

Assurance Summary

VERSION 1 24.11.2021

1 – SCHEME DETAILS

Project Name	Doncaster TCF Programme – South Parade	Type of funding	Grant
Grant Recipient	Doncaster Council	Total Scheme Cost	£1,257,000
MCA Executive Board	TEB	MCA Funding	£1,257,000
Programme name	TCF	% MCA Allocation	100%
Current Gateway Stage	FBC	MCA Development costs	0
		% of total MCA allocation	0%

2 – PROJECT DESCRIPTION

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

Yes. The funding request of £1.257m is required to fund the delivery of:

- 0.57km of new segregated walking and cycling infrastructure
- 1 new toucan crossing

The scheme will provide off road cycle facilities running from the South Parade / Thorne Road junction to the Bennetthorpe / Roman Road junction.

Between the South Parade / Thorne Road junction and proposed new toucan crossing the scheme provides 2m wide off road cycleways along each side of the carriageway. Between the toucan crossing and Bennetthorpe / Roman Road junction the scheme provides a 3m wide off road bi-directional cycleway alongside the northern side of the carriageway. The footpath will have a minimum width of 2m, and new streetlighting will be installed.

Work on site commenced at risk and this scheme is c.50% complete.

3. STRATEGIC CASE

Options assessment

Is there a clear rationale for the selection of short-listed options and the choice of the Preferred Way Forward?

	<p>Yes. The promoter has provided background as to why the specific route design was chosen, information on the optioneering process has also been included. A lower cost option has been considered which would provide shared use footway / cycleway. This was discounted on the basis that the design did not meet the LTN 1/20 standards and would provide a less coherent cycle network. During further discussion with the promoter, it was also noted that public consultation with local residents revealed that there was a lack of support for a shared cycle and footway.</p> <p>The promoter has also confirmed verbally that this scheme links to other TCF schemes and is the missing link of a wider network. It will connect the wider network to the town centre.</p>	
Statutory requirements and adverse consequences	<p><i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i></p> <p>TROs are applicable. The FBC suggests TRO approvals are still outstanding. However, discussion with the promoter confirmed this is incorrect and all approvals are in place.</p> <p>This will need to be updated as a condition of contract execution.</p> <p><i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i></p> <p>Adverse consequences relate to short term disruption to local businesses and transport during the construction phase. As the scheme is c.50% complete and is expected to be fully complete imminently, this is considered to be a minimal risk at this stage.</p>	
FBC stage only – Confirmation of alignment with agreed MCA outcomes (Stronger, Greener, Fairer).	<p>Yes, although the old template has been used the question has not been directly answered. However, various ways that the scheme links with MCA outcomes have been outlined, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Better connect the areas of transport poverty with areas of opportunity in a safe and sustainable way• To affect a mode shift away from the private car on those corridors where new opportunities are likely to see an increase in demand or where growth could be stifled• Creating a cultural shift towards making cycling and walking the natural choice for shorter journeys,• Achieving the above in ways that address current health issues and improve air quality across the SCR. <p>This scheme aims to provide segregated cycleways which will enable cyclists to avoid a congestion vehicle dominated area. The scheme links in with existing and proposed cycle routes and will therefore encourage more cyclists to use these routes by providing a continuous network right into Doncaster town centre. Increased cycling will also help to achieve improved health and wellbeing.</p>	
4. VALUE FOR MONEY		
Monetised Benefits:		
VFM Indicator	Value	R/A/G

Net Present Social Value (£)	£2,349,490	
Benefit Cost Ratio / GVA per £1 of SYMCA Investment	3.51	
Cost per Job	N/A	
Non-Monetised Benefits:		
Non-Quantified Benefits	No supplementary modelling has been completed. There are potential safety benefits relating to the improved cycling infrastructure which have not been quantified.	
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?		
The core appraisal indicates a BCR of 3.51 representing ‘medium’ value for money.		
Sensitivity testing has been completed based on increased costs as well as a lower uplift to the base number of trips. The BCR ranged from 2.87 – 3.05 which still represents ‘medium’ value for money in either scenario.		
5. RISK		
What are the most significant risks and is there evidence that these risks are being mitigated?		
The top 5 highlighted risks are:		
Risk	Mitigation	Owner
1. Delays in funding and SCR MCA approval and Funding Agreement sign-off: Potential delay to start of works as cannot order materials at risk 25% probability High risk	Work with SCR to prepare draft FA documents to reduce approval timescale	Major Projects
2. Failure to consult, engage and inform stakeholders (internal and external) in a timely and effective manner: Negative impact on the proposals - lack of buy-in and support from stakeholders for the package requires re-design and/or removal of package elements 20% probability High risk	Engagement will be continuous with key stakeholders, and undertake early consultation with those most directly affected with revised scheme design Corporate Communications team will be involved	Major Projects / Corporate Communications

3. Traffic Regulation Orders: - Objections to TROs will delay the start of the package and completion dates - Significant objections could result in the scheme being revised downwards and not achieving the desired outputs 25% probability High risk	TROs will be prepared and submitted for each individual element of the package Any objections will be for specific location and minimise the impact of delay of delivery of the package	Major Projects
4. Delays due to ongoing COVID-19 restrictions: Impact on site management while delivering package adhering to social distance rules for workers 50% probability Medium risk	Workers maintain social distancing Limited measures can be undertaken due to proposed site and works involved	Contractor
5. Increased competition for resources across SCR TCF programme: Lack of available resources means a reduced ability to deliver within TCF timescales and potentially additional cost 20% probability Medium risk	Early contractor engagement	Major Projects / Contractor

As the scheme is c.50% complete it is likely that most of the above risks are no longer as significant. In particular, delays to the funding and objections to TROs are no longer applicable. **This will need to be updated in the FBC to reflect the current position of the scheme and the remaining key risks.**

Do the significant risks require any contract conditions? (e.g. clawback on outcomes)

As above – an update will need to be provided on the remaining applicable risks given the scheme has commenced. **This should be a condition to contract execution.**

Are there any significant risks associated with securing the full funding for the scheme?

No – 100% of the funding is requested from SYMCA. There is a time pressure relating to the TCF funding deadline, however the assessment of this FBC has been expedited to mitigate this risk.

Are there any key risks that need to be highlighted in relation to the procurement strategy?

No – work on site has commenced and is well progressed.

6. DELIVERY

Is the timetable for delivery reasonable?

Unclear. Although the scheme has commenced it is unclear whether it will be delivered as per the milestones in the FBC. The FBC also includes dates such as 'Summer23' which isn't specific enough. **Whether the scheme is on track to achieve the timescales outlined in the FBC needs clarifying.**

Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?

Yes, and works have commenced.

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?

Cost certainty is 75%. Although works have commenced cost certainty is not 100% as materials are still being sourced for the remainder of the scheme. The promoter has confirmed they will fund any cost overruns.

Has the promoter demonstrated clear project governance and identified the SRO? Has the SRO or other appropriate Officer signed of this business case?

No. The SRO has not been named and the FBC has not been signed. It is stated within the FBC that a project organogram has been provided, although has not been received by the assessor. **This signed FBC is required as a condition of approval. The organogram is required as a condition of contract execution.**

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

The promoter has confirmed verbally that public consultation has been undertaken, although no evidence has been provided.

Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?

Yes. A monitoring and evaluation plan has been provided.

7. LEGAL

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

It has been confirmed that State Aid is not applicable to the scheme.

8. RECOMMENDATION AND CONDITIONS

Recommendation	Proceed to contract, with conditions.
Payment Basis	Defrayal

Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)

Conditions of approval:

- The FBC should be signed, and the SRO named.

Conditions must be satisfied before contracts are executed:

- A breakdown of the cost increases from the previous FBC (£923,753) to the current funding amount (£1,257,000) to be provided so that it is clear specifically what the funding is being claimed for and why the costs have increased. (This has currently only been provided verbally).
- FBC management case and timetables to be updated to ensure dates are provided for all milestones included in the management case (rather than 'Summer23') and to reconfirm the dates that have been included are still appropriate given the scheme is c.50% complete. Sections that state there are approvals necessary to commence work on site should be updated to reflect the fact that the scheme has already started (I.E, TROs).
- The risks included in the management case also need to be reviewed to reflect the fact that the scheme has already commenced meaning some of the current 'key risks' are likely no longer applicable.
- The project organogram referred to in the FBC as part of the governance information should be provided.

It is also recommended that the promoter is reminded that submitting the FBC once the scheme has commenced / completed is not standard procedure.