

1 – SCHEME DETAILS

Project Name	A61 Royston Active Travel Scheme	Type of funding	Grant
Grant Recipient	Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council	Total Scheme Cost	£5,200,173
MCA Executive Board	TEB	MCA Funding	£5,200,173
Programme name	TCF2	% MCA Allocation	100%
Current Gateway Stage	FBC	MCA Development costs	£989,705 (already received stage 1 and 2)
		% of total MCA allocation	13.5%

2 – PROJECT DESCRIPTION

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

Yes. The scheme will provide “a continuous LTN 1/20 compliant 3m/4m wide active travel route from Barnsley Interchange to Royston via Smithies Lane. At Smithies it will connect to an existing Public Right of Way (PROW), providing a completely off-road route to Royston and Carlton. In total 5.4km of new segregated footway will be provided with accompanying lighting, clear directional signage. Earthworks provided under the bridge at Bar Lane to continue off-road route to Lee Lane. A comprehensive drainage solution is also required to prevent flooding.”

- Sections of on and off-road routes;
- Improvements to pedestrian crossings into Toucans;
- Wayfinding signage;
- Improvements to public realm;
- Resurfacing of existing sections of the routes;
- Improvements to street lighting;
- Drainage works to allow use of the route throughout the year; and
- Clearing of waterways to reduce likelihood of flooding at specific sections of the route.

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. There is market failure in the provision of public goods such as the proposal is expected to provide – improved connectivity for active travellers, more active travel, fewer cars, more time fuel and carbon savings, improved labour productivity and beneficial social and environmental impacts,</p>
Strategic policy fit	<p><i>How well does the scheme align with the strategic objectives of the SEP and RAP?</i></p> <p>Very well</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, fully</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 A61 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 3.8)?</i></p> <p>Yes. The scheme should obviously achieve these aims.</p>
Options assessment	<p><i>Is there a genuine Options assessment</i></p> <p>The preferred scheme has been filtered from a long list of possibilities, scored according to how well overall objectives are met.</p> <p><i>.....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 preferred scheme has been designed to best meet objectives and has been appraised using the DfT's AMAT tool which calculates that the scheme is "medium" value for money.</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>No</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>Yes</p> <p><i>Have the conditions of approval granted at OBC been complied with?</i></p> <p>Yes – all outstanding queries resolved</p>

4. VALUE FOR MONEY		
Monetised Benefits:		
VFM Indicator	Value	R/A/G
Net Present Social Value (£)	£2,199,350	

Benefit Cost Ratio / GVA per £1 of SYMCA Investment	1.68	
Cost per Job	n/a	
Non-Monetised Benefits:		
Non-Quantified Benefits	Moderate beneficial: User Benefits, Accessibility,	
Value for Money Statement		
Taking into consideration the monetised and non-monetised benefits and costs, does the scheme represent good value for money?		
No – medium value		
5. RISK		
What are the most significant risks ?		
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>
1. Failure to meet Outputs / Outcomes	To be monitored. Limited domestic buildings within area	Project Manager
2. Actual inflation differs from that assumed at tender	Minimum effect due to relatively short project life.	Project Manager -
3. Part 1 Claims	Given the impact on AT schemes have had in the news - this will need to be carefully monitored should any Part 1 claims be forthcoming	Project Manager / Legal team
4. Delays during construction stage (including delays in performance by stats, works to the Strategic Road Network, adverse weather conditions etc)	Early engagement with statutory undertakers	Design Team / Project manager
5. Road Safety Audit Stage 3 identifies additional requirements	Early safety audit	Design Team / Project manager
.....and is there evidence that these risks are being mitigated?		
Yes		

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

6. DELIVERY

Is the timetable for delivery reasonable and has the promoter identified opportunities for acceleration?

Yes, the timetable is realistic

Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?

Yes – open market procedure, Yes

What is the level of cost certainty and is this sufficient at this stage of the assurance process?

90%, Yes, although stage 2 costs not tender prices. Residual risk amount should more than suffice.

Has the promoter confirmed they will cover any cost overruns without reducing the benefits of the scheme?

No – promoter suggests reducing scope if costs overrun or use of ITB funding

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

Yes. Executive Director Growth & Sustainability

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?

Yes, and more is planned; Yes.

Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?

Yes.

7. LEGAL

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

Yes

8. RECOMMENDATION AND CONDITIONS

Recommendation	Approval for contract
Payment Basis	Defrayal
Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)	
The following conditions must be satisfied before contract execution: 1. Tender prices to be returned pre MCA Board, result in a total scheme cost at or below budget. 2. Any additional conditions to be attached dependent on submission of final cost.	

