Appendix B

Assurance Panel Summary

Scheme Details

Project Name	T0002 – A61 Wakefield Road	**Type of funding**	Grant
Grant Recipient	SCC	**Total Scheme Cost**	£13,653,118
MCA Executive Board	TEB	**MCA Funding**	£13,288,689
Programme name	TCF	**% MCA Allocation**	97%

Appraisal Summary

Project Description	
Is it clear what the MCA is being asked to fund? The proposed scheme is to provide road widening at two key locations along the A61 Corridor in Barnsley to relieve traffic congestion.	
Strategic Case	
Scheme Rationale	*Does the scheme have a clearly stated rationale and provide a strong justification for public funding?* The aim of the scheme is to reduce congestion and improve bus journey times along the route
Strategic policy fit	*How well does the scheme align with the strategic objectives of the SEP and RAP?* The scheme fits well with a wide range of strategies and objectives including the SEP and RAP, locally:

Growth – growing the economy for all	**By improving bus journey times and increasing patronage, people will be able to access jobs and education in a more effective, efficient and sustainable way, sustainably increasing the economy of Barnsley and the City Region.**
Inclusion – ensuring everyone has an opportunity to contribute to and benefit from economic growth	**By enhancing the bus infrastructure provision, and significantly improving general flow**, **communities along and beyond the corridor can access greater opportunities.**
Sustainability – driving low carbon opportunities within the economy and delivering net-zero emissions	Private vehicles will still play a role in the future of mobility on the corridor, by improving capacity and resilience, person trips and the movement of goods supporting the Barnsley and City Region economy will be improved. **Improving bus reliability and services will increase the attractiveness of bus resulting in modal shift. This could be more sustainable with the introduction of electric or hydrogen buses in the future.**

<table>
<tr><td>Contribution to Carbon Net Zero</td><td>Does this scheme align with the strategic objective to achieve Carbon Net Zero?

The scheme does not fit very well with net zero objectives, as it is likely to increase traffic volumes. However, modelling indicates that buses will be benefitted more than cars leading to mode shift to bus. There is uncertainty over the sustainability of this over time, should more traffic be induced, either from the scheme alone or by housing development in future. However, the scheme incorporates some active travel lanes over a short distance, to connect proposed longer routes in an associated scheme (T0003- A61 Active Travel). The synergy between these schemes will be assessed as part of the Assurance of T0003.</td></tr>
<tr><td>SMART scheme objectives</td><td>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)?

Objectives are defined quantitatively and consistent with the nature of the scheme – linking objectives to measurable mode shift and delay reduction outcomes.

<table>
<tr><th>SCR TCF Objectives</th><th>Measures of success</th></tr>
<tr><td>To better connect the areas of transport poverty with areas of opportunity in a safe and sustainable way</td><td>This scheme will better connect areas of transport poverty with areas of opportunity by reducing congestion in the A61 corridor and improving journey times for all vehicles, with the reduction for buses being especially significant due to the new bus priority measures. In the longer-term, this will facilitate developments currently planned along the corridor, which would otherwise lead to increased congestion.</td></tr>
<tr><td>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</td><td>The improvements will make bus journey times and patronage increases of around 8% will make bus more attractive. Significant new development is planned for the corridor and these changes will ensure that new residents and businesses are encouraged to use public transport rather than cars when travelling along the corridor.</td></tr>
<tr><td>To achieve the above in ways that address current health issues and improve air quality across the SCR.</td><td>The reductions in delays of around 40% will reduce congestion and queueing, particularly at the bridge over the River Dearne. Congestion is a known cause of poor air quality. In addition, making public transport a more viable option will improve public health by encouraging a switch from private vehicles.</td></tr>
</table></td></tr>
<tr><td>Options assessment</td><td>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?

Yes, however outline costs for the rejected options and clarity over how scheme links to T0003 A61 Active Travel scheme as well as impacts on pedestrians of extended “green times” for road traffic, of the preferred option, should be provided at FBC.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Statutory requirements and adverse consequences</td><td>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?

TTRO’s and TROs are required for both Phases. The TTRO process takes approximately 6 weeks and the full TRO process can take between 12 and 18 months. A suitable timeframe has been allowed for securing TROs in the programme.</td></tr>
</table>

Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?

The applicant lists:

- Requirement for small areas of land within the boundaries of neighbouring residential and commercial properties,
- the widened bridge structure may impact on flood risk.
- loss of protected trees adjacent to Old Mill Lane
- noise and traffic disturbance during construction
- earthmoving operations and excavation of materials may mobilise contaminants, which may affect receptors such as construction workers or controlled waters.

The Assessor added:

- Increased highway capacity generating additional trips through induced demand over time.
- Community severance impacts associated with making a busy road busier still (higher traffic throughput) and adversely affecting communities that experience high levels of deprivation (areas of Smithies, Athersley South and New Lodge).
- The widened carriageway being nearer to adjacent properties that front the A61.

It is clear that the schemes proposed are intended to alleviate traffic congestion and its negative impacts on scheduled bus services in the targeted intervention area, which are likely to persist if a scheme focused on improving bus journey times is not delivered.

Value for Money

Core monetised Benefits	**£13.513m**	Non-monetised and wider economic benefits	*[Values/description – supplementary form]* Bus Reliability - Noise – Slight beneficial LAQ – Slight beneficial GHG– Slight beneficial Water Environment – Slight adverse

In your view do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?
Induced traffic, due to future housing developments, or beyond what the VDM model predicts, could erode the benefit – which is sensitive to underlying traffic growth.

