

From: [Wyn Richards](#)
To: [Nina Davies](#); [Councillor Aled Davies](#); [Councillor Rachel Powell](#); [Sian Barnes](#); [REDACTED]
Subject: ERCG - Briefing Note 130120
Date: 08 January 2020 16:35:52
Attachments: [ERCG - Briefing Note 130120.docx](#)

Dear All,

Please find attached for information a copy of the briefing note that I've circulated to the Committee for Monday's ERCG Scrutiny Committee.

Regards.

Wyn Richards
Scrutiny Manager and Head of Democratic Services / Rheolwr Craffu a Phennaeth
Gwasanaethau Democrataidd
Powys County Council / Cyngor Sir Powys
County Hall / Neuadd y Sir
Llandrindod Wells / Llandrindod
Powys LD1 5LG
Tel / Ffon: 01597 826375

From: [Sian Barnes](#)
To: [Wyn Richards](#)
Cc: [Nina Davies](#); **Section**
Subject: RE: \$\$Minutes - Draft 13012020
Date: 31 January 2020 14:21:00
Attachments: [SB edits \\$\\$Minutes - Draft 13012020.doc](#)

Hi Wyn,

Many thanks, I have made two minor amendments in red on the attached minutes.

Regards,
Sian

Sian Barnes
Arweinydd Proffesiynol Dros Dro Mynediad i Gefn Gwlad a Hamdden
Acting Professional Lead, Countryside Access and Recreation
Gwasanaethau Cefn Gwlad / Countryside Services
Cyngor Sir Powys / Powys County Council
Ffon / Tel: 01597 827595

Croesawu gohebiaeth yn Gymraeg / We welcome correspondence in Welsh
Visit our website at [Cyngor Sir Powys County Council: Countryside](#)
Find us on www.facebook.com/powys.countryside
Follow us on <https://twitter.com/PowysCountry>

Mae Gwasanaethau Cefn Gwlad a'r Gwasanaeth Hamdden Awyr Agored yn prosesu'ch data personol er mwyn bodloni ein dyletswyddau statudol, ein pwerau a'n cyfrifoldebau mewn perthynas â hawliau tramwy cyhoeddus a'r canlynol: Y Map Diffiniol, Y Gofrestr Tir Comin, parciau, lleoedd chwarae, a'r lleoedd agored rydym yn eu rheoli. Pe ddymunech wybod mwy am sut rydym yn defnyddio data personol, ewch i: <https://customer.powys.gov.uk/article/3792/Privacy-Notice-for-Countryside-Service>

Countryside Services and Outdoor Recreation are processing your personal data for the purpose of meeting our statutory duties, powers and responsibilities in relation to public rights of way, the Definitive Map, Commons Register, parks, playgrounds and open spaces that we manage. If you would like to know more about how we use personal data, please see <https://customer.powys.gov.uk/article/3792/Privacy-Notice-for-Countryside-Service>

From: Wyn Richards <@..>
Sent: 31 January 2020 10:43
To: Sian Barnes <@..>; Nina Davies <@..>; **Section**
Subject: \$\$Minutes - Draft 13012020

Dear All,

Attached are the draft minutes of the Economy, Residents, Communities and Governance Scrutiny Committee held on 13th January, 2020.

Can I have any comments / amendments by Friday 7th February please.

Many thanks.

Wyn.

Economy, Residents, Communities and Governance Scrutiny Committee

13.01.20

Draft Questioning Strategy:

Item 5 – Revised Protocol for authorising motor vehicle events affecting footpaths, bridleways and restricted byways under s.33 Road Traffic Act 1988
--

Main issue raised from previous protocol relates to the management of public safety during an event and the associated liabilities.

The requirements for organisers of events are set out in Appendices 3 and 4.

Possible Questions:

- Has the issue relating to the management of public safety during an event and associated liabilities been addressed by the revised protocol?
- Do Appendices 3 and 4 provide sufficient information for the Council in being able to determine applications for event authorisation? Are the requirements too onerous or should there be additional requirements set out in the appendices?
- Do Appendices 3 and 4 provide sufficient safeguards and protection for the Council with liabilities and associated costs falling to the event organisers rather than the Council?

Item 6 – Welsh Public Library Standards report for 2019/20

Under the Welsh Library Standards framework, the Authority's performance was measured against a revised set of 12 Core entitlements and 16 key Performance Indicators, which includes impact and outcome measures, in order to demonstrate the wide range of benefits that result from public library use, such as improvements to people's literacy skills, digital skills and health and wellbeing

The detailed Annual Assessment Report is set out in Appendix A.

For the year 2018/19, Powys Library Service met 11 of the 12 core entitlements in full, and partially achieved the 12th.

The framework has 16 quality indicators, of which 10 have measurable targets; for those with targets, Powys met 7 in full, 1 in part, and failed to meet two. (See paragraphs 2.2 and 2.4 in Appendix A)

Looking at paragraph 2.4 (Quality Indicators and benchmarks) the comparative figures between 2017/18 and 2018/19 show a variable range of results (between improved results and declining results). However there are many good aspects to the report as highlighted in the conclusion (Section 6)

Possible Questions:

- Have there been any changes to the frameworks (framework 5 in 2017/18 and framework 6 in 2018/19) which would have impacted on the results between years?
- Are there any particular reasons for the changes between years (see examples below)?

QI number	2017/18	2018/19	Change
1(a)	76%	68%	+8%
1(c)	69%	57%	-12%
2(a)	74%	81%	+7%
5(a)	11	24	+
10	512	780	+
13(b)	2490	3500	+
14(a)	15749	13570	-
14(b)	49%	58%	+9%
14(c)	699	2095	+
16(b)	4.79%	2.03%	+

- Based on the current environment within which the Library Service operates i.e. population numbers in Powys, travelling times to libraries, financial constraints on the Council, how easy or difficult is it for the service to improve the ranking under individual Quality Indicators and are some more difficult to improve than others?
- Are there any proposals to address issues raised in relation to:
 - Attendance at formal and informal training sessions
 - Inability to provide events / activities for users with special requirements in all these libraries
 - Improving library membership and attendances

Title: Proposal to Authorise Motor Sport Events on Public Roads	Impact Assessment (IA)
IA No: DCMS 110	Date: 12/05/2014
Lead department or agency: DCMS	Stage: Final
Other departments or agencies: DfT, DEFRA	Source of intervention: Domestic
	Type of measure: Primary legislation
	Contact for enquiries: Alexander.Wilkinson@culture.gsi.gov.uk Tel: 020 7211 6039

Summary: Intervention and Options

RPC Opinion:

Cost of Preferred (or more likely) Option			
Total Net Present Value	Business Net Present Value	Net cost to business per year (EANCB on 2009 prices)	In scope of One-In, Two-Out?
-£6.34m	£-1.24m	£0.14m	Yes
			IN

What is the problem under consideration? Why is government intervention necessary?

The Road Traffic Act 1988 prohibits racing and trials of speed by motor vehicles on roads in England, Wales and Scotland. Races or Trials of Speed on public roads can be permitted by Parliament through the Private Bill procedure for specific events. This process is prohibitively cumbersome for most new events, with the exception of those of major national significance. As a result, very few events currently take place on public roads, such as the Jim Clark Rally and the Tour of Mull. Government intervention is necessary to amend section 12 of the Road Traffic Act 1988 to legalise motorsport on public roads, which would allow local authorities to authorise motor races jointly with the Motor Sport Association (MSA) or the Auto Cycle Union (ACU), potentially unlocking benefits at local level.

What are the policy objectives and the intended effects?

1) To have a more efficient and accessible process for enabling local road events. 2) To promote British motor sport by enabling events currently not viable due to the Private Bill authorisation procedure.

What policy options have been considered, including any alternatives to regulation? Please justify preferred option (further details in Evidence Base)

Option 0 - Status Quo (Do Nothing).

