

# Birmingham City Council

## Report to Cabinet



17<sup>th</sup> January 2023

**Subject:** ACTIVE TRAVEL FUND TRANCHE 2 –  
PACKAGE 2: KINGS HEATH AND MOSELEY PLACES  
FOR PEOPLE OUTLINE BUSINESS CASE

**Report of:** Strategic Director Place, Prosperity & Sustainability

**Relevant Cabinet Member:** Councillor Liz Clements – Transport  
Councillor Yvonne Mosquito – Finances and Resources

**Relevant O &S Chair(s):** Councillor Chaman Lal – Sustainability and Transport  
Councillor Akhlaq Ahmed – Resources

**Report author:** Philip Edwards – Assistant Director, Transport and Connectivity  
Tel: 07557 203167 Email: philip.edwards@birmingham.gov.uk

Are specific wards affected?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No – All wards affected
If yes, name(s) of ward(s): Brandwood & Kings Heath, Moseley, Billesley		
Is this a key decision?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
If relevant, add Forward Plan Reference: 009406/2022		
Is the decision eligible for call-in?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Does the report contain confidential or exempt information?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

### 1 Executive Summary

- 1.1 This report seeks approval to the Outline Business Case for the Kings Heath and Moseley Places for People (PfP) scheme as part of the Active Travel Fund (ATF) Tranche 2 programme. The cost of the scheme will be £2.564m to be funded from Active Travel Fund Tranches 2 and 3, Road Safety Budget, School Streets Budget, Local Network Improvement Plan (LNIP), HS2 MSQW and Clean Air Zone Fund. Included in the above are detailed design costs to FBC of £0.100m which have already been approved under existing delegated powers.
- 1.2 The ATF Tranche 2 programme was approved by Cabinet on 8th September 2020. It comprises four packages of schemes to provide improved walking and cycling

facilities. Package 2 includes Places for People schemes in Kings Heath and Moseley, Lozells and other areas, which further develop and extend experimental schemes introduced in 2020 as part of the Emergency Active Travel Fund (EATF) Tranche 1 programme.

## **2 Recommendations**

That Cabinet:

- 2.1 Approves the Outline Business Case for the second phase of the Kings Heath and Moseley Places for People (PfP) scheme at a total estimated cost of £2.564m, funded by the Active Travel Fund Tranches 2 and 3, Road Safety Budget, School Streets Budget, Local Network Improvement Plan (LNIP), HS2 MSQW and Clean Air Zone Fund. The concept scheme is (subject to detailed design) shown in Appendix A and on the scheme plan in Appendix F.
- 2.2 Delegates authority to the Assistant Director Transport and Connectivity in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Transport to approve the Full Business Case for the main scheme (construction, preliminaries and optimism bias across entire scheme at an estimated cost of £2.085m).
- 2.3 Notes that the Full Business Case for the associated 20mph speed limits (construction estimated at £0.097m), Bus Gate (Bus Lane Enforcement) scheme (construction estimated at £0.097m) and traffic calming scheme on Billesley Lane (construction estimated at £0.185m) will be subject to separate approvals through existing delegations.
- 2.4 Notes that design fees of £0.100m required to develop the scheme to Full Business Case have been approved separately. A further £0.060m is now being sought to ensure completion of both preliminary and detailed design.
- 2.5 Notes that the scheme is to be delivered via a permanent Traffic Regulation Order subject to the usual statutory process.
- 2.6 Approves the procurement strategy and commencement of tendering activities for the works using the Black Country Framework Contract for Minor Works 2021-2024 and delegates authority to the Strategic Director, Place, Prosperity and Sustainability in conjunction with Assistant Director, Procurement, the Strategic Director, Council Management and the City Solicitor & Monitoring Officer (or their delegates) to award contracts, subject to the works cost being within the approved budget.
- 2.7 Authorises the City Solicitor & Monitoring Officer to negotiate, execute, seal and complete all necessary documentation to give effect to the above recommendations.

## **3 Background**

- 3.1 In May 2020, the Government announced it was launching the £250m EATF to fund measures to help councils reallocate road space for cyclists and pedestrians,

given the increased numbers of people walking and cycling due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The Government stipulated that the funding was to be used for a range of measures including pop-up cycle lanes, wider pavements, cycle and bus-only corridors and the closure of side streets to reduce rat-running. Grant funding has been provided to local authorities by Department for Transport (DfT) in three tranches:

- Tranche 1 supported the installation of temporary projects for the COVID-19 pandemic; and
- Tranche 2 supports the creation of longer-term projects.
- Tranche 3 was announced on 14 May 2022 and extends the Tranche 2 funding.

It should be noted that under the allocation of the Tranche 2 funding the 'Emergency' element of the Active Travel Fund was dropped by the DfT.

Tranche 3 of the Active Travel Fund was announced in May 2022 and covers the Places for People scheme, and two cycle routes on Bradford Street and Bristol Road Selly Oak.

3.2 ATF Tranche 2 was approved by Cabinet on 8th September 2020 with DfT providing grant funding of £4.477m for schemes in this tranche. The programme comprises four main packages:

- Package 1: Upgrade Tranche 1 Projects (particularly pop-up cycle lanes)
- Package 2: Places for People (PfP) (Low Traffic Neighbourhoods)
- Package 3: City Centre Traffic Segments
- Package 4: Additional Cycling and Walking Interventions

Package 2 includes PfP schemes in Kings Heath and Moseley, Lozells and elsewhere. The PfP programme is a series of "low traffic neighbourhoods", which are groups of residential streets, bordered by main or "distributor" roads (the places where buses, lorries, non-local traffic should be), where "through" motor vehicle traffic is discouraged or removed. The main principle is that every resident can drive onto their street, get deliveries etc., but it is harder or impossible to drive straight through from one main road to the next. With through traffic gone, the streets in a low traffic neighbourhood see dramatic reductions in motor traffic levels. While residents in a low traffic neighbourhood can still do all their journeys by car if they want or need to, some trips will be a bit more circuitous. This, combined with far quieter, safer-feeling streets, enables residents to switch to more active and healthy ways of getting around, particularly for short journeys.

This OBC covers the Kings Heath and Moseley PfP scheme. An experimental scheme was introduced in September/October 2020 with an Experimental Traffic Regulation Order (ETRO) being made on 22nd October 2020, and covered two 'cells' in the area bordered by Avenue Road, Howard Road, High Street and the railway line and included the following:

- modal filters on Highbury Road, Silver Street, Bank Street, Grange Road and Station Road
- pedestrianisation of a short section of York Road between Waterloo Road and High Street
- modal filters on All Saints Road, Hazelhurst Road and Colmore Road.

A modal filter is any measure, at a single point in a road, that allows the passage of some modes of transport but not others. In the areas listed above, modal filters that restrict the movement of motor vehicles were installed, in the form of planters and removable central bollards. In some places, there have also been further bollards placed in the footway or grass verge to prevent vehicles bypassing the planters. In the case of York Road, multiple sets of modal filters have been introduced at each end of the road to create a pedestrianised streetscape outside the local shops. These measures on York Road as installed in phase 1 are to remain in place.

In addition to the above, modal filters were installed on School Road, Cambridge Road and Poplar Road as demonstration measures. These measures will be changed with the introduction of the second phase.

While the first phase was reasonably well received by those residents within the area treated, a large volume of correspondence was received from residents on the boundary roads relating to impacts from perceived displaced traffic. It became apparent that these displacement effects were exacerbated by unrelated roadworks on other key routes in the general area and steps were taken to change diversion routes and ensure the roadworks were completed as soon as possible.

A Member Board was established and an action plan developed and implemented to help address some of the issues raised by residents. This included changes to the traffic signals at the “Red Lion” junction on Vicarage Road, the relocation of bus driver changeover to a location away from the immediate area and limiting non-essential street works within the area. These changes will remain in place under the phase 2 measures.

Many of the issues raised by residents regarding perceived displaced traffic will be directly mitigated by the implementation of the second phase of works, which is expected to deliver the benefits of the PfP approach across a wider area.

An area wide study was commissioned to identify complementary measures that could be delivered to help manage effective traffic flow through the area. The study reported in January 2022 and several of its recommendations have been incorporated into the phase 2 scheme.

- 3.3 The recommendations of a Strategy Report to Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment on the Kings Heath and Moseley Places for People scheme were accepted on 5<sup>th</sup> April 2022. The agreed strategy was to carry out further engagement with the local community on the details of the scheme in Spring/Summer 2022 with a view to the scheme being implemented in Autumn

2022 (subject to Cabinet approval). The above Strategy Report was the subject of Sustainability & Transport O&S Committee - Request for Call In on 28 April 2022 which was rejected. Due to the timing of the local elections, the engagement exercise took place in September and October 2022.

