

## Assurance Summary



### Scheme Details

<b>Project Name</b>	O0044 – Elsecar Active Travel	<b>Type of funding</b>	Grant
<b>Grant Recipient</b>	BMBC	<b>Total Scheme Cost</b>	£667,194
<b>MCA Executive Board</b>	TEB	<b>MCA Funding</b>	£667,194
<b>Programme name</b>	ATF	<b>% MCA Allocation</b>	100%

### Appraisal Summary

<b>Project Description</b>	
<i>Is it clear what the MCA is being asked to fund?</i> Yes. Outputs shown below.	
<b>Strategic Case</b>	
<i>Scheme Rationale</i>	<i>Does the scheme have a clearly stated rationale and provide a strong justification for public funding?</i>  The scheme fits well with the SEP, the Transport Strategy, the Active Travel Implementation plan and national policies to encourage urban living and active travel.
<i>Strategic policy fit</i>	<i>How well does the scheme align with the strategic objectives of the SEP and RAP?</i>  The scheme is promoted as a key part of plans to achieve these aims.
<i>Contribution to Carbon Net Zero</i>	<i>Does this scheme align with the strategic objective to achieve Carbon Net Zero?</i>  Although it aims at mode switch from car, no modelling has been done to ascertain the extent of this, although if the scheme is acceptable to residents, the potential for this is significant, given the low cost of the scheme, the presence of a significant tourist attraction and the growth in housing planned locally.
<i>SMART scheme objectives</i>	<i>State the SMART scheme objective as presented in the business case.</i> <i>Is there a 'golden thread' between the strategic objectives (see 3.2) and the scheme objectives (see 3.6)?</i>  SMART objectives are given as:  <b>Short term</b>  1. Encourage more cycling/walking; 2. Create an environment that is safer for both walking and cycling to replace journeys made by car;  <b>Long term</b>

3. To create a cultural shift towards making cycling and walking the natural choice for shorter journeys
4. To affect a mode shift away from the private car in those areas where new opportunities are likely to see an increase in demand or where growth could be stifled
5. To improve air quality and environmental impacts within the Dearne Valley Corridor

**Outputs are:**

- Enhancement of the existing Public Right of Way (PRoW) and Trans Pennine Trail (TPT) via improvements, widening and resurfacing;
- Introduction of zebra crossing on Wentworth Road and improved crossing facility on Wath Road;
- Wayfinding signage;
- Improvements to public realm, which will include improved footways within Elsecar Park, additional seating, greenscape improvements and route finders which will showcase Elsecar Heritage Centre attractions;
- Introduce a wider 30mph speed limit within Elsecar and extend on Wentworth Road. Introduce ‘dragons’ teeth’ road markings and speed roundels. A buffer speed limit of 40mph will also be introduced to between 60mph and 30mph zones. (Please see scheme plans – Appendix B).

**Measurable Outcomes**

**This is an extract from the Benefit Realisation Plan provided in the OBC (this is the same as that for Goldthorpe ATN):**

Outcome	Target
Improve facilities and access by all modes.	Increase trips by 21% walking and 350% cycling Achieve Mode Share target of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 9% walking</li> <li>• 11% cycling</li> </ul>
Increase levels of physical activity	Increase trips by 21% walking and 350% cycling Achieve Mode Share target of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 9% walking</li> <li>• 11% cycling</li> </ul>
Enhance Green Infrastructure	Increasing footfall in urban centres by 15% due to improvements to public realm.
Improve accessibility to employment	Contribute towards increasing GVA through increasing the number of economically active people living within 30 minutes of key employment sites
Improve Air Quality and noise levels	Reductions in levels of pollutants to 40 µg / m <sup>3</sup> within 5 years of opening
Improve levels of road safety	Reduction in reported casualties of 4% per year

Pedestrian and cycle counts, attitude surveys, and air quality measurement will be undertaken as part of the M&E of the scheme.

*Options assessment*

*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?*

	<p>The Applicant has used MCD analysis to identify the best combination of routes, measures and facilities to maximise net benefits to transport users and providers. All but the preferred option were discarded as failing to meet all objectives. In particular the high cost option was ruled out as taking longer than available within the programme. It would be useful to know if this is the Applicant's ambition longer term and whether they would expect more demand to eventuate.</p>		
<p><i>Statutory requirements and adverse consequences</i></p>	<p><i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i></p> <p>Yes – temporary and permanent TROs required – tbd at detailed design stage Cabinet approval likely July 2022</p> <p><i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i></p> <p>No</p>		
<p><b>Value for Money</b></p>			
<p>Core monetised Benefits</p>	<p>Not calculated</p>	<p>Non-monetised and wider economic benefits</p>	<p><i>[Values/description – supplementary form]</i></p> <p><b>In main OBC:</b> On a scale -2 to +2: 2: Increased demand for AT, net zero carbon, health, economics. 0:Improved PT viability, Social value</p> <p><b>In transport Supplementary form:</b> Mod. Beneficial: physical activity, accessibility Slight Beneficial: Noise, LAQ, GHG,Safety, security, severance Neutral: personal affordability</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 AMAT run indicates that although the BCR on the assumptions made is 0.82, the BCR could reach 1 with a moderate increase in AT forecasts above the ones used. It is recommended for the FBC that further work is done to examine the robustness of these forecasts in light of the expansion in housing expected locally. The experience of the Applicant in schemes of this type makes it likely that the costing is accurate.</p>			
<p><b>Value for Money Statement</b></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>Unknown, but scheme is relatively low cost with a large potential for effecting mode shift. Further quantification is required for FBC.</p>			
<p><b>Risk</b></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 delays due to need for safe working practices on site and need for political support throughout. Unexpected utilities' costs are also highlighted. Maintaining political support is also a key risk. Further public consultation is recommended if not already planned.</p> <p>The Applicant has put forward suitable mitigating responses to these.</p>			

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

No

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

No – 100% ATF 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?*

It appears to be. Assuming Cabinet approval (April 2021) - FBC approval Nov 2021 Start on site Dec 2021, completion March 2022.

*Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?*

Yes. DLO most likely.

*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%. This is as expected for an OBC. Applicant will reduce scope or seek more funding within any available TCF headroom

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

Yes.

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

Names typed in only.

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

Yes. Surveys and virtual meetings with residents, visitors and business owners have taken place and the Applicant is prepared to carry out more. Details required for FBC.

*Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?*

Yes, a clear and comprehensive approach has been outlined.

## **Legal**

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

Legal opinion is included within the OBC document (7.7)

## Recommendation and Conditions

<b>Recommendation</b>	Approved to proceed to FBC
<b>Payment Basis</b>	Defrayal
<b>Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)</b>	
<p><i>The following recommendations must be satisfied by the FBC.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Commitment to further public consultation throughout detailed design.</li><li>• QRA to be updated with p50 costs included in bid.</li><li>• Optimism Bias to be deleted from bid amount, any certainties to enter risk register or base costs.</li><li>• Forecasts of demand be revisited and sensitivity tests run.</li><li>• Completion of SCR Appendices of cost, outcome and output profiles</li></ul>	

**Record of Recommendation, Endorsement and Approval**

**Project Name**

<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>	Gareth Sutton Finance Manager	<b>Statutory Finance Officer Approval</b>			
<b>Signature</b>					
<b>Date</b>					
<b>Monitoring Officer or Delegate</b>	Steve Davenport SCR CA Solicitor				
<b>Signature</b>					
<b>Date</b>					