

1.7.

1.11.5. Consider how they can secure of match funding towards land acquisition and construction of this priority project, including from internal Council sources.

1.11.6. Consider future maintenance options for the cyclepath, including if there is a role for community group volunteers.

4.1. Th

1.7 FTE (Full Time Equivalent employees), is

submitted for construction funding will require some element of match funding. However, the guidance does not specify a minimum match funding percentage. Rather it states that the ATIF team will engage during the assessment process to determine the requirements for match funding.

- 4.8. While the lack of a specific match funding value to plan against is unhelpful, Officers understand that there is not an expectation from Transport Scotland that match funding would exceed the 30% required by the now terminated PFE Construction challenge fund. Based on not exceeding the 30% value, it is recommended Members plan based on the cyclepath requiring construction match funding not exceeding £2M.
- 4.9. Phasing construction over a number of financial years will enable maximisation of suitable external match funding, however this will result in a longer construction programme. Accelerating the construction programme will require additional match funding t

Design

Phase 1 Colgrain to Cardross & Phase 2 Cardross to Dumbarton

4.14. WSP has agreed that 15 March 2024 will be the final termination date of their current design contract for Phase 1 (Colgrain – Cardross) and Phase 2 (Cardross – Dumbarton). WSP have provide an outline list of design outputs er by 15 March. As such, consideration will require to be given as to how these design outputs can best be delivered to enable the project to complete all required design stages.

4.15.

PFE programme, the decision to de-fund the SPT Capital Programme in 24/25 results in the project being fully reliant on securing 24/25 PFE funding or internal Council funding in order to complete the outstanding design requirements.

Construction (stage 5)

Cardross Rail Station to Geilston Burn

4.20.

Service have completed installation of most elements of the cyclepath through Cardross Park, with only a small amount of fencing still to be installed.

4.21. With the changes to the active travel funding model for 24/25 onwards, it is expected that the costs for the remaining fencing work will require to be covered from, as yet to be identified, internal Council budgets.

4.22. To protect the public, the bridge over the Geilston Burn has been fenced off until access is agreed to further land on the west side of the Burn to construct the path through to an accessible destination.

Land Acquisition

4.23. The Council can seek a Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) for the proposed route and is only in a position to do so once that route is fully defined. Once the Council resolves to obtain a CPO, permission for that must ultimately be authorised by Scottish Ministers. Thus, the Council cannot unilaterally utilise their compulsory purchase powers. If a CPO is authorised then the Council must pay appropriate compensation, but it can take both legal and physical possession of the property before agreement on the amount of compensation to be paid is reached or determined by the Lands Tribunal where this is disputed. Possession can only be obtained if:

- The compulsory purchase is confirmed (i.e. approved) by Ministers;
- Any legal challenge to the compulsory purchase has been exhausted; and
- The Council has served formal notices taking ownership or access.
- There are limited grounds on which an objection to a CPO can be made. If objections are made then it is for Scottish Ministers to determine whether to hold an inquiry before an independent reporter. In the event that the order is subsequently confirmed by Scottish Ministers then there

4.28. Design risk refers to risk that the design fail to meet the required standards and/or design conditions imposed by external factors, for example environmental requirements. Design risks, if allowed to occur, can become issues which may mean the project design has to be changed, which can cause delays and cost increases. Defects or failures in the design can also result in an increase in future maintenance costs. Table 1 provides the top 5 identified design risks and planned mitigation.

Table 2: Selected Design Risks

Risk	Risk Description	Risk Level	Mitigation
Ground Conditions	Lack of		

5.0 CONCLUSION

5.1.

corridor to travel more sustainably and actively by walking, wheeling and cycling.

The route has been designed to be DDA compliant and will provide a safe and accessible route for those with mobility aids including wheelchairs and

- 6.5.2 Socio-economic Duty
- The route, once completed, will offer residents the opportunity to choose to travel using active travel, which are lower cost than alternative modes of transport. The route will also improve access to essential services, retail, leisure and employment opportunities for residents living along the route, with studies demonstrating those who travelled actively had a higher monthly spend in local businesses than those who travel via motorised transport. The path will also offer opportunities for individuals to travel for leisure, again encouraging spend in local businesses along and connected by the route.
- 6.5.3 Islands
- There are no adverse impacts.
- 6.6. **Climate Change**
- Active Travel is the least carbon intensive mode of travel. Providing the opportunity for residents and visitors to consider an alternative to having to use a private car to travel between these communities will
- 6.7. **Risk**
- There is a reputational risk to the Council if the project is not completed within a reasonable timeframe.
- 6.8. **Customer Services**
- None.
- 6.9. **The Rights of the Child (UNCRC)**
- Active travel is the most accessible mode of travel to young people, as it does not have any minimum age limits, does not require any form of licence, is free to use and is not tied to any fixed timetable. All new active travel infrastructure is designed to be utilised by an unaccompanied 12 year old. Engagement feedback demonstrates even stronger support for the delivery of the Helensburgh Cardross Dumbarton Cyclepath from younger members of the community than the already high overall level of community support. Wider engagement with school pupils indicates that the vast majority of pupils strongly support the provision of new active travel infrastructure, even where it would adversely impact other modes of transport.

Executive Director with the responsibility for Development and Economic Growth: Kirsty Flanagan

Policy Lead: Cllr Andrew Kain

07 February 2024

For further information contact: Colin Young
Strategic Transportation Delivery Officer
Colin.Young@argyll-bute.gov.uk
Tel: 01546 604275

Appendix 1: Helensburgh, Cardross & Dumbarton Cyclepath Programme