- 3.4 ETROs were made on 22<sup>nd</sup> October 2020. ETROs differ slightly from permanent TROs in terms of the process. For a permanent TRO there is a statutory consultation period that must take place before the scheme is implemented, and objections either over-ruled or resolved. For an ETRO, there is no requirement for statutory consultation prior to implementation (though in practice some form of 'soft' consultation usually would be undertaken). Instead, the first six months of the ETRO is the "objection period" with the scheme having already been implemented. This enables people to object (or not) on the basis of actual rather than perceived impacts. It does not however present any greater opportunity to make changes to the scheme without bringing forward a new TRO (experimental or permanent). After six months, and no longer than eighteen months after implementation an ETRO must either be made permanent or revoked (and in the latter case any associated works reinstated to the original condition). The ETRO for this scheme was subject to internal audit and consideration of objections and the Assistant Director Transport and Connectivity, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment, approved that the TRO was made permanent on 11<sup>th</sup> April 2022.
- 3.5 This new project seeks to make the extant measures permanent (described in para 3.2) and extend the scheme to the east of the High Street across to Wake Green Road in the north, Yardley Wood Road to the east and Coldbath Road/Wheelers Lane/Howard Road East to the south.
- 3.6 The extended scheme, which creates five new cells, responds to issues raised in the formal consultation. While overall the design minimises changes to the published options, there are fewer modal filters and increased use of one-way streets to remove through traffic. Each cell also has multiple access points to improve network resilience in case of an accident or roadworks.
- The existing modal filter on School Road is relocated to the south and further modal filters introduced on Greenhill Road and Oxford Road.
  - Modal filters are introduced on Ashfield Road and Melton Road with diagonal filters on Valentine Road/Poplar Road and Institute Road/Melton Road. One-way streets will be introduced on sections of Valentine Road, Poplar Road, Woodville Road, Heathfield Road, Melton Road and Institute Road.
  - A bus gate is to be introduced eastbound and westbound on Addison Road, to be enforced by two cameras, one in each direction.
  - Traffic calming is to be introduced along Billesley Lane with a pedestrian crossing to be provided near Westlands Road. A one-way gyratory system

is to be introduced at St Agnes Road/Colmore Crescent/Dyott Road with one-way streets on Melton Road, Institute Road and Gaddesby Road.

- Modal Filters will be introduced on Barn Lane, Mossfield Road and at the junction of Addison Road/Portman Road.
- Coldbath Road will be made one way northbound.
- All roads within the area to be treated, including boundary roads, are to be subject to a 20mph speed limit.

As part of preparing the Outline Business Case, a more robust costing exercise was undertaken. This resulted in a significant increase in the scheme costs compared to the original budget. Costs estimates were revised based on what other similar schemes have cost in recent times where we are seeing a significant increase in costs due to the current economic situation and the impact of inflation on construction costs generally. A value engineering exercise was undertaken and costs thoroughly reviewed again, resulting in a current estimated out-turn cost of £2.564m. This higher cost is irrespective of whether permanent or temporary infrastructure is installed, therefore it is proposed to move towards more permanent solutions in the detailed design in order to avoid the need for further expenditure on consolidation works in future. Whilst scheme costs have risen significantly, the Places for People approach is still considered to be overall value for money in that aims to provide an enhanced level of service for pedestrians and cyclists, alongside road safety improvements over a wide area by reducing the speed and volume of vehicular traffic over time. Building segregated cycle infrastructure for example to create a similar network would be considerably more costly.

The extended scheme will be delivered under a permanent Traffic Regulation Order (TRO). This is a change from the previous plan for the scheme which envisioned delivering the extended scheme under an ETRO, as was the case with the first phase. While the ETRO approach has some benefits, and enabled the delivery of the first phase of the scheme within the timescales of the Emergency Active Travel Fund, it is not considered appropriate to implement the extended scheme in this way. The significant increase in the capital cost of the scheme requires a greater level of commitment to its permanency than an ETRO offers, especially as the Council would be required to commit further scarce resource to the scheme's removal in the event of an ETRO being revoked after the objection period. As set out in 3.4. an ETRO does not allow flexibility to make changes to the scheme, only an all or nothing decision after the first six months. Proceeding with a permanent TRO will still afford citizens and stakeholders a right to make a submission to the statutory consultation process (in advance of implementation). The commitment to monitor the impact of the scheme, and where funding permits, make further enhancements, will also remain.