Option 1 - To allow on road motor races to be authorised by local authorities jointly with the MSA or ACU.

Option 1 is the preferred option.

Will the policy be reviewed? Yes. If applicable, set review date: 5 years from enactment of legislation.

Does implementation go beyond minimum EU requirements?			N/A		
Are any of these organisations in scope? If Micros not exempted set out reason in Evidence Base.	Micro N/A	< 20 N/A	Small N/A	Medium N/A	Large N/A
What is the CO ₂ equivalent change in greenhouse gas emissions? (Million tonnes CO ₂ equivalent)			Traded: N/A	Non-traded: N/A	

I have read the Impact Assessment and I am satisfied that, given the available evidence, it represents a reasonable view of the likely costs, benefits and impact of the leading options.

Signed by the responsible Chief Economist:

Paul Crawford

Date: 12/05/2014

Summary: Analysis & Evidence

Policy Option 1

Description: Allow an unlimited number of on road motorsport races each year to be regulated by an authorising body or bodies.

FULL ECONOMIC ASSESSMENT

Price Base Year 2013	PV Base Year 2013	Time Period Years 10	Net Benefit (Present Value (PV)) (£m)		
			Low: -10.99m	High: -1.34m	Best Estimate: -6.34m

COSTS (£m)	Total Transition (Constant Price) Years	Average Annual (excl. Transition) (Constant Price)	Total Cost (Present Value)
Low	0	0.6	5.4
High	0	1.4	11.7
Best Estimate	0	1.0	8.7

Description of scale of key monetised costs by 'main affected groups'

One type of costs from this proposal that can be monetised takes the form of delays to travel caused by road closures. These costs are based on the assumption that additional events would take place on weekends and predominantly on rural roads with usually light traffic. Other costs that can be monetised are based on the losses due to injuries and fatalities caused by races.

Other key non-monetised costs by 'main affected groups'

Non-monetised costs include externalities caused by noise and pollution from additional races affecting local residents. However, existing guidance and consultations with Defra suggest that these costs would be too small to be meaningfully monetised. There are also potential losses to local businesses that have to close for an event to take place, which are not expected to be additional to the national economy. In other words, some (but probably not all) losses by individual businesses due to new events would accrue as benefits to other businesses or to the same business at a different time. However, small businesses in the areas hosting new events are likely to profit from the events on average.

BENEFITS (£m)	Total Transition (Constant Price) Years	Average Annual (excl. Transition) (Constant Price)	Total Benefit (Present Value)
Low	0	0.1	0.7
High	0	0.5	4.1
Best Estimate	0	0.3	2.4

Description and scale of key monetised benefits by 'main affected groups'

From a national perspective, the main benefit of this proposal that can be monetised takes the form of additional foreign visitors attending additional motor sport events. These benefits would be concentrated on larger events which are able to draw a share of international visitors. Even for large events, however, international visitors would form only a small part of all visitors to the event. These benefits are considered indirect benefits to UK plc and have not been included for OITO or NPV to business figures.

Other key non-monetised benefits by 'main affected groups'

There are various benefits from these measures that are either non-economic in nature or cannot be monetised. These include benefits to the motor sport industry as well as social and well-being benefit from the additional events themselves, volunteering around the organisation of the events and improvements in local engagement and sense of community due to the changed authorisation procedure.

Key assumptions/sensitivities/risks

Discount rate (%) 3.5%

Assumptions had to be made with regard to the number of events that will take place as a result of these proposals, as well as the scale of these events, which types of roads will have to be temporarily closed for them to take place and how many minutes of delays these road closures would cause to the average journey. While cost assumptions made tend to be conservative, the headline results in this assessment are sensitive to changes in these assumptions.

BUSINESS ASSESSMENT (Option 1)

Direct impact on business (Equivalent Annual) £m:			In scope of OITO?	Measure qualifies as
Costs: 0.1	Benefits: 0.0	Net: -0.1	Yes	IN

Evidence Base (for summary sheets)

1. Purpose and intended effect of measure

Amending section 12 of the Road Traffic Act 1988¹ to simplify the authorisation of closed road motor sport events on public roads would reduce the burden on local authorities and motoring organisations when organising an on-road motorsport event. Legalising motor sport on public roads should also help to expand some sectors of the national economy, especially with regard to overseas tourism and the motorsport engineering industry (which in 2012 had a turnover value estimated at £9 billion, with a large export share, and UK employment generated by motorsport engineering activity of over 41,000). It will also support the government's localism agenda, by allowing local authorities to make decisions that unlock benefits to the local economy and community directly at the local level, rather than through the Private Bill procedure. Moreover, allowing motor racing and/or trials of speed on public roads will aid the development of the sport and put the UK on an equal footing with other European countries.

2. Background

The Motor Sports Association (MSA) and the Auto Cycle Union (ACU) are national governing bodies for motor sports and motorcycle sport respectively. The UK hosts around 5,000 motor sport events each year organised by MSA member clubs, as well as 4,000 motor cycle events organised by ACU member clubs. The vast majority take place at purpose built venues or in remote rural off-road locations. In addition, Parliament introduces legislation on an event by event basis to allow "on road" motor racing, hill climbs and speed trials, including the Jim Clark Rally and the Tour of Mull.

The MSA and ACU have estimated demand for new motor sport events on closed roads to be at over 100 events per year, with most of this figure consisting of very small events that would often form part of larger local festivals and events. The events could include stage rallies, hill-climbs, races and speed trials (sprints). The term "motor sport event" is being used in this Impact Assessment to cover any of these.

3. Rationale for intervention

Section 12 of the Road Traffic Act 1988 prohibits racing and trials of speed by motor vehicles on a highway or public road. Racing on public roads can be permitted by Parliament through the Private Bill procedure for specific events. A Private Bill is promoted by an individual or organisation outside of the Houses of Parliament, typically a local authority, to obtain powers or benefits which are either in excess of, or in conflict with, the general law. These powers will only apply to the body that promotes the Private Bill.

This route is currently the only option for any new on-road rallies, but it is cumbersome and has thus been used infrequently. The process can take up to 18 months and needs the approval of both Houses of Parliament. The legislation has also tended to be time limited, so that if the race is not held one year then the legislation would cease to have an effect. An example of a rally still in existence by such legislation is the Jim Clark Rally in Scotland (authorised by the Scottish Borders Council (Jim Clark Memorial Rally) Order Confirmation Act 1996)² which has been held annually in Scotland since 1997.

Government intervention is required as Section 12 of the Road Traffic Act (RTA) acts as a regulatory barrier to viable but smaller road races going ahead because of the uncertain and burdensome procedure of needing a specific Act of Parliament before any new race can be held. Amending the RTA would remove this burdensome process in favour of a more efficient procedure to authorise closed road motor

¹ <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1988/52/section/12>

² http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukla/1996/12/pdfs/ukla_19960012_en.pdf

sport events on public roads. An amendment of section 12 of the RTA will need to be effected by further primary legislation.

4. Policy objective

The overarching policy objective for Government intervention is to reduce the burden on **event organisers** (notably local authorities) when working with an authorising body to organise on-road motorsport events.

At the same time, the government's aim is to ensure that authorised closed road motor sport events remain viable and that health and safety provisions remain ensured under the new authorisation procedure.

5. Options considered

In September 2012 the Department for Transport undertook informal discussions on the proposed options with a number of local authorities, Government Departments and the Devolved Administrations. Thirteen responses were received. It should be noted that the majority of responses were from stakeholders who work in the field of motorsport and are in favour of legalising motorsport on public roads. In February 2014, the Department for Culture, Media and Sport launched a public consultation after further refinement of the proposals. This consultation asked for responses relating to the impact of the proposal, particularly on the likely number of new events, by 14 March 2014. However, most responses received to the consultation were identical in content and supportive of the proposal, and did not address questions on the likely impact.

Option 0 - Status Quo.

