

## Highways Maintenance Challenge Fund Tranche 2A Value for Money Pro-Forma

The pro-forma should be filled in with as much of the 'specific data' as possible - with supporting data / information included where possible. Not all elements will be relevant for every bid - however we would expect for most bids 'specific data' will be available for at least rows 1 and 2.

**In the 'Specific Data' Column - please supply the information in the units/format requested.**

The 'Other Supporting Data' column should be used to provide salient details not captured under 'Specific Data' and/or further supporting information.

Please add any further information on scheme benefits either at the end of this pro-forma or within the body of the main bid (or annexes)

Input data	Specific Data	Other Supporting Data / Information (either input directly or provide reference to supporting information reported elsewhere)	Information requested
Length of Scheme	7.3Km	See mapped outputs for the scheme area in Annex 2	Provide length of route covered by the scheme - if an area wide scheme then provide total route length covered by scheme.
Number of vehicles (or users) on affected section (split by vehicle type if possible)	(Total Vehs - Average Annual Daily Traffic) 3837 (Cars - AADT) 1543 (LGV - AADT) 310 (HGV - AADT) 53 (PSV - AADT) 282	Based on the North Street/Skeldergate junction, see Annex 6. Skeldergate flows used. The Total Veh figure includes cyclists. The majority of the remainder of the route is off-road therefore AADT aren't applicable.	Provide an estimate of the traffic flow on the section of route covered by the scheme - also provide details of the data used to support that estimate (e.g. age, type and duration of count, etc.).
Details of required restrictions/closures if funding not provided (e.g. type of restrictions; timing/duration of restrictions; etc.)	(restriction type - text description)  (start date of restriction - MM/YY)	Under the do minimum scenario the northern section of Route 65 (section ref 1-3 in Annex 3) will become permanently impassible due to riverbank erosion, this is rapidly accelerated with every high river event. It is difficult to state when the start date of the restriction could occur The route would be restricted for usage by all cyclists and pedestrians	Provide details of any future restrictions. E.g. If restrictions to particular vehicle types will be needed in the do minimum (i.e. without funding) provide details of why they are required, what vehicle types are covered and when such restrictions will come into place.
Length of any diversion route, if closure is required (over and above existing route)	2.6km	A permanent on road diversion of 2.6km would be required for all cyclists and pedestrians. See Annex 7 Box 1 for illustrative mapping	Provide estimate of the length of diversion route over and above existing route. It would be helpful to support this with some mapping to demonstrate this.
Average extra time per vehicle on diversion route (over and above existing route)	10 mins per cycle 48 mins per pedestrian	Assuming cycling speed of 10mph (Google Maps) Assuming walking speed of 2mph Google Maps use 2 to 4mph depending on topography 2mph used for this assessment to take into consideration less mobile users	Provide estimate of the average extra time vehicles would spend on the diversion route over and above existing route. It would be helpful to support this with details of any data used/assumptions made (e.g. source of speed data used in any calculations).
Regularity/duration of closures due to flooding: (e.g. number of closures per year; average duration of closure (hrs); etc.)	Average of 8 closures/year 48hr closure 6 km diversion 22 mins per cycle extra time for diversion 111 mins per pedestrian extra time for diversion	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	Provide estimates of closures / durations /delay and provide details of the data used to support those estimates (e.g. number of years of data etc.).
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 the scheme)	(DM Total Accidents/yr) (DM Slight Accidents/yr) (DM Serious Accidents/yr) (DM Fatal Accidents/yr) (DM Accident Rate - PIA/MVKm) (DS Total Accidents/yr) (DS Slight Accidents/yr) (DS Serious Accidents/yr) (DS Fatal Accidents/yr) (DS Accident Rate - PIA/MVKm)	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	Provide estimates of accidents (split by severity if possible) or accident rates for the without scheme (DM) case and the with scheme case (DS). Provide details of the data and assumptions/analysis used to support these estimates (e.g. number of years of data, etc.).
Number of existing cyclists; forecasts of cycling usage with and without the scheme (and if available length of journey)	(DM cyclists/day) (DM av trip length - Km) (DS cyclists/day) (DS av trip length - Km)	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) - 1448 at Millennium Bridge 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. 3000 cyclists per day at the Route 65 monitoring point by Millennium Bridge	Provide estimates of the number of cyclists (and if possible trip length) for the without scheme (DM) case and the with scheme case (DS). Provide details of the data and assumptions/analysis used to support these estimates.

<p>Other salient information for the VFM Case</p>	<p>Sustrans 'A Vision for Yorks Greenways' December 2014 report valued that the cycle network generated over £1 billion of economic benefits and a £803 million benefit to peoples health.</p> <p>York attracts more than 7 million visitors every year, the coast to coast Way of the Roses route which passes through York was evaluated to have led to 130,000 cycle journeys in 2012 with cyclists spending £3 million with small businesses along the route. Following Yorks hosting of the Tour de France in 2014 it is considered that these figures are likely to have grown by more than 50%.</p> <p>York has the third highest levels of commuter cycling in the UK behind Cambridge and Oxford.</p> <p>In the most recent Trans-Pennine-Trail Visitor Survey the Selby to York leg of the route generated approx £480K of visitor spend, however, this is probably a conservative estimate as it is based on counts done south of the York area and will not have picked up many York residents also using the trail. The City of York is committed to tackling climate change and to reducing emissions by 40% by 2020 (against a 2005 baseline). This is reflected in the City's Climate Change Framework and Action Plan.</p>	<p><i>A description of the do-minimum situation (i.e. what would happen without Challenge Fund investment). Details of significant monetised and non-monetised costs and benefits of the scheme.</i></p>
---	---	--