## **4 Options Considered and Recommended Proposal**

### **4.1 Option 1 – Do nothing / remove scheme entirely.**

This option was considered but rejected because whilst the scheme is contentious and has significant opposition, there is also a not insignificant level of support. Many of the measures already installed were in response to long standing traffic issues, and whilst further mitigations are required, some localised improvements have been observed. More fundamentally, there is a pressing need to transform the city's transport network in line with the Birmingham Transport Plan which proposes city-wide roll-out of this type of scheme. Removing the scheme would undermine this whole agenda.

### **4.2 Option 2 – Do nothing / existing elements to remain**

This option was rejected because of similar reasons to those described in 4.1 in terms of failing to deliver against social, environmental and economic imperatives set out in the Birmingham Transport Plan. Leaving the existing scheme elements in place would go some way to addressing previously identified issues, but would not seek to mitigate displacement impacts observed after the first phase of implementation.

### **4.3 Option 3 – Proceed to implementation with a different option (as per those previously consulted on)**

Previous iterations of the design have evolved into the hybrid option now put forward as the preferred concept design, taking on board views expressed in consultation. Proceeding with a different combination of previous options A, B, C and D would still meet the overall objectives of the scheme but would not take on board local opinion.

### **4.4 Option 4 – Proceed to implementation – recommended option**

The formal consultation presented two options to the west of the High Street, the existing layout (Option A) and an alternative layout (Option B). Two options for the east of the High Street were also presented (Options C and D). Further detail is provided in section C1 of the Outline Business Case (appendix A).

The recommended option is to retain the existing layout to the west with a hybrid option based on Option C to the west (See Appendix F). This option is considered to best represent the views expressed in the formal consultation whilst still meeting the objectives of the scheme.

## **5 Consultation**

### **5.1 An online engagement exercise on the Commonplace platform, undertaken between February 2021 and April 2021, relating to the Kings Heath & Moseley PfP recorded 791 responses. Respondents were relatively split on their feelings towards the changes, with 45% of respondents giving a negative response and 36% feeling positive towards the changes. 4% were mixed in their feelings and raised positives and negatives about the changes without any clear predisposition.**

- 5.2 The formal consultation presenting the options ran from 4th October 2021 until 5th November 2021. When asked “How do you feel about Kings Heath and Moseley being part in the Places for People project?”, 34% of respondents were positive or mostly positive while 56% were negative or mostly negative. 60% selected Neither as their preferred option between Options A and B. 62% selected Neither as their preferred option between Options C and D.
- 5.3 Feedback received included that there were too many modal filters and that one-way streets would be preferred. Respondents also felt that the green cell was too large and that the cells needed several points of access to spread the traffic impact and make incidents on the network easier to manage. The recommended option responds to these comments.
- 5.4 The Kings Heath & Moseley Member Board, whose membership included local MPs, ward councillors and senior council officers, was established in June 2021 to provide oversight to the project. The Board made recommendations on the pace of engagement and delivery of the project, noting the wider implications of the funding horizon, and approved the options that were the subject of formal consultation. The recommended option was presented to the Board on 10th December 2021.
- 5.5 Refer to Appendix E for the Consultation Summary Report.
- 5.6 An engagement exercise to refine the details of the scheme was held in September 2022. The purpose of the exercise was to discuss details of the proposed scheme with people in the immediate area and to ask them specific questions about aspects of the design close to their home or organisation. Seven events were held each relating to a different area of the concept design, as well as one event for businesses and one for anybody who was unable to attend their area event.
- 5.7 The feedback received at the events will inform the detailed design of the scheme, including for example the precise location for the modal filters. A key change that came as a result of the events is that Barn Lane will receive a modal filter compared to the previous proposal which made both Barn Lane and Brook Lane one-way. The proposed traffic calming on Billesley Lane is to be extended and the arrangement of one-way streets to the east of the High Street is to be reviewed during detailed design. A report on the localised engagement is included at Appendix G.
- 5.8 Correspondence has also been received outside of the formal consultation period and localised engagement covering a range of issues connected to the measures both in support of the scheme and asking for its removal. Several petitions requesting removal of the measures have been submitted, including an online petition which attracted over 4,000 signatures, along with a survey of over half the businesses in Kings Heath Business Improvement District indicating that 95% are “against” the LTN.