Do nothing and therefore do not amend section 12 of the RTA. Organisations would continue to use the Private Bill procedure for specific events. This option is cumbersome as the process can take up to 18 months and needs the approval of both Houses of Parliament. The legislation has also tended to be time limited, so that if the race is not held within one year then the legislation would cease to have an effect. Informal consultation suggests that under the current system the Private Bill procedure acts as a barrier against motorsport being held on public roads. The legal, administrative and financial implications are such that organisers are unwilling or unable to undertake them.

Option 1 - Allow local authorities to authorise closed road motor sport events together with the MSA or ACU.

The proposal is to introduce measures which allow a local authority to suspend the speed limit and applicable traffic regulations for an event, as long as the event has been approved by the authorising body. It is envisaged that the following list of legislative requirements in relation to drivers and their vehicles would be dis-applied in relation to authorised events:

- prohibiting, restricting or regulating traffic;
- restricting the speed of vehicles;
- regulating the manner of driving vehicles;
- regulating the construction, use, maintenance or lighting of vehicles;
- requiring a policy of insurance or security to be in force in relation to the use of any vehicle;
- relating to the duty chargeable on, and the licensing and registration of, vehicles;
- requiring the driver of a vehicle to hold a licence authorising him or her to drive the vehicle;

The measures would be available to any local authority which wanted to support a motor sport event in their area, subject to local consultations and consideration of other relevant local issues, including the impact on the local community, as well as the potential local benefits in terms of tourism and the benefit to the local economy.

It is proposed that the MSA, as recognised by the world governing body for motor sport, the Fédération Internationale de l'Automobile (FIA) and named in the Regulations (The Motor Vehicles Competitions and Trials Regulations 1969 as amended), or the ACU, as recognised by the world governing body for motorcycle sport, the Fédération Internationale de Motocyclisme (FIM), would be responsible for authorising motor sport events on the public highway through issuing an event permit.³

The Motor Sports Association and the Auto Cycle Union already have considerable experience of authorising events, including taking into account the needs of residents and communities when planning events. They issue skill-related competition licences for various types and classes of motor sport events and there are ranges of safety requirements that competitors must comply with in order to take part in events. They would be required to licence the participating drivers and vehicles, as well as approve the route.

6. Costs and benefits of potential options

Option 1: Allow an unlimited number of on road motorsport races each year, to be regulated by an authorising body or bodies

The primary benefits from this option are:

1. Additional expenditure in the locality hosting the race
2. Additional income for the motor sports industry
3. Non-economic benefits in the form of well-being and social benefits resulting from events

The primary costs include:

1. Costs borne by the national economy through road closures, particularly in the form of delays.
2. Costs due to a very limited number of casualties resulting from events.
3. Minor costs to local residents in the form of pollution and noise.

To calculate the total costs and benefits for this option, we require a forecast of the likely number of events that would be held each year, and the unit costs and benefits. We have sought information, through the consultation, regarding the number of races that could potentially be held each year. However, consultation responses received focused overwhelmingly on the first five questions of the consultation, including general support for the proposal and event safety.

Forecast Number of Races

The number of races per year would be determined by a combination of commercial viability and local appetite for hosting such an event. The consultation has sought responses on the number of races which are likely to be held each year.

There is currently only a very limited evidence base on the potential number of closed road events that would occur annually after the adoption of these proposals. Current estimates tend to be based on a 2010 study by SIRC.⁴ However, this study uses a simulation based on hypothetical numbers, and only includes events that are relatively significant to the local economy.

After consulting with the MSA and the ACU, we believe that the following provides a more realistic estimate of the types of events to be expected if the legislation allows for an unlimited number of races.

³ The Motor Vehicles (Competitions and Trials) Regulations 1969

⁴ SIRC (2010). The Benefits of 'Closed Road' Motor Sport Events to Host Communities.

Table 1: Estimated number of additional 2 wheel and 4 wheel events

	4 Wheel: Low Estimate	4 Wheel: High Estimate	4 Wheel: Best Estimate	2 Wheel: Low Estimate	2 Wheel: High Estimate	2 Wheel: Best Estimate
Very large scale (comparable to Jim Clark Rally).	0	2	1	0	2	1
Large events, comparable to National A category in SIRC research.	5	10	8	5	10	7
Very small scale events. These would include motor sport activities that form part of larger events without a focus on motor sport.	50	100	75	25	60	40

Source: MSA / ACU

For the smallest category of events, we would expect an economic impact well below that of the smallest category (Clubmans) in the SIRC study, which is in line with an assumption of little impact per event on the national level, and limited road closures. Costs, benefits and scale for the largest category are derived based on already existing events falling into this category.

In theory this legislation could be used to stage events that go beyond the largest category considered here, such as staging Formula 1 Grand Prix in city centres. However, while the Private Bill procedure is relatively burdensome to smaller events and therefore acts as a barrier, for an event of such scale and national and international significance as a Formula 1 Grand Prix it would not be such a significant obstacle. Therefore such hypothetical events are just as likely under existing provisions and would not be considered additional.

Costs and Benefits

Unless stated otherwise, all figures are presented in 2013 prices.

There is a degree of uncertainty on the impact of these proposals, both due to a lack of evidence on impacts at the national level, and due to the impossibility of predicting the exact design and location of any new events. The following presents the best possible estimate based on consultations with government departments as well as the MSA and the ACU, guidance by the Department for Transport and Defra, the design of already existing events, and available research.

Benefits from Visitors

Sheffield Hallam University's report detailed the expected additional expenditure from hosting motor sport events, based on the experience of other motor sport events in the UK. The estimates range from £0.027m to £1.02m for a Clubmans (a front engine, rear wheel drive race) and an international race that is not part of the World Rally Competition (WRC) respectively (see Table below).

Table 2: SIRC Estimates of Economic Impact of Stage Rallies, Hill Climbs and Sprints⁵

Event Status	Economic Benefit per Event
<i>Stage Rallies</i>	
Clubmans	£0.027m
National B	£0.133m
National A	£0.340m
International (Non World Rally Championship)	£1.020m
<i>Hill Climbs</i>	
Clubmans	£0.027m
National B	£0.053m
National A	£0.133m

Source: SIRC (2010)

These estimates of economic impacts include, "the additional visitor and organisational expenditure in the host economy that can be directly attributable to the staging of an event." The estimates include neither the expenditure by local residents nor expenditure by non-residents not attending the event.

There are, however, a number of issues with respect to the figures quoted in Table 2, which should be adequately answered before these estimates can be used to advise policy decisions.

1. The economic impacts estimated are additional to the local economy, but it is doubtful that they are entirely additional to the national economy. If the local benefits are simply the result of redistributing expenditure from one locality to another, analysis based solely on the above estimates would exaggerate the overall economic impacts at the national level.
2. The economic impacts in Table 2 have been estimates from data primarily relating to off-road events. Given that on-road events are anticipated to draw larger crowds, total numbers of visitors, and thus expenditure, are likely to be slightly larger than for otherwise similar off road events.
3. The study by SIRC focused on the benefits of additional consumer spending and did not make reference to costs as a result of road closures.

It is thus necessary to make adjustments for these factors, in addition to including the more nuanced estimate of the likely number of races outlined above.

Benefits from Domestic Visitors

The evidence available⁶ suggests that the overwhelming majority of visitors to new events will be domestic, and they thus constitute the bulk of benefits from visitor expenditure SIRC estimates for the

⁵ SIRC (2010). The Benefits of 'Closed Road' Motor Sport Events to Host Communities.

⁶ Hassan, D. & McCullogh, D. (2007). An Economic Impact Study of Round 15 of the World Rally Championship 2007: Rally Ireland. *Ulster University*.

local economy. However, it cannot be assumed that this expenditure would be additional at the national level. Our best estimate of the economic benefits to the national economy from domestic visitors to new events is thus zero. While there is a possibility that some domestic visitors will attend new events in the UK instead of attending events abroad, thereby benefiting the national economy, we are not able to quantify this impact and expect it to be negligible at the national level.

Benefits from International Visitors

Spending by foreign visitors attending closed road events will be a benefit to the national economy. However, the share of foreign visitors are likely to be relatively small, even for large events. Based on the impact study for the WRC event in Northern Ireland by Hassan & McCulloch, we estimate that for the 'very large' category of events, 7.5% of spending would be generated by overseas visitors. For the 'large' category, we estimate half of this share at 3.75%. For the 'very small' category it is not assumed that the event will lead to additional international visitors.

In line with the study by SIRC, it appears realistic to assume that visitor numbers for 'large' events would be lower in the first year due to the more national and international reputation of the event. However, consultations with the MSA suggest that it would be unrealistic to assume that new events will develop to the levels of international non WRC events over a period of five years, as is assumed in the assessment by SIRC. Hence, we estimate that new 'large' events would have the profile of National B events in Year 0 and of National A events in Years 1-9. We also assume that events would be evenly distributed between stage rallies and hill climbs / sprints. Estimates of total benefits from international visitors per year are summarised in Table 3.

Table 3: Annual Benefits from International Visitors

	Y0	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Y5	Y6	Y7	Y8	Y9
Best Estimate	£205,291	£285,973	£285,973	£285,973	£285,973	£285,973	£285,973	£285,973	£285,973	£285,973
Low No of Races	£34,863	£88,651	£88,651	£88,651	£88,651	£88,651	£88,651	£88,651	£88,651	£88,651
High No of Races	£375,719	£483,295	£483,295	£483,295	£483,295	£483,295	£483,295	£483,295	£483,295	£483,295

Source: DCMS Calculations based on Table 2 and Hassan & McCulloch (2007)

While it is assumed that only two 'very large' events will take place annually as a consequence of these proposals, Table 3 shows that the higher visitor numbers and higher share of international visitors mean that any benefits to the national economy will be sensitive to the amount of very large scale events with an international profile that are going to take place as a consequence of the legislation. Calculations for the best estimate are summarised in Table 4. These benefits are considered indirect benefits to UK plc and have not been included for OITO or NPV to business figures.

Table 4: Best Estimate of Benefits from International Visitors (Calculus)

	Stage Rallies	Hill Climbs/Sprints	International non-WRC	Total
Year 0	$7.5 \times 0.0375 \times £0.133m$	$7.5 \times 0.0375 \times £0.053m$	$0.075 \times £1.02m \times 2$	£205,291
Year 1-9	$7.5 \times 0.0375 \times £0.34m$	$7.5 \times 0.0375 \times £0.133m$	$0.075 \times £1.02m \times 2$	£285,973

Source: DCMS Calculations based on Table 2 and Hassan & McCulloch (2007)

Key non-monetised benefits

Additional Income for Motor-Sport Industry

The motor-sport industry in the UK is currently estimated to have a turnover of around £9bn. Given the commercial nature of motor racing, we have assumed that the motorsports industry will not host events which are not profitable, although these benefits for the industry are likely to constitute displacement within the national economy. Furthermore, there may be some wider gains to the motor sport industry due to improvements in its international profile, economies of scale as a result of additional events and similar benefits. While a relatively small proportionate gain to the motor-sport industry could lead to significant economic gains to the national economy compared to other costs and benefits in this Impact Assessment, it is not possible to make an estimate of these benefits at this point.

Social and Well-Being benefits

Beyond providing some economic benefits, particularly from the perspective of local economies, attending motor sport events is a source of well-being for residents of the local community as well as visitors. This is particularly the case as motor sport events can often be attended free of charge, meaning that benefits in terms of well-being will not be mitigated by entry fees for the event itself. The value of participating in sport and culture in terms of subjective well-being has been demonstrated by DCMS's CASE research reports.⁷

Similar to other forms of sport, motor sport events also provide opportunities for volunteering. As the proposals will give local authorities an additional opportunity to engage with residents in the organisation of events, there is a potential that these proposals will foster a sense of belonging and cohesion among local communities. These positive impacts at the local community have been found in studies such as the meta-evaluation of the 2012 Olympics in London.⁸

⁷ DCMS (2010). Understanding the drivers, impact and value of engagement in culture and sport. An over-arching summary of the research. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/case-programme-understanding-the-drivers-impacts-and-value-of-engagement-in-culture-and-sport>

⁸ DCMS (2013). Report 5: Post Games Evaluation. Summary Report. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/report-5-post-games-evaluation-meta-evaluation-of-the-impacts-and-legacy-of-the-london-2012-olympic-and-paralympic-games>

Costs of Road Closures

From the perspective of the national economy as a whole, delays caused by road closures and resulting congestion and detours are likely to present the largest impact of these proposals. The main reason for this is that compared to other potential costs and benefits, these costs are likely to be additional from a national perspective. Our best estimate of these costs is **£470,000** annually. The methodology presented in this section has been agreed with the Department for Transport.

Key assumptions:

Based on consultations with the MSA and the ACU as well as information on existing events such as the Jim Clark Rally, the Ulster Rally and smaller Hill Climbs, it is assumed that additional events would take place on weekends, and largely on small rural roads. It is also assumed that events will usually take place during the day, although road closures from the 2013 Jim Clark Rally suggest that events after 8pm cannot be ruled out. Road closures to accommodate new events will thus affect traffic more strongly than their mere share out of a 24 hour day would suggest. In line with information provided on existing events in Northern Ireland, it is assumed that local authorities and event organisers would try to organise events in a way that minimises disruptions to local businesses and residents.

Estimated Traffic Flow by Type of Road:

Estimates of traffic flows are based on statistics on vehicle flows published by DfT⁹, in combination with analysis from a previous Impact Assessment by DfT¹⁰, which provides a breakdown of vehicle types by class of road.

Table 5: Average Traffic Flows by Type of Road

Type of Road	Number of Vehicles per Day (AADT)	Cars/Light Vans	Light Vans	Buses/Coaches	Goods Vehicles
Major Rural	10800	80%	14%	1%	5%
Minor Rural	800	80%	16%	1%	3%
Major Urban	19300	82%	13%	2%	3%
Minor Urban	2100	84%	13%	2%	1%

Source: DfT (2012). Street Works (Charges for Unreasonably Prolonged Occupation of the Highway) (England) Regulations 2011, p. 24; DfT Statistics (2013). Motor vehicle flow by road class in Great Britain, annual from 1993.

Table 5 indicates the estimated Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) by type of road, using DfT's distinctions of major/minor and urban/rural roads. While DfT also provides AADT statistics for motorways, the evidence available does not make their inclusion into our estimate seem feasible. Furthermore, while data in Table 5 includes average daily traffic flows over an entire year, the timing of motor sport events on weekends is likely to further reduce disrupted traffic flows in practice.

Estimated Number and Duration of Road Closures and Delays by Event Size:

The estimated number and duration of road closures by event is based on information about existing events for each category, namely the Jim Clark Rally in Scotland¹¹ ('very large'), as well as the Ulster Rally ('large') and the Spamount-Omagh Hill Climb ('very small') in Northern Ireland.

Estimates for the Jim Clark Rally are based on a map of road closures and times provided to local residents,¹² while information on the other two events has been provided by the MSA. Tables 6-8 summarise the number of roads that need to be closed for each event, in combination with the duration of the closure in equivalent days and estimated delays in minutes to the average journey. As indicated

⁹ <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistical-data-sets/tra03-motor-vehicle-flow>

¹⁰ DfT (2012). Street Works (Charges for Unreasonably Prolonged Occupation of the Highway) (England) Regulations 2011

¹¹ <http://www.dft.gov.uk/traffic-counts/cp.php?la=Scottish+Borders#11014>

¹² <https://www.google.co.uk/url?q=http://www.jimclarkrally.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/PR1-to-print.pdf&sa=U&ei=hwYnU829OMSUhQe4oYDICg&ved=0CCQQFjAB&usq=AFQjCNFwZb7RNT8nPAILVNBASe1SyUQiaQ>

above, equivalent days were derived by dividing the duration of closures over 16h rather than 24h. As the tables indicate, the duration of road closures may well be inversely proportionate to the size of the event, based on the information available. While this may seem counter-intuitive, a possible reason is that there is a greater pressure to be efficient for the organisers of larger events which cause potentially greater disruptions.

Table 6: Road Closures for Very Large Events

Type of Road	Number of Roads	Number of Vehicles per Day (AADT)	Duration of Closure (Equivalent Days)	Delays to Travel (Minutes)
Major Rural	1	10800	0.3125	15
Minor Rural	41	800	0.3125	4
Minor Rural	12	800	0.25	4
Minor Rural	12	800	0.1875	4
Minor Rural	3	800	0.15625	4
Major Urban	0	19300	0.3125	10
Minor Urban	1	2100	0.3125	3

Source: MSA, DfT, DCMS Calculations, Jim Clark Rally Information for Residents¹³

Table 7: Road Closures for Large Events

Type of Road	Number of Roads	Number of Vehicles per Day (AADT)	Duration of Closure (Equivalent Days)	Delays to Travel (Minutes)
Major Rural	1	10800	0.375	10
Minor Rural	24	800	0.375	4
Major Urban	0	19300	0.375	8
Minor Urban	5	2100	0.375	3

Source: MSA, DfT, DCMS Calculations

Table 8: Road Closures for Very Small Events

Type of Road	Number of Roads	Number of Vehicles per Day (AADT)	Duration of Closure (Equivalent Days)	Delays to Travel (Minutes)
Major Rural	0	10800	0.5	10
Minor Rural	3	800	0.5	4
Major Urban	0	19300	0.5	8
Minor Urban	0	2100	0.5	3

Source: MSA, DfT, DCMS Calculations

While delays to the typical journey due to road closures in minutes need to be estimated to quantify the cost of road closures, the uncertainty about the location and design of new events makes estimating delays difficult. The estimates in Tables 6-8 thus represent upper estimates of delays to the typical journey. In his analysis of the cost of congestion caused by street works, Goodwin¹⁴ discusses various methods to simulate the delays experienced by drivers. While it is not possible to recreate the same methodology in this assessment, Goodwin estimated delays of between 19 seconds for small rural roads with light traffic, up to 3.6 minutes for large works on the busiest rural roads, with urban roads falling in between. Contrary to Goodwin's analysis, road closures for additional motor sports events would require drivers to make detours, rather than to queue at a construction site, which is reflected in the longer delays estimated here. However, delays will be mitigated to a degree by events being held on weekends

¹³ <http://www.dft.gov.uk/traffic-counts/cp.php?la=Scottish+Borders#11014>

¹⁴ Goodwin, P. (2005). Utilities' Street Works and the Cost of Traffic Congestion. <http://www.njug.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/93.pdf>

and on smaller roads, which will mean lower volumes of traffic, as well as the requirement on organisers to plan and communicate any delays and suggested diversions well in advance.

Economic Cost of Delays:

DfT's Transport Analysis Guidance (webTAG)¹⁵ provides average values for the typical vehicle journey per hour on weekends, by category of vehicle. Table 9 provides a summary of these costs in 2013 prices and per minute.

Table 9: Cost per Minute and Vehicle Type

£	Cars	Light Transport	Buses/Coaches	Goods Vehicles
Hour	12.70	15.97	96.54	15.25
Minute	0.21	0.27	1.61	0.25

Source: DfT WebTAG 3.5.6, DCMS Calculations

Combining the information included in Tables 1 and Tables 5-9 yields the annual cost figures summarised in Table 10, including a best estimate for the total cost of delays of **£470,000**. The full model for every category of event is included in **Annex A**.

Table 10: Total Cost of Delays due to Road Closures.

	Low Estimate: Number	High Estimate: Number	Best Estimate: Number	Low Estimate: Total Cost	High Estimate: Total Cost	Best Estimate: Total Cost
Large Races	10	20	15	£191,636.78	£383,274	£287,455
Very Small Races	75	160	115	£84,528.00	£180,326	£129,610
Very Large Races	0	4	2	£0.00	£105,099	£52,550
Total				£276,164.78	£668,699.34	£469,614

Source: DCMS Calculations

¹⁵ DfT (2014). Values of Time and Vehicle Operating Costs. TAG Unit 3.5.6 <http://www.dft.gov.uk/webtag/documents/expert/unit3.5.6.php>

Risks of Accidents and Fatalities

Potential accidents and / or casualties are a key risk, for which appropriate and adequate measures of mitigation / prevention are required within the proposal.

Forecast:

To create a forecast of the potential additional casualties which might occur as a result of additional on-road races, we require a forecast of the number of casualties per race and the number of races. For the number of casualties per race we can use outturn data from previous years.

Outturn data from previous years suggests approximately 0.16 fatalities per 100 races per annum for the period 2002 to 2011, see Table 11. We currently do not have data for the total number of serious and slight injuries. However, figures for injuries to drivers and staff can be derived by assuming that the ratio between spectators and drivers/staff will be the same as in the case of fatalities.

Table 11: Casualties per 100 races (spectators, event personnel and racing drivers)

Year	Fatalities (per 100 races)	Serious (per 100 races)	Slight (per 100 races)
2002	0.24	Data for the total number of casualties either seriously or slightly injured is currently unknown.	
2003	0.18		
2004	0.24		
2005	0.28		
2006	0.25		
2007	0.06		
2008	0.00		
2009	0.13		
2010	0.19		
2011	0.00		
Average 2002-11	0.16		

Source: MSA

Table 12: Casualties per 100 races (spectators only, excluding event personnel and racing drivers)

Year	Fatalities (per 100 races)	Serious and Slight (per 100 races)
2002	0.00	0.30
2003	0.00	0.06
2004	0.00	0.00
2005	0.00	0.06
2006	0.06	0.00
2007	0.00	0.06
2008	0.00	0.13
2009	0.06	0.57
2010	0.00	0.26
2011	0.00	0.06
Average	0.01	0.16

Source: MSA

Existing authorisation procedures ensure that safety standards are adhered to for each event and therefore the casualty figures provided above are relatively low. The Motorsports Association or Auto Cycle Union assesses each event through supplying a licensed Scrutineer of the appropriate grade for the level of race to take charge of the scrutineering team for each race to assess the following:

1. The skills of the driver
2. Safety of the equipment and proper preparation of the vehicle or motorcycle
3. Preparation of the venue
4. The skills of the race organiser

Organisation of an event is usually delegated to a local Motor Club. Motor Clubs have a permit to organise an event issued by the appropriate Governing Body for a certain level of event - the Governing bodies would not allow a new motor club to organise an event. Clubs are awarded high level events based on their experience of organising events. The MSA has race liability cover for each race for up to £50 million, whilst the ACU has liability cover for up to £30 million per race. Liability cover is only in place if a club is operating to a permit (issued by the authorising body), satisfies the safety conditions (set out in the yearbook) and supplementary technical regulations covering all aspects of the event have been checked prior to a permit being issued.

We would therefore expect the risk of potential casualties to be comparable to existing races.

Cost of Casualties and Injuries:

To value the cost of preventing a casualty, we use the Accidents Sub-Objective of WebTAG. The costs of fatalities and injuries are presented in Table 13.

Table 13: The Economic Cost of a Casualty

Injury Type	Lost Output	Human Costs	Medical and Ambulance	Total
Fatal	£601,126	£1,146,493	£1,032	£1,748,652
Serious	£23,159	£159,310	£14,030	£196,499
Slight	£2,448	£11,662	£1,038	£15,148

Source: Table 1, WebTAG 3.4.1: The Accidents Sub-Objective

The cost a casualty in Table 13 can be combined with the forecast of races in Table 1 and the estimated number of casualties in Table 11 to derive the total economic cost of casualties, per year, which is estimated at **£369,315** per annum, based on 132 additional events per year leading to one fatality every five years.

