

Assurance Summary



Scheme Details

Project Name	O0043 – BMBC Goldthorpe Active Neighbourhood	Type of funding	Grant
Grant Recipient	BMBC	Total Scheme Cost	£568,175
MCA Executive Board	TEB	MCA Funding	£568,175
Programme name	ATF	% MCA Allocation	100%

Appraisal Summary

Project Description	
<i>Is it clear what the MCA is being asked to fund?</i> Yes. Outputs shown below.	
Strategic Case	
<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 and the growth in housing planned.
<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: Short term 1. Encourage more cycling/walking; 2. Create an environment that is safer for both walking and cycling to replace journeys made by car; Long term 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:

- 3.25km of Low Traffic Neighbourhood;
- Point closures of main roads to through traffic, apart from buses, access and disabled;
- Widening existing footway;
- Area wide interventions (e.g. pedestrian and cycling zones and modal filters / filtered permeability);
- Selective road closures using planters, cones or similar;
- School streets with specific interventions being agreed with the schools involved.
- One-way filters;
- Controlled crossing at the junction of Doncaster Road / Beaver Street;
- Signage improvements.

Measurable Outcomes

This is an extract from the Benefit Realisation Plan provided in the OBC:

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"> • 9% walking • 11% cycling
Increase levels of physical activity	Increase trips by 21% walking and 350% cycling Achieve Mode Share target of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 9% walking • 11% cycling
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 ³ 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. Distributional Impact screening proforma completed - further analysis will need to be undertaken for FBC.

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?

	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		
<i>Statutory requirements and adverse consequences</i>	<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>Not explored in detail – the hope is if most residents change their behaviour (ie mode of travel to town) the re-routing impacts will be minimised.</p>		
Value for Money			
Core monetised Benefits	Not calculated	Non-monetised and wider economic benefits	<p><i>[Values/description – supplementary form]</i></p> <p>On a scale -2 to +2:</p> <p>2: Increased demand for AT, net zero carbon, health, economics. 0:Improved PT viability, Social value</p>
<i>In your view do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?</i>			
There is not enough information in the bid to judge the VfM of the scheme, although it looks “promising”. Maintaining local support for measures that inconvenience car drivers will be crucial to achieving expected benefits. The experience of the Applicant in schemes of this type makes it likely that the costing is accurate.			
Value for Money Statement			
<i>Taking into consideration the monetised and non-monetised benefits and costs, does the scheme represent good value for money?</i>			
Unknown, but scheme is relatively low cost with a large potential for effecting mode shift. Further quantification is required for FBC.			
Risk			
<i>What are the most significant risks and is there evidence that these risks are being mitigated?</i>			
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.			
The Applicant has put forward suitable mitigating responses to these.			
<i>Do the significant risks require any contract conditions? (e.g. clawback on outcomes)</i>			
No			
<i>Are there any significant risks associated with securing the full funding of the scheme?</i>			

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 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.

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 promoter still need to seek legal advice?

Legal opinion is included within the OBC document (7.7)

Recommendation and Conditions

Recommendation

Approved to proceed to FBC

Payment Basis	Defrayal
Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)	
<p><i>The following recommendations must be satisfied by the FBC.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Commitment to further public consultation throughout detailed design• QRA to be updated with p50 costs included in bid• Optimism Bias to be deleted from bid amount, any certainties to enter risk register or base costs• AMAT tool be used to estimate benefits• Corrections to OBC as agreed	

Record of Recommendation, Endorsement and Approval

Project Name

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