



## Assurance Summary

### Scheme Details

<b>Project Name</b>	T0028 Unity AT	<b>Type of funding</b>	Grant
<b>Grant Recipient</b>	DMBC	<b>Total Scheme Cost</b>	4,391,562
<b>MCA Executive Board</b>	TEB	<b>MCA Funding</b>	4,391,562
<b>Programme name</b>	TCF	<b>% MCA Allocation</b>	100%

### Appraisal Summary

Project Description	
<i>Is it clear what the MCA is being asked to fund?</i>	
<b>Yes:</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 14.1km of new segregated walking and cycling infrastructure</li> <li>• 2.7km of new cycle quiet streets</li> </ul>	
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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved connectivity for pedestrians and cyclists along the two key corridors into Doncaster leading to 68% uplift in the number of walking and cycling trips.</li> <li>• Segregated cycle facilities to enable more cycle journey stages</li> <li>• Better connectivity for cyclists throughout the entire length of the routes</li> <li>• More space for people to feel safe from vehicles.</li> </ul>
<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>The scheme has a clear strategic rationale shown in section 3.1 which aligns well with SCR's objectives, including improving businesses and lives of residents, key to the SEP objectives, and aligning to TCF objectives.</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><b>Yes</b></p>
<i>SMART scheme objectives</i>	<p><i>State the SMART scheme objective as presented in the business case.</i></p> <p>The package will contribute to the following outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More walking and cycling journeys across the SCR (68% increase)</li> <li>• Increased percentage of population cycling to work (68%).</li> </ul> <p>These outcomes will be expected to be realised between one and five years after completion of the works, are linked to the Mayor's Transport Strategy outcomes and are in accord with the approved SCR programme monitoring and evaluation plan. In order to measure these outcomes a survey will be carried out to collect data on the number of cyclists using the scheme. The survey will be carried out on a weekday in June, both one and five years following completion of the works. The data will feed into the two evaluation reports. Traffic counts will be undertaken at the following locations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thorne Road (between Coventry Grove and Thornhill Avenue)</li> <li>• Leger Way (north of Bennetthorpe / Leger Way/ Bawtry Road roundabout)</li> </ul> <p><i>Is there a 'golden thread' between the strategic objectives (see 3.2) and the scheme objectives (see 3.6)?</i></p>

	<b>Yes.</b>		
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><b>Yes.</b>3.9 describes the previous work done to generate, sift and identify the preferred corridor option that best meets the overall objectives whilst taking account of feasibility, geographic “fit” and local aspirations. The DfT’s EAST tool was used.</p>		
Statutory requirements and adverse consequences	<p><i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i></p> <p><b>No</b></p> <p><i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i></p> <p>The scheme aims to improve the physical environment for pedestrians and cyclists, and whilst there are no significant changes planned for vehicles in any of the elements of the package, <b>there may be some resistance to the priority given to active travel modes from car users</b> given recent publicity around active travel.</p> <p><b>There may be some short-term disruption to local businesses and the transport network during construction</b> of the elements of the package. This will be managed by using a phased approach to the areas of construction, ensuring businesses can operate during normal working / operating hours, and any social distancing measures required by the guidance at the time can be managed and adhered to by the public and contractors.</p>		
<b>Value for Money</b>			
Core monetised Benefits	[Core BCR – table 4.22] <b>1.55</b>	Non-monetised and wider economic benefits	[Values/description – supplementary form] <b>Enviro:</b> <b>Slight Positive</b> – Noise, LAQ, GHG <b>Distri.</b> <b>Positive</b> - Accidents. Severance, Accessibility
<p><i>In your view do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?</i></p> <p><b>No</b>, the scheme drawings provide confidence that the costings are reasonably accurate. Costs in the appraisal include 15% Optimism and 15% residual risk and inflation to 2023, the main risk to the BCR is assessed to be demand. However, the AMAT appraisal was based on local recent counts and is considered robust. There may also be net benefits for car users, which have not been calculated.</p>		<p><i>Do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?</i></p> <p><b>No</b></p>	
<b>Value for Money Statement</b>			
<i>Taking into consideration the monetised and non-monetised benefits and costs, does the scheme represent good value for money?</i>			
<b>Medium VfM</b>			
<b>Risk</b>			
<i>What are the most significant risks and is there evidence that these risks are being mitigated?</i>			
	<b>Risk</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>	<b>Owner</b>
	<b>1. Delays in funding and SCR MCA approval and Funding Agreement sign-off:</b> Potential delay to start of works as cannot order materials at risk 25% probability - <b>High risk</b>	Work with SCR to prepare draft FA documents to reduce approval timescale	Major Projects

<p><b>2. Failure to consult, engage and inform stakeholders</b> (internal and external) in a timely and effective manner: Negative impact on the proposals - lack of buy-in and support from stakeholders for the package requires re-design and/or removal of package elements 20% probability - <b>High risk</b></p>	<p>Engagement will be continuous with key stakeholders, and undertake early consultation with those most directly affected with revised scheme design Corporate Communications team will be involved</p>	<p>Major Projects / Corporate Communications</p>
<p><b>3. Traffic Regulation Orders:</b> Objections to TROs will delay the start of the package and completion dates. Significant objections could result in the scheme being revised downwards and not achieving the desired outputs 25% probability <b>High risk</b></p>	<p>TROs will be prepared and submitted for each individual element of the package. Any objections will be for specific location and minimise the impact of delay of delivery of the package</p>	<p>Major Projects</p>
<p><b>4. Delays due to ongoing COVID-19 restrictions:</b> Impact on site management while delivering package adhering to social distance rules for workers 50% probability <b>Medium risk</b></p>	<p>Workers maintain social distancing Limited measures can be undertaken due to proposed site and works involved</p>	<p>Contractor</p>
<p><b>5. Increased competition for resources across SCR TCF programme:</b> Lack of available resources means a reduced ability to deliver within TCF timescales and potentially additional cost 25% probability <b>Medium risk</b></p>	<p>Early contractor engagement</p>	<p>Major Projects / Contractor</p>

*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 – 100% SCR funding**

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

**No – decision on DLO or commercial will be taken pre FBC (September 2021) and 5.2 states that cost overruns will be covered by the Council.**

### **Delivery**

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

**Yes.** Surveys and planning including public consultation will start before Start on site, which will occur as soon as TRO's are confirmed to minimise risk of abortive spend.

*Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?*

**Not finalised.** The scheme milestones are mapped out in section 7.1 and are realistic for a scheme of this scale.

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

**60%. Ideally higher** but FBC will be based on detailed designs and procurement route will be known.

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

**Yes**

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

**Yes** (per 6.3)

*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** (per 7.3)

*Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?*

**Yes** (per 3.6)

### **Legal**

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

**Yes, No.**

--

## Recommendation and Conditions

<b>Recommendation</b>	Proceed to FBC
<b>Payment Basis</b>	Defrayal
<b>Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)</b>	
<b>Required before a stage 2 contract can be executed -</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Submission of the MCA Appendices A</li></ul>	
<b>The FBC to include -</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A Stage 2 DIA</li><li>• Procurement route finalised</li><li>• 95% cost certainty</li></ul>	

