

Assurance Summary



Scheme Details

Project Name	T0017/2 – Doncaster College to Doncaster Station - FBC	Type of funding	Grant
Grant Recipient	DMBC	Total Scheme Cost	£418,850
MCA Executive Board	Transport	MCA Funding	£418,850
Programme name	TCF	% MCA Allocation	100%

Appraisal Summary

Project Description	
<i>Is it clear what the MCA is being asked to fund?</i> Unchanged since OBC –improvements to the walk link between the Interchange and College.	
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>The scheme fits well with the SEP, the Transport Strategy, the TCF programme and national policies to encourage urban living and active travel. Specifically: <i>“ the College have complained about the safety of the working route to the station. Some students have even said that they hire taxis for what is a 5-10 minute walk. A letter of support from the College notes that a consultation with students was undertaken into the issues surrounding the route in 2019 and their comments have fed into the design of the works. Investment has been also prioritised in this area to extend the reach of the high-quality walking and cycling infrastructure in the Town centre.”</i> (source: Doncaster TCF College to Station OBC v2.0 200421).</p> <p>The scheme will see improvements made for pedestrians from Doncaster College to Doncaster Interchange along Grey Friars Road and will help provide students and staff with a more attractive active travel route along with greater security. The underpass lighting will be upgraded to detect when in use, saving energy as well as providing greater reassurance to users. No change in cycling demand is expected.</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>The scheme is promoted as a key part of plans to achieve these aims. The need for the scheme has been related to results from an informal consultation exercise of key users (students) which is now attached to the submission (Appendix 1). The issues are listed as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Lighting issues and intimidating, unclean environment particularly under the bridge.</i> • <i>Security and safety concerns particularly related to individuals begging</i> • <i>Better/safer crossing facilities on Grey Friars Road.</i> • <i>Improvement of facilities to improve mobility and access for disabled students;</i>
<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>Yes. The walking uplift expected will very slightly reduce the amount of Noise and carbon emissions from road traffic, according to the AMAT tool.</p>
<i>SMART scheme objectives</i>	<p><i>State the SMART scheme objective as presented in the business case.</i> <i>Is there a ‘golden thread’ between the strategic objectives (see 3.2) and the scheme objectives (see 3.6)?</i></p> <p>The Applicant has set out two broad SMART objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To create a cultural shift towards making cycling and walking the natural choice for shorter journeys

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To achieve the above in ways that address current health issues and improve air quality across the SCR. <p>Outputs are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1600 sq m of improved walking infrastructure 300 sq m of new walking infrastructure 2 junction improvements to benefit pedestrians. <p>Outcomes (measurable)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> More walking and cycling journeys Improved air quality. <p>Distributional Impact Analysis now complete. This showed that the area around the scheme has a higher than average proportion of one or multiple vulnerable socio-demographic groups likely to use the route and benefit from increased personal security and safety as well as from the improved accessibility provided.</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> <p>Yes. Applicant has completed an options assessment, which includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A high level sift, primarily around geographical fit and deliverability within the TCF timeframe A more detailed sift, using the Department for Transport's Early Assessment Sifting Tool. further refinement of the assessment based on more detailed delivery factors and benefits analysis factoring in changes to SCR Active Travel standards to further prioritise specific scheme element 																										
<i>Statutory requirements and adverse consequences</i>	<p><i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i></p> <p>No. Cabinet approval granted July 2021 (according to the bid) Temporary TROs during works. Could be a need for permanent.</p> <p><i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i></p> <p>No. The promoter states <i>"short term disruption to local businesses and the transport network during construction 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."</i> In operation it is likely that the scheme will have minimal impact on other road users.</p>																										
Value for Money																											
Core monetised Benefits	<p>Following engagement with the promoter, the uplift factor has now been reduced from 30% to 9.6% and the BCR is now 1.45. Benefits (in 2010 market prices and values) comprise:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="450 1142 1095 1474"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>£000</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Congestion benefit</td> <td>13.18</td> <td>3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Infrastructure maintenance</td> <td>0.04</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Accident</td> <td>1.24</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Local air quality</td> <td>0.22</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Noise</td> <td>0.08</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Greenhouse gases</td> <td>0.30</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Reduced risk of premature death</td> <td>249.03</td> <td>59%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		£000	%	Congestion benefit	13.18	3%	Infrastructure maintenance	0.04	0%	Accident	1.24	0%	Local air quality	0.22	0%	Noise	0.08	0%	Greenhouse gases	0.30	0%	Reduced risk of premature death	249.03	59%	Non-monetised and wider economic benefits	<p><i>[Values/description – supplementary form]</i></p> <p>Moderately beneficial: Severance</p>
	£000	%																									
Congestion benefit	13.18	3%																									
Infrastructure maintenance	0.04	0%																									
Accident	1.24	0%																									
Local air quality	0.22	0%																									
Noise	0.08	0%																									
Greenhouse gases	0.30	0%																									
Reduced risk of premature death	249.03	59%																									

Absenteeism	53.01	13%
Journey ambience	106.37	25%
Indirect taxation	-0.87	0%
PVB	422.57	100%

Source: 129 Doncaster Station to College - Preferred Option (Core Scenario) summary sheet
The PVC reported in the AMAT result has OB input as well as base costs. This is an error as the tool ,adds OB internally. So the true PVC is £16,000 lower than the reported value (PVC=£303,470), which increases the core scenario BCR from 1.39 to **1.45**.

In your view do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?

The revised BCR has been tested, by the Assessors, for a range of uncertainties. As shown below:

Test	BCR
Covid (25% reduction in uplift)	1.16
No Uplift in demand	0.35
Cost increase +15%	1.26
25% uplift red plus 15% cost increase	1.01

Value for Money Statement

Taking into consideration the monetised and non-monetised benefits and costs, does the scheme represent good value for money?

The uplift used in the original submission was based on a case study that was later considered over-optimistic and an alternative estimate (9.6%) has been agreed by the promoter. The OBC and AMAT calculations have now been revised by the promoter.

Risk

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

The key risks from a delivery perspective relate to public consultation, working practices during COVID and skills shortages. The promoter has put forward adequate management and mitigation measures.

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% TCF funded

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

Competition for resources across the TCF programme could add to delay and cost. Any cost increases to be funded by promoter.

Delivery

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

Yes.

Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?

Yes – DLO to be used

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%. This is as expected for an OBC. Financial case says if unforeseen risk eventuate these will be covered by the Council.

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

Yes. No.

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. Elected members advised of proposal, College has provided letter of support, adjacent businesses, cyclists and disability groups will be engaged

Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?

Yes, a clear and comprehensive approach, with a detailed BRP, to be managed at Programme level has been outlined.

Legal

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

The promoter has stated that the proposed works do not affect trade between member states and therefore State Aid rules do not apply. (As for most transport infrastructure)

Recommendation and Conditions

Recommendation	Approval to proceed to contract
Payment Basis	Defrayal
Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)	
Prior to contract execution - <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Appendix A and B (Cash flows and Value contribution)• SRO signature on FBC	
Conditions in contract – <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Standard clawback	

