

Greater Manchester Combined Authority

Date: 26 March 2021

Subject: Active Travel (Cycling and Walking) Update

Report of: Andy Burnham, Mayor of Greater Manchester, Portfolio Lead for Transport and Eamonn Boylan, Chief Executive Officer, GMCA & TfGM.

PURPOSE OF REPORT:

To note the updates provided regarding the Active Travel portfolio for Greater Manchester, and approve the Region's Active Travel Fund Delivery Plan, MCF governance updates and the Active Travel Interim Design Guidance.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The GMCA is requested to:

1. Note and agree the changes to the Active Travel Programme Governance utilised for the Mayor's Challenge Fund, in order to drive efficiency, as set out in Section 2;
2. Note the progress made to date regarding the delivery of the Mayor's Challenge Fund, and the intention to provide future updates, as set out in Section 3 and Appendix B;
3. Approve the adoption of the Active Travel Interim Design Guide for all cycling and walking schemes, as set out in section 4 and Appendix C; and
4. Note and approve the Delivery Plan for the Greater Manchester Active Travel Fund programme for submission to the Department for Transport, in accordance with the requirements of the fund, as detailed in Section 5 and Appendix D.

CONTACT OFFICERS:

Steve Warrener Director of Finance and Corporate Services
Steve.Warrener@tfgm.com

BOLTON
BURY

MANCHESTER
OLDHAM

ROCHDALE
SALFORD

STOCKPORT
TAMESIDE

TRAFFORD
WIGAN

Richard Nickson Cycling and Walking Programme Director
Richard.Nickson@tfgm.com

Simon Warburton Strategy Director
Simon.Warburton@tfgm.com

Equalities Implications:

The Bee Network and the infrastructure which will enable it, will be fully inclusive in its design and development, with the proactive involvement of organisations such as the Disability Design Reference Group (DDRG).

Climate Change Impact Assessment and Mitigation Measures –

The Active Travel capital programmes have been designed to support and expedite delivery of the Bee network which is designed to facilitate a switch from the mechanised modes to walking or cycling, which will see a reduction in both local pollutants and greenhouse gases. By 2040 130,000 daily trips are expected to switch to cycling and walking from private car and taxi use. This equates to around 735,000 less vehicle kilometres being driven per day, with the resultant environmental benefits.

Risk Management:

The recommendations of this report will directly support MCF scheme delivery and enable prioritised infrastructure spending. This will directly assist in mitigating the programme risk of not fully expending the available budget. A programme risk register is maintained and updated by the TfGM MCF programme team.

Legal Considerations:

Legal Delivery Agreements and legal side-letters will be produced and implemented for full scheme and development cost approvals as appropriate.

Financial Consequences – Revenue:

Revenue consequences are set out in paragraphs 3.1 – 3.3 and 5.2

Financial Consequences – Capital:

Financial consequences are set out in paragraphs 3.1 – 3.3 and 5.2

Number of attachments to the report:

No attachments. 4 Appendices within the document.

Comments/recommendations from Overview & Scrutiny Committee

BACKGROUND PAPERS:

Note: Reports prior to 2021 are listed on earlier papers on this subject

- 29 January 2021 - Mayor's Challenge Fund Cycling and Walking Financial Approvals
- 12 February 2021 - Mayor's Challenge Fund Cycling and Walking Financial Approvals
- 26 March 2021 Mayor's Challenge Fund Cycling and Walking Financial Approvals

TRACKING/PROCESS		
Does this report relate to a major strategic decision, as set out in the GMCA Constitution		YES
EXEMPTION FROM CALL IN		
Are there any aspects in this report which means it should be considered to be exempt from call in by the relevant Scrutiny Committee on the grounds of urgency?		No exemption
GM Transport Committee	Overview & Scrutiny Committee	
[Date considered at GM Transport Cttee if appropriate]	[Date considered by the relevant Overview & Scrutiny Committee]	

1. INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

- 1.1 On 29 March 2018, GMCA agreed to allocate £160 million of Greater Manchester's £243 million Transforming Cities Fund (TCF) to develop a Mayor's Cycling and Walking Challenge Fund (MCF). The governance and management approach for the MCF programme was adopted by the Combined Authority in May 2018.
- 1.2 The fund is being used to deliver the first phase of the Bee Network, which is the walking and cycling element of the Our Network plan to transform Greater Manchester's transport system. The Bee Network, once complete, will cover circa 1,800 miles and be the longest, integrated, planned network in the country connecting every neighbourhood of Greater Manchester. The initial network plan was contained in Greater Manchester's cycling and walking infrastructure proposal (adopted by GMCA in June 2018), as part of a GM Streets for All highways improvement programme.
- 1.3 In developing a long-term approach to infrastructure delivery, the decision was taken to over-programme the MCF and create an infrastructure pipeline. On the 5 May 2020 GMCA approved the first phase of Bee Network delivery with a forecast value of £216.5 million. Progression of these schemes are subject to dedicated MCF Financial Approvals papers, the latest of which is a companion to this March 2021 paper.
- 1.4 During 2020, Greater Manchester was awarded a total of 18.97 million through Central Government's Active Travel Fund. This was split across two phases - £3.2 million in Tranche 1 and £15.87 million in Tranche 2. The fund has several associated Government requirements, including appropriate consultation, monitoring and evaluation, and the production of a delivery plan.
- 1.5 Central Government's 2020 publication of their Gear Change strategy and the supporting active travel technical note LTN 1/20 have emphasized the criticality of design standards for walking and cycling and the importance of a common approach. This accords with the standards-led approach which has been adopted for the Bee Network.
- 1.6 This paper makes a number of recommendations associated with the Active Travel agenda, including the adoption of interim Active Travel technical design guidance, the production of Greater Manchester's Delivery Plan for the Region's Active Travel fund programme; and a governance and delivery performance update for the Mayor's Challenge Fund.

2 MCF GOVERNANCE UPDATE

- 2.1 Since the inception of the MCF programme, TfGM has been working closely with scheme promoters to set up, develop and deliver the projects in line with the agreed

governance arrangements, in particular those agreed by the Combined Authority on 25 May 2018.

2.2 Experience of the programme to date, subsequent developments, and close collaboration with Local Authority Partners, has enabled the identification of opportunities to both strengthen and improve the MCF governance and assurance arrangements in ways intended to resolve common issues and help streamline the process and drive efficiency.

2.3 The following systems and approaches have been developed over the life of the programme and are to be viewed as additions and updates to the original May 2018 governance paper:

- Following the appointment of TfGM's Cycling and Walking Programme Director, the Cycling and Walking Delivery Board has become a Programme Board and is chaired by the Programme Director. This meets monthly.
- The Active Travel Design Review Panel (DRP) has been established by TfGM and enables swift, collaborative resolution of design issues with scheme promoters. The DRP is agnostic of scheme funding and is intended to support a common approach to design standards across Greater Manchester.
- Effective scheme approval by the Greater Manchester Cycling and Walking Board (via email exchange rather than formal meeting) to expedite the approvals process, prior to Combined Authority agreement. This approach was agreed by the Board on the 10 October 2019.
- In the case of those Major MCF Schemes (over £5 million MCF funding) to be delivered in phases, TfGM will undertake Outline Business Case (OBC) assurance, with the MCF Programme Team undertaking the assurance for the subsequent Full Business Case for each component phase. This reduces the time taken to approve the Business Cases.
- Proposed scheme revisions to the Prioritised MCF programme (agreed by the Combined Authority in May 2020), where delivery issues arise, to be agreed by the Cycling and Walking Programme Board and reported to the Greater Manchester Cycling and Walking Board.
- Monthly MCF Financial Approvals reports presented to the Combined Authority for agreement, providing regular, scheduled approvals.

3 MCF PERFORMANCE UPDATE

3.1 March 2021 represents the culmination of the third year of the Mayor's Challenge Fund, which was established in 2018. Through six tranches, a total of 82 schemes have been granted Programme Entry approval - with a combined forecast MCF funding requirement of £358.5 million, and a forecast total value of £492.7 million, including local contributions.

3.2 Following the agreement to over-programme the MCF to include the creation of an infrastructure pipeline, on the 5 May 2020 GMCA approved the first phase of Bee Network delivery, based on identified District priorities. This phase has a forecast

value of £216.5 million and details of the schemes contained within this phase can be found at Appendix A.

