

Assurance Summary



Scheme Details

Project Name	T00081&3 City Centre to Attercliffe and Darnall Active Travel OBC	Type of funding	Grant
Grant Recipient	SCC	Total Scheme Cost	£17,999,943
MCA Executive Board	TEB	MCA Funding	£17,999,943
Programme name	TCF	% MCA Allocation	100%

Appraisal Summary

Project Description

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

Yes. This scheme involves the development of a core cycle route connecting the city centre towards Darnall, through Attercliffe and the Advance Manufacturing Park (AMP) corridor. The route also includes a spur to the Olympic Legacy Park, with supporting measures to ensure comfort and safety of cyclists feeding into the core route from adjacent residential and employment areas.

Section 2.3 states that the SCR funds will be used to prepare and design the preferred options and deliver:

improved cycle infrastructure	7.2km
improved pedestrian infrastructure	1.6km
junction improvements	10
new bus lanes	1.4km
Signalised junction improvements	7
bus stop upgrades (shelter, boarders, bus box, etc):	25
segregated cycle track	4.12km
Traffic calming measures	3.6km
pedestrian crossing upgrades	14
segregated cycle crossings:	11

Only a modest reduction in road space is proposed

Strategic Case

<i>Scheme Rationale</i>	<i>Does the scheme have a clearly stated rationale and provide a strong justification for public funding?</i> Yes. The rationale is clear and well evidenced and justifies public funding
<i>Strategic policy fit</i>	<i>How well does the scheme align with the strategic objectives of the SEP and RAP?</i> Fully
<i>Contribution to Carbon Net Zero</i>	<i>Does this scheme align with the strategic objective to achieve Carbon Net Zero?</i> Fully
<i>SMART scheme objectives</i>	<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> Partially. A clearer set of directly measurable targets relating to model results would be a useful improvement in the FBC		
<i>Options assessment</i>	<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> Apparently, although capital costs of non-preferred options are not presented.		
<i>Statutory requirements and adverse consequences</i>	<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> In gross terms Yes. The Assessor states <i>"The proposed reallocation of road space along the A1678 corridor trades improved safety and connectivity for people walking, cycling and using public transport for journeys along this route against maintaining convenient access to/parking immediately outside of some premises and journey times for general motorised traffic..... Enhanced enforcement of existing waiting and loading restrictions along Attercliffe Road (e.g. through the use of Red Routes) will further enhance the safety and journey time reliability for people cycling and using buses along Attercliffe Road, but may cause some minor inconvenience for local businesses that continue to local incorrectly and in contravention to existing restrictions. Construction impacts will be short-term, and mitigated through Traffic Regulation Orders and diversionary routes implemented prior to works commencing."</i>		
Value for Money			
Core monetised Benefits	<i>[Core BCR – table 4.22]</i> 1.16	Non-monetised and wider economic benefits	<i>[Values/description – supplementary form]</i>
<i>In your view do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?</i> There is always risk around a single measure of the BCR. TAG guidance has been followed. Optimism bias of 21% of base costs has been used. The result is sensitive to demand and future traffic levels and the impact of COVID, long term, on travel patterns and modes. The BCR takes full account of likely delays to a greater number of motorists than active travellers on the corridor resulting from the interventions. These are more than offset by the health benefits for the latter and reductions in accidents overall. The BCR seems conservative on the basis that walking 'environment quality' (amenity) benefits have not been appraised, and neither have wider economic benefits associated with the contribution the reprioritised corridor is expected to make in relation to the place function, and economic vitality, of Attercliffe High Street and the area around the Don Valley Bowl/Arena		<i>Do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?</i> No. These have not been appraised but are an upside risk.	
Value for Money Statement			
<i>Taking into consideration the monetised and non-monetised benefits and costs, does the scheme represent good value for money?</i> Medium, but with potential to be high, taking account of non-monetised impacts of improving the environment for people to use the space for purposes other than passing through			
Risk			
<i>What are the most significant risks and is there evidence that these risks are being mitigated?</i> As below. The P50 residual risk is calculated at £2.756m (18% base costs) based on a QRA of the events in the risk register (see Risk register). There is clear awareness of the risks although the full responsibility lies with the client to mitigate. <i>"Levels of risk are considered to be proportionate to the status of the scheme, with clear project management protocols in place to manage identified risks as the scheme progresses – based on SCC's standard processes and its Capital Delivery Service (CDS)."</i> (Assessor's comment)			

Risk <i>[State the risk and identify both its probability and impact on a scale of high-medium-low]</i>	Mitigation <i>[State how you will mitigate the risk]</i>	Owner <i>[State who is responsible for mitigating this risk]</i>
Unexpected commuted sum can't be funded by SCC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to be factored into budget. • Early estimate required to allow discussions ref funding source to take place. • Need to factor into design and seek advice from HMD ref design changes to minimise sums. 	PM
Unexpected Utilities' costs. C2 stats complete shows minimal diversion required however cannot be certain until options finalised and C4's complete.	C2's to be shared with cost manager to allow some initial costing work to be done for contingency purposes. Need to factor in potential programme delay. Estimated costs confirmed by C3 and C4 checks.	PM
Road safety audit (stages 1-3) may identify unforeseen issues that require additional works over and above those already allowed for. (potential for additional crossing points?)	Potential design addition for crossing point	PM
Supply chain issues. Pressure on UK supplies from demand	Investigate supply chain and give advanced warning / pre-order.	PM
Traffic management restrictions result in a delivery programme which cannot be accomodated within the funders timescales.	Early consultation with Traffic Management team. Share draft programme with stakeholders (including HMD) to understand potential impacts and update programme.	Client

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. D&B contract to be tendered Jan 22.

Works assumed to be permitted development, so no Planning consent required. No match funding, no additional land.

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 – Appendix MC9 (Critical Path) provides a clear project delivery plan with milestones that are commensurate with the current stage of scheme design. There is some uncertainty as to when construction will commence (February and April 2023 are variously mentioned), but it is understood that SCC's intention is to commence construction prior to the end of March 2023 - subject to detailed design and engagement of design contractors in January 2022.

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% Yes – unless de-scoped, from additional non-secured funding sources. Any currently unforeseen risks, that emerge pre FBC can be managed but thereafter are a risk to the achievement of expected benefits. For this reason the scope has been broken down into coherent packages.

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

Yes. Appendix MC7 gives this information, although it would be useful to have clarity in the OBC document

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. Detailed in Section 7.11

Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?

Yes. Detailed in Section 7.12. However *“Post implementation monitoring makes reference to counts, travel time and catchment analysis, and user/non-user surveys, but these are not directly linked to a set of SMART targets that are expressed quantitatively (in line with the anticipated benefits forecast in the economic appraisal for the*

scheme), as noted on previous comments. It is understood that the Promoter intends to develop these in conjunction with its preferred Design and Build contractor, and recommended that targets are developed based upon the outcome and benefit targets expressed section 7.14.” (Assessor report)

Legal

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

Yes. No

Recommendation and Conditions

Recommendation	Proceed to FBC
Payment Basis	Defrayal
Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Clarity on construction start dates• A set of directly measurable targets• Show base costs, residual risks, OB values in in table 3.• A full DIA• At FBC the TCF grant will be capped at £15.3m which is maximum amount available.	

