

CAIRNGORMS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY
EXPENDITURE JUSTIFICATION (PROJECT PROPOSAL)

1. Title

Shovel Ready path related projects being delivered by the Cairngorms Outdoor Access Trust

2. Expenditure Category

Operational Plan		Code		Procurement	
Programme:				Grant	
Core or Project spend		Code		Capital	√

Is this spend to be funded from an existing budget line, existing line with additional funds or is it a totally new spend?	£	Existing budget	
	£	Additional	
	£ 640,000	New budget	√

3. Description

- Brief overview of project/activity including cost summary
- Specific elements for which support is sought (if not whole project/activity)

A bid was made to Scottish Government to access funding that would be used for capital projects which would help stimulate the economy. The projects that went forward were for path improvements and other access infrastructure. The funding total was for £640,000 and this funding was approved. The works that were bid for and were agreed by Scottish Government are:

Bachnagairn bridge	15,000
Rothiemurchus car park	50,000
Achlean car park	25,000
Speyside Way (existing)	250,000
Speyside Way Kinrara	300,000
Total	640,000

The costs and funding are full costs for delivery of the above works.

Since the Scottish Government approval was given there has been further consideration as to the merits of taking forward the two car parks. CNPA, along with partners are in the process of developing a strategic approach to visitor management throughout the Glenmore corridor. This will include the provision car parks. As such it would be premature to develop a further car park in Rothiemurchus before this strategy work is complete. The Achlean car park still requires a number of permissions including that of the owners. It is therefore proposed to re-direct the £75,000 ear-marked for car parks to other priority paths. Work is currently in hand to specify additional sections of path on the Speyside Way extension or wider Core Path Plan which would benefit from early completion.

4. Rationale and Strategic Fit

- Why is the Park Authority considering investing staff and/ or financial resources in this project?
- Objectives/intended beneficiaries
- Evidence of need and demand
- Why is the Park Authority considering investing
- Fit with National Park Plan/Corporate Plan/other relevant strategies
- Linkages to other activities/projects
- What contribution may be made to improving KPI's?

The improvement of paths and related infrastructure can assist greatly in delivering the long term outcome of: *People enjoying the Park through outstanding visitor and learning experiences*. The planned works will improve the existing quality of visitor provision and the specific improvements to the existing Speyside Way will enable a greater range of people enjoy this route. The further development of the route across Kinrara will enable the route to be extended to the south and will link with the existing Badenoch Way at Dalraddy. The Speyside Way is a popular route and the consultation exercises that were undertaken on the extension demonstrated strong support for the route south to Newtonmore.

The projects fit both with the Scottish Government's objectives in stimulating the economy through capital construction and the Park Authority's objectives in relation to: *Management of core paths and outdoor access and Maintaining and improving high quality visitor facilities*.

5. Option Analysis

- Are there other ways in which the above objectives could be achieved?
- If so, why is this the preferred option?

The projects will be delivered through the Cairngorms Outdoor Access Trust who have a strong record in effective delivery. It would be possible to manage these contracts in-house but this would put much greater demand on staff time and there is much less experience in-house on managing contracts. There is therefore greater risk doing this work in-house than enabling COAT to deliver.

6. Risk Assessment

- Strategic, Organisational Risks: Does the project assist in managing or reducing any of the strategic risks identified by the Audit Committee or Management Team? Please reference the Strategic Risk Register and specify which risks are addressed through the project and how these risks are addressed.
- Project Risks: Are there risks to the CNPA in funding this project/activity?
- Are there risks in the project/activity not being delivered to required timescale/quality?
- Comment on the likelihood of such risks occurring, their potential impact, and (where appropriate) any action that would be taken to mitigate the risks.

Risks on improving the existing route of the Speyside Way contained within the package of works are minimal as Seafeld Estate have already given permission for the work to go ahead and planning permission is not required as it is resurfacing an existing track. Estate permission has also already been secured for the Bachnagairn bridge.

