

CAIRNGORMS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY
EXPENDITURE JUSTIFICATION/(PROJECT PROPOSAL)

1. Title

Aviemore Countryside Park

2. Expenditure Category

Operational Plan		Code		Procurement	
Programme:				Grant	
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	
	£ 80,000	New budget	√

3. Description

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

<p>Funding is being sought for the next tranche of works associated with the Aviemore Countryside Park. The overall aim of the park is to provide a safe and accessible countryside Park on the banks of the River Spey. The objectives that the Park will fulfil are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improving the quality of life for residents; • Increasing social cohesion and a sense of community; and • Enhancing the local environment. <p>The park will comprise a network of all access and natural paths linking the north, south and centre of Aviemore and running alongside the river Spey. To date funding has been given for the repair of two bridges linking the south area of the Park.</p> <p>Funding is now being sought for path works, a bridge and the fencing off of the path from stock. The proposals are shown in Annex I with the pathworks denoted in red, the fencing in black and the new bridge in yellow labelled B3 in the north east section of the annex. The total value of the three elements of work is estimated to be £80,000.</p>
--

The works are being managed through the Aviemore and Cambusmore Enhancement Company (ACE) who have engaged the Spey Catchment Officer to undertake delivery.

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 objectives that ACE has set provide a strong fit with the National Park Partnership Plan's long term objectives of "...recreation opportunities have improved the health and enjoyment of visitors and residents." The work will fit well with the specific programmes of promoting active enjoyment, management of core paths and outdoor access and maintaining and improving high quality visitor facilities.

The demand for these improvements has come through ACE which has been the delivery arm of the Community Council to date. The paths identified for improvement are Core paths and there was strong local support for their inclusion during the public consultation exercise on the last round of core paths.

The proposed works also provide a clear fit with the Corporate Plan outcomes of an excellent network of paths, continually improving with good information on recreation opportunities easily accessed by visitors and residents.

5. Option Analysis

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

It would be possible to manage all the work in-house but this would require additional staff resources to oversee the contracts. It would also put the risk of non-delivery onto CNPA rather than ACE. The Spey Catchment Project Officer is an engineer by background and has a sound track record in delivery. This option remains the most cost effective for CNPA.

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.

Planning permission has already been secured for all the works to be taken forward. The risks are therefore confined to unavailability of contractors, contractor costs coming in higher than budgeted and late delivery. Each of these are explored in turn.

The project officer has engaged with potential contractors to check availability and has confirmed that there are firms available to deliver this work in the current financial year.

Costs remain unknown at present and to address the potential shortfall in funding the Project Officer is actively pursuing other sources of funding.

Late delivery can be avoided by tight control of the contracts and through such instruments as penalty clauses. The duration of the works is such that overruns are unlikely.

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)

Path works: £48,000

Fencing: £17,000

Bridge: £15,000

Total: £80,000

The CNPA funding is exclusively money coming from Scottish Government to stimulate the economy through a series of capital projects.

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 in the current financial year.

Scottish Government funding and the support of the National Park Authority in sourcing the 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 project aims are to improve accessibility through the upgrading of a beaten grass sward path into a path that complies with full accessibility standards. Gradients on the route will be kept to an absolute minimum wherever possible and cross slopes on paths will comply with the Countryside for All standards.

The new bridge will also enable a greater range of mobility users to access the riverside network.

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 and will therefore be market tested in relation to their value for money.

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?

This is a discrete capital project. Maintenance of the paths, bridge and fences will fall to ACE (or their successor bodies) to undertake and will be a condition of grant.

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?

This project is wholly funded through Scottish Government shovel ready capital and without it this project 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 desire for this work has come from the community through the Community Council and their delivery arm: the Aviemore and Cambusmore Enhancement Company. The relevant stakeholders have therefore expressed their full support for this work.

14. Recommendation

I recommend that funding of £80,000 be given to the Aviemore and Cambusmore Enhancement Company to deliver the works described in section 3 of this report.

Name: Bob Grant Signature: _____ Date: 23 July 2013

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: