

APPENDIX A - Assurance Summary

VERSION 1 24.11.2021

1 – SCHEME DETAILS

Project Name	Rotherham Town Centre Active Travel Package – Sheffield Road Phases 1-3	Type of funding	Grant
Grant Recipient	RMBC	Total Scheme Cost	£9,737,840
MCA Executive Board	TEB	MCA Funding	£8,617,840
Programme name	TCF	% MCA Allocation	88%
Current Gateway Stage	FBC	MCA Development costs claimed to date	£1,094,802
		% of total MCA allocation	12.7%

2 – PROJECT DESCRIPTION

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

Grant funding of £8,617,840 is requested to deliver improvements to the A6178 Sheffield Road to facilitate active travel between Tinsley and Rotherham Town Centre. The scheme has been split into three phases which includes:

Phase 1: new cycle tracks between the borough boundary and Bessemer Way.

Phase 2: new cycle tracks between Bessemer Way and Centenary Way.

Phase 3: improved conditions for walking and cycling between Centenary Way and the town centre and will support wider town centre regeneration.

The output of the schemes amounts to 4.9km of route for non-motorised users. This is predominantly segregated cycle routes, with some on carriageway cycle lanes and improved pedestrian spaces. There will also be 3 new crossings and 2 improved crossings included in the scheme.

At OBC the total scheme costs for the Sheffield Road scheme was £8,826,108. Since then, the costs have increased by c.10% to £9,737,840.

3. STRATEGIC CASE	
<p><i>Options assessment</i></p>	<p><i>Is there a clear rationale for the selection of short-listed options and the choice of the Preferred Way Forward?</i></p> <p>Yes. A 'do minimum' option and two viable alternative options have been considered alongside the preferred option. The two viable options were discounted because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The first alternative option provides unsegregated cycle routes on Sheffield route and would not be LTN 1/20 compliant. It would therefore have limited effectiveness. • The second alternative option was to implement measures to reduce traffic on Westgate. This received significant local opposition, particularly from businesses. This option was also based on pre-covid traffic counts and following consultation with Active Travel England it was agreed traffic reduction measures were unnecessary given the current traffic levels. <p>The preferred option has been selected as it is the option which best meets the outcomes and is deliverable within the funding available.</p>
<p><i>Statutory requirements and adverse consequences</i></p>	<p><i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i></p> <p>No. As the scheme is fully within the existing highway network and does not present a material impact on the transport system the scheme will be delivered under the existing powers of the Council and permitted development rights.</p> <p><i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i></p> <p>No. There are no adverse consequences which remain unresolved. However, there are potential adverse consequences associated with modal shift. There is a risk that modal shift from car may reduce congestion and so release suppressed demand for car travel, potentially for longer trips, so increasing car mileage and its adverse impacts, notably carbon emissions. However, the promoter stated that this effect is not anticipated to be so significant to materially offset benefits on the local network.</p> <p>Furthermore, there are potential disbenefits to existing road users due to changes to capacity at the Bessemer Way Roundabout. This has been tested by junction testing the revised junction arrangements at Bessemer Way Roundabout, utilising Bovy's formula for capacity at roundabouts of this design. This assessment indicated an RFC of 78% in the worst arm in the worst hour in 2028, which is within the recommended 80% maximum.</p>
<p><i>FBC stage only – Confirmation of alignment with agreed MCA outcomes (Stronger, Greener, Fairer).</i></p>	<p>Various ways in which the scheme aligns with the agreed MCA outcomes have been provided:</p> <p>Stronger – providing improved accessibility to businesses along the route by linking into the existing public transport network.</p> <p>Fairer – encouraging and facilitating people to adopt active travel modes over private cars. This may have health benefits for the people in the area (both through increased physical exercise and improved air quality).</p> <p>Greener – facilitating a transition to a low carbon transport network, by creating a modal shift away from the private car to more sustainable modes including cycling and walking.</p>

4. VALUE FOR MONEY

Monetised Benefits:

VFM Indicator	Value	R/A/G
Net Present Social Value (£)	+£328,850	
Benefit Cost Ratio / GVA per £1 of SYMCA Investment	1.08	
Cost per Job	N/A	

Non-Monetised Benefits:

Non-Quantified Benefits	No supplementary modelling undertaken.
-------------------------	--

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 BCR is low value for money as it is below 1.5 (BCR = 1.08). Sensitivity testing has been carried out based on a demand increase and decrease of +/- 25%. This resulted in a BCR ranging from 0.49 to 1.67. No wider impact assessment was completed. A distributional impact assessment has been completed which showed social and environmental impacts which were either 'neutral' or 'slight positive'.

