

Transforming Cities Fund: Expression of Interest

1 PROJECT & APPLICANT'S INFORMATION	
Project Name:	Broom Road cycleways and associated traffic management <i>[The official name of the project]</i>
Project Location	Rotherham S60 <i>[Provide full details of the project location, including address, postcode and Local Authority area(s) - in addition please also append a site map/ plan]</i>
Applicant Organisation	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council <i>[Lead local authority]</i>
Contact Name and Role:	Mr Nathaniel Porter Senior Transport Planner <i>[Provide details of the project lead for this application within your organisation]</i>
Email:	nat.porter@rotherham.gov.uk <i>[E-mail address details for the project lead]</i>
Telephone:	01709 254377 <i>[Telephone number for the project lead]</i>
Other Delivery Partners and Roles:	Not applicable <i>[Provide details of other delivery partners and their role(s) in the delivery of the scheme]</i>
2 STRATEGIC CASE	
2.1 – Please provide a summary description of your overall project, appending any supporting graphics where relevant.	
<p>The project consists of two elements –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of cycleways along Wellgate and Broom Road, Rotherham, with associated works at junctions and crossings. • Works to provide improved conditions for walking and cycling along Broom Valley Road. <p>It was initially envisaged that the works on Broom Valley Road would consist of a simple point closure or bus gate along the route. However, since project inception and submission of the ATF SOBC -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Department for Transport has increased its expectations in respect of public consultation and support for Active Travel fund schemes; • Design development has identified that there exists considerable opportunity for different approaches to be taken to better meet (as yet unknown) community preferences. <p>This proposal therefore is to afford the project additional time and budget to conduct a greater level of public consultation in respect of Broom Valley Road, and to provide financial headroom to be able to respond to feedback received. Any additional funding not required in meeting public expectations in respect of Broom Valley Road would be re-invested in provide a greater length of cycleways on Broom Road itself.</p> <p><i>[A summary of the overall project – maximum 200 words]</i></p>	
2.2 – Specifically what are you seeking MCA funding for?	
The SCR funds will be used to pay for:	

- The preparation costs in relation to the design development of the preferred option. This will include both preliminary design, detailed design and related scheme promotion and consultation material.
- The construction of the scheme.

Our proposal is that works in 2021/22 would first be funded by tranche 2 Active Travel Fund (£1 million), with subsequent works funded by Transforming Cities Fund (£1½ million), and then SCR Gainshare (£½ million). This is intended to cash flow the project within the funding deadlines of external partners.

It is proposed the TCF ask is funded by deletion of the AMID to Brinsworth cycle route scheme from the TCF programme.

[Describe the specific elements of the project you expect the MCA to fund – approx. 200 words]

2.3 – Please set out the link to the TCF SOBC objectives:

- To better connect the areas of transport poverty with areas of opportunity in a safe and sustainable way
- To affect 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
- To create a cultural shift towards making cycling and walking the natural choice for shorter journeys
- To achieve the above in ways that address current health issues and improve air quality across the SCR

The scheme is intended to affect a mode shift away from private car, and to enable cycling as a natural choice for shorter journeys.

Approximately 16,000 people travel in or out of Rotherham town centre via Wellgate in a typical weekday, per the SYPTTE annual cordon count for 2019. Of these, around 17% arrive by non-motorised means (i.e. walking or cycling).

However, number of cyclists are low, making up around ½% of passenger traffic at the count point. These figures suggest public dissatisfaction with existing conditions for cycling for this entry into the town centre.

Transport models of commuting flows into central Rotherham suggest that, with high levels of investment to achieve safe and comfortable cycling conditions, cycle volumes on this corridor could be increased by as much as fifteen or twenty-fold. Whilst some of these will be abstracted from buses and walking, there is potential ultimately for around two-thirds of these trips to be abstracted from car use, as well as for additional trips to be generated by people who may not have access to cars or to public transport. Achieving these benefits will require much greater investment in infrastructure so as to achieve a network effect; however, this requires the first links to be provided.

This corridor was identified as a priority route in the City Region's LCWIP. As such, the scheme is also included in SCR Active Travel Implementation Plan. Moreover, this corridor is identified as being priority for intervention in the draft Rotherham Cycling Strategy (which is subject to public consultation), and is identified in the Propensity to Cycle Tool as being the corridor into central Rotherham with greatest potential for cycling uptake.

