

Concern was expressed at the Panel hearing that the financial information available to the Council at its meeting on 14th July was incomplete, in particular that the scheme costs broken down to individual scheme elements was not available within the papers.

The purpose of the report to Council was to seek approval to revise the best and final bid to DfT by removing elements identified in the Joint Local Transport Plan i.e. the BRT and the A4 Park and Ride. Approval from Council was sought because these proposals could be seen as contrary to existing transport policy.

The report identified a maximum contribution from the Council of £17.8m and delegated to relevant officers, in consultation with Cabinet authority, authority for finalising amendments to the scope of the bid and financial arrangements. Revenue reversion risks of £3.8m were also identified in the report.

It is clear that Council were aware that the figures were subject to further refinement and indeed they still are. The interim breakdown of figures provided to Cllr Hanney does not affect the limits set by Council for best and final bid. As long as the final bid complies with those limits the interim analysis of individual elements is not material to the decision. Attached to this paper is the latest estimate of the cost of the BTP broken down to individual elements with a reconciliation to the table provided to Cllr Gerrish at the Council meeting.

The following specific questions were recorded in the minutes:

1. Newbridge Park & Ride Extension

Although Cllr. Crossley (Leader of Council) gave a pledge in May 2011 that there would be no extension of the Park and Ride at Newbridge, the proposals to Cabinet and Council contain provision for such an extension.

It would appear, however, that the financial totals (without appropriate detail) provided for decision by Cabinet and Council and advised to this Committee include provision for an extension of Newbridge by 500 spaces.

a) Please confirm that the capital financing requirements in respect of Newbridge have been overstated and by how much and that any bid to DfT will be reduced to reflect only an additional 250 spaces.

The interim analysis provided to Cllr Gerrish for the Council meeting did indeed include the costs of 500 spaces because the impact of the reduction is still subject to the outcome of the TVG application. The best and final bid to DfT will include the estimated cost of providing 250 spaces. We estimate that this amendment will reduce the cost of this element of the scheme by £265,000 and this new figure is included in the attached breakdown of scheme costs.

b) What are the revenue implications for the Council given there will now be substantially less income as a result of fewer spaces?

The revenue implications of changing individual elements of the bid are still being worked on. The Council's Transport Strategy assumes that as P&R spaces increase, city centre car parking spaces are released for economic development. It follows that development of fewer P&R spaces will retain more

city centre spaces. As these spaces generate more income than P&R spaces (because of the higher tariff) there is a compensating revenue effect.

2. The amount of £1.89m referenced as 'BWR Transport Scheme' is contained within the revised package. I understand that this amount is payable by Crest under the BWR S106 Agreement but only towards the BRT.

Why would Crest still want to pay this amount, which is now entirely at their discretion, when you have eliminated the BRT which is likely to affect the viability of BWR?

Without and until Crest's agreement to an alternative, which isn't evident, shouldn't this element be deleted from any bid to DfT or it be made clearer that the Council will step in to fund this amount if Crest choose not to?

This will not affect the viability of the BWR. The development of BWR will continue to need improved public transport to reduce its impact on the surrounding road network. The payment is not 'entirely at their discretion' but are covered by the terms of the signed 106 agreement which provide for Crest's funding of an alternative to the BRT to serve the BWR site.

3. Isn't the amount of £1,616,500 for City Centre Works double-counting? Isn't this already being funded under the Council's Public Realm budget?

Yes the City Centre works are funded by the PR&MS budget and are included as part of our Local Contribution as originally envisaged in our Expression of Interest submitted in December last year.

4. I note that Bus Stops and Real Time Information are still £4,587,292 when there is no BRT and no Eastern Park & Ride? Similarly, the amounts for Ticket Machines (£175,000) and Variable Messaging Signs (£803,250) are unchanged. Given the elimination of the BRT, the elimination of an Eastern Park Ride, and a halving of the expansion at Newbridge, isn't this stretching credibility with the DfT in terms of value for money?

