



Assurance Summary

Scheme Details

Project Name	T0014 West of Doncaster Active Travel Link	Type of funding	Grant
Grant Recipient	DMBC	Total Scheme Cost	£4,520,631
MCA Executive Board	TEB	MCA Funding	£4,520,631
Programme name	TCF	% MCA Allocation	100%

Appraisal Summary

Project Description

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

Yes. In 2.2:

*“In **Balby** the scheme will provide a combination of off-road cycle facilities and on road quiet ways, in particular enabling cyclists to avoid and cross Balby Road by using a quieter route that runs parallel towards the Doncaster Town Centre. The scheme will also link cycles to Balby from neighbouring villages along segregated cycle facilities enabling more residents from Conisbrough, Warmsworth, Loversall and Wadworth a safer, more appealing cycle into the town centre. The scheme aims to take advantage of the existing high levels of walking and cycling in Balby, which is located within one mile of the town centre and is ideal to enable more active travel commuting journeys.*

*Around **Mexborough** the scheme will improve active travel links in and around the town, providing an off-road link from the town to the Trans Pennine Trail. Until recently usage of the Trans Pennine Trail has been in decline and the proposed scheme aims to continue the work already undertaken to reverse this decline in line with Doncaster Cycling Strategy.*

*The **Edlington** scheme will provide an off-road cycle route which will connect the existing and future planned residential neighbourhoods, to employment opportunities within Warmsworth. The facilities will also provide a route towards the proposed Balby scheme providing connections towards Doncaster town centre.”*

Para 2.3 lists these outputs:

- 11.1km of improved walking and cycling infrastructure
- 4.6km of new walking and cycling infrastructure
- 1 junction improvements to benefit non-car modes.

Strategic Case

Scheme Rationale

Does the scheme have a clearly stated rationale and provide a strong justification for public funding?

Yes.

Para 3.1, “the following are barriers to a coherent network of active travel routes:

- Poor quality or non-existent cycle facilities
- Poor lighting leading to a perception of insecurity
- Insufficient footway width for pedestrians
- Poor quality or non-existent crossing facilities
- Incoherent routes to key education facilities and/or existing active travel routes.”

Strategic policy fit	<p><i>How well does the scheme align with the strategic objectives of the SEP and RAP?</i></p> <p>Para 3.3 describes how the proposed scheme is aligned to local and national policies with reference to NPPF, LCWIP and SCR's Active Travel Implementation Plan.</p>		
Contribution to Carbon Net Zero	<p><i>Does this scheme align with the strategic objective to achieve Carbon Net Zero?</i></p> <p>The scheme is stated to be “key” to achieving Doncaster’s target of an 85% reduction in net greenhouse gas emissions by 2030 and zero by 2050 (para 3.3).</p>		
SMART scheme objectives	<p><i>State the SMART scheme objective as presented in the business case.</i></p> <p>The overall objectives of the TCF programme in Doncaster (per 3.6) are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved connectivity for public transport users, pedestrians and cyclists • Segregated cycle facilities to enable more cycle journey stages • Better connectivity for cyclists • More space for people to feel safe from vehicles. <p>The project’s aims are:</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 the routes 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 the routes by 55% for walking and 68% for cycling. <p><i>“These objectives should be achieved 5 years following completion of the works. 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.”</i></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>Yes.</p>		
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>Yes. It is clear from 3.9 that substantial development work was undertaken in identifying the 2 options taken forward for detailed assessment.</p>		
Statutory requirements and adverse consequences	<p><i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i></p> <p>Yes – TROs.</p> <p><i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i></p> <p>Potentially, yes.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Resistance to the priority given to active travel modes from car users. 2. Short term disruption to local businesses and the transport network during construction. 		
Value for Money			
Core monetised Benefits	<p><i>[Core BCR – table 4.22]</i></p> <p>1.22</p>	Non-monetised and wider economic benefits	<p><i>[Values/description – supplementary form]</i></p> <p>Slight Positive: Noise, LAQ, GHG</p>
<p><i>In your view do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?</i></p> <p>Yes, the BCR would fall to 1.0 if walking uplift is reduced to +25% from the 55% used. (The 55% was based on a Sustrans study.)</p>	<p><i>Do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?</i></p> <p>No</p>		
Value for Money Statement			

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

Low VfM

Risk

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

Apart from approval delay (updated timeline required for FBC):

Risk	Mitigation	Owner
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. Objections to Traffic Regulation Orders: 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: a reduced ability to deliver within TCF timescales and potentially additional cost 25% probability Medium risk	Early contractor engagement	Major Projects / Contractor

Do the significant risks require any contract conditions? (e.g. clawback on outcomes)

No. (although abandonment risk needs considering)

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, although not decided whether in-house or external suppliers to be procured. Risks may be different. Clarity required for FBC. The experience of the Council Team in carrying out similar work is set out in 5.1A.

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.

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?

Yes.

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

Yes.

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?

Some – ward members. Outcome not clear. 7.3 states “6 weeks, to start June 2021” but that period is over. No information given on progress or results.

Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?

Yes.
Legal
<i>Has the scheme considered Subsidy Control compliance or does the promotor still need to seek legal advice?</i>
Yes, No.

Recommendation and Conditions

Recommendation	Approved for FBC
Payment Basis	Defrayal
Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)	
<p>Prior to contract execution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submission of MCA Appendices A <p>The following information is required for FBC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Breakdown of construction costs • 95% cost certainty • Results of public consultation • Likelihood of opposition to the scheme leading to abandonment and cost mitigation • Details designs • Monitoring and Evaluation Plan • Updated timeline • Updated appraisal results with sensitivity tests. 	

