

## Appraisal Panel Summary

### Scheme Details

<b>Project Name</b>	iPort Bridge		
<b>Grant Recipient</b>	South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive.		
<b>SCR Executive Board</b>	Transport and Environment	<b>SCR Funding</b>	£5,458,141
<b>% SCR Allocation</b>	94%	<b>Total Scheme Cost</b>	£5,798,291

### Appraisal Summary

#### Project Description

The iPort is one of the UK's largest multimodal logistic hubs, located southeast of Doncaster, near junction 3 of the M18 motorway. This is already a large employment site for the region and is partially developed, to the north. When the site is fully occupied, the iPort will have created in the region of 5,000 new jobs. The current occupiers of the site include Amazon and Lidl.

Access to the iPort by public transport and active travel modes is currently restricted to Great Yorkshire Way, from the north of the site. This access restriction increases the reliance on the private car for employees and visitors to the iPort.

The proposal is for a new bridge and highway link between West End Lane in New Rossington and iPort Avenue. The scheme would facilitate up to 8 buses per hour (55/56 bus service) being routed through the iPort via a bus gate along a camera enforced bus lane. This would make public transport a viable option for people working and visiting the iPort. The proposal also includes a segregated pedestrian and cycle bridge connection, providing improved active travel access between the iPort and the surrounding residential areas.

The MCA funds (DfT TCF) would pay for the design and associated infrastructure costs in relation to the iPort bridge scheme. This includes:

- A new bus, pedestrian and cycle highway and bridge link (approx. 0.5km);
- A new junction onto iPort Avenue;
- A segregated cycle / footway;
- A camera enforced bus lane;
- Relocation of one bus stop;
- Three new bus stops;
- Bus lane signals;
- Signalised crossings on West End Lane.
- Associated scheme landscaping.

#### Strategic Case

The proposed scheme has a clear strategic rationale. The outline business case (OBC) demonstrates strong linkage to transport strategy goals, mayoral commitments and policies. It is also completely aligned with the SEP, enhancing green connectivity and improving access to jobs particularly for residents of the Rossington area. The scheme also clearly supports the overarching core TCF objectives. The OBC strategic case demonstrates good linkage with other relevant national and local policies, including NPPF, Doncaster Core Strategy Development Plan, and the emerging Local Plan.

The main potential adverse consequence of the bridge going ahead is localised noise disbenefit to the rear of properties on Heatherfields Crescent, which has been recognised by the promoter in the design. The main potential adverse consequence of the scheme not going ahead is continuing poor green connectivity between iPort and the residential area to the east. This will lead to poorer employment prospects for residents of that area (particularly for non-car-owning households) and a constrained

labour market for iPort businesses. The potential adverse consequences of the scheme not going ahead appear to significantly outweigh those of going ahead.

### **Value for Money**

The modelling and appraisal approach that has been adopted is logical, proportionate and robust. The decision not to use the SCR strategic model (SCRTM1) is supported, given the nature of the scheme. The benefits of improved bus operations arising from the proposed bridge; and from improved connectivity for pedestrians and cyclists has been appraised.

The approach adopted is well-aligned with WebTAG guidance and data values and uses the DfT AMAT tool appropriately. There are some areas where the forecast benefits may be seen as conservative, as noted above. It is recommended that in the FBC additional benefits highlighted above are considered, including the additional two-minute time saving on bus services serving the south of iPort; and additional benefits from cycling and walking trips transferring from car use.

Costings appear to be accurate to a level that would be expected at OBC stage. Appropriate allowance has been made for both risk and optimism bias.

The overall BCR, as calculated, represents high value for money. Sensitivity testing to understand the impact of lower and higher bus demand on BCR still shows high value for money in both cases. For completeness, it is recommended that for the FBC, additional sensitivity testing on walking and cycling demand is undertaken within AMAT, in line with the MCA TCF COVID-19 Supplementary Guidance Note 2020.

### **Risk**

From the quantified risk assessment based on the risk register, £1,468,791 allowance has been added to the inflation-adjusted base cost. Optimism bias has been allowed for at 15% for highway and civil engineering elements and 23% for bridge elements, which are in line with the recommendations for Stage 2 design in SCR's TCF business case guidance.

The key risk for the scheme is that the business case rests heavily on the improved bus connection and journey times to iPort that it provides. The current services 55 and 56 are commercial services, and therefore subject to market forces (including COVID impacts). Clarification has been sought on how SYPTE would manage this risk. The clarification indicates that the assessment of the routes commercial risk is low and that SYPTE operates a tendered service which could be adjusted if future demand requires it. It is recommended that this statement is further examined at FBC, with the potential for a condition to be included into the final contract award for the scheme which would maintain public transport provision if commercial decisions outside of the promoters control remove the current service.

### **Delivery**

The project Management and Delivery plan is clear and appropriate to the nature of the scheme. The project management structure is clearly defined, and scheme milestones are clearly mapped out and appear achievable and realistic.

Monitoring and evaluation procedures are not yet defined, as they need to fit within the overall MCA TCF monitoring and evaluation plan which is still in development. A monitoring and evaluation plan for the scheme should be submitted as part of the FBC.

### **Legal**

State Aid requirements have been carefully considered and legal opinion sought, leading to a clear and justified conclusion that State Aid is not applicable to this scheme.

## Recommendation and Conditions

<b>Recommendation</b>	Approval to progress to FBC and draw down further scheme development funds
<b>Payment Basis</b>	Payment on defrayal
<b>Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)</b>	
<p><b><i>The following conditions must be satisfied before contract execution.</i></b></p> <p>None at this stage. Inclusion of condition are subject to submission of the Full Business Case.</p> <p><b><i>The following conditions must be satisfied before drawdown of funding.</i></b></p> <p>None at this stage. Inclusion of condition are subject to submission of the Full Business Case.</p> <p><b>The following conditions must be included in the contract</b></p> <p>None at this stage. Inclusion of condition are subject to submission of the Full Business Case.</p>	

**Record of Recommendation, Endorsement and Approval**

**Barnsley Digital Innovation Hub**

<b>Appraisal Panel Recommendation</b>		<b>Board Endorsement</b>		<b>MCA Approval</b>	
<b>Date of Meeting</b>		<b>Date of Meeting</b>		<b>Date of Meeting</b>	
<b>Head of Paid Service or Delegate</b>	Ruth Adams Deputy CEX	<b>Endorsing Officer (Board Chair)</b>		<b>Approving Officer (Chair)</b>	
<b>Signature</b>		<b>Signature</b>		<b>Signature</b>	
<b>Date</b>		<b>Date</b>		<b>Date</b>	
<b>S73 Officer or Delegate</b>	Simon Tompkins Finance Manager	<b>Statutory Finance Officer Approval</b>  <b>Name:</b>  <b>Signature:</b>  <b>Date:</b>			
<b>Signature</b>					
<b>Date</b>					
<b>Monitoring Officer or Delegate</b>	Steve Davenport SCR CA Solicitor				
<b>Signature</b>					
<b>Date</b>					