# **Assurance Panel Summary**

## **Scheme Details**

| Project Name     | Quality Streets - Active Travel and Digital Infrastructure |                          |        |  |  |
|------------------|--|--------------------------|--------|--|--|
| Grant Recipient  | Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council                     |                          |        |  |  |
| MCA Executive    | Infrastructure and   | MCA Funding              | £9.0m  |  |  |
| Board            | Transport and  |                          |        |  |  |
|                  | Environment  |                          |        |  |  |
| % MCA Allocation | 95%  | <b>Total Scheme Cost</b> | £9.45m |  |  |

# **Appraisal Summary**

# **Project Description**

Doncaster Town Centre Quality Streets - Active Travel and Digital Infrastructure Programme will see the continued delivery of the Doncaster Quality Streets programme to support and enable new investment in the town's urban employment and residential development zones; linking the City Gateway to the Civic and Cultural Quarter. The scheme includes a mix of traffic management, street lighting, junction improvements, active travel provision, landscaping and environmental improvements, as well as the provision of new digital infrastructure.

The overall aim of the scheme is to develop a streetscape that is suitable for all road users and caters for the urban centre through supporting pedestrians, bike users, disabled and buses in a safer environment.

The funding will be used for the costs associated with the delivery of the overall scheme with an estimated square meterage of 15,893m2. Infrastructure improvements include:

- Cycle lanes
- Highway improvements including single carriageway and road narrowing
- Public realm improvements
- Improved bus stops and real time information points
- Installation of ducting to enable digital infrastructure provision to improve digital connectivity

Upon completion the scheme will deliver 1.4km of cycle lanes on Wood Street, Cleveland Street, Duke Street and St Sepulchre Gate providing the connectivity for cyclists from Civic and Cultural Quarter to the Station Forecourt.

The highway improvements include narrowing the highway to accommodate the new cycle lanes across all four streets, Wood Street one way from Prince Gate towards Cleveland Street, Cleveland Street bus gate remains and becomes one way outbound, relocating the location of the taxi rank on St Sepulchre Gate and removal on pay and display parking on Duke Street and Wood Street.

St Sepulchre Gate, Duke Street, Cleveland Street and Wood Street will all benefit from public realm improvements which will include new paving, wider footpaths, trees, new lighting, CCTV to create an environment where residents and visitors choose to return to.

## **Strategic Case**

The Applicant has made clear references to the relevant Strategic objective, including: TCF objectives, SCR Transport Strategy objectives and aims and the 2020-2040 Growth Plan. The business case also sets out the contribution the scheme makes to Doncaster's own policies including the Doncaster Inclusive Growth Strategy, as well as being aligned to the Doncaster Growing Together, Doncaster's 2020 Cycling Strategy and Doncaster Local Plan (2015-2035).

There are short term (2 years after completion) goals which are to increase cycling and create a cycling culture, as well as increasing football in the area by between 2% and 4%. The business case also sets

out medium term (5 years after completion) goals to increase footfall to the area by a range of 10% to 15%.

The scheme objectives do not capture all of the outcomes of the scheme, for example there are a number of wider impacts which have not been reflected as SMART objectives and are important for the economic case eg, increases in spending as a result of the public realm improvements and increase footfall. This weakness is not critical, but should be considered in the monitoring and evaluation of the scheme.

### Value for Money

Overall, the economic case provides sufficient detail and robust methodologies through the use of AMAT and VURT tools.

The Applicant presents a Core BCR of 1.7 : 1 and has undertaken sensitivity testing to consider the key areas of risk. The Applicant has tested:

- A 25% reduction in trips in both the do minimum and do something has been undertaken to understand the potential impact on the BCR. This reduction lead to a BCR of 1.34: 1
- Low level and high level uplift factors have also been used in AMAT to determine the impact of both High and Low response to the scheme.

The sensitivity testing includes consideration COVID-19 and has been undertaken in AMAT as part of the appraisal.