- 3.3 Inclusive of the financial approvals proposed in March, to date the MCF programme has seen full approval for 23 work packages - with a combined, committed value of £43.5m. These approvals have been supported and enabled by the agreement of £37.2 million of scheme development costs, across 67 schemes. Development costs represent an advanced portion of a scheme's overall cost.
- 3.4 Appendix B to this report, provides a high-level breakdown by scheme promotor of the MCF approvals to date. This is based on the reported position for February 2021 and takes into account previous approvals. Further progress updates will be brought to subsequent meetings of the Combined Authority, to help inform and plan future phases of Bee Network delivery.

4 ADOPTION OF ACTIVE TRAVEL INTERIM DESIGN GUIDE

- 4.1 On 29 November 2019, the Combined Authority agreed that the common design standards that are applied to MCF schemes should be adopted for all cycling and walking schemes going forward, regardless of funding method. To help facilitate this, work began on a GM Streets For All Design Guide.
- 4.2 However, subsequent to this commitment, there is now an imperative set out by central government through Local Transport Note 1/20 for all new active travel infrastructure to meet its standards. Furthermore, a new body, Active Travel England, is being formed later this year to ensure that government funded infrastructure meets LTN 1/20. It is therefore all the more critical that all active travel infrastructure delivered in Greater Manchester meets the required standards.
- 4.3 Whilst work continues on the Streets For All Design Guide, it was recognised that there remains a need for clear, adopted guidance from the Greater Manchester Combined Authority, to which designers can work when developing schemes, particularly those funded through the Mayor's Challenge Fund (MCF), to enable the double buggy and competent 12-year-old 'tests' to be met.
- 4.4 To this end a Greater Manchester Active Travel interim Design Guide, at Appendix C, has been rapidly developed by the TfGM Cycling and Walking Team to provide a key point of reference for designers of active travel schemes, ahead of the publication of the future Streets for All (S4A) Design Guide and serving as a model technical note for how S4A can be delivered. It draws on the body of existing high quality UK design guidance on cycling and walking, and makes direct reference to a number of key publications for more detailed advice, including LTN1/20; London Cycling Design Standards; A Guide to Inclusive Cycling and London Pedestrian Comfort Guidance.
- 4.5 The GM Interim Design Guide has been shared and discussed with Local Authority Partners, including through the Transport Strategy Group (TSG) and the Greater

Manchester Highways Group. The draft guidance has also been presented to and 'endorsed by the Greater Manchester Cycling and Walking Board (the Mayor's Board). In proposing the guidance, it is recognized that its deployment would be undertaken in close working with local authority members, officers and communities, so as to ensure that solutions result that are shaped by the guidance and the characteristics of the different places in Greater Manchester. place-based

5 ACTIVE TRAVEL FUND DELIVERY PLAN

- 5.1 In May 2020 the Department for Transport announced indicative funding allocations from the then newly created Active Travel fund, to support local transport authorities with delivering cycling and walking facilities. The funding came in 2 tranches. Tranche 1, to support the installation of temporary projects as part of emergency Covid response measures; and tranche 2, for the creation of longer-term projects as part of the longer-term recovery.
- 5.2 Following a bid that was submitted on 5 June 2020, GMCA were awarded £3.17 million of funding for Tranche 1, and a further £15.87 million for Tranche 2 following Greater Manchester's bid on 7 August 2020. This has created a GM Active Travel Programme with a value of £19.04 million. The Tranche 2 programme and Local Authority funding breakdown was agreed by the Combined Authority in December 2020, and the associated values added to the appropriate CA Transport Capital and Revenue budgets.
- 5.3 In accordance with the requirements of the fund, Greater Manchester are required to develop and confirm a Delivery Plan for the region's Active Travel Fund (ATF) programme. To achieve this Local Authority partners have provided plans setting out their scheme delivery proposals, including overall timeframes, planned outcomes and any key risks or dependencies. This confirms that the programme is forecast to achieve the timescales set by the Department for Transport, for substantive delivery by March 2022.
- 5.4 A copy of the Region's Delivery Plan, compiled from Local Authority responses, is attached at Appendix D, and will be shared with the Department for Transport. Delivery Plans were received for all 26 schemes in the GM ATF Programme. The GM-wide ATF Complimentary Measures package agreed by the Combined Authority in December 2020 will align with and support the timeframes of the individual scheme delivery plans provided.
- 5.5 Under the requirements of the Active Travel Fund – and in accordance with the bid submitted, TfGM will work with Local Authority partners to provide a design assurance function for the schemes in the programme. This will be undertaken through the Active Travel Design Review Panel which has been established and meets weekly.
- 5.6 Regional governance and progress reporting to both the Combined Authority and Central Government, will be facilitated by regular ATF scheme reporting, including cost control and schedule management. Progress updates on Greater Manchester's Active Travel Programme and its delivery will be brought to future meetings of the GMCA.

