

Assurance Summary



Scheme Details

Project Name	T0034 River Dearne Long Route Active Travel Scheme OBC	Type of funding	Grant
Grant Recipient	BMBC	Total Scheme Cost	£559,664
MCA Executive Board	TEB	MCA Funding	£559,664
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>The scheme consists of a package of measures which seeks to improve walking and cycling connectivity between A61 Gyratory at Old Mill Lane and A633 Grange Lane via A628 Pontefract Road. The proposal will also incorporate a spur which will improve connectivity to Old Tannery Road. The plans for the scheme are set out in Appendix B and the option appraisal is set out in Appendix J. The list of interventions includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Infrastructure improvements to 2.45km of off-road active travel route and improving widths to accord with LTN 1/20, MCA standards, but in parts built to 4/5 metres in width; ▪ Provision of Toucans crossing at A61 Old Mill Lane; ▪ Improved crossing facilities on Pontefract Road and Grange Lane; ▪ Wayfinding signage; ▪ Improvements to public realm; ▪ Resurfacing improvements; ▪ Improvements to lighting; ▪ Incorporation of a dish channels to the existing steps to allow cyclists to negate level differences in the Dearne Valley Park. <p>MCA funding will cover all preparation, management and monitoring and evaluation costs associated with the scheme.</p>	
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></p> <p>Yes. The proposed scheme has a clear strategic rationale to facilitate a reduction in dependence on private car travel through the provision of new and enhanced active travel infrastructure.</p>
<i>Strategic policy fit</i>	<p><i>How well does the scheme align with the strategic objectives of the SEP and RAP?</i></p>

	<p>Yes. The scheme is well aligned with SCR's transport and environmental objectives, as well as those of SCR's Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) and the objectives of the Transforming Cities Fund (TCF) programme</p>
Contribution to Carbon Net Zero	<p><i>Does this scheme align with the strategic objective to achieve Carbon Net Zero?</i></p> <p>Yes.</p>
SMART scheme objectives	<p><i>State the SMART scheme objective as presented in the business case.</i></p> <p>These are stated to be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To better connect the areas of transport poverty with areas of opportunity in a safe and sustainable way • 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 • To create a cultural shift towards making cycling and walking the natural choice for shorter journeys • To improve the safety of the A61 corridor • To improve air quality and environmental impacts along the corridor <p>The scheme objectives are clearly stated <u>but are not consistent with a scheme of this nature and value</u>. Several appear to be at programme rather than scheme level. Target values should relate to scheme not long-term SCR Transport strategy targets.</p> <p>The OBC should be updated to include short term targets and address other issues raised by the Assessor.</p> <p><i>Is there a 'golden thread' between the strategic objectives (see 3.2) and the scheme objectives (see 3.6)?</i></p> <p>No.</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></p> <p>Yes. Several realistic options have been identified and are presented. These options have subsequently been sifted to identify the preferred option. The reasoning presented for the preferred option appears sound.</p> <p>The Option Appraisal Report (OAR) provided as Appendix J indicates that a qualitative sifting process was used to reduce the number of schemes and that the scheme options were appraised using a modelling tool. For completeness it would be useful to include details of the key stakeholders who fed into the option generation process through the virtual workshop.</p>
Statutory requirements and adverse consequences	<p><i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i></p> <p>Some parts may need planning permission. Expected - November 2021</p> <p>TROs needed as part of detailed design</p> <p><i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i></p> <p>No significant adverse consequences of the scheme going ahead have been identified at this stage. If the scheme goes ahead it is not expected to have a significant impact on the highway network as the preferred option is predominantly off-road.</p> <p>There are expected to be some minor adverse ecological impacts associated with the installation of lighting at points on the route; however, potential adverse impacts on wildlife will be mitigated by limiting the installation of lighting to areas where there is a perception of danger.</p>

Value for Money			
Core monetised Benefits	[Core BCR – table 4.22] 3.23	Non-monetised and wider economic benefits	[Values/description – supplementary form] The applicant suggests moderate positive impacts are expected for greenhouse gas emissions, physical health and wellbeing, and accessibility, with slight positive impacts for noise, local air quality, landscape, journey quality, accidents, security, and severance.
<p>In your view do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?</p> <p>In general, the input values and assumptions used in the modelling seem reasonable. Although the anticipated growth rate for cycling (323%) may be viewed as a little on the high side, advice from SCR officers suggests that this scheme has sufficient similarities to the cited Sustrans case studies that its use is justifiable. The conservative assumption that no pedestrian uplift is anticipated, coupled with the use of sensitivity tests to vary the expected uplift in demand does give a degree of reassurance that the scheme will realise benefits even if the cycle demand achieved is not as high as the growth rate used in the modelling.</p> <p>There is an issue with the PVB, PVC and BCR figures set out in Section 4.22. The AMAT tool outputs for the Grange Lane section of the scheme is 2.72 whilst that of the Old Mill Lane section is 1.43. The combined PVB (1,955.53) divided by the combined PVC (943.88) show a total BCR of 2.07 which is in the ‘High’ Value for Money category set out in DfT’s Value for Money Framework. The numbers should be revised and corrected if this scheme is approved for progression to FBC.</p> <p><u>Aside from the above there appear to be no shortfalls that would threaten the robustness of the scheme appraisal.</u></p>		<p>Do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?</p> <p>Set against these are potential slight adverse impacts for townscape, biodiversity, and water environment, which suggests overall that environmental and social impacts of the scheme will be positive.</p>	
Value for Money Statement			
<p>Taking into consideration the monetised and non-monetised benefits and costs, does the scheme represent good value for money?</p> <p>Yes, albeit further work is required for the FBC (see below)</p>			
Risk			

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

1. **COVID and the impacts – potential issue around delivery of materials, contractors working on site**
2. **Land not dedicated / secured**
3. **Statutory Undertakers Apparatus**
4. **Old Mine Workings**
5. **Failure to identify / ensure that all local access requirements are resolved / met including Rights of Way diversions and private means of access.**

The Quantified Risk Assessment (Appendix E) is comprehensive and the levels of risk appear acceptable. The mitigation/management measures proposed for the risks identified appear appropriate.

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.

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

The applicant has prepared a Benefits Realisation and Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (Appendix A). This is well-structured but requires additional work should the scheme progress to the FBC stage.

Delivery

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

Yes. The scheme milestones are sufficiently mapped out for OBC stage and appear realistic for a scheme of this nature.

Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?

Yes. The proposed works are likely to go to the Direct Labour Organisation. (DLO). This is anticipated to be February 2022.

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%

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

Yes, Yes.

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

Yes.

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

No, but only generic across the borough

Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?

The applicant has prepared a Benefits Realisation and Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (Appendix A). This is well-structured but requires additional work should the scheme progress to the FBC stage.

Legal

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

Yes, No.

Recommendation and Conditions

Recommendation	Proceed to FBC <u>subject to funding availability (currently no headroom in TCF2 programme)</u>
Payment Basis	Defrayal
Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)	
<p>Required before a stage 2 contract can be executed -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Submission of the MCA Appendices A• Funding availability <p>FBC to address detailed concerns raised by Assessor detailed in the business case and assessment.</p>	