The Bus Stops and Real Time Information will be spent on the show case bus routes throughout the City and they provide significant benefits supporting the scheme. The costs of these elements have been reviewed and are now set out in the attached table. In the light of the Smartcard project separately funded by DfT through the WoE, the £175,000 for Ticket Machines is no longer needed and these costs will not be included in the Best and Final Bid.

5. The revised Property Costs of £909,000 are expressed as 'net'.

Please confirm that it is the Administration's intention not to renew the planning consents for the BRT route and the Bathampton Meadows Park and Ride, to dispose of any properties acquired in relation to those elements of the Bath Transport Package, and not to protect the BRT route in any way for the future.

This Administration will not renew the planning permission for a Park and Ride on Bathampton meadows and we are discussing with officers the best way to protect the former BRT route from future development.

6. The amounts included for Risk (£2,685,144) and Inflation (£1,094,509) look very high given the elimination of the BRT, the Eastern Park and Ride and the halving of the Newbridge Park and Ride extension and the fact that inflation and risk cannot apply to costs already expended. Please confirm that the amounts included for inflation and risk can be fully justified and please let me have detailed computations for review.

The attached table shows the revised risk and inflation element of the project. They are robust and provide confidence that the project can be delivered at these costs.

7. The amount for vehicles is unchanged at £2,950,000. Why would a Park & Ride operator consider anywhere near this level of investment when there is no BRT, no Eastern Park and Ride (1400 spaces) and a halved Newbridge Park and Ride extension (250 spaces less)?

This element of the project is currently being reviewed and we currently estimate that the reduced P&R expansion will result a requirement of £400,000 for new vehicles and this is now included in the scheme costs in the attached table. This will not impact the funding requirement of the Council.

8. There is an amount of £7,952,000 set down as 'BID'. What is this comprised of? Does it include any costs relating to elements of the Bath Transport Package that are not now included?

A detailed breakdown of this amount has been provided to Cllr Hanney and includes costs of developing elements of the project that have now been deleted.

9. It would appear that the Council's financial commitment as per the Council resolution is:-

£21.6m (being Council contribution to revised package of £17.8m plus at least £3.8m revenue reversion risk related to the deletion of the Bathampton Meadows Park and Ride and the BRT) plus:-

- a) Any additional costs relating to 'alternatives to Bathampton Meadows Park and Ride possibly including rail as part of our future Transport Strategy' (Resolution 1.9)
- b) Any additional costs relating to other unfunded aspirations (Resolutions 1.10-1.15)

In both the Council's letter of 18 July 2011 to Mr. Emerson (the Inspector appointed in connection with the Draft Core Strategy) and in the Council Agenda Paper, great stress is placed on the initiatives set out in Resolutions 1.9-1.15. However none of these have any funding for implementation i.e. of relevant measures that Officers

may suggest in response or that Cabinet would like to do irrespective of Officer advice? So how realistic is it (in the absence of any specific or detailed funding proposals) that the DfT and the Inspector for the Core Strategy will take the Council seriously in terms of a bid to Government for funding and as evidence of a credible Transport Strategy / Core Strategy?

The Councils commitment is not £21.6m. The full amount of the bid costs of circa £8.0m is included within the Council's commitment of £17.8m. The revenue reversion risk simply means that bid costs relating to deleted elements that would otherwise be capitalised will fall to revenue. The costs have already been incurred, there is no additional expenditure

Proposals in paragraphs 1.9 – 1.15 of the Council resolution will not form part of the bid for funding to DfT. Cabinet have asked that the proposals are evaluated as part of the Council's future Transport strategy. The revised Bath Transport Package will not represent the totality of the Council's Transport Strategy just as the original package did not. The Council will have the opportunity to explain to the Inspector at the inquiry into the Core Strategy how our emerging transport strategy will support the objectives of our plan.

10. Resolution 1.10 suggests additional signage on the A46 to direct more traffic to an extended Lansdown P&R. However, Lansdown is only being extended by 390 spaces while the Bathampton Meadows Park and Ride would have accommodated 1,400 spaces. Is there any concern the additional signs may direct traffic to a full Lansdown P&R with possibly even more signs needed to send on somewhere else?