6 RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 The recommendations are set out at the front of the report.

Eamonn Boylan

Chief Executive Officer, GMCA & TfGM

Appendix A: MCF Prioritised Schemes

Schemes to be Delivered – in full or in part

Tranche 1
Bolton: B6226 Chorley New Road
Bury: Metrolink Bury Line – Cycle Parking
Bury: New and Upgraded Crossing Points and Junctions
Manchester: Manchester to Chorlton
Oldham: King Street foot/cycle bridge
Oldham: Union Street West foot/cycle Bridge
Rochdale: Castleton Local Centre Corridor
Salford: SBNI – A6 Broad Street / B6186 Frederick Road
Salford: Chapel Street East Phase 1: Demonstrator Project
Stockport: Gillbent Road – Crossing Upgrade
Tameside: Tameside Active Neighbourhoods
Trafford: A5014 Talbot Road
Wigan: Victoria Street/Warrington Road Junction Improvements
Tranche 2
Salford: Swinton Greenway
Stockport: Hazel Grove Access Upgrades
Trafford: Talbot Road A56 Chester Road
Wigan: Standish Mineral Line
Tranche 3
Salford: Trafford Road
Wigan: Toucan Crossings – Wigan Central
Tranche 4
GM: GM Bike Hire
Manchester: Levenshulme Mini Holland
Manchester: Mancunian Way/Princess Parkway Junction
Manchester: Rochdale Canal Bridge 88-80a
Manchester: Route 86 (Northern Quarter)
Rochdale: Castleton Town Centre Phase 2
Salford: Barton Aqueduct
Stockport: A6 MARRR Links
Stockport: Bramhall Park to A6
Stockport: Crossings package
Stockport: Heatons Cycle Link
Stockport: Interchange
Stockport: Ladybrook Valley

Appendix A: MCF Prioritised Schemes – continued

Tameside: Crown Point
Trafford: Wharfside Way
Wigan: Leigh Atherton Tyldesley
Tranche 5
Bolton: Town Centre Phase 1 (East)
Bury: Fishpool
GM: Active Neighbourhoods Support
GM: Safety Camera Digitisation and Upgrade
Manchester: Northern and Eastern Gateway
Salford: City Centre Package
Salford: RHS Links
Stockport: Heaton Norris Park Bridge
Stockport: Hempshaw Lane
Tameside: Ashton South
Tameside: Ashton Streetscape Scheme
Trafford: Sale - Sale Moor - Sale Water Park
Trafford: Urmston Area Active Neighbourhood
Wigan: Standish to Ashton
Tranche 6
Bolton: Astley Bridge-Crompton
Bolton: Westhoughton Bee Network
Bury: Elton
Bury: Pimhole
Bury: Radcliffe Central
GM: Bee Network Crossings
Manchester: Beswick Filtered Neighbourhood
Manchester: Manchester Cycleway
Oldham: Chadderton Improvements
Oldham: Oldham Town Centre Improvements
Oldham: Park Road (NCN 626) Town Centre Connection
Oldham: Royton Town Centre Connection
Stockport: Romiley Neighbourhood and Links
Stockport: Thompson Street Bridge
Tameside: A57 Denton to Hyde
Trafford: North Altrincham Bee Network
Trafford: Seymour Grove

Appendix A: MCF Prioritised Schemes - continued

Schemes for Development Only

Stockport: Welkin Road - Town Centre Severance Package
Tameside: Ashton West Retail Centre Link Bridge
Oldham: Park Bridge (NCN 626) – Ashton under Lyne
Manchester: Oldham Road (Inner Radial)
Stockport: Heatons WRH
Salford: Trinity Way/Springfield Lane Crossing
Salford: Monton Town Centre
Salford: Ordsall Filtered Neighbourhood
Salford: Liverpool Street Corridor