There are greater risks around the elements of the work package relating to the Speyside Way extension given the greater sensitivities of this development both with some land managers and also in reflection of some adverse comment during the consultation periods on the finally adopted route. These risks will have to be managed very closely during the operational delivery of projects on the Speyside Way extension by both CNPA officers and COAT staff responsible for project management.

There is also some reputational risk for CNPA in effective utilisation of shovel ready capital funding made available to it by Scottish Government. Approval to use of the funds is sought now in order to allow COAT to move forward to implement a package of priority pathworks that will fully utilise the grant sums available.

7. Costs and Funding

- Detail the financial costs of the project/activity
- Detail the sources of funding
- Justification also needs to be given if the CNPA is the major funder
- Detail any non-monetary costs to the CNPA (such as Member or staff input)

Bachnagairn bridge	15,000
Speyside Way extension	375,000
Speyside Way (existing)	250,000
Total	640,000

All the funding is coming direct from Scottish Government with no CNPA financial contribution being required.

The Recreation and Access Programme Manager will be required to spend time ensuring the works are being delivered effectively but this is part of his existing role sitting on COAT's Management Group.

8. Funding conditions

- Detail the project specific conditions that need to be included in any contract for services or grant offer letter in order that CNPA obtains the intended outcomes and Value for Money
- In the case of grant offers, our Financial Memorandum requires that SEERAD agree these conditions in advance of the grant offer being made

All works must be completed within the current financial year 2013/14.
Scottish Government funding must be acknowledged in all publicity about the projects.

9. Deliverables/ Impact Assessment including Equalities

- Could the project have any discriminatory or negative effects on particular groups?
- Have opportunities been taken to promote equality within the project design?
- Does the project fall within one of the Park Authorities priority areas for considering equality impacts?
- What end products/outputs will be delivered?
- How will success be measured?
- How will the project be monitored and what will be the feedback to the CNPA?

The projects are all about improving accessibility through the design of routes that meet the needs of as wide a range of users as possible. Gradients on the extension will be kept to an absolute minimum wherever possible and cross slopes on paths will comply with the Countryside for All standards. The improvements to the existing Speyside Way will provide a much better surface than that which currently exists and will open up the potential for buggies and wheelchairs to use the route.

High quality paths will result from the work and user feedback is encouraged through the Speyside Way website. Other mechanisms for feedback exist such as reporting problems through the access pages on the CNPA website. Positive feedback through the above websites will be the main way mechanism for determining success.

10. Value for Money

- In view of the costs, do the deliverables appear to offer value for money? (consider cost of comparable projects, where available).

All works let will be subject to full competitive tendering processes.

11. Exit or Continuation Arrangements (where applicable)

- If this is not a discrete, time-limited, project or piece of work, what are the exit/continuation arrangements for when CNPA support ceases?

There are all discrete capital projects. Maintenance of the Speyside Way is managed through CNPA annual resourcing of the Trust.

12. Additionality

- Does this work/project substitute for or duplicate work being carried out or proposed by others?
- What would be the effects of the CNPA not supporting the project? Would it proceed without CNPA support?

These projects are wholly funded through Scottish Government shovel ready capital and without it these projects would not go ahead.

13. Stakeholder Support

- Have the organisations and/or communities that would have an interest in this work/project been involved, and are they supportive?
- If supporter are also not funders an explanation may be required.

The extension of the Speyside Way has been a long held desire of people living in Badenoch and Strathspey. This was made clear through two rounds of public consultation and during the consultation on the core paths plan.

14. Recommendation

I recommend that funding of £640,000 be given to the Cairngorms Outdoor Access Trust to deliver the works described in section 3 of this report.

Name: Bob Grant

Signature: _____ Date: _____

15. Decision to Approve or Reject

Group Director

Name:	Signature:	Date:

Director of Corporate Services

Name:	Signature:	Date:

Chief Executive

Name:	Signature:	Date:

Finance Committee

Name:	Signature:	Date:

Board

Not applicable – below approval limits		
Name:	Signature:	Date:

Scottish Government

Not applicable – below approval limits		
Name:	Signature:	Date: