

1 – SCHEME DETAILS

Project Name	Manvers to Wath cycle route	Type of funding	Grant
Grant Recipient	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Total Scheme Cost	£1,178,211
MCA Executive Board	TEB	MCA Funding	£1,028,211
Programme name	TCF	% MCA Allocation	87%
Current Gateway Stage	FBC	MCA Development costs	£8,211
		% of total MCA allocation	0.7%

2 – PROJECT DESCRIPTION

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

Yes;

- The preparation costs which have been incurred in relation to the design development of the preferred option. This will include both preliminary design, detailed design and related scheme promotion and consultation material.
- The construction of the scheme including:
 - A 3m wide and approximately 125m long bi-directional cycle track between the A633 Manvers Way and the northern end of Moor Road.
 - A one-way section of road approximately 40m long at the southern end of Moor Road from the junction of the B6097 Biscay Way.
 - A 3m wide bi-directional cycle track approximately 40m long at the southern end of Moor Road.
 - Signalised pedestrian and cycle crossings across the B6097 Biscay Way.
 - A 3m wide cycle track 10m long between the B.6097 Biscay Way and Moor Road to the south.

3. STRATEGIC CASE

<i>Options assessment</i>	<i>Is there a clear rationale for the selection of short-listed options and the choice of the Preferred Way Forward?</i> Apart from the BAU, options for a lower cost) shared use footway (with or without a separate cycle track where feasible) have been considered but not modelled as not meeting strategic and economic objectives.
<i>Statutory requirements and adverse consequences</i>	<i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i>

	<p>Yes, TROs, expected Nov/Dec 2022</p> <p><i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i></p> <p>Some traffic congestion is anticipated, as a result of reduced road-space – the possibility of traffic reduction has not been considered.</p>
--	---

<i>FBC stage only – Confirmation of alignment with agreed MCA outcomes (Stronger, Greener, Fairer).</i>	There is close alignment with the strategic objectives. (FBC 3.2 and 3.3)
---	---

4. VALUE FOR MONEY

Monetised Benefits:

<i>VFM Indicator</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>R/A/G</i>
<i>Net Present Social Value (£)</i>	£0.249m	G
<i>Benefit Cost Ratio / GVA per £1 of SYMCA Investment</i>	1.3	G
<i>Cost per Job</i>	N/A	

Non-Monetised Benefits:

<i>Non-Quantified Benefits</i>	Environmental and social impacts have not been quantified and are expected to be negligible
--------------------------------	---

Value for Money Statement

Taking consideration of the monetised and non-monetised benefits and costs, and the uncertainties, does the scheme represent value for money?

Yes.

5. RISK

What are the most significant risks and is there evidence that these risks are being mitigated?

See below. Risks are relatively low and responsibility for avoidance/minimisation has been identified.

Risk	Mitigation	Owner
<i>[State the risk and identify both its probability and impact on a scale of high-medium-low]</i>	<i>[State how you will mitigate the risk]</i>	<i>[State who is responsible for]</i>

		<i>mitigating this risk]</i>
1. Works cost not market tested <i>Probability: 35%</i> <i>Estimate: £ 22,750</i>	Controlled through contract conditions with contractor.	Client
2. Design amendments - miscellaneous dayworks <i>Probability: 55%</i> <i>Estimate: £ 12,492</i>	Design as complete as possible before issue.	C. Fewtrell
3. Inclement weather conditions during construction above CE thresholds. <i>Probability: 20%</i> <i>Estimate: £ 5,043</i>	No mitigation possible.	Not applicable
4. Additional diversion or road closures requiring temporary traffic management. <i>Probability: 30%</i> <i>Estimate: £ 4,450</i>	Early liaison with HNMG and HE.	C. Fewtrell
5. Unforeseen utility works <i>Probability: 5%</i> <i>Estimate: £ 3,998</i>	Timely issue of NRSWA notices. Continuous review of utility locations supplemented with trial pits at critical locations and ground penetrating radar surveys during works lead in.	C. Fewtrell

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 for 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?

Procurement contracts were expected to be complete “in Autumn” 2022 (See FBC 7.3). This is now expected in January 2023. Completion by May 2023 seems **optimistic**.

Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?

Yes –existing Framework Agreements will be used (See FBC 7.4)

What is the level of cost certainty and is this sufficient at this stage of the assurance process? Has the promotor confirmed they will cover any cost overruns?

90%. Additional funding if required will be sought (elsewhere) by the promoter.

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

Yes – See organogram and details in FBC 7.5

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

<p>Yes <i>Has public consultation taken place and if so, is there public support for the scheme?</i> Yes. There is substantial but minority support for the scheme (41%) as expected for a cycling scheme impacting negatively on roadspace. <i>Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?</i> Yes (FBC Appendix 6)</p>
<p>7. LEGAL <i>Has the scheme considered Subsidy Control compliance or does the promotor still need to seek legal advice?</i> Yes. There is no state subsidy involved.</p>

8. RECOMMENDATION AND CONDITIONS	
Recommendation	Approve and proceed to contract
Payment Basis	Defrayal
Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)	
<p>Tender prices being within budget at FBC.</p>	