## **6 Risk Management**

6.1 The following risks have been identified in relation to the scheme:

- Objections will be received in response to TROs  
Mitigation: Further engagement on the detailed design of the scheme took place in September 2022, feedback from which will inform the detailed design.
- That the lockable bollards will slow down the operations of Emergency Services and a key would be needed by several different parties;  
Mitigation: keys have been issued to Emergency Services. Ambulance Service have advised they prefer to navigate around the modal filters.
- That the scheme will not be delivered before the deadline for ATF3 funding;  
Mitigation: Provide regular updates to public and councillors to avoid an information vacuum. Change control procedures to extend the funding period have been agreed with TfWM.
- There is insufficient funding within the project for the works to be completed, particularly if costs have increased due to inflation;  
Mitigation: Costs have been reviewed and a contingency sum added to scheme cost to cover inflation
- That the measures (e.g. 20mph speed limits and bus gates) are not followed by drivers. This may lead to the false perception by residents that they are safe from dangerous / non-compliant driving;  
Mitigation: Measures will be designed to be self-enforcing where possible. Enforcement measures (e.g. speed cameras) will also be considered where feasible as well as signage and traffic calming measures
- Shortage of contracting resources potentially leading to a delay in commencement of the works.  
Mitigation: Works will be procured through an existing framework and programmed with the contractor as early as possible to ensure resource is available when required.

Further details are provided in Appendix C.

## **7 Compliance Issues:**

7.1 **How are the recommended decisions consistent with the City Council's priorities, plans and strategies?**

- 7.1.1 The proposals support the City Council's priorities (prosperous, inclusive, safe, healthy and green) as outlined in the City Council Finance Plan 2022 to 2026, the Birmingham Development Plan (BPD) 2031, the Birmingham

Transport Plan 2031, and the West Midlands Strategic Transport Plan. Further details are given in Section B1 of Appendix A.

- 7.1.2 The scheme supports Additional Climate Change Commitments including the aspiration for the City Council to be net zero carbon by 2030, as agreed by Cabinet on 30th July 2019, following the declaration of a Climate Change Emergency passed by full City Council on 11th June 2019.
- 7.1.3 It also aligns with national government policies including the Transport Decarbonisation Plan published in July 2021, the Tackling Obesity Strategy and Gear Change: A Bold Vision for Cycling and Walking.

## **7.2 Legal Implications**

- 7.2.1 The City Council in carrying out transportation, highway and infrastructure related work will do so under the relevant primary legislation comprising the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, Highways Act 1980, Road Traffic Act 1974, Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, Traffic Management Act 2004, Traffic Act 2000, and other related regulations, instructions, directives, and general guidance.
- 7.2.2 Section 1 of the Localism Act 2011 contains the Council's general power of competence and Section 111 of the Local Government Act 1972 contains the Council's ancillary financial and expenditure powers in relation to the discharge of its functions.

## **7.3 Financial Implications**

### **Capital Costs**

- 7.3.1 ATF Tranche 2 was approved by Cabinet on 8th September 2020. The programme consists of four packages of schemes, with an allocation of £4.477m received from central government via TfWM (comprising £3.983m capital and £0.494m revenue), along with £0.305m capital as a local match-funding contribution from the City Council giving an overall fund of £4.782m (comprising £4.288m capital and £0.494m revenue)

Package 2 includes Places for People (PfP) and a small number of School Street schemes. £0.808m of capital funding has been allocated to the PfP tranche 2 measures within the ATF programme, of which £0.085m has already been vired to the School Streets programme. Furthermore £0.324 has been allocated for development and design of schemes and £0.037m has been approved for delivery of the Florence Road PfP Quick Win scheme. This leaves £0.362m unallocated prior to the approval of the Kings Heath and Moseley PfP scheme.

- 7.3.2 The estimated capital cost for delivery of the Kings Heath and Moseley PfP scheme is £2.564m funded from the capital allocation for Package 2 of the ATF programme and other funding sources as indicated in the table below. These sums are in addition to the Development and Design costs approved previously. The final costs and funding will be reported as part

of the FBCs. The funding sources listed below are all capital grant funding apart from the Clean Air Zone Fund which is surplus revenue income.

Active Travel Fund 2	£262,000
Active Travel Fund 3	£250,000
Approved Design Fees	£100,000
HS2 MSQW Refund	£159,500
Road Safety Budget	£651,500
School Streets Budget	£200,000
Clean Air Zone Fund	£941,700
<b>Scheme cost</b>	<b>£2,564,700</b>

- 7.3.3 A total of £2.596m of the DfT capital funding and BCC match funding has been approved to date through the Cabinet Report and subsequent Chief Officer delegated decisions, which includes the fees spent to date in developing the Places for People scheme and producing this OBC. The current overall capital funding position is shown in Section G3 of the appended OBC.

