

Appendix C4 Assurance Summary

VERSION 1 24.11.2021

1 – SCHEME DETAILS

Project Name	O0043 – BMBC Elsecar Active Travel Scheme	Type of funding	Grant
Grant Recipient	BMBC	Total Scheme Cost	£575,177
MCA Executive Board	TEB	MCA Funding	£575,177
Programme name	ATF	% MCA Allocation	100%
Current Gateway Stage	FBC	MCA Development costs	£78.504
		% of total MCA allocation	13.6%

2 – PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Is it clear what the MCA is being asked to fund?

There have been some small changes to the scheme's scope since the OBC, as some improvements have been implemented by the promoter already. The scope is now:

- Enhancement of 2.8km of existing Public Right of Way (PRoW) and Trans Pennine Trail (TPT) via improvements, widening and resurfacing;
- Introduction of zebra crossing and 2 further crossings on Wentworth Road.
- 2 improved crossing facilities on Wath Road and 1 improved crossing facility on Tingle Bridge Lane
- Wayfinding signage;
- Improvements to public realm, which will include improved footways within Elsecar Park, additional seating, greenscape improvements and route finders which will showcase Elsecar Heritage Centre attractions;
- Reduction of speed limit to 40mph on Water Lane;
- Introduce a wider 30mph speed limit within Elsecar and extend on Wentworth Road. Introduce 'dragons' teeth' road markings and speed roundels. A buffer speed limit of 40mph will also be introduced to between 60mph and 30mph zones. (Please see scheme plans – Appendix B).

3. STRATEGIC CASE	
Scheme Rationale	<p><i>Does the scheme have a clearly stated rationale and provide a strong justification for public funding?</i></p> <p>Yes. The scheme fits well with the SEP, the Transport Strategy, the Active Travel Implementation plan and national policies to encourage urban living and active travel.</p>
Strategic policy fit	<p><i>How well does the scheme align with the strategic objectives of the SEP and RAP?</i></p> <p>Well. The scheme is promoted as a key part of plans to achieve these aims.</p>
Contribution to Carbon Net Zero	<p><i>Does this scheme align with the strategic objective to achieve Carbon Net Zero?</i></p> <p>Yes</p>
SMART scheme objectives	<p><i>State the SMART scheme objective as presented in the business case.</i></p> <p>SMART objectives are given as:</p> <p>Short term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage more cycling/walking; • Create an environment that is safer for both walking and cycling to replace journeys made by car; <p>Long term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To create a cultural shift towards making cycling and walking the natural choice for shorter journeys • To effect a mode shift away from the private car in those areas where new opportunities are likely to see an increase in demand or where growth could be stifled • To improve air quality and environmental impacts within the Dearne Valley Corridor <p><i>Is there a 'golden thread' between the strategic objectives (see 3.2) and the scheme objectives (see 3.8)?</i></p> <p>Each of these is specified in detail with targets that are measurable, with timescale, metrics and plans for measurement detailed in Appendix A</p>
Options assessment	<p><i>Is there a genuine Options assessment and is there a clear rationale for the selection of short-listed options and the choice of the Preferred Way Forward?</i></p> <p>Yes – See Appendix J. The applicant has followed a logical and systematic process to define the optimal features of the scheme in comparison to high and low-cost alternatives and shown that the preferred option best meets strategic and economic objectives.</p>
Statutory requirements and adverse consequences	<p><i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i></p> <p>Yes – TRO's currently being prepared</p> <p><i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i></p> <p>No – this enhances an existing PWROW/TPT route</p>
FBC stage only – Confirmation of alignment with agreed MCA outcomes (Stronger, Greener, Fairer).	<p><i>Does the scheme still align with strategic objectives?</i></p> <p>Yes</p> <p><i>Have the conditions of approval granted at OBC been complied with?</i></p> <p>Yes :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Commitment to further public consultation throughout detailed design ? <p>Done</p>

	<div>2. QRA to be updated with p50 costs included in bid ? Done</div> <div>3. Optimism Bias to be deleted from bid amount, any certainties to enter risk register or base costs ? Done</div> <div>4. Forecasts of demand to be revisited and sensitivity tests done Done</div> <div>5. Completion of SYMCA Appendices Yes</div>	
4. VALUE FOR MONEY		
Monetised Benefits:		
VFM Indicator	Value	R/A/G
Net Present Social Value (£)	£702.89m	
Benefit Cost Ratio / GVA per £1 of SYMCA Investment	1.77	
Cost per Job	n/a	
Non-Monetised Benefits:		
Non-Quantified Benefits	On a scale -2 to +2: +2 For increased demand for AT, net zero carbon, health, economics. 0 For Improved PT viability, Social value	
Value for Money Statement		
Taking into consideration the monetised and non-monetised benefits and costs, does the scheme represent good value for money? The scheme is of medium value for money (1.5<BCR<2)		
5. RISK		
What are the most significant risks and is there evidence that these risks are being mitigated? The promoter has been proceeding at risk with construction in order to ensure completion of the scheme before May 2022. Earlier delays to the scheme start mean that some costs have risen faster than inflation and the full P50 risk provision at December 2021 will be required. Do the significant risks require any contract conditions? (e.g. clawback on outcomes) No Are there any significant risks associated with securing the full funding of the scheme? No Are there any key risks that need to be highlighted in relation to the procurement strategy? No		

6. DELIVERY

Is the timetable for delivery reasonable and has the promoter identified opportunities for acceleration?

Yes, Yes

Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?

Yes - DLO

What is the level of cost certainty and is this sufficient at this stage of the assurance process?

90%. Yes

Has the promoter confirmed they will cover any cost overruns without reducing the benefits of the scheme?

No –overruns will be discussed and a course of action agreed.

However, standard contract conditions apply

Has the promoter demonstrated clear project governance and identified the SRO?

Yes. Yes

Has the SRO or other appropriate Officer signed off this business case?

Yes

Has public consultation taken place and if so, is there public support for the scheme?

Yes – public consultation took place in 2021.

Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?

Yes

7. LEGAL

Has the scheme considered Subsidy Control compliance or does the promotor still need to seek legal advice?

Yes. No

8. RECOMMENDATION AND CONDITIONS

Recommendation	Proceed to Contract
Payment Basis	Defrayal
Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)	
The following conditions must be included in the grant agreement <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Clawback on outputs and outcomes	