In order to derive the cost of serious and slight injuries, assumptions have to be made about the number of injuries to drivers, as well as about the distribution between serious and slight injuries. For the number of injuries to drivers, it is assumed that the distribution will follow the same pattern as that of casualties indicated in Tables 11 and 12, meaning that drivers and event staff will be 15 times as likely to suffer injuries as spectators. For the distribution of injuries, it is assumed that 80% of injuries will be slight. On the basis of these assumptions, the total cost of injuries per year is estimated at **£173,752**, based on 132 additional events per year. Assuming safety procedures and resulting fatalities and injuries will resemble current patterns, total annual costs from fatalities and injuries are thus estimated at **£543,067**. Adjusting for the high and low estimates of the number of races, high and low estimates for the annual cost of injuries and fatalities are £691,187 and £349,702 respectively. Calculations are summarised in Table 14.

Table 14: Annual Cost of Fatalities and Casualties (Calculus)

	Drivers and Event Personnel	Spectators	Total
Injuries	$(132 * 0.16 * (0.2 * £196,449 + 0.8 * £15,148) * 0.01) * 15$	$(132 * 0.16 * (0.2 * £196,449 + 0.8 * £15,148) * 0.01)$	£173,752
Fatalities	$132 * 0.16 * £1,748,652 * 0.01$		£369,315

Source: DCMS Calculations

Key non-monetised costs

Noise and Pollution:

Holding additional motor sport events on closed public roads will inevitably lead to externalities in the form of noise and emissions resulting from the race itself, its organisation as well as visitors to the event. However, consultations with Defra and existing guidance suggest that these costs would be negligible in comparison to other costs and benefits in this Impact Assessment, and that existing guidance is not suitable for monetising these costs.

For the cost of emissions, existing guidance by Defra¹⁶ provides costs per tonne for different types of pollution. Based on these estimates, the number of additional events estimated here is unlikely to make a significant difference to the overall costs based on these estimates. The primary risk resulting from additional motor sport events on closed roads is that they would tip daily or hourly average pollution levels over current limit values in areas which are currently at risk of breaches. However, this is highly unlikely to occur as additional events are expected to take place overwhelmingly in rural areas which currently have limited traffic and congestion and on weekends.

Defra also provides guidance on the cost of increased noise levels to local residents.¹⁷ However, the annual cost of noise levels to residents affected does not exceed £150 annually in 2010 prices, meaning that increased noise for a number of hours per year does not have an impact that can be reasonably quantified. It is however worth pointing out that the proportionate increase in noise levels would be larger in the rural areas in which events are predominantly expected to take place, although fewer households will be affected in rural areas. For urban environments, changes in noise levels have been modelled in an evaluation of the Baltimore Grand Prix¹⁸ and found to be substantial, but were not monetised.

Potential Losses to Local Business:

There is a potential for losses to some local businesses that would have to close for a number of hours on the day of the event. However, we do not expect these closures to impose significant costs on local businesses or to be additional to the national economy. Due to the expected nature of additional motor sport events, we expect only very few businesses to be located along the race course. More importantly, any income lost to individual businesses on the day of the event is expected to lead to gains to other businesses in the local area on the day of the event, or to the same business during different time periods. This is due to the additional amount of people in the local area around the time of the event, and the necessity to inform residents about the event well in advance, which will allow for the planning of delayed purchases from local businesses. Any losses would thus lead to displacement rather than costs for the national economy overall, and it is unlikely that there would be a net loss to local businesses overall.

¹⁶ <https://www.gov.uk/air-quality-economic-analysis#damage-costs-approach>

¹⁷ <https://www.gov.uk/noise-pollution-economic-analysis>

¹⁸ http://www.hmmh.com/cmsdocuments/Baltimore_Grand_Prix_Noise_Study.pdf

Total Cost over 10 Year Period

Table 15 indicates annual costs and benefits over a 10 year period for the best estimate as well as the high and low number of races.

Table 15: Total Annual Cost and Benefit

£m		Y0	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Y5	Y6	Y7	Y8	Y9
Best Estimate	Cost	1.013	1.013	1.013	1.013	1.013	1.013	1.013	1.013	1.013	1.013
	Benefit	0.205	0.286	0.286	0.286	0.286	0.286	0.286	0.286	0.286	0.286
Low No of Races	Cost	0.626	0.626	0.626	0.626	0.626	0.626	0.626	0.626	0.626	0.626
	Benefit	0.035	0.089	0.089	0.089	0.089	0.089	0.089	0.089	0.089	0.089
High No of Races	Cost	1.360	1.360	1.360	1.360	1.360	1.360	1.360	1.360	1.360	1.360
	Benefit	0.376	0.483	0.483	0.483	0.483	0.483	0.483	0.483	0.483	0.483

Source: Tables 1-14, DCMS Calculations

Over a 10 year period, our best estimate of the Net Present Value (2013 prices) of the proposal is **-£6.34m**. High and low estimates of the NPV are -£1.34m and -£10.99m respectively.

Intuitively, this negative NPV result is driven by costs that are additional at a national level in combination with benefits that tend to be only additional at a local level. In other words, while additional motor sport events are likely to be beneficial to local economies, the national economy does not benefit in the same way from consumers spending their money on attending motor racing events instead of other things, since the alternative would likely not require road closures or entail injuries and fatalities.

OITO

The measure is covered by One In Two Out and counts as an IN. Costs and benefits to business under the OITO methodology are summarised in Table 16.

Table 16: Business Cost and Benefit

£m		Y0	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Y5	Y6	Y7	Y8	Y9
Best Estimate	Cost	0.145	0.145	0.145	0.145	0.145	0.145	0.145	0.145	0.145	0.145
	Benefit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Low No of Races	Cost	0.085	0.085	0.085	0.085	0.085	0.085	0.085	0.085	0.085	0.085
	Benefit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
High No of Races	Cost	0.206	0.206	0.206	0.206	0.206	0.206	0.206	0.206	0.206	0.206
	Benefit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Source: DfT WebTAG 3.5.6, DCMS Calculations

Guidance provided by DfT enables us to make a best estimate of the share of total costs from delays due to road closures that would be borne by business. Specifically, DfT's webTAG guidance provides data on the share of traffic on weekends that is related to work, which is relatively low and drives the low share of business costs within total costs, as well as on the value of work related journeys per hour that would be lost by business, which is higher than for other journeys.

On the benefits side, we expect all gains from spending by international visitors in the local area to go to business, which would be additional on the national level. However, these benefits would be a consequence of behaviour change that is considered indirect, and thus not fall within the scope of OITO. Hence, benefit figures in Table 16 are equal to zero. Overall, these figures lead to an Equivalent Annual Net Cost to Business (EANCBS) of **£0.14** over a 10 year period in 2009 prices, meaning a small net cost to business. The full model for the cost to business per event is summarised in **Annex B**.

Key Assumptions and Sensitivities

The NPV figure is sensitive to our assumptions concerning additionality, particularly around the displacement of benefits, as indicated by the difference between the £40m benefit over five years from additional visitors in SIRC's simulation, compared to our best estimate of average annual benefits of £0.3m. However, there is no indication that spending by domestic visitors would be additional to the national economy.

Furthermore, the model used in the Impact Assessment necessarily rests on a number of assumptions concerning the number, timing and design of new motor sport events, and is sensitive to changes in these assumptions. For example, cost figures would change proportionately to changes in the expected duration of delays and the estimated amount of traffic on closed roads. Our estimates for these values represent conservative but reasonable cost assumptions based on the evidence available.