Appendix B: MCF Performance Summary

Authority	Total Scheme Summary	Finance Summary														
Bolton		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Total (£)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Prioritised Budget</td> <td>£ 7,600,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dev Costs Approved</td> <td>£ 1,234,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Full Approval Value</td> <td>£ -</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Reported Scheme Spend</td> <td>£ 798,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Total (£)	Prioritised Budget	£ 7,600,000	Dev Costs Approved	£ 1,234,000	Full Approval Value	£ -	Reported Scheme Spend	£ 798,000				
	Total (£)															
Prioritised Budget	£ 7,600,000															
Dev Costs Approved	£ 1,234,000															
Full Approval Value	£ -															
Reported Scheme Spend	£ 798,000															
Bury		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Total (£)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Prioritised Budget</td> <td>£ 12,000,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dev Costs Approved</td> <td>£ 1,607,305</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Full Approval Value</td> <td>£ -</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Reported Scheme Spend</td> <td>£ 577,322</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Total (£)	Prioritised Budget	£ 12,000,000	Dev Costs Approved	£ 1,607,305	Full Approval Value	£ -	Reported Scheme Spend	£ 577,322				
	Total (£)															
Prioritised Budget	£ 12,000,000															
Dev Costs Approved	£ 1,607,305															
Full Approval Value	£ -															
Reported Scheme Spend	£ 577,322															
Manchester		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Total (£)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Prioritised Budget</td> <td>£ 37,200,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dev Costs Approved</td> <td>£ 4,960,166</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Full Approval Value</td> <td>£ 8,275,708</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Reported Scheme Spend</td> <td>£ 5,303,447</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Total (£)	Prioritised Budget	£ 37,200,000	Dev Costs Approved	£ 4,960,166	Full Approval Value	£ 8,275,708	Reported Scheme Spend	£ 5,303,447				
	Total (£)															
Prioritised Budget	£ 37,200,000															
Dev Costs Approved	£ 4,960,166															
Full Approval Value	£ 8,275,708															
Reported Scheme Spend	£ 5,303,447															
Oldham		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Total (£)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Prioritised Budget</td> <td>£ 12,600,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dev Costs Approved</td> <td>£ 2,120,515</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Full Approval Value</td> <td>£ 773,536</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Reported Scheme Spend</td> <td>£ 836,761</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Total (£)	Prioritised Budget	£ 12,600,000	Dev Costs Approved	£ 2,120,515	Full Approval Value	£ 773,536	Reported Scheme Spend	£ 836,761				
	Total (£)															
Prioritised Budget	£ 12,600,000															
Dev Costs Approved	£ 2,120,515															
Full Approval Value	£ 773,536															
Reported Scheme Spend	£ 836,761															
Rochdale		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Total (£)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Prioritised Budget</td> <td>£ 11,900,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dev Costs Approved</td> <td>£ 428,500</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Full Approval Value</td> <td>£ -</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Reported Scheme Spend</td> <td>£ 351,239</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Total (£)	Prioritised Budget	£ 11,900,000	Dev Costs Approved	£ 428,500	Full Approval Value	£ -	Reported Scheme Spend	£ 351,239				
	Total (£)															
Prioritised Budget	£ 11,900,000															
Dev Costs Approved	£ 428,500															
Full Approval Value	£ -															
Reported Scheme Spend	£ 351,239															
Salford		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Total (£)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Prioritised Budget</td> <td>£ 28,300,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dev Costs Approved</td> <td>£ 5,166,329</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Full Approval Value</td> <td>£ 13,005,816</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Reported Scheme Spend</td> <td>£ 3,908,880</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Total (£)	Prioritised Budget	£ 28,300,000	Dev Costs Approved	£ 5,166,329	Full Approval Value	£ 13,005,816	Reported Scheme Spend	£ 3,908,880				
	Total (£)															
Prioritised Budget	£ 28,300,000															
Dev Costs Approved	£ 5,166,329															
Full Approval Value	£ 13,005,816															
Reported Scheme Spend	£ 3,908,880															
