

## Assurance Summary



### Scheme Details

<b>Project Name</b>	O0047 Broom Road cycleways and associated traffic management OBC	<b>Type of funding</b>	Grant
<b>Grant Recipient</b>	RMBC	<b>Total Scheme Cost</b>	£3,000,000
<b>MCA Executive Board</b>	TEB	<b>MCA Funding</b>	£3,000,000
<b>Programme name</b>	ATF2/TCF/Gainshare	<b>% MCA Allocation</b>	100%

### Appraisal Summary

Project Description	
<p><i>Is it clear what the MCA is being asked to fund?</i></p> <p>Yes, but Phase 2 is not adequately defined, with no drawings provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Phase 1 - Wellgate and Broom Road – 650m of street to be provided with cycleways</li> <li>• Phase 2 - Broom Valley Road – <u>one of four options</u>, to be tested at consultation post OBC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Closure of the street to through traffic</li> <li>○ Closure of the street to through traffic except buses</li> <li>○ Provision of type B2 advisory cycle lanes</li> <li>○ Provision of cycle tracks alongside Broom Valley Road</li> </ul> </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> <p><b>Yes. Table 1 sets out the relationship between transport strategy goals and policies, as well as commitments made by the MCA Mayor. Table 2 goes on to demonstrate how the proposed scheme aligns with those goals and objectives.</b></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><b>Section 3.2 asserts that the SCR Transport Strategy is itself aligned with the Strategic Economic Plan.</b></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, but impact is negligible (~0.3% of emissions on Phase 1)</b></p>
<i>SMART scheme objectives</i>	<p><i>State the SMART scheme objective as presented in the business case.</i></p> <p><b>More people cycling.</b></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><b>Yes, objectives are both highly relevant to proposed scheme, and are set out with appropriate timescales. It is recommended, for future interpretation, that a distinction is made between “number of people cycling” and “number of cycle trips” at a certain point. There is a difference between these two measures.</b></p>
<i>Options assessment</i>	<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>

	<b>No – the main criteria for selecting the preferred option was engineering. No public consultation has taken place, contrary to DfT Guidance for transport investment.</b>		
<i>Statutory requirements and adverse consequences</i>	<p><i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i>  <b>TROs only</b>  <i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i>  <b>Yes – Congestion costs at Clifton roundabout have not been monetised. This should be calculated for the FBC if the OBC is approved.</b></p>		
<b>Value for Money</b>			
Core monetised Benefits	<i>[Core BCR – table 4.22]</i> <b>1.07</b>	Non-monetised and wider economic benefits	<i>[Values/description – supplementary form]</i> <b>None quantified</b>
<p><i>In your view do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?</i>  <b>Yes. The cycling and walking uplifts forecasted are reasonable, but more certainty is required for the walking uplifts at FBC, and the promoter should cite more relevant local evidence than he has. The BCR is highly sensitive to this.</b>  <b>Also, the operation of the Clifton Road junction is highly sensitive to the assumptions employed in its modelling, as well as the volume of traffic that is passing through it. The promoter accepts that there are “acceptable” disbenefits considering the benefits of the scheme against a declining trend in traffic levels” but has not monetised them.</b></p>		<p><i>Do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?</i>  <b>Congestion impacts have not been monetised and could render the scheme poor VFM (BCR&lt;1)</b></p>	
<b>Value for Money Statement</b>			
<p><i>Taking into consideration the monetised and non-monetised benefits and costs, does the scheme represent good value for money?</i>  <b>No. Probably Poor taking into account disbenefits to road users.</b></p>			
<b>Risk</b>			
<p><i>What are the most significant risks and is there evidence that these risks are being mitigated?</i>  <b>As regards showstopper and capital cost risks:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Narrow &amp; substandard traffic lanes and footways on part of Broom Road likely to be raised at Road Safety Audit with no alternatives available (showstopper)</b></li> <li><b>2. Unforeseen utility works</b></li> <li><b>3. Works cost not market tested</b></li> <li><b>4. Additional and/or extended tarmac layers at tie-ins or within scheme where lower layers to be retained (Assumptions re: existing build up / infrastructure prove to be optimistic, or where more extensive resurfacing required)</b></li> <li><b>5. Additional night and weekend working required</b></li> </ol> <p><b>The QRA appropriately allocates risks to stakeholders and includes normal mitigation measures</b>  <i>Do the significant risks require any contract conditions? (e.g. clawback on outcomes)</i>  <b>No.</b>  <i>Are there any significant risks associated with securing the full funding of the scheme?</i>  <b>No.</b>  <i>Are there any key risks that need to be highlighted in relation to the procurement strategy?</i>  <b>No. Costs may increase substantially as the scheme is designed in more detail, however an allowance is made in costing for Optimism Bias.</b></p>			
<b>Delivery</b>			

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

**Yes, but he has requested funding for Phase 1 and part of Phase 2 (to be completed in 2022/3). Since Phase 2 has not been defined, costed or appraised the grant should be reduced to cover Phase 1 (completion 2021/22) only, unless Phase 2 can be defined clearly at FBC.**

*Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?*

**Yes. Section 5.1 does describe the approach to procurement; Timescales and milestones are provided at Section 7.1.**

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

**No - Phase 1 - 60%.**

**Phase 2 - 30%**

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

**No.**

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

**Yes, 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?*

**No. The applicant considers that it would raise expectations or upset motorists unduly.**

*Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?*

**Yes.**

## **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 <u>subject to available headroom within the TCF programme</u>
<b>Payment Basis</b>	Defrayal
<b>Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)</b>	
<p>The project is recommended to proceed to FBC however funding is only currently available for ATF2/Gainshare (Phase 1). Alternative funding and business case provisions are required for the phase 2.</p> <p>The FBC should -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. exclude Phase 2, unless justified by robust appraisal to the same standard as that for Phase 1 and funding available;</li><li>2. include contract prices based on detailed designs</li><li>3. include more relevant local evidence (with references) of walking uplifts based on an actual scheme or suite of schemes or examples from other sources than provided in the OBC and</li><li>4. include robust estimates of congestion disbenefits at Clifton Roundabout as a result of the scheme.</li></ol>	