Small and Micro Business Assessment

As this measure does not directly regulate the majority of businesses affected, it is not possible to exempt small and micro businesses from the proposal.

Based on the expected nature of additional closed road motor sport events, we expect small businesses in rural areas in which the event typically takes place to be affected by a large share of both the costs and the benefits of this measure. In addition to the considerations for the national level outlined above, there is a potential for some redistribution of spending by domestic visitors towards local small businesses in areas where additional events take place, for example in the hospitality sector. Overall, the net impact on small business is thus uncertain, but likely to be small, in line with our estimates of the impact on business overall.

Social Impact

As set out under the section on non-monetised benefits, we expect the proposed measure to have positive social impacts, in the form of well-being, increased local engagement and engagement with the sport such as volunteering, and an improved sense of community as a result of authorising events at the local level.

Competition Impact

We **do not expect an impact**, either directly or indirectly, on the number and range of suppliers, or their ability or incentive to compete. Any benefits to the motor sport industry are not expected to reduce competition.

Annex A: Cost of Delays per Event

Very Large Race Category:

Type of Road	Number of Roads	Number of Vehicles per Day (AADT)	Duration of Closure (Equivalent Days)	Delays to Travel (Minutes)	Vehicle Shares Cars/Light Vans	Light Vans	Buses/Coaches	Goods Vehicles	Cost per Road
Major Rural	1	10800	0.3125	15	80%	14%	1%	5%	£11,866.50
Minor Rural	41	800	0.3125	4	80%	16%	1%	3%	£9,626.80
Minor Rural	12	800	0.25	4	80%	16%	1%	3%	£2,254.08
Minor Rural	12	800	0.1875	4	80%	16%	1%	3%	£1,690.56
Minor Rural	3	800	0.15625	4	80%	16%	1%	3%	£352.20
Major Urban	0	19300	0.3125	10	82%	13%	2%	3%	£0.00
Minor Urban	1	2100	0.3125	3	84%	13%	2%	1%	£484.71
Total Cost									£26,274.85

Large Race Category:

Type of Road	Number of Roads	Number of Vehicles per Day (AADT)	Duration of Closure (Equivalent Days)	Delays to Travel (Minutes)	Vehicle Shares Cars/Light Vans	Light Vans	Buses/Coaches	Goods Vehicles	Cost per Road
Major Rural	1	10800	0.375	10	80%	14%	1%	5%	£9,493.20
Minor Rural	24	800	0.375	4	80%	16%	1%	3%	£6,762.24
Major Urban	0	19300	0.375	8	82%	13%	2%	3%	£0.00
Minor Urban	5	2100	0.375	3	84%	13%	2%	1%	£2,908.24
Total Cost									£19,163.68

Very Small Race Category:

Type of Road	Number of Roads	Number of Vehicles per Day (AADT)	Duration of Closure (Equivalent Days)	Delays to Travel (Minutes)	Vehicle Shares Cars	Light Vans	Buses/Coaches	Goods Vehicles	Cost per Road
Major Rural	0	10800	0.5	10	80%	14%	1%	5%	£0.00
Minor Rural	3	800	0.5	4	80%	16%	1%	3%	£1,127.04
Major Urban	0	19300	0.5	8	82%	13%	2%	3%	£0.00
Minor Urban	0	2100	0.5	3	84%	13%	2%	1%	£0.00
Total Cost									£1,127.04

Cost of Delays:

£	Cars	Light Transport	Buses/Coaches	Goods Vehicles
Hour	12.70	15.97	96.54	15.25
Minute	0.21	0.27	1.61	0.25

	Low Estimate: Number	High Estimate: Number	Best Estimate: Number	Low Estimate: Total Cost	High Estimate: Total Cost	Best Estimate: Total Cost
Large Races	10	20	15	£191,636.78	£383,274	£287,455
Very Small Races	75	160	115	£84,528.00	£180,326	£129,610
Very Large Races	0	4	2	£0.00	£105,099	£52,550
Total				£276,164.78	£668,699.34	£469,614

Annex B: Cost to Business per Event

Very Large Race Category:

Type of Road	Number of Roads	Number of Vehicles per Day (AADT)	Duration of Closure (Equivalent Days)	Delays to Travel (Minutes)	Vehicle Shares Cars/Light Vans	Light Vans	Buses/Coaches	Goods Vehicles	Cost per Road
Major Rural	1	10800	0.3125	15	80%	14%	1%	5%	£3 652.44
Minor Rural	41	800	0.3125	4	80%	16%	1%	3%	£2 961.89
Minor Rural	12	800	0.25	4	80%	16%	1%	3%	£693.51
Minor Rural	12	800	0.1875	4	80%	16%	1%	3%	£520.14
Minor Rural	3	800	0.15625	4	80%	16%	1%	3%	£108.36
Major Urban	0	19300	0.3125	10	82%	13%	2%	3%	£0.00
Minor Urban	1	2100	0.3125	3	84%	13%	2%	1%	£149.81
Total Cost									£8,086.15

Large Race Category:

Type of Road	Number of Roads	Number of Vehicles per Day (AADT)	Duration of Closure (Equivalent Days)	Delays to Travel (Minutes)	Vehicle Shares Cars/Light Vans	Light Vans	Buses/Coaches	Goods Vehicles	Cost per Road
Major Rural	1	10800	0.375	10	80%	14%	1%	5%	£2 921.95
Minor Rural	24	800	0.375	4	80%	16%	1%	3%	£2 080.54
Major Urban	0	19300	0.375	8	82%	13%	2%	3%	£0.00
Minor Urban	5	2100	0.375	3	84%	13%	2%	1%	£898.86
Total Cost									£5,901.36

Very Small Race Category:

Type of Road	Number of Roads	Number of Vehicles per Day (AADT)	Duration of Closure (Equivalent Days)	Delays to Travel (Minutes)	Vehicle Shares Cars	Light Vans	Buses/Coaches	Goods Vehicles	Cost per Road
Major Rural	0	10800	0.5	10	80%	14%	1%	5%	£0.00
Minor Rural	3	800	0.5	4	80%	16%	1%	3%	£346.76
Major Urban	0	19300	0.5	8	82%	13%	2%	3%	£0.00
Minor Urban	0	2100	0.5	3	84%	13%	2%	1%	£0.00
Total Cost									£346.76

Business Related Travel

£	Cars	Light Transport	Buses/Coaches	Goods Vehicles
Business Share	1.70%	87.83%	100.00%	100.00%
Hour	34.57	17.19	96.54	15.25
Minute	0.58	0.29	1.61	0.25

	Low Estimate: Number	High Estimate: Number	Best Estimate: Number	Low Estimate: Total Cost	High Estimate: Total Cost	Best Estimate: Total Cost
Large Races	10	20	15	£59,013.61	£118,027	£88,520
Very Small Races	75	160	115	£26,006.80	£55,481	£39,877
Very Large Races	0	4	2	£0.00	£32,345	£16,172
total				£85,020.41	£205,853.00	£144,570

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE ECONOMY, RESIDENTS, COMMUNITIES AND GOVERNANCE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE HELD AT COMMITTEE ROOM A - COUNTY HALL, LLANDRINDOD WELLS, POWYS ON MONDAY, 13 JANUARY 2020

PRESENT

County Councillor M J Dorrance (Chair)

County Councillors K W Curry, D O Evans, J Gibson-Watt, E M Jones, G Jones, I McIntosh, J Pugh and D Selby

In attendance: County Councillors

Cabinet Portfolio Holders In Attendance: A W Davies, R Powell and G Breeze

Officers: Nigel Brinn, N Davies, Wyn Richards, Sian Barnes and Kay Thomas

Other Officers In Attendance:

Apologies for absence were received from County Councillors P C Pritchard and M Barnes

1.	APOLOGIES
-----------	------------------

Apologies for absence were received from County Councillors P. Pritchard and M. Barnes.

