## APPENDIX 4

## PROJECT DEFINITION DOCUMENT (PDD)

## 1. General Information

| Directorate | Economy | Portfolio/Committee | Clean Streets, <br>  <br> Environment |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Project Title | Natural Rivers | Project Code | N/A |
| Project <br> Description | Project background |  |  |

Birmingham and Black Country Wildlife Trust (B\&BCWT) have been delivering landscape-scale enhancements through the Nature Improvement Area (NIA) project for the last four years. Birmingham City Council (BCC) and the Environment Agency (EA) have been project partners, amongst many others, over this time (BCC through the work of the city ecologist team and the Parks and Nature Conservation dept.). Initially the NIA was funded through a DEFRA grant that covered the first three years implementation. At the end of this funding, B\&BCWT were successful in obtaining additional non-governmental grant funding to continue this work, however this was much reduced. Projects implemented through this have included work with the EA for stream channel re-profiling, removing weirs and the introduction of native bankside vegetation to improve habitat connectivity, eg for fish and water vole. Other projects include work with BCC to improve the diversity of derelict woodland plantation. This involved the selective removal of trees, understorey planting and the addition of native woodland flora.

All of these habitat enhancements have been welcomed by the project partners and citizens of Birmingham alike. The recent reductions in available funding for NIA work has meant that these successful, wider landscape-scale projects have had to be scaled back.

It is against this background and the current call for proposals under European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) Priority Axis 6 that we wish to respond to the call.

## The project

It is expected that the Natural Rivers project will be funded through the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) Priority Axis 6..

The project will expand on the work already undertaken in delivering landscape enhancements by B\&BCWT through Birmingham and Black Country NIA and the flood alleviation projects of the EA, which deliver landscape and watercourse improvements that assist in the delivery of meeting European targets on water quality set through the Water Framework Directive.

These landscape enhancements will include:

- Management of bankside trees
- Management of bankside vegetation and the addition of native flowering plants
- Management of plantation woodlands to improve the age structure and diversity.
- Changes to watercourses to alleviate flood risk
- Creation of new wetland areas
- In-channel improvements to aid the movement of fish, eg installation of fish passages, removal of man-made weirs.

These enhancements will not only improve the habitat quality for wildlife but will enhance the value for leisure and recreation.

This project will be delivered through collaborative working between BCC, B\&BCWT and the EA.

## How the project will operate

If successful, a 0.4 FTE project monitoring/finance officer will be recruited by BCC ( $100 \%$ funded through ERDF). The project partnership will be managed by a Service Level Agreements with the two project partners (B\&BCWT and the EA).

The EA have funding in place to commence work on their key projects as part of this project and it is this funding that will form the majority of the $50 \%$ match funding required.

The following project outcomes will be delivered by the relevant project partner:

## Environment Agency

- Flood alleviation works
- Weir removals / fish passage installation
- Wetland creation


## BCC Parks and Nature Conservation Dept.

- Bankside tree management
- Woodland plantation thinning
- Control of invasive species


## Birmingham and Black Country Wildlife Trust

- Community engagement in growing local flora
- Community engagement in fresh water invertebrate surveys
- Diversification of river bank flora through planting / seeding
- Diversification of woodland ground flora through planting / seeding

The work will be undertaken in a phased approach over the course of the three year project. It is envisaged that the majority of the EA works will be completed within the first year of the project.

Links to Corporate and Service Outcomes

The project supports the delivery of the following strategic outcomes set out in the Council Business Plan and Budget 2016+:

- A Strong Economy
- A Healthy, Happy City
and, in particular, the sub-outcomes:
- An enterprising, innovative green city delivering sustainable growth, meeting the needs of the population and strengthening Birmingham's global standing;
- Sports and physical activities that contribute to people's health and wellbeing and delivered in partnership with others, where parks and open spaces are maintained and enhanced to enable citizens to improve their health and quality of life.

The project aligns with strategic objectives in the Birmingham Development

|  | Plan (BDP) relating to: <br> - improving health and well-being <br> - conserving the natural environment <br> - securing infrastructure to support future growth and prosperity <br> In particular, the project will contribute to the implementation of BDP policies GA9, TP2, TP6, TP7 and TP8. <br> The project is consistent with Birmingham's approach to supporting ecosystem services and improving natural capital set out in the Council's Green Living Spaces Plan, and is compliant with the work of the Green Commission. |
| :---: | :---: |
| Project Benefits | The project will deliver multiple benefits, these include: <br> - Reductions in flood impacts through improved channel design <br> - Improved water quality though appropriate land management <br> - Improved biodiversity within the stream and rivers aided by improved connectivity <br> - Improved connectivity for wildlife through better managed, more diverse habitats <br> - More resilient tree stock through appropriate management and replanting <br> - Improved visual amenity <br> - Improved sense of safety for citizens through well managed public spaces |
| Project Deliverables | The project deliverables are set out in the project benefits above. |