#### **Revenue Implications**

- 7.3.4 This project will create assets that will form part of the highway upon completion of the project; as such they will need to be maintained within the overall highway maintenance regime. As part of the City Council's obligations under the Highway Maintenance and Management Private Finance Initiative (HMMPFI) contract, Highways have been formally notified of the proposed changes to the highway inventory arising from this scheme. The works relate to SSD number 6666/02.
- 7.3.5 The estimated net highway maintenance costs for the newly-created assets associated with the proposals are £6,000 per annum which includes energy costs of £300 per annum. This cost will be funded from the provision for Highways Maintenance held within Corporate Policy contingency.
- 7.3.6 The City Council will be responsible for the camera enforcement operation, and income will be generated from Penalty Charge Notices (PCNs) issued as part of the enforcement regime regarding the bus gate on Addison Road. This income will be used in the first instance to cover the operational cost of enforcement. The bus lane enforcement financial model in Section E1 of Appendix A is a summary of the estimated income and expenditure showing that over the expected 5-year life of the cameras, income from PCNs is estimated at £0.156m with operational and other costs estimated at £0.030, leaving a retained surplus of £0.126m.

- 7.3.7 Any surpluses will be used in line with the strategy for utilising sums generated from bus lane enforcement as outlined in the 'Transportation and Highways Capital Programme 2022/23 to 2026/27 – Annual Programme Update' report approved at Cabinet on 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2022. This will be in line with the applicable regulations; 'Provisional Guidance on Bus Lane Enforcement in England Outside of London' (February 2008). At the end of each year, the Place, Prosperity & Sustainability Directorate of the City Council will provide to the Department for Transport an annual report of the costs and revenues, and the allocation of the revenue generated.

At the end of the camera life a decision will be required on whether to replace them or to also remove the poles and electrical connections. Either option would require allocation of a budget at the appropriate time.

#### **7.4 Procurement Implications (if required)**

- 7.4.1 The procurement route is to use the Black Country Framework Contract for Minor Works 2021-2024 and call off in accordance with its protocol. The approval for the award of contracts for individual schemes will be in accordance with the Constitution's Procurement and Contract Governance Rules.
- 7.4.2 The BLE cameras will be supplied by Yunex Traffic (formerly Siemens Mobility Ltd) using the City Council's 'Birmingham Bus Lane Enforcement Support and Maintenance Service' contract approved on 25th October 2021 by the Director of Planning, Transport and Sustainability in conjunction with the Interim Assistant Director Procurement, Director of Council Management and the City Solicitor and Monitoring Officer (or their respective delegates).

#### **7.5 Human Resources Implications (if required)**

- 7.5.1 The scheme will be delivered by existing City Council staff with support from consultants and contractors through existing frameworks.

#### **7.6 Public Sector Equality Duty**

- 7.6.1 An Equality Analysis was produced for the overall ATF Tranche 2 programme (EQUA544) as reported to Cabinet on 8th September 2020. The initial screening did not require a full Equality Analysis to be produced at that time but noted that the needs of disabled people and other protected groups needed to be taken into account during development and delivery of individual schemes.
- 7.6.2 A scheme-specific Equality Analysis (EQUA773), attached as Appendix B, has also been produced which identified broadly positive and neutral impacts on protected characteristic groups. See also Section C3 of the OBC.

## **8 Appendices**

### **8.1 List of Appendices accompanying this report:**

- Appendix A – Outline Business Case
- Appendix B – Equality Analysis
- Appendix C – Risk Assessment
- Appendix D – Delivery Programme
- Appendix E – Consultation Outcome
- Appendix F – Scheme Plans
- Appendix G – Localised Engagement Report

## **9 Background Documents**

‘Emergency Active Travel Fund – Tranche 2’, Report to Cabinet, 8th September 2020.

‘Transportation and Highways Capital Programme 2022/23 to 2027/28 – Annual Programme Update’, Report to Cabinet, 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2022.

‘Birmingham Transport Plan’, Report to Cabinet, 12th October 2021.

‘Active Travel Fund Tranche 2 – Package 2: Kings Heath Places For People Strategy Report’ Report To Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment, 4th April 2022

‘Objection to Traffic Regulation Order (ETRO) on the Kings Heath Places for People scheme, Brandwood & Kings Heath’, Report to Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment, 11<sup>th</sup> April 2022

‘Objection to Traffic Regulation Order (ETRO) on the Bournville, Castle Vale and Moseley Places for People schemes’, Report to Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment, 11<sup>th</sup> April 2022

[Template March 2019](#)