2.	MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS
-----------	-------------------------------------

The Chair was authorised to sign the minutes of the previous meeting held on 25 November, 2019 as a correct record.

3.	DECLARATION OF PARTY WHIPS
-----------	-----------------------------------

There were no declarations of party whips which have been given in relation to the meeting in accordance with Section 78(3) of the Local Government Measure 2011.

4.	DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST
-----------	--------------------------------

The Committee received a disclosure of Personal Interest from County Councillors G. Jones, E. M. Jones, K. Curry and A. Davies in relation to item 5 - Revised Protocol for Authorising Motor Vehicle Events Affecting Footpaths, Bridleways and Restricted Byways under S.33 Road Traffic Act 1988.

The disclosures were made as the revised protocol could affect bridleways and footpaths that cross the land that the Councillors own or rent.

5.	REVISED PROTOCOL FOR AUTHORISING MOTOR VEHICLE EVENTS
-----------	--

	AFFECTING FOOTPATHS, BRIDLEWAYS AND RESTRICTED BYWAYS UNDER S.33 ROAD TRAFFIC ACT 1988
--	---

The Committee undertook a pre-decision scrutiny of the report of the Portfolio Holder for Finance, Countryside and Transport.

The revised protocol seeks a balance between safety and access to rights of way. Whilst these events are not trials of speed they are events where there will be many people as well as vehicles. Advice from Counsel was sought who advised that temporary closure notices should be used for rights of way where such events take place. The benefits of this is to protect public safety as well giving the public access to other footpaths instead of those affected by the event. The Committee was advised that the Section 151 Officer had commented that whilst the closures would cause the Council additional administrative costs, the charges would cover this additional work.

Question / Comment: Is public liability in place if the footpath remains open and is this covered by the application?
--

Response: This is what has led to the revised protocol due to the risk. The liability remains with the driver. However if a member of the public uses a path which is closed then this is an offence.
--

Question / Comment: How many of these events have been in the last 2 years?
--

Response: 30 events in 2019; up to 45 in previous years.

Question / Comment: Whilst the law has not changed, the protocol has changed regularly. Organisers want a period of calm. This revision will cause more work and lead to less events. There is an economic benefit from these events which should not be slowed down. As a number of events have been arranged the start date at the end of July is not helpful, so can this be delayed? As there's been so much change, can the new protocol be reviewed after 12 months and then a moratorium on changes for 5 years. Other Council also charge different rates with some not charging at all due to economic benefits.
--

Response: There have been no changes to the protocol in the last few years. There have been discussions with organisers. With regard to costs, if the organisation does the work then it will cost less. There is also no element of profit in the costs to be levied, they will just cover the Council's costs. The consultation process has been a lengthy process. It is also difficult to measure the economic benefits from such events.
--

Question / Comment: If an event is on a bridleway and on a road does this process cover both? Is there monitoring of these events?

Response: Yes where use of public rights of way are concerned. The process can also be applied to trials of average speed which is a bit of a grey area. The process does not absolve drivers from driving with due care and attention.
--

Question / Comment: Will the new protocol apply to new events rather than from a specific date: There also needs to be a single point of contact for events seeking advice for all aspects of the event.

Response: The start date suggested is when the new process will apply to applications received. Any events which have been arranged or applied for prior to the start date will operate under the current process. The application form is a simple checklist to assist organisers.

Question / Comment: How will temporary closures be advertised.

Response: As these will be a maximum of 5 day closures, there will be notices on site and contact with Town and Community Councils, and path user groups. The intention of the new process is to speak to people earlier about events than happens under the current process.

Question / Comment: If an organisation submits an application before July, will they use the current protocol? Can the new protocol be reviewed after 12 months, including fees?

Response: Yes it is the current protocol for applications before July. Organisers will be contacted after 12 months to see if changes are needed. The review will also consider fees.

Question / Comment: How does the protocol work within the National Park Area?

Response: The protocol will apply to the National Park area within Powys.

Outcome:

The report and responses to questions were noted.

6. WELSH LIBRARY STANDARDS REPORT

The Committee undertook a pre-decision scrutiny of the report of the Portfolio Holder for Young People and Culture.

The Committee was advised that the Council was continuing to work with communities in relation to libraries. The quality indicators in the report showed an improvement on the previous year. The contribution of partners and volunteers was very important to the service. The report was for 2018/19 and is an interpretation by Welsh Government of library standards in Wales which includes 12 core entitlements and 10 quality indicators.

Question / Comment: There is no reference to dilemmas for the future in the documents. Are maintaining and improving standards possible with the future financial position for the Council?

Response: Yes as long as the Council works with volunteers and continues partnership working. It should be possible to maintain services for the future.

Question / Comment: Does this mean that all libraries can be kept open in future?

Response: If the Council gets the relationship right there is no reason why we cannot keep the current number of libraries, but there is a need to work with communities.

Question / Comment: The Council is willing to work with communities.

There has been a review of libraries over 12 months and a reduced number of opening hours has reduced usage of libraries. There is a need from the Council to assist libraries as well.

Response: The long term stability of libraries is important. The model in Herefordshire is that libraries are volunteer led. There is a long way to go and assurances cannot be given about libraries. There needs to be voluntary led services but supported by specialist library staff.

Question / Comment: The Communities are on side at present, but they may not be in 12 to 18 months.

Response: The Portfolio Holder indicated that she wanted to visit all libraries in Powys again and continue the dialogue with communities.

Question / Comment: Why are we supporting buildings such as Y Gaer rather than libraries?

Response: Each library is unique. However, all the libraries either large or small need volunteer involvement.

Question / Comment: Events for people with special requirements – is this disabled people or those with other requirements?

Response: The definition of special requirements is very broad. In relation to events for people with special requirements, the Council badges all events as inclusive, but not everyone wants to attend them.

Question / Comment: For some of the individuals who are reluctant to come along, can the Council target those groups / individuals as its concerning that the target is not being met?

Response: With Integrated Care Funding and other funding, the Council in 2019/20 is working with various groups to try and improve on this target.

Question / Comment: How does the Council improve on the target regarding reading material?

Response: It would take a budget increase of £100k for the Council to meet this target.

Question / Comment: When the Council decides on access to libraries there is no consultation with communities on what times of day and days are best for communities.

Response: It is agreed that there should be consultation with communities as there's a need to maximise the use of libraries.

Question / Comment: Welsh Government has published indicators of deprivation. How are we going to use libraries to engage with people?

Response: There is a need to engage people and make libraries more relevant to them. Work can be undertaken with individual libraries to see what can be done.

Question / Comment: Despite austerity, libraries are successful. What is the Council doing to value its staff?

Response: Staff have been recognised by means of the staff awards.

The Committee expressed its thanks to the service for its work.

Outcome:

The report and the responses to questions were noted.

7.	LDP WORKING GROUP - APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER AS AN OBSERVER
-----------	---

The Committee was asked to appoint a Member as an observer on the Local Development Plan Working Group to replace County Councillor P. Pritchard who had been appointed on behalf of Montgomeryshire Members to the Working Group.

RESOLVED that County Councillor D. Selby be appointed as the Committee's observer representative on the Local Development Plan Working Group.

8.	WORKING GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS
-----------	--------------------------------------

The Committee received and noted the recommendations of the Digital Powys Strategy Working Group held on 20 November, 2019.

9.	SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME
-----------	--------------------------------

The Committee received a copy of the Scrutiny Forward Work Programme. It was suggested that a request be made to the Co-ordinating Committee for the following items to be included on the scrutiny forward work programme:

- Progress on Council house building programme.
- Refurbishment and re-development of County Farms.

The Committee asked for progress on the Mid Wales Growth Deal. The Committee was advised that there would be a presentation to the next meeting of Council. A Joint Scrutiny Working Group was also being arranged with Ceredigion to scrutinise the Mid Wales Growth Deal.

County Councillor M J Dorrance (Chair)