environment Agency and Sustrans to develop the bid and will work closely with them during the delivery phase, a degree of flexibility is vital in any scheme to ensure the needs of all users are considered.

B9. Stakeholder Support (maximum 50 words for a) and 100 words for b)

c) Does this proposal have the support of the Local MP(s);

Yes No

Name of MP(s) and Constituency

1 Julian Sturdy MP – York Outer (see Annex 13)

2

3

etc.

d) List other stakeholders supporting the Scheme: See Annex 13

1 Cycling UK

2 York Ramblers

3 Love to Ride

4 Sustrans

5 York Cycle Campaign

6 Get Cycling

7 York Bike Belles

8 NHS Trust

9 Environment Agency

10 Make it York

11 Wednesday Wheelers

12 Trans Pennine Trail

SECTION C: Declarations

C1. Senior Responsible Owner Declaration

As Senior Responsible Owner for York NCN65 Cycle Route Reinvigoration I hereby submit this request for approval to DfT on behalf of City of York Council and confirm that I have the necessary authority to do so.

I confirm that City of York Council will have all the necessary powers in place to ensure the planned timescales in the application can be realised.

Name: Neil Ferris

Signed:

Position: Director of Economy & Place



C2. Section 151 Officer Declaration

As Section 151 Officer for [*name of authority*] I declare that the scheme cost estimates quoted in this bid are accurate to the best of my knowledge and that [*name of authority*]

- has allocated sufficient budget to deliver this scheme on the basis of its proposed funding contribution
- will allocate sufficient staff and other necessary resources to deliver this scheme on time and

on budget

- accepts responsibility for meeting any costs over and above the DfT contribution requested, including potential cost overruns and the underwriting of any funding contributions expected from third parties
- accepts responsibility for meeting any ongoing revenue requirements in relation to the scheme
- accepts that no further increase in DfT funding will be considered beyond the maximum contribution requested
- has the necessary governance / assurance arrangements in place
- has identified a procurement strategy that is legally compliant and is likely to achieve the best value for money outcome
- will ensure that a robust and effective stakeholder and communications plan is put in place

Name: Ian Floyd

Signed:



Submission of bids:

The deadline for bid submission is 5pm on:

31 March 2017 for Challenge Fund Tranche 2A (2017/18 funding)

An electronic copy only of the bid including any supporting material should be submitted to:

roadmaintenance@dft.gsi.gov.uk copying in Paul.O'Hara@dft.gsi.gov.uk