

Assurance Summary

VERSION 1 24.11.2021



1 – SCHEME DETAILS			
Project Name	CRSTS10: York Road to Melton Road Trans Pennine Trail Improvements	Type of funding	Grant
Grant Recipient	DMBC	Total Scheme Cost	£804,024
MCA Executive Board	TEB	MCA Funding	£350,000
Programme name	CRSTS	% MCA Allocation	43.5%
Current Gateway Stage	BJC	MCA Development costs	£0
		% of total MCA allocation	0

2 – PROJECT DESCRIPTION	
<p><i>Is it clear what the MCA is being asked to fund?</i></p> <p>Installation of a sealed surface (flexipave) and widening to LTN 1/20 along a section of Trans Pennine Trail (National Cycle Network) between York Road and Melton Road.</p>	
3. STRATEGIC CASE	
Scheme Rationale	<p><i>Does the scheme have a clearly stated rationale and provide a strong justification for public funding?</i></p> <p>Yes. Yes</p>
Strategic policy fit	<p><i>How well does the scheme align with the strategic objectives of the SEP and RAP?</i></p> <p>It works towards all strategic objectives</p>
Contribution to Carbon Net Zero	<p><i>Does this scheme align with the strategic objective to achieve Carbon Net Zero?</i></p> <p>Yes</p>

SMART scheme objectives	<p>State the SMART scheme objective as presented in the business case. 1.6km of improved multi-use trail to enable increase in active travel</p> <p>Is there a 'golden thread' between the strategic objectives (see 3.2) and the scheme objectives (see 3.8)? Yes</p>
Options assessment	<p>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? Yes – Do Minimum and low cost options included in appraisal and shown to be sub-optimal</p>
Statutory requirements and adverse consequences	<p>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements? Yes – TROs (unclear if controversial, but unlikely as route is already in use for active travel)</p> <p>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter? None stated or likely</p>
FBC stage only – Confirmation of alignment with agreed MCA outcomes (Stronger, Greener, Fairer).	<p>Does the scheme still align with strategic objectives? Yes</p> <p>Have the conditions of approval granted at OBC been complied with? N/A</p>

4. VALUE FOR MONEY

Monetised Benefits:

VFM Indicator	Value	R/A/G						
Net Present Social Value (£)	<p>£1.311m</p> <p>Of which :</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Mode shift</td> <td>5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Health</td> <td>64%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Journey quality</td> <td>31%</td> </tr> </table>	Mode shift	5%	Health	64%	Journey quality	31%	
Mode shift	5%							
Health	64%							
Journey quality	31%							
Benefit Cost Ratio / GVA per £1 of SYMCA Investment	3.26							
Cost per Job	n/a							

Non-Monetised Benefits:

None	
<i>Non-Quantified Benefits</i>	None
Value for Money Statement	
<i>Taking into consideration the monetised and non-monetised benefits and costs, does the scheme represent good value for money?</i>	
Yes.	
5. RISK	
<i>What are the most significant risks ?</i>	
Engagement with user groups could raise issues – but unlikely, also COVID and inflation effects still possible.	
<i>.....and is there evidence that these risks are being mitigated?</i>	
Promoter doing what is possible to avoid these.	
<i>Do the significant risks require any contract conditions? (e.g. clawback on outcomes)</i>	
No	
<i>Are there any significant risks associated with securing the full funding of the scheme?</i>	
No – match funding from Sustrans is already approved	
<i>Are there any key risks that need to be highlighted in relation to the procurement strategy?</i>	
No – DLO to be used	
6. DELIVERY	
<i>Is the timetable for delivery reasonable and has the promoter identified opportunities for acceleration?</i>	
Timescale for construction is realistic (Sept-Nov)	
<i>Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?</i>	
Yes – not procuring on open market	
<i>What is the level of cost certainty and is this sufficient at this stage of the assurance process?</i>	
75% - yes	
<i>Has the promoter confirmed they will cover any cost overruns without reducing the benefits of the scheme?</i>	
Promoter states (5.5) that cost overruns will be met by the Council.	
<i>Has the promoter demonstrated clear project governance and identified the SRO?</i>	
Yes. Neil Firth	
<i>Has the SRO or other appropriate Officer signed off this business case?</i>	
No.	
<i>Has public consultation taken place and if so, is there public support for the scheme?</i>	
Yes – in 2021 there was general consultation re TPT but specific user consultation (cyclists and disability groups) is planned post approval according to 6.7 (but not shown in milestones)	
<i>Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?</i>	
Yes – also required by Sustrans	
7. LEGAL	
<i>Has the scheme considered Subsidy Control compliance or does the promoter still need to seek legal advice?</i>	

Yes, No.

8. RECOMMENDATION AND CONDITIONS

Recommendation	Proceed to contract
Payment Basis	Defrayal

Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)

Prior to release of the Grant Agreement
The following conditions have to be satisfied before the Grant Agreement can be released –

- BJC to be signed by SRO
- Appendix B Social Value Tool to be submitted