Benefits arise primarily from health improvements, although there is also a small contribution to carbon reduction.

5. RISK

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

The top 5 key risks are:

No.	Risk	Likelihood (High, Med, Low)	Impact (High, Med, Low)	Mitigation	Owner
1	Actual inflation differs from level assumed at tender. Cost of materials and fuel increases beyond predicted levels.	35%	Med	Minimal mitigation possible however the tendered rates will be set for the duration of the contract to further mitigate this risk. Agree prices in advance where possible but ensure they are realistic and allow for instability in the economy.	PM & Contractor
2	Additional and/or extended tarmac layers at tie-ins or within scheme where lower layers to be retained (Assumptions re: existing build up /	30%	Med	Full mitigation not possible, however where possible, the detailed design has sought to minimised the tie-in risk.	PM

	infrastructure prove to be optimistic, or where more extensive resurfacing required)				
3	Unforeseen utility works	35%	High	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. Seek opportunities to design out need for diversions, as far as practicable, to be considered at detailed design.	RMBC
4	Part or full funding not approved by SYMCA to cover past and forecast project costs	15%	High	Early engagement and open conversation with SYMCA re. funding. Transparent and realistic cost forecasting.	RMBC
5	Risk that co-ordination between TCF and AT programme does not work.	20%	High	Continued liaison with SCR Active Travel office. Feedback to TCF Programme Board and escalation within SCR should a 'logjam' occur. RMBC to prepare for appraisal a reduced scheme to deliver majority of benefits whilst avoid areas of contention, as a back-up plan.	RMBC

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

The total funding of £9,737,840 is sourced from:

- £200k – levelling up fund (DLUHC)
- £120k – RMBC funds
- £800k – highway maintenance challenge fund
- £8,617,840 – SYMCA.

All funding other than the contribution from SYMCA is approved.

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

Procurement of the main contractor has been completed via the regional Yorkshire and Humber YORHub purchasing organisation as a further competition under the existing YorCivil2 framework South Region Lot 5 (Civil Works between £4M and £10M). Esh Construction have been chosen to deliver the scheme and the contract has been agreed.

6. DELIVERY

Is the timetable for delivery reasonable?

Yes. Works are scheduled to commence in May23 with the project opening in Jul24. Phase 1 was delivered alongside other highways and drainage works. It commenced in Jul21 and was completed in Jan22.

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 90% which is sufficient for this stage. The promoter has confirmed that the reason cost certainty is not higher than 90% is due to an inability to fix prices for a long period of time.

A risk allowance of £887k has been included in the project budget and section 5.7 of the FBC states that this allowance should cover foreseeable additional costs. If costs increase further a change request may be submitted, and ultimately RMBC will cover additional overspend if necessary.

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

Yes. A project organogram has been provided and the SRO has been identified. The business case has not been signed – **this is required as a condition of approval.**

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

Yes. Public consultation is referred to in section 6.8. A letter drop and online consultation took place in July21 and April22 for both phases of the scheme. It is noted that public consultation did not demonstrate support for the project with the majority of respondents expressing disapproval. Opposition to these elements mostly came from local businesses. However, it is highlighted that the contentious areas (reduced car capacity at Bradmarsh Way and traffic reduction measures around Westgate) are not included in the proposed scheme which was revised to take into account public feedback. Subsequent engagement on the scheme with these revisions indicated that this has addressed the material concerns of local businesses.

The promoter has also noted that negative feedback from the public was often associated with a lack of support for active travel schemes generally rather than this scheme specifically.

Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?

Yes. Section 6.9 of the FBC states that monitoring and evaluation will be undertaken. A M&E plan has also been included.

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.

8. RECOMMENDATION AND CONDITIONS

Recommendation	Proceed to Contract
-----------------------	---------------------

Payment Basis	Defrayal
Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)	
Condition of approval: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Business case to be signed.• Rotherham to submit new TCF allocation profile	