

Assurance Summary

VERSION 1 24.11.2021



1 – SCHEME DETAILS			
Project Name	T0014-2 Mexborough Gateway	Type of funding	Grant
Grant Recipient	DMBC	Total Scheme Cost	£1,200,116
MCA Executive Board	TEB	MCA Funding	£1,200,116
Programme name	TCF	% MCA Allocation	100%
Current Gateway Stage	FBC	MCA Development costs	£124,812
		% of total MCA allocation	10.4%

2 – PROJECT DESCRIPTION	
<p><i>Is it clear what the MCA is being asked to fund?</i> 2.85km of new and improved walking and cycling infrastructure.</p>	
3. STRATEGIC CASE	
<i>Scheme Rationale</i>	<p><i>Does the scheme have a clearly stated rationale and provide a strong justification for public funding?</i> The scheme aims to “effect 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. Achieved by increasing the number of cyclists using the routes by 68%.”</p>
<i>Strategic policy fit</i>	<p><i>How well does the scheme align with the strategic objectives of the SEP and RAP?</i> The scheme aligns well with these.</p>
<i>Contribution to Carbon Net Zero</i>	<p><i>Does this scheme align with the strategic objective to achieve Carbon Net Zero?</i> Scheme saves a small amount of carbon assuming car trips are reduced.</p>

<p><i>SMART scheme objectives</i></p>	<p><i>State the SMART scheme objective as presented in the business case.</i> This summarises table 2.5 :</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="539 284 1998 767"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="539 284 750 376">Theme</th> <th data-bbox="750 284 969 376">Indicator</th> <th data-bbox="969 284 1308 376">Outcome</th> <th data-bbox="1308 284 1998 376">Contribution from this Programme/Project</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="539 376 750 572" rowspan="2">Greener</td> <td data-bbox="750 376 969 469">Carbon emissions</td> <td data-bbox="969 376 1308 469">Reduced carbon emissions</td> <td data-bbox="1308 376 1998 572" rowspan="2">Dedicated infrastructure for active travel will encourage increased walking and / or cycling in the local areas, which will lead to a reduction in car miles saved and a reduction in congestion. See AST in Appendix 1 for Greenhouse Gases NPV benefits.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="750 469 969 572">Carbon intensity of transport network</td> <td data-bbox="969 469 1308 572">Improved carbon intensity</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="539 572 750 767">Fairer</td> <td data-bbox="750 572 969 767">Personal Wellbeing</td> <td data-bbox="969 572 1308 767">Improved personal wellbeing (as measured by indicators on feeling life is worthwhile, life satisfaction, happiness, and anxiety).</td> <td data-bbox="1308 572 1998 767">Dedicated infrastructure for active travel will encourage increased walking and / or cycling. This will impact upon health leading to reduced level of absenteeism and reduce the risk of premature death. The scheme will also enhance journey quality and ambience.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><i>Is there a 'golden thread' between the strategic objectives (see 3.2) and the scheme objectives (see 3.8)?</i> The above table shows how the scheme will achieve strategic benefits and these are monetised in the Economic case. Delivery and usage will be monitored and evaluated.</p>	Theme	Indicator	Outcome	Contribution from this Programme/Project	Greener	Carbon emissions	Reduced carbon emissions	Dedicated infrastructure for active travel will encourage increased walking and / or cycling in the local areas, which will lead to a reduction in car miles saved and a reduction in congestion. See AST in Appendix 1 for Greenhouse Gases NPV benefits.	Carbon intensity of transport network	Improved carbon intensity	Fairer	Personal Wellbeing	Improved personal wellbeing (as measured by indicators on feeling life is worthwhile, life satisfaction, happiness, and anxiety).	Dedicated infrastructure for active travel will encourage increased walking and / or cycling. This will impact upon health leading to reduced level of absenteeism and reduce the risk of premature death. The scheme will also enhance journey quality and ambience.
Theme	Indicator	Outcome	Contribution from this Programme/Project												
Greener	Carbon emissions	Reduced carbon emissions	Dedicated infrastructure for active travel will encourage increased walking and / or cycling in the local areas, which will lead to a reduction in car miles saved and a reduction in congestion. See AST in Appendix 1 for Greenhouse Gases NPV benefits.												
	Carbon intensity of transport network	Improved carbon intensity													
Fairer	Personal Wellbeing	Improved personal wellbeing (as measured by indicators on feeling life is worthwhile, life satisfaction, happiness, and anxiety).	Dedicated infrastructure for active travel will encourage increased walking and / or cycling. This will impact upon health leading to reduced level of absenteeism and reduce the risk of premature death. The scheme will also enhance journey quality and ambience.												
<p><i>Options assessment</i></p>	<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> The choice of these routes is unclear but there is no reason to suppose they are not significant or in need of improvement. The preferred option is not the one with the highest BCR, but in this case the AMAT/BCR is probably underestimating the future impact of the TPT – Mexboro link as it connects with the Canal route making longer cycle journeys more attractive, especially in summer.</p>														
<p><i>Statutory requirements and adverse consequences</i></p>	<p><i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i> TROs <i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i> None flagged</p>														
<p><i>FBC stage only – Confirmation of alignment with agreed MCA outcomes (Stronger, Greener, Fairer).</i></p>	<p><i>Does the scheme still align with strategic objectives?</i> Yes <i>Have the conditions of approval granted at OBC been complied with?</i> OBC was approved by AP on 1/9/2021 with a number of conditions normally expected to be met at FBC. These have mostly been met.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="638 1394 1809 1450"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="638 1394 1227 1425">OBC Condition</th> <th data-bbox="1227 1394 1809 1425">Outcome</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="638 1425 1227 1450">Breakdown of construction costs</td> <td data-bbox="1227 1425 1809 1450">See Appendix 3</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	OBC Condition	Outcome	Breakdown of construction costs	See Appendix 3										
OBC Condition	Outcome														
Breakdown of construction costs	See Appendix 3														

	95% cost certainty	75% - DLO (cost risks remain)
	Results of public consultation	To be completed
	Likelihood of opposition to the scheme leading to abandonment and cost mitigation	20% residual chance cited in FBC
	Detail designs	See Appendix 2
	Monitoring and Evaluation Plan	See Appendix 6
	Updated timeline	Gantt chart provided
	Updated appraisal results with sensitivity tests.	AMAT model and appraisal summaries provided

4. VALUE FOR MONEY

Monetised Benefits:

<i>VFM Indicator</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>R/A/G</i>
<i>Net Present Social Value (£)</i>	£0.184m	
<i>Benefit Cost Ratio / GVA per £1 of SYMCA Investment</i>	1.3	
<i>Cost per Job</i>	n/a	

Non-Monetised Benefits:

<i>Non-Quantified Benefits</i>	Neutral – townscape, heritage, biodiversity, water, security (apart from journey quality) Moderate beneficial – Severance.
--------------------------------	---

Value for Money Statement

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

Medium

5. RISK

What are the most significant risks ?

Funding delays, Local opposition, cost increases/resource shortages.

.....and is there evidence that these risks are being mitigated?

Yes, as far as possible via early stakeholder engagement and use of DLO

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 match funding entailed

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. Not clear if acceleration feasible.

Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?

Yes –all staff to be directly employed.

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

75% - Yes, given uncertainties

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

Yes, No.

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

Yes, Neil Firth.

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

No.

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

Stated to be “ongoing” but not clear what if any events have taken place or what the public engagement strategy is. No mention in 6.1 or GANNT chart. But as it is off road with no land required it is unlikely to face opposition.

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)	