[Please specify the market failure or equity objective. Detail the opportunities/barriers that have been identified, supported by sufficient evidence. maximum 500 words]

2.3 – Please set out your SMART objectives

This must cover (a) short-term outputs, eg km of cycle route by x date and (b) medium-term outcomes, eg increase in cycling of x [number/%] by y [date]

a) Short-term SMART outputs

Objective 1 Delivery of outputs as set out in this document.
b) Medium-term SMART outcomes
Objective 2 Enable more travel by active modes Measure of success More people cycling Timescale 1 and 3 years post opening Indicators Number of people cycling along areas of intervention Dependencies, Risks, Constraints Unforeseen changes in demand for origins and destinations. Permanent changes in travel demand (especially commuting) arising from COVID-19 pandemic

3 ECONOMIC CASE		
Please indicate the potential for this project to support a Stronger Economy in South Yorkshire:		
Outcome	Rating +2 to -2	Justification of the score
Increase demand for active travel	+2	<p>The Propensity to Cycle Tool indicates this corridor as having the greatest potential for uplift in cycling into central Rotherham, and the third greatest potential of any corridor in the Borough, based on 2011 travel to work data.</p> <p><i>[max 100 words]</i></p>
Improve public transport / viability	+1	<p>Whilst the scheme may result in some increase in peak hour congestion, existing bus priority will mitigate this impact for buses.</p> <p>Buses may see some small benefit as consequence of seeing increased competitiveness relative to cars, but this will mostly arise from slightly worsened delays for cars.</p> <p>Abstraction from buses to cycling may have a small negative impact on bus service viability.</p> <p>The scheme does have a relationship to other Transforming Cities to make considerable improvement to bus journey times on the A.631 between Rotherham and Maltby. In this context, the impacts of the Broom Road scheme are considered to bring a slight additional benefit to bus services.</p> <p><i>[max 100 words]</i></p>
Unlock land for development	+1	<p>A number of housing sites are identified in south east Rotherham, and there are nodes on the highway network (notably Worrygoose Roundabout) operating at capacity. Supporting shifts for active travel will help mitigate these. This scheme won't deliver sufficient network to achieve significant relief of relevant bottlenecks in and of itself, but will form a first step in developing a network which would.</p> <p><i>[max 100 words]</i></p>
Improve highway capacity	-1	<p>The scheme will reduced highway capacity at Clifton Roundabout. Two approaches have been undertaken to testing</p>

		<p>this impact to date – one indicating the junction will operate at about practical capacity, the other indicating the junction will operate over practical capacity in peak hours. RMBC interpretation of the findings is to expect increased queueing on Broom Road in the AM peak.</p> <p><i>[max 100 words]</i></p>
--	--	--

Please indicate the potential for this project to support a Greener Economy in South Yorkshire, specifically Net Zero Carbon. Consider the extent this scheme could reduce carbon emissions from a significant source of emissions

Qualitative	Rating +2 to -2	Justification of the score
Net Zero Carbon	+0	<p>Abstraction of car trips to cycling is an expected impact of the scheme, and this will result in reduction in CO₂ emissions.</p> <p>Initial estimates suggest this may be in the order of 350 kg CO₂ per annum, or about 0.04% of the circa 800,000 kg CO₂ p.a. estimated to be emitted by cars and taxis on Wellgate and Broom Road, between its junctions with Hollowgate and Broom Lane.</p> <p>Greater benefit may be achieved as other schemes add value over time, by virtue of network effect, although even this potential is estimated to only be around 4% of car emissions in Rotherham in optimistic scenarios. This is in part because carbon emissions from cars are principally driven by medium and longer distance travel, with 85% of car mileage accrued on trips exceeding 5 miles length, and so unlikely to be suitable for cycling in many cases (England, 2019) (National Travel Survey table NTS0308).</p> <p><i>[max 100 words]</i></p>

Please indicate any other benefits not included above which are important to demonstrate value for money of your scheme (eg air quality, health benefits etc- add lines as needed)

Qualitative	Rating +2 to -2	Justification of the score
Health	+1	<p>Initial appraisal work and experience of appraisal of similar schemes indicates health benefits will be the greatest monetisable benefit associated with the proposals.</p> <p><i>[max 100 words]</i></p>

4 COMMERCIAL CASE

How well understood is the potential procurement approach (mark one)?