The Variable Message signs referred to in question 4) above will indicate if spaces are available at Lansdown P&R sites. When this is full drivers will be directed to available spaces within the city.

11. In considering alternatives to the Bathampton Meadows Park and Ride which has now been ruled out, please confirm for the record that Lambridge is not an option given the proposals regarding the Recreation Ground with Bath Rugby?

Yes Lambridge has been ruled out as an alternative the Bathampton Meadows P&R.

12. Given the deletion of key elements of the Bath Transport Package which were integral to the Draft Core Strategy, will the Council not be subject to increased challenge as to the deliverability of the Core Strategy with consequential risk of planning applications (that would otherwise have been contrary to the Core Strategy) being approved at Appeal, urban extensions, and serious difficulties in terms of credibility for the Examination by the Inspector including at the public hearings?

See answer to question 9) above.

13. The aforesaid letter of 18 July 2011 to the Inspector (paras 8.19-8.22) indicates that 'The draft Bath Parking Strategy has not yet been approved by Members and is,

therefore not yet publicly available. A programme for approval by Members and public release of the Parking Strategy is still being assessed in light of the need to amend it as a result of changes to the BTP.'

Why was there no mention of the potential impact on the Council's Parking Strategy in the Council Agenda Paper?

The Council paper was dealing very specifically with amendments to the BTP and a wider discussion of the potential changes to an emerging Parking Strategy was not considered possible at that stage. In any event officers have been directed to identify and evaluate an alternative Park and Ride site to the East as part of the emerging Transport Strategy. Other measures to encourage modal shift and reduce the demand for city centre parking spaces are also being considered. The removal of the A4 P&R from the bid will impact the timing of the redevelopment of city centre car parks but not necessarily the quantum.

14. What are the prospects for the development of Avon Street Car Park and Coach Park and other key sites in the absence of a viable Transport Strategy, a viable Parking Strategy and a viable Core Strategy?

Revision of the BTP does not automatically invalidate any of these strategies. The BTP was only part of the wider Transport Strategy has been de-scoped as requested by DfT.

The revised package still has elements that increase P&R capacity and allow for phased development of city centre car parks. It was highly unlikely all of the car parks would have been developed simultaneously any way. Removing unpopular elements from the bid has improved the cost benefit ratio of the scheme, reduced the cost to DfT and improving the scheme deliverability by removing the need for CPO's. All these things will be attractive to DfT. There is time to develop a more sustainable Transport Strategy and seek alternative sources of funds for other capital schemes over the period of the Core Strategy.

15. When will the views of the Urban Regeneration Panel (URP) and the Transport Commission be sought on the revised 'Package'?

The Transport Commission will not be meeting prior to the submission of the revised Package so they will not be able to comment. The Urban Regeneration Panel will have the opportunity to discuss the Package at their meeting on 1st September 2011. The Chair of the Transport Commission has indicated that it might be more productive to support development of the emerging Transport Strategy rather than review revisions to the scheme bid. There is insufficient time for the Commission to complete a detailed evaluation of the scheme before the submission deadline in September.

Bath Transportation Package	Original Expression of interest	Council 14th July	Current Cabinet 9th August
	£'000	£'000	£'000
Preparation Costs	7,952	7,952	7,952
Property costs (net)	10,997	990	990
Main scheme	22,553	18,852	18,905
A4 P&R	5,039	0	0
City Centre works (Public Realm)	1,514	1,616	1,616
Other work (BWR)	0	1,890	1,989
	48,055	31,300	31,452
Vehicles	2,950	2,950	400
Total	51,005	34,250	31,852
Funded by			
Dft Grant	25,600	11,300	11,664
Borrowing (Service supported)	6,500	1,000	1,000
Borrowing (Corporate)	12,400	12,000	11,786
Revenue reversion		3,500	3,500
S 106 BWR	2,000	1,989	1,989
Capital receipts	1,514	1,514	1,514
	48,055	31,300	31,452
Vehicles	2,950	2,950	400
TOTAL	51,005	34,250	31,852