



Assurance Summary

Scheme Details

Project Name	T0017/3 Bennethorpe to Hallgate (South Parade) Cycleways OBC	Type of funding	Grant
Grant Recipient	DMBC	Total Scheme Cost	£923,753
MCA Executive Board	Transport	MCA Funding	£923,753
Programme name	TCF	% MCA Allocation	100%

Appraisal Summary

Project Description	
<p><i>Is it clear what the MCA is being asked to fund?</i> Yes, section 2.2 states: “The scheme will provide off road cycle facilities along both sides of the carriageway, running from the South Parade / Thorne Road junction to the Bennethorpe / Roman Road junction. Along the south side of South Parade the 2.0m wide cycleway will be set back from the carriageway and run along Hall Cross Hill, a quiet cul-de-sac which provides on street parking to adjacent buildings. Along the north side of South Parade the scheme provides an off road 2.0m wide cycleway with a 3m wide bi-directional cycleway between Town Fields and a proposed new toucan crossing. The bi-directional section allows connectivity with the proposed new Unity cycle scheme package, in order to take cyclists safely across the carriageway and into the town centre. The package will deliver the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1km of new segregated walking and cycling infrastructure • 1 new toucan crossing 	
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> Yes. The scheme is part of a strategy to break down some of the barriers in developing a coherent network of active travel routes including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor quality or non-existent cycle facilities • Poor quality or non-existent crossing facilities • Incoherent routes to key facilities and/or existing active travel routes.
<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>Section 3.2 adequately describes how the proposed scheme aligns with the relevant SEP and TCF aims i.e.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active Travel – to develop further a coherent network of active travel routes across SCR, but focusing initially between the areas of transport poverty and the areas of opportunity, the main urban centres and those corridors with the greatest opportunity for mode shift.

	<p>Section 3.3 indicates that the scheme aligns with other policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LCWIP • Active Travel Implementation Plan within the 2019 Transport Strategy • Doncaster Inclusive Growth Strategy 		
<i>Contribution to Carbon Net Zero</i>	<p><i>Does this scheme align with the strategic objective to achieve Carbon Net Zero?</i> Yes – although effects are slight.</p>		
<i>SMART scheme objectives</i>	<p><i>State the SMART scheme objective as presented in the business case.</i> Section 3.6 presents the principal objectives as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To effect 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. Achieved by increasing the number of cyclists using South Parade by 68%. • To create a cultural shift towards making cycling and walking the natural choice for shorter journeys. Achieved by increasing the number of walking and cycling trips along South Parade by 68%. <p><i>Is there a 'golden thread' between the strategic objectives (see 3.2) and the scheme objectives (see 3.6)?</i> The strategic objectives are to improve the network; the scheme targets an area of the network where it is most likely to do this as well succeed in stimulating demand for cycling where it is already significant.</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> Yes. The LCWIP work developed an indicative programme of cycling and walking improvements across the SCR by identifying key cycle desire lines and two corridor level maps per local authority area, highlighting the preferred route and feeder areas for further development. This work was used to develop the initial options for the active travel elements of this bid where they overlap with the priority corridors and/or provide connections to the rail network.</p> <p>The assessor raised a number of queries related to the design and the method of developing the design.</p> <p>The promoter has responded providing surety that the characteristics and features of the design are appropriate and have been developed following a sifting process, at SOBC.</p>		
<i>Statutory requirements and adverse consequences</i>	<p><i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i> TROs only <i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i> Potentially yes. Business stakeholders may object to the reduced on-street parking. There may be minor delays at the proposed toucan crossing.</p>		
Value for Money			
Core monetised Benefits	[Core BCR – table 4.22] 1.94	Non-monetised and wider economic benefits	[Values/description – supplementary form] Slight positive: Noise, LAQ, GHG
<p><i>In your view do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?</i> Some risk – BCR falls to 1.33 with low AT demand plus 25% reduction in uplift plus 15% cost increase.</p>		<p><i>Do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?</i> No</p>	

The assessor is concerned that no attempt has been made to validate the census data used to estimate daily demand. It is required that available ATC data be used instead, for the FBC

Value for Money Statement

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

Yes

Risk

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

Risk	Mitigation	Owner
1. Delays in funding and SCR MCA approval and Funding Agreement sign-off: Potential delay to start of works as cannot order materials at risk 25% probability High risk	Work with SCR to prepare draft FA documents to reduce approval timescale	Major Projects
2. Failure to consult, engage and inform stakeholders (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 High risk	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.	Major Projects / Corporate Communications
3. Traffic Regulation Orders: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 High risk	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	Major Projects
4. Delays due to ongoing COVID-19 restrictions: Impact on site management while delivering package adhering to social distance rules for workers 50% probability Medium risk	Workers maintain social distancing Limited measures can be undertaken due to proposed site and works involved	Contractor
5. Increased competition for resources across SCR TCF programme: Lack of available resources means a reduced ability to deliver within TCF timescales and potentially additional cost 20% probability Medium risk	Early contractor engagement	Major Projects / Contractor

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?

Yes - it is optimistic /risky to start the procurement process before funding /TRO surety (Nov 22) and complete 1-2 months after then.

Delivery

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

It's optimistic.

Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?

Yes. Yes

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% - but not based on this scheme. It would be expected to be higher – and indeed at 90% for FBC.

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

Yes.

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

No

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

No. Unknown

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

Recommendation	Approved for FBC
Payment Basis	Defrayal
Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)	
FBC should include: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• ATC data on cycle use on this corridor be used for baselining and AMATs re-run• Updated scheme drawing with legend, if not supplied earlier• the total quantity of reduced car parking spaces;• the impact of the proposed Toucan crossing,• results of consultation with businesses affected,• updated/corrected risk register,• updated/corrected section 4.22,• completed DIA (accidents, severance, accessibility).	

