



## Assurance Summary

### Scheme Details

<b>Project Name</b>	T00082 Magna-Tinsley OBC  AKA: Bawtry Road (Brinsworth to Tinsley) Waverley AMP Active Travel Scheme	<b>Type of funding</b>	Grant
<b>Grant Recipient</b>	SCC	<b>Total Scheme Cost</b>	£5,276,350
<b>MCA Executive Board</b>	TEB	<b>MCA Funding</b>	£5,276,350
<b>Programme name</b>	TCF	<b>% MCA Allocation</b>	100%

### Appraisal Summary

Project Description	
<p><i>Is it clear what the MCA is being asked to fund?</i> Yes.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Sheffield Road cycle tracks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ New unidirectional cycle tracks on both sides of Sheffield Road between the Sheffield/Rotherham district boundary and Blackburn Meadows Way</li> <li>○ Upgrade and widening of footpaths on Sheffield Road</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. <b>Blackburn Meadows Way</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Upgrade of the existing shared use infrastructure to provide traffic-free, segregated and safe infrastructure for both pedestrians and cyclists along this road</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. <b>New toucan crossings</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provision of a two/three new toucan crossings to provide safe crossing points and reduce levels of severance resulting from the physical and built environment. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Sheffield Road</b> – new crossing from Tinsley Village to the canal towpath. This will allow access to a traffic free route to the opportunities at Meadowhall and accessible from Meadowhall South tram stop</li> <li>- <b>Meadowhall Road/Meadowhall Way</b> – one/two new crossings across the six traffic lanes. This will help remove a severance issue for the National Cycle Network and improve access on foot or by bicycle to Meadowhall Interchange</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ol>	
Strategic Case	
<i>Scheme Rationale</i>	<p><i>Does the scheme have a clearly stated rationale and provide a strong justification for public funding?</i> <b>Yes.</b> The strategic rationale is clear, with a lack of safe walking and cycling infrastructure acting as a deterrent to trips between Sheffield, Meadowhall, Magna and Rotherham. The scheme seeks to address that gap, in combination with others being developed through the TCF programme, by applying LTN 1/20 guidance to establish a flagship walking and cycling route under the M1 Tinsley Viaduct and improve alternatives to driving for local trips in this area as well as the continuity of the route between Rotherham and Sheffield.</p>
<i>Strategic policy fit</i>	<p><i>How well does the scheme align with the strategic objectives of the SEP and RAP?</i> <b>Yes.</b> There is clear alignment with the growth, inclusion and sustainability objectives set out in the SEP, as well as the SCR Transport Strategy and Transforming Cities Fund objectives. The scheme forms part of a combination of interventions that seek to deliver significant components of the City Region's published LCWIP.</p>

Contribution to Carbon Net Zero	<p><i>Does this scheme align with the strategic objective to achieve Carbon Net Zero?</i>  <b>Yes</b>, although not quantified for the strategic case.</p>		
SMART scheme objectives	<p><i>State the SMART scheme objective as presented in the business case.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 0.92km of new segregated cycle track</li> <li>• 0.92km of upgraded cycle track</li> <li>• 0.92km of upgraded footpaths</li> <li>• 2/3 toucan crossings</li> </ul> <p>This needs to be more focussed on outcomes than outputs – e.g. target levels of AT in this location, changes in car use if discernible, impact on safety and journey times for cyclists. The M&amp;E plan (7.14) broadly describe the sources of data for each outcome but not the methodology for the evaluation. However, it is accepted that this will be carried out centrally..</p> <p><i>Is there a 'golden thread' between the strategic objectives (see 3.2) and the scheme objectives (see 3.6)?</i>  <b>No</b>, this is not clearly set out.</p>		
Options assessment	<p><i>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?</i>  <b>Yes</b>. The need for solutions to congestion in this corridor are established, and the options available for increasing active travel's share are well researched.</p>		
Statutory requirements and adverse consequences	<p><i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i>  <b>Only those associated with TROs</b>. The position of SCCs boundary on Blackburn Meadows Way is unclear, and may result in a need for land acquisition. TBC for FBC.  Impact on motorway junction operation has been modelled and is minimal.</p> <p><i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i>  <b>No</b>. If the scheme does <u>not</u> go ahead then an opportunity to improve access to Sheffield, Rotherham, Magna, Meadowhall and local facilities/employment land uses in Tinsley/Templeborough will be missed. Identified potential for mode-shift from private car trips, and releasing capacity on local bus/tram-train services, will not be realised if the scheme is not delivered. If the scheme <u>is</u> implemented there may a minimal impact on the operation of J34N and J34S as a result of the new pedestrian crossings close to Meadowhall. This was not found to be significant through junction assessment using appropriate modelling tools, and has been discussed with Highways England (as key stakeholders).</p>		
<b>Value for Money</b>			
Core monetised Benefits	<p><i>[Core BCR – table 4.22]</i>  <b>1.07</b></p>	Non-monetised and wider economic benefits	<p><i>[Values/description – supplementary form]</i>  <b>Enviro/Social Slight beneficial:</b>  LAQ, GHG, Townscape</p> <p><b>Distributional Positive</b>  Accidents (Stage 2 DIA required for FBC)</p>
<p><i>In your view do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?</i>  Base demand is appropriately estimated, based on a combination of local count ped/cycle data and background growth uplifts since the counts were completed (October 2019) in line with default AMAT assumptions. As with all AT schemes there are uncertainties on the demand side, which the promoter has tested for. Increases in cost are covered by the OB assumed (24% - higher than usual for this stage).  High growth (50% increase) = <b>1.79</b></p>		<p><i>Do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?</i>  <b>No</b>, these are all likely to eventuate</p>	

