

Assurance Summary**Scheme Details**

Project Name	T0016 Doncaster Station Access Package	Type of funding	Grant
Grant Recipient	DMBC	Total Scheme Cost	£6,015,550
MCA Executive Board	TEB	MCA Funding	£6,015,550
Programme name	TCF	% MCA Allocation	100%

Project Description	
<i>Is it clear what the MCA is being asked to fund?</i>	
<p>A package of enhancements to station accessibility by active modes at Adwick, Bentley, Conisbrough, Kirk Sandall, Thorne North and South including:</p> <p>10.1 km of improved walking and cycling infrastructure</p> <p>10.9km of new walking and cycling infrastructure</p> <p>30 junction improvements to benefit non-car modes.</p>	
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></p> <p>Yes. The Applicant highlights strong links between the scheme and local and national policies. The works are on the public highway and represent a public good that the private sector would not provide commercially, otherwise.</p>
<i>Strategic policy fit</i>	<p><i>How well does the scheme align with the strategic objectives of the SEP and RAP?</i></p> <p>The Applicant also highlights strong links between the scheme and wider national and local policies.</p>
<i>Contribution to Carbon Net Zero</i>	<p><i>Does this scheme align with the strategic objective to achieve Carbon Net Zero?</i></p> <p>The scheme encourages active travel without significantly disadvantaging car use so whilst it is consistent with Carbon reduction objectives, it is not a significant contributor as it stands.</p>

<p><i>SMART scheme objectives</i></p>	<p><i>State the SMART scheme objective as presented in the business case. Is there a 'golden thread' between the strategic objectives (see 3.2) and the scheme objectives (see 3.6)?</i></p> <p>The Applicant has set out a number of clear SMART objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 • Improve connectivity for public transport users, pedestrians and cyclists throughout the borough • Install segregated cycle facilities to enable more cycle journey stages. • Provide connectivity for cyclists throughout the borough to access train stations as part of a multi modal commute • Improve passenger experience • Create space for people to feel safe from vehicles <p>Outputs are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10.1 km of improved walking and cycling infrastructure • 10.9km of new walking and cycling infrastructure • 30 junction improvements to benefit non-car modes. <p>Outcomes (measurable)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased walking and cycling long term (to be monitored) • Positive feedback from users <p>For the FBC, the applicant should include the further detail on how it intends to measure uplifts in Active Mode transport along the route (counters). The clarifications response confirms that is the intention, but the FBC should include this along with links to the wider TCF monitoring plan.</p>
<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></p> <p>The applicant has undertaken detailed sifting and revising of potential options for investment as well scheme adaptation to reflect updated SCR Active Travel Standards. This has ensured that the scheme has been designed to address the specific needs and challenges identified in Section 3.1 of the business case. However, the incremental benefit of the wider design compared to the lower cost option should be quantified – via AMAT if possible.</p>

<p><i>Statutory requirements and adverse consequences</i></p>	<p><i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i></p> <p>Yes – TROs – expected completion Spring 2022, SOS “Autumn 2021” requires “TRO approval” not “completion”. PI not required, public consultation Jan 2021. Cabinet approval required before contracts can be let</p> <p><i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i></p> <p>Biggest risks relate to recovery of PT usage and continued high levels of active travel after COVID and failure to gain public support leading to changes to final design and cost. These will be resolved by monitoring and continuous public engagement.</p>		
<p>Value for Money</p>			
<p>Core monetised Benefits</p>	<p><i>[Core BCR – table 4.22]</i></p> <p>3.70</p>	<p>Non-monetised and wider economic benefits</p>	<p><i>[Values/description – supplementary form]</i></p> <p>Environmental benefits deemed to be largely neutral; Wider impacts have not been explored.</p>
<p><i>In your view do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?</i></p> <p>The BCR has been tested for a 25% reduction in demand growth and for a 30% increase in costs and the high VFM score found to be robust to these, individually. If demand does not grow from current levels, the BCR only falls to 1 due to the benefit of the scheme for existing active travellers.</p>			
<p>Value for Money Statement</p>			
<p><i>Taking into consideration the monetised and non-monetised benefits and costs, does the scheme represent good value for money?</i></p> <p>Yes.</p>			
<p>Risk</p>			
<p><i>What are the most significant risks and is there evidence that these risks are being mitigated?</i></p> <p>The key risks from a delivery perspective pertain to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • failure to consult, engage and inform stakeholders (internal and external) in a timely and effective manner – potentially requiring re-design and leading to delays (20% probability, high risk) • Traffic Regulation Orders: Objections would delay implementation and could potentially lead to scheme downscaling (25% probability, high risk) • Delays due to ongoing COVID-19 restrictions: Impact on delivery timescales (50% probability, high risk). <p>The Applicant has put forward suitable mitigating responses to these risks.</p>			

Do the significant risks require any contract conditions? (e.g. clawback on outcomes)

Recovery from COVID is outside the applicant's control, but should there be substantial re-design (eg to width of way or roundabout) following public engagement, the appraisal should be updated to ensure continued high VfM

Are there any significant risks associated with securing the full funding of the scheme?

No – 100% TCF funded

Are there any key risks that need to be highlighted in relation to the procurement strategy?

Competition for resources across the TCF programme could add delay and cost.

Delivery

Is the timetable for delivery reasonable and has the promoter identified opportunities for acceleration?

Yes, via early and ongoing engagement with major contractors

Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?

Slightly vague – seasons not months. Applicant will need to make the timetable and key milestones for procurement clear for the FBC.

What is the level of cost certainty and is this sufficient at this stage of the assurance process? Has the promoter confirmed they will cover any cost overruns without reducing the benefits of the scheme?

60%

95% Expected for FBC.

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

Yes.

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

No

The Applicant should provide a more detailed account of the structure and roles that will be involved in the delivery of the project, for the FBC

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

No.

Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?

Yes, a clear and comprehensive approach has been outlined by the Applicant.

Legal

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

The Applicant confirms that the scheme will not constitute State aid; *“The funding applicant is a Local Authority and the proposed works do 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	Authorisation to proceed to FBC
Payment Basis	Defrayal
Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)	
<p>The following to be provided in advance of execution of the stage 2 Grant Letter –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. OBC to be signed and intended submission date of the FBC to be confirmed given conflicting dates in the OBC. <p>The following recommendations must be satisfied as part of FBC -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">2. Applicant to provide alongside the FBC -<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Section 3.8 - single tick only, not 3;• Appraisal results for the 'Do Less' option;• final scheme costs based on the completed detailed scheme design and an agreed price with the successful contractor/value contained on the supplier brief;• a brief exploration of wider benefits;• final appraisal results using the latest version of AMAT;• fuller DIA as set out in section 7 of the Economic Assessment Report;• procurement strategy in more detail;• clarity on timescales and key milestones for delivery;• reconciliation of residual risk claimed with total expected value of remaining risks in the risk register; and• an organogram.3. Timescales for TRO to be clarified given start on site is subject to this.4. FBC to be signed prior to submission to the MCA Executive.5. MCA appendices to be completed in full and submitted with the FBC. <p>.</p>	