

## Assurance Summary



### Scheme Details

<b>Project Name</b>	T0005 A631 Rotherham to Maltby Bus Corridor OBC (revised)	<b>Type of funding</b>	Grant
<b>Grant Recipient</b>	RMBC	<b>Total Scheme Cost</b>	£2385,826
<b>MCA Executive Board</b>	TEB	<b>MCA Funding Requested</b>	£2,385,826
		<b>MCA Funding Available</b>	£2,250,000
<b>Programme name</b>	TCF	<b>% MCA Allocation</b>	95%

### Appraisal Summary

Project Description	
<p><i>Is it clear what the MCA is being asked to fund?</i></p> <p>Three sections of bus lane are proposed, all along the A631 Bawtry Road:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Between Addison Road, Maltby and Denby Way, Hellaby (1.2 km length). This bus lane consists of an additional lane;</li> <li>2. In the vicinity of Wickersley School and Sports College (0.2 km length). This bus lane consists of a combination of additional lanes, and repurposing existing acceleration / deceleration tapers, in the Rotherham-bound direction; and,</li> <li>3. Improvements to the bus stop at Brecks Crescent to ease the passage of buses pulling away</li> </ol>	
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><b>Yes. There is a clear rationale with strong justification for funding apart from the traffic management measures at this stage</b></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><b>Yes. The scheme clearly aligns with all relevant strategies and plans of the region, LA's and HMG</b></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><b>Yes.</b></p>
<i>SMART scheme objectives</i>	<p><i>State the SMART scheme objective as presented in the business case.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scheme objectives are to reduce peak period bus journey times along the bus lanes proposed and thereby improve perceptions of bus services and increase bus patronage relative to the 'do minimum' case.</li> </ul> <p><i>Is there a 'golden thread' between the strategic objectives (see 3.2) and the scheme objectives (see 3.6)?</i></p> <p><b>Yes. The scheme aims, by reducing journey times, to make buses more attractive to use for residents and businesses thereby achieving the three goals of improving access to economic opportunity, achieving a cleaner and greener Sheffield City Region and a safer, more reliable and accessible public transport network. Progress will be monitored via a number of monitoring systems available.</b></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><b>Yes, the scheme proposes to address a clear problem and is the best engineering solution for it.</b></p>		
Statutory requirements and adverse consequences	<p><i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i></p> <p><b>Yes. TRO's only, expected Jan 2022</b></p> <p><i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i></p> <p><b>The LTN measures originally proposed have been removed from the scheme. The ARCADY modelling undertaken in connection with the design of the setback is sufficient to confirm, for OBC, that delays would be minimal. However, for FBC it is recommended that additional surveys are undertaken to repeat the exercise and further refine the design.</b></p>		
<b>Yes.</b>			
Core monetised Benefits	<p><i>[Core BCR – table 4.22]</i></p> <p><b>0.20</b></p>	Non-monetised and wider economic benefits	<p><i>[Values/description – supplementary form]</i></p> <p><b>Environmental and social benefits have not been quantified</b> <b>Reliability has been analysed to some extent</b></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><b>A BCR of 0.20 would not normally be acceptable if referenced to the DfT Value for Money Framework. Further assessment outside the journey time modelling could be undertaken to potentially bolster the BCR. As mentioned within the Economic Case, a single year has been used to assess the scheme benefits – we recommend that either an additional future year is used to demonstrate the profile of benefits (which could result in a higher BCR) or text is provided to demonstrate the likely increase in benefits as a result of increased congestion in the DM.</b></p>		<p><i>Do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?</i></p> <p><b>Reliability can and in this case should, be monetised as is likely to far outweigh the core benefits to passengers passing over the interventions. It is likely that this would more than cover the scheme costs.</b></p>	
<b>Value for Money Statement</b>			
<p><i>Taking into consideration the monetised and non-monetised benefits and costs, does the scheme represent good value for money?</i></p> <p><b>Yes, although this needs confirmation at FBC</b></p>			
<b>Risk</b>			
<p><i>What are the most significant risks and is there evidence that these risks are being mitigated?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Unforeseen utility works</b></li> <li>• <b>Works cost not market tested</b></li> <li>• <b>Additional and/or extended tarmac layers at tie-ins or within scheme where lower layers to be retained (Assumptions re: existing build up / infrastructure prove to be optimistic, or where more extensive resurfacing required)</b></li> <li>• <b>Design amendments - miscellaneous dayworks</b></li> <li>• <b>1/17 and 1/13 may be onerous - resulting in additional night and weekend working</b></li> </ul> <p><b>The levels of risk shown across the management case are minimal and the risk register (Appendix 5) shows that the risks are capable of being managed. An extra risk that needs to be included is that PT services decline in frequency or accept route diversions, meaning that the project benefits are not realised.</b></p> <p><i>Do the significant risks require any contract conditions? (e.g. clawback on outcomes)</i></p>			

**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.**  
**The procurement strategy only confirms that the scheme will be delivered by the Council’s internal delivery team, or alternatively by direct appointment through existing frameworks available to RMBC. This should be confirmed at FBC**

**Delivery**

*Is the timetable for delivery reasonable and has the promoter identified opportunities for acceleration?*  
**Yes, there is a clear management and delivery plan and scheme milestones are realistic for a scheme of this scale.**

*Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?*  
**No, there is uncertainty re DLO or open market which needs resolving and confirming before FBC submitted.**

*What is the level of cost certainty and is this sufficient at this stage of the assurance process?*  
**60%, No. Needs to be 75% and based on actual scheme design**

*Has the promoter confirmed they will cover any cost overruns without reducing the benefits of the scheme?*  
**No.**

*Has the promoter demonstrated clear project governance and identified the SRO?*  
**Yes, Yes, Paul Woodcock**

**Strategic Direction, Regeneration & Environment**

*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, scheme specific engagement has been carried out and it has been decided to remove a controversial element. The remaining elements are fully supported**

*Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?*  
**Yes. Traffic monitoring including surveys will be undertaken on completion to check operation and to monitor levels of usage. Review of SYPTE bus journey time data will be conducted one- and three-years post completion to measure the impact of the scheme on improving bus journey times and reliability. This will provide the evidence to monitor the SMART objectives. Evaluation will be led by SYMCA**

**Legal**

*Has the scheme considered Subsidy Control compliance or does the promoter still need to seek legal advice?*  
**Yes. No.**

**Recommendation and Conditions**

<b>Recommendation</b>	Proceed to FBC with conditions
<b>Payment Basis</b>	Defrayal
<b>Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)</b>	

**Required for FBC:**

- 1. Consideration of an additional modelled year and review of traffic growth/congestion in DM scenario**
- 2. Inclusion of monetised reliability benefits in a “wider BCR”**
- 3. Clarity on social and environmental benefits**
- 4. A DIA scoping study**
- 5. Detailed design drawings**
- 6. Decision on procurement method and impact on costs and milestones**
- 7. The TCF request to be capped at £2.25m in line with programme baseline.**
- 8. Strategic Case needed due to low BCR**

**Record of Recommendation, Endorsement and Approval**

**Project Name**

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

**Name:**

**Signature:**

**Date:**