

Assurance Summary

VERSION 1 24.11.2021



1 – SCHEME DETAILS

| | | | |
|-----------------------|---|---------------------------|---------|
| Project Name | Doncaster ATF Programme – West Road School Street | Type of funding | Grant |
| Grant Recipient | Doncaster Council | Total Scheme Cost | £60,000 |
| MCA Executive Board | TEB | MCA Funding | £60,000 |
| Programme name | ATF | % MCA Allocation | 100% |
| Current Gateway Stage | BJC | MCA Development costs | 0 |
| | | % of total MCA allocation | 0% |

2 – PROJECT DESCRIPTION

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

It is clear from further investigation that DMBC have already spent the money and are seeking retrospective funding for a four month trial of traffic management measures that led to resident opposition and subsequent termination of the trial with no plan for further implementation. The moneys were spent on:

- Signage
- Permit Systems
- Improved Storage Facilities
- Community consultation throughout the trial.
- Traffic Management throughout the trial
- If trial successful- Footway Improvements and permanent signage

3. STRATEGIC CASE

| | | |
|--|---|--------------|
| Options assessment | <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>The scheme is actually a public consultation and traffic management trial that has taken place already, with the aim, of limiting traffic around the school and encouraging active travel, which are important strategic objectives. It was terminated due to opposition by local residents. There are no permanent assets created, with the promoter paying for consultancy fees involved. SYMCA are now being asked to fund these costs ex post.</p> | |
| Statutory requirements and adverse consequences | <p><i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i></p> <p>All statutory processes were completed. <i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i></p> <p>Yes – local opposition eventuated, stopping the project proceeding to implementation</p> | |
| FBC stage only – Confirmation of alignment with agreed MCA outcomes (Stronger, Greener, Fairer). | <p>Yes,</p> <p>Health;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase in levels of physical activity through a mode shift away from the vehicle drop off at school to walking, cycling and scooting. <p>Net Zero</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase in active travel for school journeys (Increase of 20% baseline) <p>This scheme aimed to increase levels of walking, cycling and scooting (Active Modes) by 20% to West Road Primary School before Easter 2023. This is due to complaints of congestion and road safety concerns on West Road at school drop off and pick up times</p> | |
| 4. VALUE FOR MONEY | | |
| Monetised Benefits: | | |
| VFM Indicator | Value | R/A/G |
| Net Present Social Value (£) | £0 | |
| Benefit Cost Ratio / GVA per £1 of SYMCA Investment | 0 | |
| Cost per Job | N/A | |
| Non-Monetised Benefits: | | |
| Non-Quantified Benefits | No supplementary modelling has been completed. | |

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?
No monetised or non-monetised Benefits achieved

5. RISK

What are the most significant risks and is there evidence that these risks are being mitigated?
No risks as no further spend anticipated – project was terminated Dec 22

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?
N/A

Are there any key risks that need to be highlighted in relation to the procurement strategy?
N/A – scheme completed.

Ec 2022

Is the timetable for delivery reasonable?
N/A

Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?
N/A

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?
100%

Has the promoter demonstrated clear project governance and identified the SRO? Has the SRO or other appropriate Officer signed of this business case?
Good level of detail on the internal governance. Business case not signed.

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

Yes. No.
Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?
Reasonable proposals were in place for the scheme.

7. LEGAL

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

8. RECOMMENDATION AND CONDITIONS

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Recommendation | There is no scheme to recommend. AP to decide whether to support these development costs retrospectively |
|-----------------------|---|

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| Payment Basis | |
|----------------------|--|

| |
|---|
| Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses) |
|---|

| |
|--|
| |
|--|