Some consideration should be made around the values that are provided within VURT as the underlying assumption in the tool are likely to overestimate the benefits which are realised in different places. As the majority of the benefits are derived from the active travel benefits, this limitation of local values is not considered critical. AMAT has been undertaken using recognised data sources and methods with the costs also being processed through this tool. The benefits and costs produced are therefore following TAG and have good analytical assurance.

COVID-19 sensitivity testing has been undertaken in AMAT as part of the appraisal. A 25% reduction in trips in both the do minimum and do something has been undertaken to understand the potential impact on the BCR.

Low level and high level uplift factors have also been used in AMAT to determine the impact of both High and Low response to the scheme.

It should be noted that the assessment of traffic impacts has been based on current year traffic count data for an average 07:00-19:00 period which may not pick-up peak traffic points where capacity constraints are likely to be at their highest i.e. by spreading the assessment across the day the peaks are dampened.

A high-level approach to calculating jobs and GVA has been included in the submission. This provides a broad-brush assumption to provide a ballpark figure for uplift in jobs and GVA. Displacement and additionality have not been taken into account therefore the figures have a very low analytical assurance. These wider economic benefits have not been included in the BCR but are considered as part of the overall Value for Money.

#### Risk

The top 5 risks have been highlighted and mitigated, and a full list has been supplied in Appendix U. The top risk is identified as a failure to consult with stakeholders, leading to lack of up-take. The ongoing engagement of DMBC Corporate Communications is identified as the mitigation action which reduces the risk to an acceptable level. It will be important for DMBC to ensure this activity takes place. Other risks include typical events for a scheme of this nature, e.g. cost increase and delays due to Covid.

The risks are appropriately identified, and mitigations briefly described. 15% of total cost has been allocated for risk/contingency. However, there is no explanation of how risks will be managed or the

processes that will be followed. This is a weakness of the business case and DMBC will need to ensure risk management is part of project delivery.

Inbound bus routes will be impacted as part of the scheme, however these diversions were also in place during the Covid-19 Town Centre Emergency Access arrangements, with no negative impact on buses. The council will engage with SYPTE and bus operators to test if proposed routes are fit for purpose.

This assumption that disruption to a route during Covid-19 will have the same effect in the long term when traffic returns to long term levels is suspect and more analysis should be done around this.

# Delivery

The Major Projects Board is accountable to the Council's leadership for PM. A designated PM will be responsible for the overall delivery, supported by internal service partners. The project will be monitored daily, and progress meetings held once works commence on site.

Key milestones are set out in 7.1, including dependencies and dates. Public consultation has been indicated as Sep 2020 to Feb 2021 (in the past), and dates set out for TROs that are required. Dates proposed seem to be realistic for the project.

The council plans to utilise existing in-house suppliers to deliver the majority of the work – any additional work will be procured in line with Contract Procedure Rules and Public Contract Regulations (2015). Specialist contractors will be required for the connection of new lighting columns and CCTV cameras.

The Applicant sets out that pre-start preliminary works can commence following funding approval. These include statutory services surveys, planning in any redirection of statutory services and Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO) process commencement.

The financial case costs have been well evidenced using a schedule of costs although no project specific inflation has been included which could be further justified. £450k has been confirmed in corporate match funding

# Legal

The funding applicant and the site owner is a local authority and the proposed scheme does not meet one of the prescribed State Tests of 'Affecting Trade between Member States', therefore State Aid Rules do not apply.

### **Recommendation and Conditions**

| Recommendation                                   | Contract award, subject to Conditions of Award |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| Payment Basis                                    | Payment on defrayal                            |  |  |  |
| Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses) |  |  |  |  |

| The following conditions must be satisfied before contract execution.  None.  |
|---|
| The following conditions must be satisfied before drawdown of funding.  None.   |
| The following conditions must be included in the contract  DMBC to work with SCRMCA to undertake monitoring and evaluation of the scheme in line with Getting Build Fund and Transforming Cities Fund requirements. |
|   |

# Record of Recommendation, Endorsement and Approval

# **Quality Streets**

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