Stockport		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Total (£)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Prioritised Budget</td> <td>£ 27,500,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dev Costs Approved</td> <td>£ 8,652,680</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Full Approval Value</td> <td>£ 14,903,931</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Reported Scheme Spend</td> <td>£ 5,128,737</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Total (£)	Prioritised Budget	£ 27,500,000	Dev Costs Approved	£ 8,652,680	Full Approval Value	£ 14,903,931	Reported Scheme Spend	£ 5,128,737				
	Total (£)															
Prioritised Budget	£ 27,500,000															
Dev Costs Approved	£ 8,652,680															
Full Approval Value	£ 14,903,931															
Reported Scheme Spend	£ 5,128,737															
Tameside		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Total (£)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Prioritised Budget</td> <td>£ 10,300,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dev Costs Approved</td> <td>£ 1,937,125</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Full Approval Value</td> <td>£ 686,951</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Reported Scheme Spend</td> <td>£ 610,190</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Total (£)	Prioritised Budget	£ 10,300,000	Dev Costs Approved	£ 1,937,125	Full Approval Value	£ 686,951	Reported Scheme Spend	£ 610,190				
	Total (£)															
Prioritised Budget	£ 10,300,000															
Dev Costs Approved	£ 1,937,125															
Full Approval Value	£ 686,951															
Reported Scheme Spend	£ 610,190															
Trafford		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Total (£)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Prioritised Budget</td> <td>£ 20,000,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dev Costs Approved</td> <td>£ 1,462,200</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Full Approval Value</td> <td>£ -</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Reported Scheme Spend</td> <td>£ 634,400</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Total (£)	Prioritised Budget	£ 20,000,000	Dev Costs Approved	£ 1,462,200	Full Approval Value	£ -	Reported Scheme Spend	£ 634,400				
	Total (£)															
Prioritised Budget	£ 20,000,000															
Dev Costs Approved	£ 1,462,200															
Full Approval Value	£ -															
Reported Scheme Spend	£ 634,400															
Wigan		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Total (£)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Prioritised Budget</td> <td>£ 19,800,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dev Costs Approved</td> <td>£ 5,034,432</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Full Approval Value</td> <td>£ 2,979,993</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Reported Scheme Spend</td> <td>£ 566,450</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Total (£)	Prioritised Budget	£ 19,800,000	Dev Costs Approved	£ 5,034,432	Full Approval Value	£ 2,979,993	Reported Scheme Spend	£ 566,450				
	Total (£)															
Prioritised Budget	£ 19,800,000															
Dev Costs Approved	£ 5,034,432															
Full Approval Value	£ 2,979,993															
Reported Scheme Spend	£ 566,450															
GM Wide Schemes		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Total (£)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Prioritised Budget</td> <td>£ 29,300,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dev Costs Approved</td> <td>£ 3,092,550</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Full Approval Value</td> <td>£ 2,400,666</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Reported Scheme Spend</td> <td>£ 1,779,170</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Total (£)	Prioritised Budget	£ 29,300,000	Dev Costs Approved	£ 3,092,550	Full Approval Value	£ 2,400,666	Reported Scheme Spend	£ 1,779,170				
	Total (£)															
Prioritised Budget	£ 29,300,000															
Dev Costs Approved	£ 3,092,550															
Full Approval Value	£ 2,400,666															
Reported Scheme Spend	£ 1,779,170															
MCF Total		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Total (£)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Prioritised Budget</td> <td>£ 216,500,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dev Costs Approved</td> <td>£ 37,195,802</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Full Approval Value</td> <td>£ 43,532,771</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Reported Scheme Spend</td> <td>£ 20,581,680</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Programme Mngt Spend</td> <td>£ 4,043,206</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Spend to Date</td> <td>£ 24,624,886</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Total (£)	Prioritised Budget	£ 216,500,000	Dev Costs Approved	£ 37,195,802	Full Approval Value	£ 43,532,771	Reported Scheme Spend	£ 20,581,680	Programme Mngt Spend	£ 4,043,206	Total Spend to Date	£ 24,624,886
	Total (£)															
Prioritised Budget	£ 216,500,000															
Dev Costs Approved	£ 37,195,802															
Full Approval Value	£ 43,532,771															
Reported Scheme Spend	£ 20,581,680															
Programme Mngt Spend	£ 4,043,206															
Total Spend to Date	£ 24,624,886															

