

1 – SCHEME DETAILS

Project Name	Darton Active Travel Hub	Type of funding	Grant
Grant Recipient	BMBC	Total Scheme Cost	£357,272
MCA Executive Board	TEB	MCA Funding	£357,272
Programme name	CRSTS	% MCA Allocation	100%
Current Gateway Stage	OBC	MCA Development costs	£81,650
		% of total MCA allocation	22.8%

2 – PROJECT DESCRIPTION

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

- Refurbishment of the existing building to make DDA compliant
- Refit the building to create AT Hub – storage facilities
- Provision of bikes, e-bikes and ancillary equipment
- Submission of Planning Application (if required) for Change of Use
- Procurement of consultant to develop Delivery Model for this and the other 2 AT Hubs proposed (Goldthorpe and SEAM);
- Consultation events with key stakeholders in relation to the design and construction of the scheme to gauge opinion;
- Resolution of any issues arising;
- Data collection;
- Scheme evaluation and monitoring following completion of the scheme;
- Preparation of the Full Business Case;
- Internal Governance – Cabinet reports, Ward Member briefings etc;
- Procurement and construction, including contract administration, supervision and compliance with Construction Design Management (CDM) Regulations;
- Liaising with the local Cycle Forums and area Committees;
- Liaising with key businesses / stakeholders / residents.

3. STRATEGIC CASE	
Scheme Rationale	<p><i>Does the scheme have a clearly stated rationale and provide a strong justification for public funding?</i></p> <p>Yes. Whilst Darton’s catchment area for cyclists is smaller, Barnsley’s ATH established in 2016 has loaned over 800 bikes and 600 e-bikes and provided a repair and secure storage area for over 30 bikes at one time. Other facilities are provided. It is proposed to replicate this model in area where active travel is established, including Darton.</p>
Strategic policy fit	<p><i>How well does the scheme align with the strategic objectives of the SEP and RAP?</i></p> <p>All three of the MCA’s inclusive economic growth policies within the Transport Strategy are supported as well as the NPPF, ATIP and wider strategies</p>
Contribution to Carbon Net Zero	<p><i>Does this scheme align with the strategic objective to achieve Carbon Net Zero?</i></p> <p>Yes - it improves air quality through modal shift to active travel where possible</p>
SMART scheme objectives	<p><i>State the SMART scheme objective as presented in the business case.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To better connect the areas of transport poverty with areas of opportunity in a safe and sustainable way • To affect 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 • To create a cultural shift towards making cycling and walking the natural choice for shorter journeys • To improve the safety of the transport corridor • To improve air quality and environmental impacts along the corridor <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 – more cycling improves health outcomes and connectivity by bus and rail to development sites, encouraging mode shift from car and economic growth.</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. The main “Do Something” choice is between various standards of refurbishment of the existing building or a new build. The latter would require more land, and therefore be more uncertain /delayed and be substantially more expensive for the public sector. Operational options will be investigated post OBC approval but could involve public or private ownership of the asset (public more likely) and public or private operation (private or voluntary sector more likely).</p>
Statutory requirements and adverse consequences	<p><i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i></p> <p>No</p> <p><i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i></p> <p>None known</p>
FBC stage only – Confirmation of alignment with agreed MCA outcomes (Stronger, Greener, Fairer).	<p><i>Does the scheme still align with strategic objectives?</i></p> <p>n/a</p> <p><i>Have the conditions of approval granted at OBC been complied with?</i></p> <p>n/a</p>

4. VALUE FOR MONEY		
Monetised Benefits:		
<i>VFM Indicator</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>R/A/G</i>
<i>Net Present Social Value (£)</i>	-£42.05	R
<i>Benefit Cost Ratio / GVA per £1 of SYMCA Investment</i>	0.87	R
<i>Cost per Job</i>	N/A	
Non-Monetised Benefits:		
N/A		
<i>Non-Quantified Benefits</i>	N/A	
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>		
No		
5. RISK		
<i>What are the most significant risks ?</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure to maintain political support • Statutory Undertakers Apparatus • Increase in cost of construction materials – risk with the tender process asking contractors to hold their price • Part 1 Claims 		
The demand is unlikely to be at a level sufficient to generate a BCR>1 and there are significant operational costs involved.		
<i>.....and is there evidence that these risks are being mitigated?</i>		
Yes. There is a current risk register with a mitigation strategy for construction costs. The p50 costs post mitigation are included in the scheme costs.		
<i>Do the significant risks require any contract conditions? (e.g. clawback on outcomes)</i>		
Yes. If there is no operator willing to bear the operating costs, and the scheme fails to Attract adequate users, it will have to close, risking taxpayers' money.		
<i>Are there any significant risks associated with securing the full funding of the scheme?</i>		
No additional capital contributions are sought but the scheme depends on ongoing revenue funding which has not been adequately defined – and could exceed likely income.		
<i>Are there any key risks that need to be highlighted in relation to the procurement strategy?</i>		
Yes – failure by the promoter to support the scheme long enough to generate benefits in excess of capital costs – ie 20 years.		

6. DELIVERY

Is the timetable for delivery reasonable and has the promoter identified opportunities for acceleration?
Yes.
Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?
No
What is the level of cost certainty and is this sufficient at this stage of the assurance process?
60%
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
Has the SRO or other appropriate Officer signed off this business case?
Yes
Has public consultation taken place and if so, is there public support for the scheme?
No
Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?
Yes

7. LEGAL

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

8. RECOMMENDATION AND CONDITIONS

Recommendation	Proceed to FBC but with no prejudice to a decision to not fund
-----------------------	--

Payment Basis	Defrayal
----------------------	----------

Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)

For FBC:

- Contract with 3rd party covering the net costs of income of services to be provided, operating arrangements.
- Ongoing subsidy requirements agreed over project life.

Clawback:

- If a third-party commitment to bearing the operating risks (agreed operating costs-revenue) over 20 years cannot be found by year 5 and if the sponsor cannot continue to operate the facility, the MCA’s contribution to be repaid at that point.