

Assurance Summary



Scheme Details

Project Name	O0048 SCC Netheredge Crookes ATN OBC	Type of funding	Grant
Grant Recipient	SCC	Total Scheme Cost	£795,154
MCA Executive Board	TEB	MCA Funding	£795,154
Programme name	ATF/Gainshare	% MCA Allocation	100%

Appraisal Summary

Project Description

Is it clear what the MCA is being asked to fund?

Not entirely, because this is promoted as a community project with details to be decided through a consultation process which will inform the design. Based on requests and comments received by the Council over many years it will; probably consist of point closures, improved crossing points for pedestrians, one-way streets, restricted access for cars etc.

Breakdown of spend per A2:

	2021/22
Preparatory Cost	£50,900
Professional Fees (Consultation)	£16,333
Acquisition of Land/ Buildings	
Delivery Cost construction materials construction costs, including traffic management costs etc. (A detailed Bill of quantities will be appended to the FBC)*	£561,921
Vehicles, Plant, Equipment	
Risk Allowance/ Contingency	£166,000
Inflation	
Other	
Total	£795,154

* Further detail of the delivery cost was supplied 9/9:

C2/3/4 utility searches / Topo surveys, project management costs	£79,000
Construction, temp traffic management, traffic counts and parking counts	£445,000
road safety audits	£5,000
SCC staff time	£32,921

The precise scope and content of the interventions is to be determined, so cost is very uncertain.

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 – to reduce car dependency for short distance trips.</p>
<i>Strategic policy fit</i>	<p><i>How well does the scheme align with the strategic objectives of the SEP and RAP?</i> Adequately – the scheme should contribute to 2 Strategic outcomes – Fairer by increasing opportunities for safer, active travel and Greener by reduced ICE traffic. Contribution to Growth depends more on the extent of unintended and unmodelled traffic congestion resultant from re-routing.</p>
<i>Contribution to Carbon Net Zero</i>	<p><i>Does this scheme align with the strategic objective to achieve Carbon Net Zero?</i> Yes</p>
<i>SMART scheme objectives</i>	<p><i>State the SMART scheme objective as presented in the business case.</i> Short term Improve cycling environment -> number/length of facilities -> reduced casualties (Stats19 records) Improve access to key city centre destinations for all modes-> number/length of facilities -> increased GVA (ONS stats) Long term Create a cultural shift to cycling -> number/length of facilities -> increased bike/reduced car trips (counts) Part of city-wide AT network (as above) <i>Is there a 'golden thread' between the strategic objectives (see 3.2) and the scheme objectives (see 3.8)?</i> Yes – as above</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> There is no OAR and a long list of options has not been formally defined and appraised, due to the timescale of the funding allocation and required spend. The scheme includes detailed interactive public consultation (with Counter Context, who specialise in this) to determine the design of the scheme, with no hard and fast proposals upfront. Costs are therefore indicative and, as the promoter acknowledges, a maximum within which the scheme must fit. Lower and higher cost options are presented <u>that show higher returns</u> than the preferred option but the higher cost option may be impractical in the timescale (involving permit parking) or unmonetized disbenefits (for the lower cost alternative).</p>
<i>Statutory requirements and adverse consequences</i>	<p><i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i> Potentially TRO's. <i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i></p>

Yes, adjoining roads may see an increase in traffic and removal/relocation of residential parking may be opposed. This will be monitored and mitigation measures will be considered.

Value for Money

Core monetised Benefits	<i>[Core BCR – table 4.22]</i> 3.99	Non-monetised and wider economic benefits	<i>[Values/description – supplementary form]</i> Enviro impacts Slight beneficial: Noise, LAQ and GHG. No DIA carried out.
-------------------------	---	---	--

In your view do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?
No, on balance, although cycling base counts not done – census data and PCT used instead.
 The 2 parts of the scheme are presented with separate AMATs to reflect local conditions and differing baseline positions and uplifts. Reducing demand uplifts by 25% and increasing OB to 30% (together) reduces the BCR to 2.99.
 The promoter has committed to installing new counters to measure traffic flows, at least “with” the scheme but if timescales allow, to set baselines.

Do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?
They shouldn’t, if local public supports the measures in practice not just in theory. Rerouting unwanted traffic could counteract these benefits, but promoter hopes some traffic disappears.

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?

No.	Risk	Likelihood (High, Med, Low)	Impact (High, Med, Low)	Mitigation
1	Traffic management restrictions result in a delivery programme which cannot be accommodated within the funding timescales.	low	low	Early consultation with Traffic Management team – book road space
2	Unusual design features requested as part of community consultation result in concerns raised in the Road Safety Audit; create design difficulties or result in reluctance in adoption of the works under the PFI impacting on budget and programme.	med	med	Identify and flag up areas of potential concern at the earliest opportunity.
3	Unexpected Utilities' costs. Risk of delay and cost overrun.	med	med	Request C2, C3 and C4 stats and trial hole estimates as early as possible.
4	Delivery timescales slip Impact on scope and deliverability. Programme delays.	high	high	Review scope of project
5	Insufficient access to materials and resources. Competition from other projects being delivered locally through TCF, HOTC2, etc. Project delays impact on delivery timescales	med	high	Monitor and assess impact on programme. Consider in cost plan. Broaden supply chain if necessary

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?

No

Delivery

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

No – consultation will need to complete mid-Sept (NOW) to allow detailed design/costing in Sept/October and procurement started in time to commence work in Jan 22. Slippage likely to be 1 month+ from OBC timeline.

Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?

Yes – via existing contractor, AMEY

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?

30% - Not adequate by TCF/GS standards, but a feature of the EATF stream that schemes not worked up in any detail prior to the announcement.

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

Yes, although the organogram is illegible. **Yes (TFS)**

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

Yes – TFS.

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

Underway

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	Proceed to FBC
Payment Basis	Defrayal
Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)	
FBC to provide:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 95% cost certainty• Legible organogram• Indication of when local baseline counts will be available	