Appendix C: Interim Active Travel Design Guide (see separate document)

Appendix D: Active Travel Fund (ATF) Delivery Plan

District:	Greater Manchester ATF Infrastructure Programme (26 schemes)																		
Budget	£13,290,300																		
Date of return:	23 rd February, 2021																		
Scheme Description and DfT outputs:	<p>The Active Travel Fund (ATF) Programme is a DfT-funded programme which provides active travel infrastructure and support in response to and recovery from the coronavirus pandemic. GM's ATF Programme consists of four packages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Access to and within the Regional Centre •Access to and within Town Centres •Active Neighbourhoods •Complementary Measures and Benefits Realisation <p>The infrastructure programme consists of twenty-six proposed schemes, implemented across and led by the ten districts. Five of these are Low Traffic Neighbourhood schemes, with the remaining schemes being implementing elements of segregated cycle paths, crossings, footways etc.</p> <p>The DfT have stipulated minimum requirements in relation to Design, Consultation and Monitoring & Evaluation standards.</p> <p>Scheme metrics</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>x</th> <th>Scheme element</th> <th>Total miles planned for construction</th> <th>Total units planned for construction</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td>New segregated cycleway (permanent)</td> <td>Approx. 10</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>New segregated cycleway (temporary)</td> <td>0.2</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>New permanent footway</td> <td></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			x	Scheme element	Total miles planned for construction	Total units planned for construction		New segregated cycleway (permanent)	Approx. 10	N/A		New segregated cycleway (temporary)	0.2	N/A		New permanent footway		N/A
x	Scheme element	Total miles planned for construction	Total units planned for construction																
	New segregated cycleway (permanent)	Approx. 10	N/A																
	New segregated cycleway (temporary)	0.2	N/A																
	New permanent footway		N/A																

	New temporary footway	0.68	N/A
	New shared use facilities (in exceptional circumstances)	0.48	N/A
	Park and cycle/stride facilities	N/A	15
	Provision of secure cycle parking facilities	N/A	20
	New road crossings	N/A	50
	Installing segregation to make an existing cycle route safer	14.43	N/A
	Widening existing footway	0.17	N/A
	Bus priority measures (e.g., bus gates)	N/A	1
	Upgrades to existing facilities (e.g., surfacing, signage, signals)	N/A	8
	Restriction or reduction of parking availability (e.g., closing bays or complemented by	N/A	497

	increasing fees)		
	Low Traffic Neighbourhood	N/A	5
	Traffic calming (e.g., lane closures, reducing speed limits)	N/A	6
	School streets	N/A	1
	Other (please specify):	Miles of point closure	0.36
	Other (please specify):	Introducing 1-way traffic	1

<p>Key milestone data:</p> <p>a. Provide a schedule of key scheme dates and milestones.</p>	<p>The key milestones below show the date range provided for GM's Programme of Schemes:</p> <p>Design commencement: 1/10/2020-1/5/2021 Consultations commence: 4/2/2021-1/6/2021 Consultations conclude: 28/2/2021-14/7/2021 Design Review Panel Approvals: 1/5/2021-11/8/2021 Works Start on site dates: 1/3/2021-7/2/2022 Finish on site: 31/3/2021-1/4/2022</p>
<p>Delivery Arrangements:</p> <p>a. Identify the bodies responsible for the delivery of the scheme, including details of any principal or sub-contractors that will be used.</p> <p>b. Identify the means by which services will be</p>	<p>Design and Delivery arrangements for each scheme in the programme are in keeping with established district approaches across GM. In some cases, where internal design/delivery is not the preferred approach, districts have design and development partners in place to support with functions such as highway design Examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Salford City Council sub-contractor support is provided by Argyle NW Construction Ltd.