| Key Project Milestones | Planned Delivery Dates |
| :--- | :--- |
| Cabinet approval to bid/PDD | 20 September 2016 |
| Submission of project proposal | 30 September 2016 |
| Outcome of bid announced | 30 November 2016 |
| FBC approval | This project links to planned work being undertaken by the EA and work on the <br> Project start |
| Dependencies on <br> other projects or <br> activities | NIA undertaken by B\&BCWT. The project partners' work will continue if <br> funding is not successful, but will have a more limited impact. The EA's funds <br> for project implementation are being used to provide the majority of the match <br> funding; should this opportunity be lost it is doubtful that a project on this scale <br> will be viable for some time. |
| Achievability | The project is an ambitious one. Our external project partners both have <br> experience of delivering landscape-scale nature conservation projects. Our <br> internal partner (Parks and Nature Conservation dept.) currently manages all <br> BCC green space and non-highway trees; using the existing grounds <br> maintenance and tree service contracts will allow us to match the demands of <br> the project to workforce availability. |
| Project Manager | Initially Nicola Farrin will draw up the full ERDF application with input from <br> project partners. A 0.4 FTE project monitoring and finance officer will be <br> appointed (costs 100\% covered by the ERDF grant) should the bid be <br> successful. |
| Project <br> Accountant | Michelle Garrison, Finance Manager, City Finance. <br> Project Sponsor |
| Anne Shaw, Assistant Director, Transportation \& Connectivity <br> Proposed Project <br> Board Members | The Project Board will be constituted from the Natural Rivers project <br> partnership members if the bid is successful. |


| Head of City <br> Finance (HoCF) | Simon Ansell | Date of HoCF <br> Approval |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Other Mandatory Information |  |  |  |
| • Has project budget been set up on Voyager? |  |  |  |
| • Issues and Risks updated |  | No. |  |


| Risk | Probability | Impact | Status/Comments |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Matched funding not identified | Low | High | Match funding has been identified and <br> is committed to projects that will form <br> part of this project outcomes. |
| Partners leaving the project | Low | Medium / <br> high | A partner may decide that they are <br> unable to continue in the project. The <br> Conditions of Grant Aid will commit <br> partners to their commitments, <br> including funding obligations. |
| Running over budget/ not keeping <br> to time | Low | High | A 0.4FTE project monitoring/finance <br> officer will be appointed to minimise <br> the risk of this happening. They will <br> work 100\% of their time on this <br> project. |
| Partners not delivering | Low | High | A Service Level Agreement will be put <br> in place to ensure that every partner is <br> aware of their responsibilities to the <br> project, and the consequences should <br> they default from these. |

## 2. Options Appraisal Records

The following sections are evidence of the different options that have been considered in arriving at the Project Definition. All options should be documented individually.

There are no other funds currently available for undertaking work on this scale.

| Option 1 | ERDF Priority 6 Axis Bid |
| :---: | :---: |
| Information Considered | Ability for: <br> Improving habitat quality and eco-system services Improving natural capital <br> Reducing flood risk <br> ERDF Priority Axis 6 funding call <br> Partnership working with EA and B\&BCWT |
| Pros and Cons of Option | Pros <br> - Improved flood resilience <br> - Improved water quality and connectivity <br> - Improved and well managed habitats for wildlife <br> - Improved resilience of Birmingham's tree and woodland resources <br> - Improved visual amenity of green space <br> Cons <br> - Requests for similar works within the city that currently cannot be funded |
| People Consulted | We have worked with a range of people in developing this bid. The main ones are: <br> - Birmingham and Black Country Wildlife Trust <br> - Environment Agency <br> - BCC Parks and Nature Conservation dept. <br> - Members of the Local Sites Partnership |


|  | EcoRecord |
| :--- | :--- |
| Recommendation | That we pursue the ERDF Priority Axis 6 funding bid for the Natural Rivers <br> Project |
| Principal Reason <br> for Decision | The ERDF Priority Axis 6 stream is the only significant funding source <br> currently available for this work. It will assist us in taking forward priorities we <br> have articulated as a City Council, improving the natural environment, natural <br> capital and ecosystem services. |


| Option 2 | Do Nothing |
| :---: | :---: |
| Information Considered | Ability for: <br> Improving habitat quality and ecosystem services <br> Improving natural capital <br> Reducing flood risk <br> ERDF Priority Axis 6 funding call <br> Partnership working with the EA and B\&BCWT |
| Pros and Cons of Option | Pros <br> - No work required to generate bid <br> - No need to manage grant funded work <br> Cons <br> - Loss of availability of match funding <br> - Loss of opportunity to deliver wide scale works <br> - Work undertaken by the EA of limited scope and impact <br> - Loss of opportunity to deliver wider flood alleviation benefits <br> - Further degradation of natural habitats resulting in loss of biodiversity <br> - Loss of habitat connectivity <br> - Degradation in the visual amenity less attractive places for citizens to use |
| People Consulted | BCC, B\&BCWT, EA |
| Recommendation | Reject this option |
| Principal Reason for Decision | Cons outweigh the Pros |