Low growth (33% red'n) = **0.78**  
 Optimistic COVID (+34% cycling; +38% more walking = **1.59**  
 Pessimistic COVID (-19% cycling; -21% walking) = **0.83**

In all tests, toucan crossing benefits are excluded. Separate modelling indicates accident savings worth £1.05m PVB. This would increase BCRs for all tests to above 1.

**Value for Money Statement**

*Taking into consideration the monetised and non-monetised benefits and costs, does the scheme represent good value for money?*  
**Yes**, probably conservative as ignores weekends and underestimates increasing attractiveness of Meadowhall.

**Risk**

*What are the most significant risks and is there evidence that these risks are being mitigated?*

Risk	Mitigation	Owner
1. Widening behind bus stop on Blackburn Meadows Way may require additional land take – <b>50% likelihood</b>	Investigation into SCC land boundaries ongoing. Alternative design to be investigated if not.	SCC PM/Designer
2. Change in legislation resulting from Brexit may result in materials and supply chain issues – <b>50% likelihood</b>	Suppliers to be approached in advance, advance orders placed and/or alternative materials sought	SCC PM
3. Condition of existing services (lighting standards) may not be adequate and may need moving to accommodate new works – <b>50% likelihood</b>	Lamp standards that require moving to be identified. Light plot of proposed scheme required.	SCC PM/Designer
4. Location of existing services may result in unexpected utilities' costs – <b>50% likelihood</b>	C2 stats complete show minimal disruption required. C2s to be shared with cost manager to allow some initial costing work to be done for contingency purposes. Contingency to also be factored into the potential programme	SCC PM
5. SCR are proposing to hold 10% of the funds for contingency, to be used on a first come first served basis. If delays are experienced in the release of contingency funds the project will experience delays – <b>30% likelihood</b>	Confirm the timescales and process for release of funds from SCR. Maintain relationship with SCR contact Monitor and review scheme costs regularly.	SCC PM

Some risks identified are considerable (top 4 have 50% likelihood), and bring the possibility of cost escalation / need for alternative scheme designs, but are duly priced within the scheme risk register. SCR's retention of 10% of funds for contingency purposes also helps to mitigate some of this risk.

*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**, a contribution from Highways England (not assumed) is being requested – to be confirmed pre FBC

*Are there any key risks that need to be highlighted in relation to the procurement strategy?*

**Delivery**

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

**Slightly optimistic** overall. Note that Stage 2 work commences on site in May 2023, which may not fall within the TCF programme delivery timescales (but may be fine on the basis that Stage 1 work is due to commence in 2022).

*Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?*

**Yes, Yes**

*What is the level of cost certainty and is this sufficient at this stage of the assurance process?*

**60%**. Higher would be better – but risk provision (p50= 7% base costs) excludes inflation which increases the joint provision to 12%. OB higher than normal, to reflect.

*Has the promoter confirmed they will cover any cost overruns without reducing the benefits of the scheme?*

**No** – cost overruns would result in delay to completion whilst other funding sought.

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

**Yes**, a clear plan for project and programme management is laid out  
*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?*

**Yes**, but will continue, with all local interest groups involved.

*Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?*

**Yes, broadly.** More detail will be required for FBC

## Legal

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

**Yes.**

## Recommendation and Conditions

<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Proceed to FBC</b>
<b>Payment Basis</b>	<b>Defrayal</b>
<b>Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)</b>	
<p><b>Required before a stage 2 contract can be executed -</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Submission of the MCA Appendices A</li></ul> <p><b>The following issues should be covered at FBC -</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Confirmation of number of toucan crossings proposed</li><li>- How outcomes will be measured, in detail, with reference to AMAT and central M&amp;E plan</li><li>- Potential contribution from HE with any obligations</li><li>- Need for land/other statutory requirements and impact on project</li><li>- Update of risk register/QRA and correction of small inconsistency between MC11 and 6.1/Appendix F1</li><li>- Sign-off by SRO</li></ul>	