<p>procured if not already in place.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The OneTrafford Partnership provides highways design services for Trafford; supported by Amey <p>The required procurement for Greater Manchester's programme will form a mixture of call-off approaches from existing frameworks or competitive tendering where required. Examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bury Council will manage the delivery of the scheme with additional resource provided by TfGM framework consultants. The framework supports a direct award to the preferred consultant where work is valued below £50,000 and a competitive tender for work of a greater value. • Stockport Council will procure a Design, Procure and Construct contract underpinned by its Strategic Alliance of Framework Consultants and Framework Contractors.
<p>Governance Structure:</p> <p>a. Provide any details of the project's internal approval process, including appropriate board(s) and any defined reporting process.</p>	<p>Each GM Local Authority has in place internal assurance processes and procedures. Examples of these include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oldham Council's Capital Investment Programme Board (CIPB) will incorporate schemes into the portfolio, in accordance with Council governance procedures. The transport capital programme is subject to ongoing monitoring and regular updates are provided to Oldham Council's Capital Investment Programme Board. <p>Local Authority governance approaches are a precursor, and complementary to, the regional governance and assurance function to be undertaken by TfGM. Working collaboratively with District Partners, regional assurance will enable a focus on Design Quality (through an established Design Review Panel), with governance support regarding Communications and Engagement and cost management. GM's ATF programme will also be subject to regular reporting to enable future updates to both the Combined Authority and Central Government.</p>

<p>Legislative Compliance, Approvals Powers & Consents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Outline any legislative requirements that apply to the scheme and how these will be met; b. Identify any required powers and consents required need to be achieved for the scheme e.g., TROs, land acquisition 	<p>Requirements are limited to scheme promoters, with the predominant requirements being for Temporary/Permanent Traffic Regulation Orders and Notices of Intent (which will follow the usual established approaches within the relevant local authority).</p> <p>There is a potential requirement for land acquisition in one case (land classification and ownership currently under investigation). Should land acquisition be required, processes will be put in place to identify and manage any issues arising; and alternative designs considered should acquisition not be possible within the required timeframes.</p>
<p>Risk and issues management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Outline (as a minimum) the top three scheme risks and issues and the associated mitigation plans. 	<p>Each scheme has identified a number of associated risks, for which mitigating actions are being put in place. The top risks across the Greater Manchester Programme are:</p> <p><u>Objections raised during consultation</u> All individual scheme programmes allow for an opportunity to modify plans as a result of objections and feedback during the consultation programme. Thorough consultation to take place, including: Commonplace and web-based consultation; promotion through social media and temporary signs within and close to the impacted area.</p> <p><u>Lack of political support</u> Ongoing and extensive engagement with elected members to take place, pre and post elections.</p> <p><u>Resource constraints impact on programme delivery</u> Resource capacity constraints to be identified early and appropriate support secured to meet project and programme requirements, utilising existing procurement frameworks where required to reduce impact on programme timescales.</p>

	<p><u>Supplier performance constraints (due to COVID-19) elongating timescales</u> Ensure supplier consideration of performance constraints through tender evaluation process.</p> <p><u>Cost uncertainty - scheme proposals developed with outline costs, with final, detailed costs not yet known.</u></p> <p>Detailed designs to inform updated cost estimates. QRAs to be developed as part of budget setting. Alternatives compliant designs and value engineering to be considered should scheme costs escalate.</p>
<p>Design compliance:</p> <p>a. Confirm and explain how the scheme complies with the design requirements set out within the Active Travel Fund (this can be provided separately if needed).</p>	<p>TfGM has implemented a Design Review Panel (DRP) to ensure consistent design standards across all Active Travel Infrastructure developments. The DRP meets on a weekly basis and is an established element of Active Travel scheme development within Greater Manchester. The DRP will be utilised for ATF design assurance to ensure schemes meet the design requirements of the fund.</p>
<p>Counter Fraud and due diligence:</p>	<p>The GMCA maintains clear policies and arrangements in respect of counter fraud and anti-corruption. Policies are available to all staff with clear reporting routes defined. The Treasurer in conjunction with Chief Officers is responsible for the development and maintenance of GMCA anti-fraud and corruption policies and fraud risk management processes. As this is a regional delivery programme, the GMCA contact details are provided:</p> <p>Sarah Horseman Head of Audit and Assurance Greater Manchester Combined Authority Sarah.Horseman@greatermanchester-ca.gov.uk</p> <p>Individual districts routes and processes for fraud reporting, and individual contact details, are available on request.</p>