| Option 3 | Deliver at another location within the city |
| :--- | :--- |
| Information <br> Considered | Ability for: <br> Improving habitat quality and eco-system services <br> Improving natural capital <br> Reducing flood risk <br> ERDF Priority Axis 6 funding call <br> Partnership working with the EA and B\&BCWT |
| Pros and Cons of <br> Option | Pros <br> - Land available in BCC ownership <br> Cons $\quad$ • No match funding available |
| People Consulted | BCC, B\&BCWT, EA |$|$| Recommendation | Reject this option |
| :--- | :--- |
| Principal Reason <br> for Decision | Lack of match funding |

## 3. Option Recommended

Assessing the three options available, it was clear that Option 3 - "Deliver at another location within the city" - was not a viable option as our matchfunding partner (the EA) has to deliver within the River Rea catchment. Therefore, the required match funding would not be available.

Option 2 - "Do nothing" - would not deliver the benefits of flood alleviation or the benefits to biodiversity that are required. BCC are also obliged under the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2010 to protect and promote biodiversity through all of their actions. This means that Option 2 is not a viable option.

Option 1 is the only option that allows us to deliver the benefits, achieve the match funding and meet our obligations under the NERC Act.

Therefore, it is recommended that Option 1 be accepted.

## 4. Budget information

The following table illustrates the total costs and funding for the delivery of the Natural Rivers project.

| Budget Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Voyager Code | Financial <br> Year 2016- <br> 17 | Financial <br> Year 2017- <br> 18 | Financial Year 201819 | Financial Year 201920 | Totals |
| Capital Costs | TBA | $£($ in '000s) |  |  |  |  |
| Expenditure: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Habitat enhancement works |  | 612.5 | 269.6 | 267.5 | 28.3 | 1177.9 |
| Totals |  | 612.5 | 269.6 | 267.5 | 28.3 | 1177.9 |
| Revenue Costs | TBA | $£\left(\right.$ in ${ }^{\prime} 000 \mathrm{~s}$ ) |  |  |  |  |
| Expenditure: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BCC staff costs |  | 3.6 | 23.2 | 22.4 | 10.1 | 59.3 |
| Office costs |  | 0.5 | 4.5 | 3.4 | 1.5 | 9.9 |
| Other running costs |  | 1.9 | 17.9 | 15.8 | 9.1 | 44.7 |
| Totals |  | 6 | 45.6 | 41.6 | 20.7 | 113.9 |
| Total Expenditure |  | 618.5 | 315.2 | 309.1 | 49 | 1291.8 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $£\left(\right.$ in ${ }^{\prime} 000 \mathrm{~s}$ ) |  |  |  |  |
| Funded by: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Capital |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ERDF |  | 306.25 | 134.8 | 133.75 | 14.15 | 588.95 |
| EA \& BBCWT |  | 306.25 | 134.8 | 133.75 | 14.15 | 588.95 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals |  | 612.5 | 269.6 | 267.5 | 28.3 | 1177.9 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Revenue |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ERDF |  | 3 | 22.8 | 20.8 | 10.35 | 56.95 |
| BCC |  | 3 | 18.7 | 17.8 | 8.3 | 47.8 |
| EA \& BBCWT |  |  | 4.1 | 3 | 2.05 | 9.15 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals |  | 6 | 45.6 | 41.6 | 20.7 | 113.9 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Funding |  | 618.5 | 315.2 | 309.1 | 49 | 1291.8 |

## Notes - Revenue Consequences

BCC contribution towards revenue costs will be provided by officer time and will be met from existing team revenue budgets.

| 5. Project | t Requirements/Information |
| :---: | :---: |
| Products required to produce Full Business Case | - Detailed Project Plan <br> - More detailed assessment of revenue cost implications. It is not anticipated these will exceed the amounts quoted above. <br> - Full Business Case report. |
| Estimated time to complete project development | The bid is due for submission by 30 September 2016. We could expect to hear whether we have been successful in November with a likely timetable of end of November for acceptance of the grant. This short timescale is to ensure that the ERDF funding agreements are in place by the time of the Government's Autumn Statement. |
| Estimated cost to complete project development | N/A |
| Funding of development costs | N/A |


| Planned FBC <br> Date | 13 December 2016 | Planned Date for <br> Technical <br> Completion | 31 March 2019 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

