



Assurance Summary

Scheme Details

Project Name	O0046 A630 Conisbrough to Warmsworth Cycle Superhighway	Type of funding	Grant
Grant Recipient	DMBC	Total Scheme Cost	£999,924
MCA Executive Board	TEB	MCA Funding	£999,924
Programme name	ATF2	% MCA Allocation	100%

Appraisal Summary

Project Description	
<p><i>Is it clear what the MCA is being asked to fund?</i></p> <p>Yes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2km of new cycling infrastructure • 2km of improved walking infrastructure • 1 junction improvement to benefit non-car modes. • 1 Toucan crossing • Improved cycle storage within Conisbrough and Warmsworth • Improved street lighting along the active travel corridor 	
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 response is clear that the funds would enable DMBC to provide a 2km bi-directional cycle track with pedestrian improvements and a new crossing. The submission explains what the project is expected to deliver; a new active travel facility which will enable active travel journeys between Conisbrough and Warmsworth.</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>Partially - the proposed scheme supports the objectives set out in the SEP, but does not discuss the RAP. However, the response at Section 2.5 does briefly indicate which outcomes derived from SEP and RAP are supported by the proposed scheme - albeit the level of detail provided is limited and unquantified.</p>
<i>Contribution to Carbon Net Zero</i>	<p><i>Does this scheme align with the strategic objective to achieve Carbon Net Zero?</i></p> <p>No evidence is provided within the Strategic Case as to the extent to which carbon would be reduced by the scheme. This is required for the FBC.</p>
<i>SMART scheme objectives</i>	<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 3.6)?</i></p> <p>No - the objectives set out under 2.4 are not SMART. For example the objective "More walking and cycling journeys across the SCR" is not scheme specific nor measurable. The provision of counters as stated in the latest version, is essential but their position, timescale for usage and the interpretation of results, particularly concerning trip purpose, needs to be stated. If this is to be managed centrally then this should also be agreed and reported in the FBC.</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- There is a clear rationale for the selection of short-listed options. The principal options available to the promoter (without acquiring new land) have been considered.</p>		
Statutory requirements and adverse consequences	<p><i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i></p> <p>TROs only.</p> <p><i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i></p> <p>No adverse consequences are identified within the submission which could not be addressed through conventional engagement and engineering processes. For example, there may be some short- term disruption to local businesses and the transport network during construction of the elements of the package.</p>		
Value for Money			
Core monetised Benefits	<p><i>[Core BCR – table 4.22]</i></p> <p>2.00</p>	Non-monetised and wider economic benefits	<p><i>[Values/description – supplementary form]</i></p> <p>High and Positive effect claimed for:</p> <p>LAQ</p> <p>Accessibility</p>
<p><i>In your view do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?</i></p> <p>No. The AMAT assessment followed guidance and results are reasonable. Counts in Jun 2021 indicate substantial demand exists already and the uplifts are based on similar scheme/area results. However, it is not clear if the comparators are appropriate. If only 75% of the forecast uplift is achieved, the BCR drops to 1.03. There is thus a good chance that at least medium value for money will be achieved, but more surety is required for FBC</p>		<p><i>Do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?</i></p> <p>No. But further work is needed to quantify these for FBC.</p>	
Value for Money Statement			
The scheme has the potential to generate twice its cost in terms of monetizable social benefit.			
Risk			
<p><i>What are the most significant risks and is there evidence that these risks are being mitigated?</i></p> <p>Lack of public support continuous engagement with stakeholders is in place</p> <p>COVID restrictions – little can be done</p> <p>Increasing competition for resources – early contractor involvement is planned (is this relevant with the DLO?)</p> <p><i>Do the significant risks require any contract conditions? (e.g. clawback on outcomes)</i></p> <p>No</p> <p><i>Are there any significant risks associated with securing the full funding of the scheme?</i></p> <p>No</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			
<p><i>Is the timetable for delivery reasonable and has the promoter identified opportunities for acceleration?</i></p> <p>Yes - commencement now stated to be in November.</p> <p><i>Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?</i></p> <p>Yes, DLO to be used for civils</p> <p><i>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?</i></p>			

75%, Yes, Yes.

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

Yes

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

Yes

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

Yes

Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?

Not clearly.

Legal

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

Yes

Recommendation and Conditions

Recommendation

Proceed to FBC

Payment Basis

Defrayal

Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)

Required for FBC -

- An assessment of local air quality impacts in terms of emission reduction at peak times and quantification of carbon reduction impacts;
- More surety that the demand uplifts used are appropriate to this case;
- scheme targets for the scheme need to be made SMART and reference made to the M & E plan and
- detailed design to clarify location of toucan crossing
- FBC to note that ongoing maintenance costs are to be met by the promoter

