



Assurance Panel Summary

Scheme Details

Project Name	T0025 - Doncaster Road, Dalton	Type of funding	Grant
Grant Recipient	RMBC	Total Scheme Cost	£ 1,912,175
MCA Executive Board	TEB	MCA Funding	£ 1,912,175
Programme name	TCF	% MCA Allocation	100%

Appraisal Summary

Project Description	
<p><i>Is it clear what the MCA is being asked to fund?</i></p> <p>Yes - The improvement of 400m of the A630 Doncaster Road (a key radial route between Rotherham and Doncaster), at Dalton, with associated revisions to junctions and crossings. The scheme provides an additional eastbound traffic lane between Mushroom Roundabout and Dalton Lane, to ease the flow of traffic away from the roundabout and reduce blocking back and further congestion in the peak periods.</p>	
Strategic Case	
Scheme Rationale	<p><i>Does the scheme have a clear rationale and provide a justification for public funding?</i></p> <p>Yes – the scheme aims to prevent queuing back onto the roundabout as 2 lanes of traffic merge into one. This roundabout connects the A6123/A630 Herringthorpe Valley Rd – part of the ring road around Rotherham – with the A630 radial between Rotherham and Doncaster, parallel to the M18. Traffic volumes on the A630 are very high at peak times with limited ability for the signals to control the flow onto the eastbound arm without adding to delays to other traffic, primarily that on the ring road.</p> <p>The scheme is intended to boost productivity by reducing journey time for all motorised vehicle users, and improve access to destinations including employment sites along this route.</p>
Strategic policy fit	<p><i>Does the scheme align with the strategic objectives of the SEP and RAP?</i></p> <p>Perhaps - the emphasis of this scheme is on “keeping traffic moving” so the improvements necessarily benefit car and freight users substantially more than bus users. However, this is not a “zero-sum game” as bus journey times are demonstrably higher and more variable at the intervention site in the commuting peaks than at other times and whilst on their own, the benefits to public transport are not enough to provide value for money, they are a “step in the right direction” towards a “cleaner and greener” City region. Options for improving cycling facilities have been considered but do not provide a solution to the problem, albeit larger scale reduction in car usage would do so, but require substantially higher investment and political support. However, the tendency for road capacity to fill up over time is the main concern regarding the long-term alignment to objectives. The applicant has stated their intention to monitor and if necessary, control traffic volumes via signal timings at the roundabout to avoid this.</p>

<p>Contribution to Carbon Net Zero</p>	<p><i>Does this scheme align with the strategic objective to achieve Carbon Net Zero?</i></p> <p>Possibly - The modelling of the scheme shows slight reductions in carbon emissions. However, the applicant states that “a sensitivity test will be undertaken once the other parameters of the core CAZ preferred option scenario have been determined, incorporating both CAZ measures and the proposed scheme, to confirm this will not have adverse air quality impacts. This test will be available at FBC submission. RMBC will not progress the scheme in the unlikely case that it undermines efforts to achieve compliance with statutory air quality limits.”</p>
<p>SMART scheme objectives</p>	<p><i>State the SMART scheme objective as presented in the business case.</i></p> <p><i>Is there a ‘golden thread’ between the strategic objectives (see 3.2) and the scheme objectives (see 3.7)?</i></p> <p>Yes - Objectives are clear and well defined and readily measured as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To improve eastbound bus journey times in evening peak hours • To improve eastbound bus journey reliability in evening peak hours • To increase bus patronage relative to ‘do minimum’ <p>Although benefits for bus users are a very small proportion of the monetised benefits, car users will also receive these benefits since road space is shared in the eastbound direction. Beyond the intervention site, traffic counts and surveys will be used to compare impacts on the wider network with forecasts.</p>
<p>Options assessment</p>	<p><i>Is there a clear rationale for the selection of short-listed options and the choice of the Preferred Way Forward?</i></p> <p>Yes – A range of options have been considered, with main reason for rejection parenthesised:</p> <p>Option:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Do Min. (no action) B. Operating signals at the roundabout to hold traffic back on the eastbound arm – longer queuing possible C. A dedicated bus lane eastbound – ineffective as pinchpoint remains at head of queue D. greater provision of active travel interventions – higher cost and ineffective for all at this scale/location E. Additional lane eastbound by removal of westbound bus lane – OK for cars (highest BCR) but ineffective for bus users F. Lengthening merge lane eastbound, requiring some land take – benefits most, subject to volume of traffic attracted to this route from others (preferred option albeit lower BCR than E)
<p>Statutory requirements and adverse consequences</p>	<p><i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i></p> <p>No – apart from TRO’s, expected completion September 2021</p> <p><i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i></p> <p>Yes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Adverse AQMA impacts in the CAZ- applicant commits to modelling these and reporting for FBC 2. Induced traffic could “choke-off” benefits – applicant commits to controlling this as far as possible

Value for Money					
Core monetised Benefits	<i>[Core BCR – table 4.22]</i>		Non-monetised and wider economic benefits	<i>[Values/description – supplementary form]</i>	
		£m		All social and environmental impacts deemed neutral. No wider impacts considered, apart from bus reliability, which was shown to be 41 seconds worse in the peaks than in the inter-peak. This saving, if sustained would represent a significant addition to the 27 secs (44 seconds if scheme 100% effective) of average journey time estimated for bus users as a result of the scheme. Delay savings for pedestrians are also claimed (but not quantified) with conversion of the existing staggered crossing to a single stage arrangement.	
	GHG	0.034			
	Car and freight users	4.556			
	Indirect tax	-0.074			
	Bus Users	<u>0.051</u>			
PVB	4.567				
				PVC	1.551
				BCR	2.94
<p><i>Do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?</i></p> <p>Yes - Future underlying traffic growth, or induced traffic beyond the high growth forecast, would once again cause queuing and erode benefits. This can be controlled to some extent by preventing too much traffic entering the roundabout, although this could shift the problem upstream.</p>			<p><i>Do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?</i></p> <p>The local air quality impacts may be excessive – this will be confirmed or rebutted by a sensitivity test of the model to be carried out for FBC</p>		
Value for Money Statement					
<p><i>Taking consideration of the monetised and non-monetised benefits and costs, and their residual risks, does the scheme represent value for money?</i></p> <p>Yes</p>					
Risk					
<p><i>What are the most significant risks and is there evidence that these risks are being mitigated?</i></p> <p>There is a risk that the scheme will not proceed if the landowners are unwilling to negotiate. Efforts are underway to avoid this. There are a number of individually small risks to cost, the largest being ground conditions (rock or other hard material) and extent of resurfacing required. Investigations will be made prior to construction – no mitigation possible.</p> <p><i>Do the significant risks require any contract conditions? (e.g. clawback on outcomes)</i></p> <p>No – Risk provision should be adequate (although this assessment has not checked this in detail) and an appropriate level of optimism bias is included in the BCR.</p> <p><i>Are there any significant risks associated with securing the land or full funding for the scheme?</i></p> <p>Yes, communication with the owners of the land required for the scheme has not been established. Efforts are now being made with the aim of gaining their signature to a Deed of Dedication in time for the FBC. The applicant has no reason to believe this will not be granted by December 2021.</p> <p><i>Are there any key risks that need to be highlighted in relation to the procurement strategy?</i></p> <p>No</p>					

Delivery

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

Yes – provided the land can be acquired as planned

Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?

Yes

What is the level of cost certainty and is this sufficient at this stage of the assurance process? Has the promotor confirmed they will cover any cost overruns?

60%; Yes, Cost overruns will be met from residual risk allowance or alternative sources will be sought.

Has the promoter demonstrated clear project governance and identified the SRO? Has the SRO or other appropriate Officer signed of this business case?

Yes, the SRO is the Strategic Director Regeneration and Environment, who has (dry) signed the OBC

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

No - scheme specific engagement has not been carried due to the need to manage expectations in case bid is not taken approved

Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?

Yes – It is included in the project plan. Monitoring of traffic via surveys and ATCs will be undertaken on completion. Bus journey time data will be reviewed one and three years post completion. These data are routinely collected and cover the intervention area. There is no mention of measuring bus occupancy
Evaluation will be led by SCR at programme level.

Legal

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

Yes – no obligations foreseen.

Recommendation and Conditions

Recommendation	Proceed to FBC
-----------------------	----------------

Payment Basis	Defrayal
----------------------	----------

Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)

The following conditions must be satisfied before FBC approval/ contract execution.

Land required for the scheme to be secured

QRA and base costs to be updated

P50 risk to be reconciled with residual risk element in scheme cost

Bus patronage data for X78 during the pandemic and proposals for monitoring this post construction

More detail of traffic signal timings at-and-on Mushroom roundabout - currently and with the scheme – how is it envisaged that queue length growth will be managed?

A sensitivity test for CAZ impacts

Monetisation of bus reliability impacts