<p>Tried and tested, risk largely with supplier: Established supplier market and promoter team have existing experience. Very Low risk</p>	
<p>Tried and tested, some risk sharing: Established supplier market and promoter team have existing experience. Expectation that risk sharing can be mitigated. Low Risk</p>	
<p>Emerging or some risk sharing: Potential new market or a small number of suppliers. Increasing levels of risk sharing or limits to the ability to mitigate. Medium risk</p>	
<p>Novel procurement or complex risk sharing: Uncertain supplier market, new product or service, limited promoter experience and potential for promoter bearing significant risks. High risk</p>	

Procurement route to be defined:	✓
5 FINANCIAL CASE	
A - Total Estimated Scheme Cost (£)	£ 3,000,000
B - Estimated TCF Grant Funding Sought (£):	£ 1,500,000
C - Total Estimated Investment from other sources (£):	£ 1,500,000
D - TCF as % of Total Estimated Scheme Investment:	50%

6 MANAGEMENT CASE	
What is your preferred target date to start and complete the scheme?	
Complete outline design	Broom Road cycleways – April '21 Broom Valley Road works – August '21
Issue Outline Business Case to MCA	June '21, plus update at September '21 to confirm Broom Valley proposals
Complete procurement	Broom Road cycleways – October '21 Broom Valley Road works – February '22
Start works	November 2021
Complete work / scheme opening	January 2023
What would you need to accelerate these dates?	
<p>Greater flexibility in SCR assurance processes, to allow for phased design and delivery, and to allow flexibility to conduct and respond to public consultation. For OBC, it is proposed to issue an OBC at June '21 in advance of confirmation of Broom Valley Road proposals, with an update at September '21 to confirm these post consultation. For Full Business Case, we would propose to submit an FBC in September 2021</p> <p><i>Please advise how the MCA or other external bodies could aid delivery eg: resources/ advice/ land/ powers etc</i></p>	
Please set out the top five delivery risks which could impact you completing the scheme within the TCF funding deadline of March 2024 and mitigations for this	
<p>Public consultation including TROs – public attitude to the proposals are untested and elements of the scheme may prove contentious. This proposal to use TCF funding is intended as mitigation to allow greater time and budget to resolve public concerns.</p> <p>Physical constraints resulting in challenging design and build – preliminary design on Broom Road indicates that the proposals are achievable, but this work as been conducted on OS data and does not include for elements of less than idea width. There are risks that topographic survey, or location of statutory undertakers equipment, may raise issues rendering the scheme infeasible or more expensive than information to date suggests. Mitigation includes early commissioning of surveys and detailed design tasks.</p> <p>Network management implications – there is a potential for increased peak hour congestion arising from the proposals. There is risk these may not be politically acceptable – this is mitigated for by early discussions with elected members (which indicate support based on information currently available). There is also risk around economic appraisal – this is mitigated for the early discussions with SCR assurance.</p>	

Alignment of funding streams and associated processes – The proposal would see the project delivered using three funding streams, each with different deadlines for defrayal. Whilst from a delivery perspective projects are to be twin-tracked, for assurance purposes the projects need to be appraised as a package to adequately convey the network effect achieved through alignment of interventions. However, different development timescales means limited information will be available for later works if business cases are submitted to timescales required for most onerous (in terms of financial profile) fund. Mitigation is early discussion with SCR with a view to securing flexibility in assurance process to enable delivery.

Procurement – increased project activity associated with greater amounts of funding potentially available to RMBC may raise challenges of capacity in construction sector. Intention is to deliver through direct award utilising existing framework; mitigation for risks around market capacity will be early discussion with relevant supplier(s) on the framwrok to establish capacity.

Please include any statutory processes which need to be followed.

Please provide evidence that you have sufficient backing from your organisation to progress this scheme to the timescale you have proposed.

Scheme proposals have been discussed and agreed to be progressed in discussions with council Leader and highways portfolio holder in advance of Active Travel Fund submission. Proposal to delete AMID to Brinsworth cycle route has been agreed by RMBC Major Projects Board.

NEED PAUL WOODCOCK CONSENT TO SUBMIT

Please provide the evidence here or append a letter or other evidence as appropriate.

Please confirm if an initial assessment of State Aid has been undertaken and is applicable to this scheme. Failure to consider State Aid may lead unrecoverable costs for the scheme promoter if the project is unsuitable for MCA funding.

Yes	No
	✓

[Details regarding State Aid can be found at: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/state-aid>. Scheme Promoters must obtain their own legal advice on State Aid]