

Report sponsor: Strategic Director of
Communities and Place
Report author: Head of Traffic & Transportation

Darley Mills Bridge – Delivery of a temporary footbridge bridge and delivery options

Purpose

- 1.1 To obtain approval to deliver a short-term temporary footbridge (as described below) at Darley Mills.

Recommendation(s)

- 2.1 To approve the delivery of a short-term temporary footbridge option, as detailed in this Report.
- 2.2 To delegate authority to the Strategic Director of Communities and Place, following consultation with the Director of Legal, Procurement and Democratic Services, to enter into all necessary contractual agreements to facilitate delivery of the short-term temporary footbridge.
- 2.2 To approve a waiver, in line with the Contract Procedure Rules, to allow the appointment of a specialist contractor to deliver the short-term temporary footbridge solution.
- 2.3 To approve funding of up to £500k for the delivery of a short term temporary footbridge and delegate authority to the Strategic Director of Corporate Resources in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance, Digital and Culture to utilise this funding.

Reason(s)

- 3.1 Delivery of a short-term temporary bridge option is the quickest option for delivery, supports the community and local businesses, and allows time for the consideration and development of other options.
- 3.2 The construction and delivery of the longer-term temporary options have emerging complications and substantial cost factors. Trying to deliver these quickly, or at all, needs to be carefully considered as there are significant emerging risks.

Supporting information

Short-term temporary footbridge option

- 4.1 This option has been presented by a specialist contractor, after initially rejecting the possibility. They have done additional work and liaised with a crane operator and have presented a potential short-term solution.

- 4.2 The solution requires the Council to be satisfied with some of the associated risks. These have been assessed by the Structural Engineering Team and are attached to this report.
- 4.3 The option is not risk free and relies on an assessment that the existing bridge is weak, but stable, and will remain so for the next six months, or possibly longer. At present it is not believed that any work is required to remove weight from the bridge, or that access will be required in the short-term to carry out any further work or assessment of the bridge. This has previously been one of the key factors against spanning the existing bridge with a temporary solution.
- 4.4 The temporary bridge proposal does not rely on support from the existing bridge however it will need to be anchored, at least partially, on the existing foundations which support the ends of the existing bridge. There is a risk that if the bridge fails, it could lead to failure of the temporary solution, so assessing this and any mitigation is key to this option.
- 4.5 The current quote for the short-term temporary bridge is £200k. There will be some additions to this which will increase the cost approximately up to £300k. The cost includes £185k rental/lease for 12 months. The six months rental/lease cost is £150k.
- 4.6 The proposed delivery time, from the point of order, is 3 – 4 weeks, plus a week to build.

Longer-term temporary bridge options

- 4.7 Two locations have been considered for a temporary bridge with the purpose of being in place for three to four years to provide access, whilst a permanent replacement bridge project is developed and delivered.
- 4.8 Location 1 - North of the existing bridge with access direct into the Mills. The bridges that are currently available cannot be lifted into this position. There is another option of launching a bridge from the Mills side of the river, but this is logistically difficult, adding significantly to time and cost, and require the closure of the Mill Yard businesses for at least six weeks.
- 4.9 Location 2 – ‘the Cricket Ground’ bridge. This is to the south of the existing bridge. Initially this was thought to be the most deliverable and logistically simple option. However, after consulting with specialist contractors, the span required and the flood risk, means that pre-formed or ‘kit’ options for foundations are not possible and bespoke in-situ cast foundations will be required. The current estimate is that foundations alone could take six months to build and cost £500k. The current estimate of the total cost of a bridge at this location is likely to be £1.2 to £2m.
- 4.10 As the costs, complications, and risks of two options above has become more apparent over the last couple of weeks, then delivering a short-term option at a relatively low cost and allowing time for further research and development is the preferred and recommended option.

- 4.11 One of the two options (4.8 and 4.9) could be required as part of the delivery of a permanent replacement of the existing bridge, so there is merit in approving resource and a budget to continue further investigation and initial design. A minimum of £50k will be required for investigation, with (up to) a further £100k being required for more detailed work and an outline design.
- 4.12 The scale of the project(s) is now becoming evident and taking on significance. The governance of the projects, plus decision making by for example, Urgent Leader decisions, delegations, and appropriate oversight, are emerging concerns set in the context of also needing to be able to deliver an initial response as soon as possible.

Other considerations

- 4.13 The scale of costs associated with the options in 4.8 and 4.9 could mean that this option is rejected. In this scenario the short-term temporary bridge could potentially be maintained until the replacement scheme has been fully developed and a new permanent bridge has been fabricated. This would mean taking away the temporary bridge when demolition of the existing is required and work on-site is ready to begin on the permanent project.
- 4.14 The status and ownership of the existing bridge. It is considered likely that the short-term temporary solution is likely to lead to the Council being deemed to have taken control of the bridge and the liabilities. If this is acceptable, then there is a need to start the process for the transfer of title.

Public/stakeholder engagement

- 5.1 Regular engagement with all stakeholders from the businesses and community
- 5.2 Engagement with heritage groups and English Heritage

Other options

- 6.1 Do nothing, however no other organisation is likely to provide a solution.

Financial and value for money issues

- 7.1 The value is in supporting the businesses in the Mills and the local community. The full cost of a replacement project is estimated to be over £5m. This report does not outline funding for the £5m.
- 7.2 The funding of the temporary solution of £500k is available from underspends in the capital programme from 2021/22. Although the expenditure outlined in this report is revenue – the underspends from the programme are revenue in nature and can be used to fund this type of expenditure.

There may be further costs above the £300k outlined in this report and cabinet are asked to delegated decisions on the total funding of £500k to this project to the Strategic Director of Corporate Resources in consultation with the Cabinet member for Finance, Digital and Culture.

- 7.3 If in future further funding is required, then financials will be approved as appropriate.

Legal implications

- 8.1 By intervening in this manner, there is a risk that the Council will become the owner of the existing structure and responsible for demolition and replacement of the existing bridge.

Climate implications

- 9.1 The route over the bridge is part of the national cycle network and provides a link for pedestrians and enhances the enjoyment of the park and local amenities.

Other significant implications

- 10.1 None directly relevant to this report.

This report has been approved by the following people:

Role	Name	Date of sign-off
Legal	Emily Feenan, Director of Legal, Procurement and Democratic Services	12/07/2022
Finance	Toni Nash, Head of Finance	12/07/2022
Service Director(s)		
Report sponsor	Rachel North, Strategic Director of Communities and Place	12/07/2022
Other(s)	Simon Riley, Strategic Director of Corporate Resources	12/07/2022

Background papers: