

Assurance Summary

VERSION 1 24.11.2021

1 – SCHEME DETAILS

Project Name	Active Travel Crossings Fund	Type of funding	Grant
Grant Recipient	SYMCA	Total Scheme Cost	£1,000,000
MCA Executive Board	TEB	MCA Funding	£1,000,000
Programme name	Mayor's Sustainable Transport Fund	% MCA Allocation	100%
Current Gateway Stage	BJC	MCA Development costs	£100,000
		% of total MCA allocation	10%

2 – PROJECT DESCRIPTION

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

Yes. Total funding requested is £1m (inc. £100k development costs). The purpose of the scheme is to provide infrastructure to improve safety for cycling and walking in the region to encourage a mode shift away from car usage and enable access to local green spaces.

The scheme is expected to deliver controlled crossings, refuges and other associated traffic calming measure in prioritised areas across South Yorkshire. Specifically, the following outputs are expected:

- Barnsley: 1 x Pegasus crossing
- Doncaster: 2 x pelican crossings, 1 x toucan crossing
- Rotherham: 2 x puffin crossings, amendments to road and footway. Removal of bus shelter.
- Sheffield: various improvements including traffic calming measures, 7 x pedestrian refuges, 5x traffic islands, 3 x footways, 3 x disabled parking bays.

3. STRATEGIC CASE

Options assessment	<i>Is there a clear rationale for the selection of short-listed options and the choice of the Preferred Way Forward?</i>
---------------------------	--

	<p>Yes. An appropriate options analysis has been undertaken and a preferred option selected. 3 options have been considered – a ‘do nothing’ option and two viable options which differ largely based on cost. The scheme was included within the Active Travel Fund 3 bid to DfT, and although funding was not available for the crossings that form this scheme, the previous Mayor Jarvis and Dame Storey felt these scheme warranted funding and allocated £1m from the Mayors Sustainable Transport Fund.</p> <p>The scheme / preferred option in its current form is therefore based on the previous bid to DfT as well as the allocated funding of £1m.</p>	
Statutory requirements and adverse consequences	<p><i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i></p> <p>None have been highlighted.</p> <p><i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i></p> <p>No. A risk has been included relating to lack of support from the community / local residents for the scheme (likely due to disruption etc) but it is stated that continued community engagement will take place to mitigate this risk.</p>	
FBC stage only – Confirmation of alignment with agreed MCA outcomes (Stronger, Greener, Fairer).	N/A – not FBC.	
4. VALUE FOR MONEY		
Monetised Benefits:		
VFM Indicator	Value	R/A/G
Net Present Social Value (£)	N/A	
Benefit Cost Ratio / GVA per £1 of SYMCA Investment	N/A	
Cost per Job	N/A	
Non-Monetised Benefits:		
Non-Quantified Benefits	<p>As this scheme is ostensibly a package of safety related improvements it does not fit in appropriately to an AMAT assessment.</p> <p>The key benefits associated with the scheme relate to safety improvements and accident reduction. DfT data suggests casualties have a social cost of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• £2.115m – fatal	

- £238k – serious
 - £18k – slight
- Casualty data from Nov19 – Nov22 has been provided for the areas which will be improved by the scheme which showed 2 fatal accidents, 3 serious accidents, and 13 slight.

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. As mentioned above, although the nature of the scheme means an AMAT assessment has not been completed, there are benefits relating to safety improvements which demonstrate value for money.

5. RISK

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

Seven key risks and mitigants have been included in the BJC as follows:

No.	Risk	Likelihood (High, Med, Low)	Impact (High, Med, Low)	Mitigation	Owner
1	Actual inflation differs from that submitted either at BJC or tender	High	High	To be monitored – though minimum effect likely as this is a relatively short delivery period	Project Manager
2	Delays during construction due to adverse weather conditions	Med/High	Med/High	To be monitored – arrange nighttime or weekend working	Design Team / Project Manager
3	Insufficient access to materials	Low	Low	Early discussions with contractor	Project Manager
4	Part 1 Claims	Low	Low	Given the impact on AT schemes have had in the news this will need to be carefully monitored – early engagement with local residents / councillors	Project Manager
5	Community/Residents against installation	Med	Med	Continued engagement	Project Manager
6	Large Trees/Vegetation	Low	Low	Further investigation on footways	Project Manager
7	Speeding and safety	Med	Med	Ongoing work with SY Police via speed surveys may result in lowering speed limit	Project Manager

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. 100% of the funding has been allocated as part of the Mayors Sustainable Transport Fund. Risks relating to funding arise from whether additional costs can be covered by the relevant Local Authorities. However, they have agreed to do so.

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

No. The scheme will be delivered by each relevant Council through Framework Agreements of each individual Council's existing Highway Non Core Contract which was competitively tendered or through the Direct Labour Organisation (DLO).

6. DELIVERY

Is the timetable for delivery reasonable?

Yes – the delivery timescales vary depending on number of measures to be delivered, with all elements expected to be completed by Sep23.

Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?

Yes – as mentioned above the procurement strategy is to use the relevant Council's existing contracts.

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 stated as being 95% due to the limited nature of the £1m funding allocation and the chosen procurement route. Any additional costs will be covered by the relevant council.

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

Yes – Alex Linton is identified as being the SRO.

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

Consultation has taken place although still ongoing for some councils. The crossings included in this scheme are from a list of potential projects compiled from suggestions from public, local councillors, businesses, community groups and accident statistics. These locations included in this scheme were identified as the most preferred over the other viable options given the high speeds and safety concerns in those areas.

Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?

It has been described that a new M&E plan specific to Active Travel is currently being developed by SYMCA and that once this is complete the Local Authorities will monitor the scheme in line with this.

7. LEGAL

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

Yes – this has been considered and it has been concluded that the test for a measure to be a subsidy is not met.

8. RECOMMENDATION AND CONDITIONS

Recommendation	Proceed to contract
Payment Basis	Defrayal
Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)	
None applicable.	