

Assurance Summary



Scheme Details

Project Name	O0046 A630 Conisbrough to Warmsworth Cycle Superhighway FBC	Type of funding	Grant
Grant Recipient	DMBC	Total Scheme Cost	£999,924
MCA Executive Board	TEB	MCA Funding	£999,924
Programme name	ATF £673,924/Gainshare £326,000	% MCA Allocation	100%

Appraisal Summary

Project Description	
<p><i>Is it clear what the MCA is being asked to fund?</i></p> <p>Yes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2km of new cycling infrastructure • 2km of improved walking infrastructure • 1 junction improvement to benefit non-car modes. • 1 Toucan crossing • Improved cycle storage within Conisbrough and Warmsworth • Improved street lighting along the active travel corridor 	
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>Yes - the response is clear that the funds would enable DMBC to provide a 2km bi-directional cycle track with separate pedestrian improvements and a new toucan crossing. The submission explains what the project is expected to deliver; a new active travel facility which will enable active travel journeys between Conisbrough and Warmsworth.</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>Partially - the proposed scheme supports the objectives set out in the SEP, but does not discuss the RAP. However, the response at Section 2.5 does briefly indicate which outcomes derived from SEP and RAP are supported by the proposed scheme - albeit the level of detail provided is limited and unquantified.</p>
<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</p>
<i>SMART scheme objectives</i>	<p><i>State the SMART scheme objective as presented in the business case.</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>
<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- There is a clear rationale for the selection of short-listed options. The principal options available to the promoter (without acquiring new land) have been considered. A shared (cycling and walking) facility would not encourage walking to the same degree as a</p>

	segregated facility although no attempt has been made to estimate this effect, possibly because the capital costs of a shared lane is expected to be 90% of the capital cost of a segregated one.		
<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> No adverse consequences are identified within the submission which could not be addressed through conventional engagement and engineering processes. For example, there may be some short- term disruption to local businesses and the transport network during construction of the elements of the package.</p>		
Value for Money			
Core monetised Benefits	[Core BCR – table 4.22] 2.00	Non-monetised and wider economic benefits	[Values/description – supplementary form] High and Positive effect claimed for: LAQ Accessibility
<p><i>In your view do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?</i> No. The AMAT assessment followed guidance and results are reasonable. Counts in Jun 2021 indicate substantial demand exists already and the uplifts are based on similar scheme/area results. However, it is not clear if the comparators are appropriate. If only 75% of the forecast uplift is achieved, the BCR drops to 1.03. The key sensitivity is to cycling demand uplift (68%). If walking demand increased by 10% BCR would be 1.72.</p>		<p><i>Do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?</i> No.</p>	
Value for Money Statement			
The scheme has the potential to achieve a high BCR			
Risk			
<p><i>What are the most significant risks and is there evidence that these risks are being mitigated?</i> Lack of public support continuous engagement with stakeholders is in place COVID restrictions – little can be done Increasing competition for resources – early contractor involvement is planned (is this relevant with the DLO?) <i>Do the significant risks require any contract conditions? (e.g. clawback on outcomes)</i> No <i>Are there any significant risks associated with securing the full funding of the scheme?</i> No <i>Are there any key risks that need to be highlighted in relation to the procurement strategy?</i> No</p>			
Delivery			
<p><i>Is the timetable for delivery reasonable and has the promoter identified opportunities for acceleration?</i> Yes - commencement now stated to be in November. <i>Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?</i> Yes, DLO to be used for civils <i>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?</i> 100%, Yes, Yes.</p>			

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

Yes

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

Yes

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

Yes

Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?

Not clearly.

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 Contract
Payment Basis	Defrayal
Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)	
<i>The following conditions must be satisfied before contract execution.</i>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Confirmation that the spend profile provided in Appendix A is correct,2. Agree detailed schedule of inclusive growth indicators and targets (e.g. % of [previously unemployed] locals offered permanent contracts and apprenticeships, mentoring and school engagement and engagement with the local supply chain) to ensure the project delivers wider socio-economic benefits and that these can be captured, monitored and reported.	
The conditions above should be fully satisfied by 06/01/2022. Failure to do so could lead to the withdrawal of approval.	
<i>The following conditions must be satisfied before drawdown of funding.</i>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none">3. Formal confirmation of commitment to address any cost overruns without unduly compromising project outputs and outcomes.	
The following conditions must be included in the contract	
<ol style="list-style-type: none">4. Clawback will be applied on outputs at MCA discretion	

Record of Recommendation, Endorsement and Approval

Project Name

Appraisal Panel Recommendation		Board Endorsement		MCA Approval	
Date of Meeting		Date of Meeting		Date of Meeting	
Head of Paid Service or Delegate	Ruth Adams Deputy CEX	Endorsing Officer (Board Chair)		Approving Officer (Chair)	
Signature		Signature		Signature	
Date		Date		Date	
S73 Officer or Delegate	Gareth Sutton Finance Manager	Statutory Finance Officer Approval			
Signature					
Date					
Monitoring Officer or Delegate	Steve Davenport SCR CA Solicitor				
Signature					
Date					