

CAIRNGORMS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY
EXPENDITURE JUSTIFICATION/(PROJECT PROPOSAL)

1. Title

'Gateway Improvements'- Lecht Road Lay-by and Tomnavoulin Lay-by

2. Expenditure Category

Operational Plan		Code		Procurement	
Programme:				Grant	x
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	
	£ 30,000	Additional budget	Scottish Gov
	£	New budget	

3. Description

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

The project is to landscape upgrade two key lay-bys.

See attached plans at the end of this report.

Tomintoul A939 Lecht Road (Highland Tourist Route)

- Clear fell conifer plantations to stump, remove all brash from site and replant with groups of native trees
- Reduce lay-by by 50% and refurbish surface
- Construct a new path from lay-by to the village
- Remove all Crown Estate signs and information structure and reseed areas
- Install new information board
- Rationalise and relocate road signs
- Install new 'Tomintoul' village sign (and a second at north entrance to village)

Tomnavoulin lay-by (Cairngorms National Park Entry Point)

- Upgrade entrance with new bitmac surface
- Add topsoil and plant around upgraded entrance
- Remove twelve trees to stump to 'open up' both the site and CNP sign
- Set paving around information board and planters

An application for planning permission has been submitted.

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?

Delivering the Tomintoul and Glenlivet Master Plan is part of the developing National Park Partnership Plan 2012-17

5. Enabling Development 5c. Tomintoul Regeneration Strategy

8. Placemaking 8b. Glenlivet & Tomintoul Landscape Partnership

Master Plan:

The main gateways are at the north entrance to the village (A939) and the combined eastern approach (A939 /B9008), which is effectively a serial gateway, with a number of entrance points as the roads arrive at the shelterbelts, the Glenlivet Estate entrance feature and the village edge.

There is an opportunity to improve the appearance of these gateways through environmental improvements. In general, the design concept for these gateway improvements should be understated, aiming to reflect the local landscape character and using indigenous species and local materials (stone and timber) to enhance the relationship between the village and the surrounding landscape.

5. Option Analysis

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

There is no other obvious option for the upgrade of these sites

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.

Tomintoul and Glenlivet Development trust is a relatively new organisation and this is a large capital project for them to deliver. Experienced landscape architects, Ian White Associates, have been contracted to take forward the work and the Trust is being supported by CNPA and Crown Estate.

The felling of the trees at Lecht road is causing some concern locally particularly over how the site will look. The aim of the project is to leave the clear fell as tidy as possible but it will be a clear fell site and some local criticism can be anticipated. Nevertheless, this project will deliver a much better outcome than if the site were felled as part of normal forest operations.

There is also likely to be some criticism locally about a new village sign for Tomintoul regardless of the design.

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)

Cost estimates have been prepared by Ian White Associates Landscape Architects. The work will be tendered for competitively unless it can form part of existing contracts let by Crown estate for such activity as tree felling.

The total cost of delivering the works is estimated at: **£71,500**

Funding

TGDT Trust	£25,000
Crown estate	£6,000
CNPA (Shovel Ready)	£30,000
	£61,000

This leaves a projected deficit of £10,500. We are trying to obtain additional funds from the Scottish Government Scenic Routes initiative and failing that we will postpone Tomnavoulin Development until funds are available.

We are also seeking specific support from Moray Council for the road sign improvements.

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

The offer will take the form of a normal grant offer with standard conditions. Maintenance and insurance of the facility will remain the responsibility of Crown Estate as landowner and we will obtain a formal agreement with them confirmation of this situation.

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 designs have been developed to current best practice.

Success will be measured through informal feedback received from visitors by local tourism businesses, VIC staff and Crown estate Ranger Service

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).

The Landscape Architect was appointed following competitive tender and the contractors will also be appointed via a competitive tendering process demonstrating 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, time-limited project.

The ongoing maintenance of the site beyond the contract period will fall to Crown Estate.

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?

No other organisations or individuals are doing or planning similar works.

This project would not proceed to this quality without CNPA support. Within the next 5 years the Crown Estate will need to clear fell the trees at Lecht Road but it is unlikely that they would invest in the high quality landscaping being proposed in this project.

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 supporters are also not funders an explanation may be required.

The communities have been consulted on the original master plan and the specifics of this project. TGDT has done a good job of keeping residents informed of progress.

14. Recommendation

That £30,000 be released for the upgrade of two lay-bys as outlined in this justification.

Name: _____ 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: _____

Lecht road lay-by Tomintoul



- KEY**
- Arable grass
 - Rough grass
 - Alignment line level
 - Trees to be retained
 - Trees to be removed
 - New access for planting
 - New broadleaf woodland planting
 - New mixed broadleaf woodland planting
 - Roadway
 - Parking bays
 - Public benches
 - Interpretation boards
 - Entry public seating

INFORMATION

DATE: 2013/09/13
 SCALE: 1:500

FOR: CAIRNGORMS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY
 PROJECT: LECHT ROAD LAY-BY TOMINTOUL

DESIGNED BY: IAN WHITE ASSOCIATES
 DRAWN BY: IAN WHITE

**IAN WHITE ASSOCIATES
 LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS**

Tomnavoulin Lay-by

