

### 1 – SCHEME DETAILS

<b>Project Name</b>	Active Travel Fund 4 North Bridge Connector	<b>Type of funding</b>	Grant
<b>Grant Recipient</b>	City of Doncaster Council	<b>Total Scheme Cost</b>	£1,400,000
<b>MCA Executive Board</b>	MCA	<b>MCA Funding</b>	£1,400,000
<b>Programme name</b>	ATF	<b>% MCA Allocation</b>	100%
<b>Current Gateway Stage</b>	BJC	<b>MCA Development costs</b>	0
		<b>% of total MCA allocation</b>	

### 2 – PROJECT DESCRIPTION

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

Yes, it is clear what the MCA is funding which is a replacement to the existing staggered crossing on North Bridge Road across Church Way. The staggered crossing splits the road crossing into two parts and requires tight manoeuvres for cycles, mobility aids and pushchairs mixed in amongst pedestrians between the crossing points. This results in the crossing being unnecessarily awkward, crowded on the centre island at peak times and often leads to users crossing at undesignated points where there is a more natural desire line, posing a risk to road safety.

The outputs are:

- Redesigned more direct Toucan Crossing
- Upgrade to 0.32km of existing cycle track to LTN 1/20 standards
- Instalment of an automatic counter
- Improved wayfinding and information signs

The funding will also cover the costs of consultation.

### 3. STRATEGIC CASE

*Options assessment*

*Is there a clear rationale for the selection of short-listed options and the choice of the Preferred Way Forward?*

	<p>Yes, there is a clear case for change in that adaptations to the crossing would enable pedestrians and cyclists to cross more efficiently and provide a more seamless transition onto the existing cycling and footway infrastructure at either side.</p> <p>The viable options are limited to one which just replaces the crossing and the Preferred which also includes upgrades to the existing cycle lanes to bring them up to LTN1/20 standards. The preferred design would safely segregate cyclists and pedestrians and improve accessibility for wheelchairs, mobility aids and pushchairs.</p> <p>There is a clear rationale for the selection of the Preferred Option as it will ensure that Pedestrians and Cycles have their own segregated approach to the new toucan crossing facilities minimising conflict in their approaches which the alternative would not address.</p>	
<i>Statutory requirements and adverse consequences</i>	<p><i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i></p> <p>There are no statutory requirements although the project will need to follow the Active Travel design review process once in place.</p> <p><i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i></p> <p>With regard to the assessment of the wider implications of the project the applicant has only referred to the positive economic benefits of the projects as calculated by the AMAT. This question is supposed to assess the wider implications of installing the project in terms of things like disruption, severance etc. However given the nature of the intervention to existing assets then the disruption shouldn't be too severe.</p>	
<i>FBC stage only – Confirmation of alignment with agreed MCA outcomes (Stronger, Greener, Fairer).</i>	<p>The project aligns with the Greener theme with the enabling and promotion of active travel contributing to the falling Car usage outcome.</p>	
<b>4. VALUE FOR MONEY</b>		
<b>Monetised Benefits:</b>		
<b>VFM Indicator</b>	<b>Value</b>	<b>R/A/G</b>
<i>Net Present Social Value (£)</i>	£2,548,870	
<i>Benefit Cost Ratio / GVA per £1 of SYMCA Investment</i>	3.74	
<i>Cost per Job</i>		
<b>Non-Monetised Benefits:</b>		
<i>Non-Quantified Benefits</i>	<p>The applicant has stated that there will be a slight positive in Social Value impact from the use of CDC's in-house DLO.</p>	

--	--

**Value for Money Statement**

*Taking consideration of the monetised and non-monetised benefits and costs, and the uncertainties, does the scheme represent value for money?*

The VfM has been calculated using standard methodology and the active travel benefits produce a BCR of 3.74 which is good. This has been tested through sensitivities on costs and scale of impact and still produce good BCR's.

**5. RISK**

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

The top 5 risks are set out below taken from a more detailed risk register which do capture the most appropriate risks for the type of project.

No.	Risk	Likelihood (High, Med, Low)	Impact (High, Med, Low)	Mitigation	Owner
1	Political Support	Med	High	Regular communication to ensure positive engagement and buy- in throughout and identify any required changes to design at appropriate milestones. Ensure insights from public consultation shared.	Doncaster Council
2	Public Support	Med	High	Inclusive and comprehensive approach to engagement and consultation, particularly targeting those directly impacted, and at an early stage.	Doncaster Council
3	Competition for resources/materials	Med	High	Early engagement with suppliers.	Doncaster Council
4	Construction phasing – traffic management and co-ordination	Med	High	Early and ongoing engagement of key stakeholders and close management of project progress against delivery timeline.	Doncaster Council
5	Ineffective communication	Med	High	Communications plan developed with a focus on clear, consistent and timely messaging and regular, inclusive and proactive engagement with key stakeholders.	Doncaster Council

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

Clawback on non-achievement of outputs.

*Are there any significant risks associated with securing the full funding for the scheme?*

n/a

*Are there any key risks that need to be highlighted in relation to the procurement strategy?*

No

**6. DELIVERY**

*Is the timetable for delivery reasonable?*

Yes, the timetable is reasonable but will be dependent on the public consultation being carried to time and producing positive results.

*Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?*

The applicant has determined that the project will be delivered by the DLO but there is no rationale as to why this represents best value. However, they have considered social value in that DLO predominantly employ Doncaster Residents who will undertake these works.

*What is the level of cost certainty and is this sufficient at this stage of the assurance process? Has the promotor confirmed they will cover any cost overruns?*

The cost certainty is 95% which is acceptable for this scheme in terms of the analysis of costs. However, because the scheme is subject to consultation there is a chance that it could change the design and cost.

The promoter has confirmed they will cover cost overruns.

*Has the promoter demonstrated clear project governance and identified the SRO? Has the SRO or other appropriate Officer signed of this business case?*

The project governance is clearly explained with an organogram provided.

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

The proposals set out for consultation appear appropriate for the scheme however given that public consultation has not yet taken place then this represents a risk to the project in terms of maintaining the proposed design of the Preferred Option and meeting the timescales.

*Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?*

Yes, a comprehensive M&E plan has been provided which sets out a logical process to gather data regarding the outputs and outcomes of the scheme.

## 7. LEGAL

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

Yes Subsidy Control has been considered and determined to not be subsidy which is reasonable.

## 8. RECOMMENDATION AND CONDITIONS

<b>Recommendation</b>	Approval of BJC for the value of £1,400,000
<b>Payment Basis</b>	Defrayal
<b>Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)</b>	
<p><b>The following conditions must be satisfied before contract execution.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• CDC to provide confirmation of project scope and milestones following consultation process.</li></ul>	