Value for Money Statement

Taking into consideration the monetised and non-monetised benefits and costs, does the scheme represent good value for money?
Low (Central case BCR = 1.32)

Risk

What are the most significant risks and is there evidence that these risks are being mitigated?
Top 5 risks on the risk log, with their mitigations, are:

1. **Utilities** – cost of diversions; delays & disruption to scheme

   Mitigation: Obtain C3/C4 estimates; challenge utility company betterment; get street works involved future maintenance; investigate BMBC discount; Request utilities co-ordination in Employer's Requirement; insist on contractor being pro -active; set up early meeting with Stats as part of lead-in; provide contactor with all necessary details; consider anti-claim agreement; build Traffic Management and builders work into main contractors package; plot all utilities on one drawing

2. **Land Purchase and access**

   Mitigation: Early engagement with landowners; objections or tracking down landowners may be an issue – a CPO not a practical option to resolve as it would make the scheme undeliverable, however, it is usual practice to retain this option as it is helpful during negotiations.
   Another option would be to amend the design to avoid any such issues.

3. **Public objections** after consultations; ecology activists

   Mitigation: Work with planners to overcome objections; consult with police on road safety and highway matters; dialogue with community groups

4. **SCR approval time for OBC/FBC**. Compliance with the SCR TCF approval process may delay Contract award and put added strain on the programme. It may also mean that Contractors may decline to tender or over price their submissions.

   Mitigation: Continuing engagement with SCR; keep SCR regularly updated on progress.

5. **Stability of retaining wall** and other existing structures adjacent to bridge - including accidental wheel loading over service bays

   Mitigation: Commission full structural survey; regular dialogue with BMBC Bridge Engineers.

The applicant states that there is full support for the scheme from all involved stakeholders.

Risks are documented in the risk log, and have been individually priced. Section 7.9 in OBC form needs to be completed to reflect this. Land acquisition from third parties, and statutory diversions are recognised as significant risks to both costs and delivery timescales (in relation to TCF limitations).

Do the significant risks require any contract conditions? (e.g. clawback on outcomes)
No, but further work is required at FBC

Are there any significant risks associated with securing the full funding of the scheme?
The applicant should confirm the source and readiness of ITB and public match funding.

Are there any key risks that need to be highlighted in relation to the procurement strategy?
Greater detail on third party land acquisition, risks, and number of negotiations required to acquire land will be needed as the scheme matures to FBC

Delivery

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

Yes – It is understood that bridge works are anticipated to commence immediately in line with the start on site date. Highways geometry has been approved in principle by BMBC, with Stage 2 design submitted to BMBC for formal comment/ acceptance. TM limitations are still to be established with BMBC, which will be included in tender documents to allow the selected contractor to develop their costs and phasing plans.

Understood that a comms plan has been developed, but the consultation process has been delated by Purdah (awaiting confirmation from Mayoral office that SYPTE can proceed).

Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?
Design and contract administration utilising SYPTE frameworks.

The main works procurement process for Phase 1 is scheduled to run from 08/11/21 to 01/06/22. Currently the SCAPE public procurement framework is under consideration. This allows for full FBC approval.

The main works procurement dates for Phase 2 run from 29/11/2021 to 01/06/2022. It is proposed that BMBC's own Highways Delivery Team carry out this scheme subject to agreement.

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%; Yes; Yes.

Has the promoter demonstrated clear project governance and identified the SRO?
Yes - Effective governance structures have already been established. The TCF programme structure is provided in Appendix D. The specific A61 Wakefield Road project structure is outlined in Appendix E, with the Senior Responsible Officer being the SYPTE's Director of Transport Operations. The Project Management Roles and Responsibilities are shown in Appendix F.

Engineering consultants are already appointed for the design of the scheme.

Consultants have also been appointed to carry out the cost management and contract administration.

Has the SRO or other appropriate Officer signed of this business case?
No

Has public consultation taken place and if so, is there public support for the scheme?
No. Planned to take place between 7th May – 2nd July 2021

Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?
No. The applicant references the SCR evaluation plan for all TCF schemes, but does not propose specific monitoring and evaluation of impacts for this scheme. It is understood that a scheme-specific A61 Wakefield Road Bus Corridor Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Plan will be developed for FBC.

Legal

Has the scheme considered Subsidy Control compliance or does the promotor still need to seek legal advice?
State Aid is not applicable to the scheme.

Recommendation and Conditions

Recommendation	Proceed to Full Business Case
Payment Basis	Defrayal
Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)	

The following requirements must be satisfied as part of FBC:

6. Detail of how this scheme will link with T003 A61 Active Travel and how it will comply with LTN 1/20 and SCR guidance on cycle scheme design;

7. Consideration of benefits/disbenefits for people walking and cycling to tie in with any work to refine the cycling scheme designs to ensure they comply with SCR and LTN1/20 cycling design guidance, and to clarify the role, function and delivery timescale for the of the off-carriageway cycle route proposed through the adjacent development site;

8. Clarification over the form and nature of re-provisioned crossings and the impact upon pedestrians of extended ‘green’ time for vehicular traffic along this section of the A61;

9. Reconsideration of whether scope exists to afford greater priority for bus passengers and active travellers;

10. Outline costs for other options;

11. Detail regarding assumptions/link between the probability/impact scores and the costs assigned to each risk;

12. Confirmation that P50 cost excludes risks to the promoter;

13. More detail on third party land acquisition/usage costs, and the status of negotiations and specifically whether the £150,000 of risk allowed for land acquisition from Asda (giving a total value of £225,000) is considered sufficient;

14. Clarification over timescales for securing ITB and public match funding;

15. Some stats costs (even based on C2s) could be included at 6.2. (If works don’t happen, it is assumed that money (minus admin) would be returned) and

16. A scheme-specific A61 Wakefield Road Bus Corridor Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Plan.