

### 1 – SCHEME DETAILS

|                       |                             |                           |             |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|
| Project Name          | Station Access Improvements | Type of funding           | Grant       |
| Grant Recipient       | BMBC                        | Total Scheme Cost         | £540,884.00 |
| MCA Executive Board   | TEB                         | MCA Funding               | £540,884.00 |
| Programme name        | TCF                         | % MCA Allocation          | 100%        |
| Current Gateway Stage | FBC                         | MCA Development costs     | £90,025.53  |
|                       |                             | % of total MCA allocation | 16.6%       |

### 2 – PROJECT DESCRIPTION

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

The scheme will deliver:

- 420m of new active travel route;
- 490m of improved active travel route;
- 3 new crossings beneficial to active travel;
- 2 improved crossings beneficial to active travel; and
- Improved bus accessibility and regularity.

### 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><b>Yes</b> - the applicant has provided a clear strategic rationale for the project to be funded – to provide new and improved routes for walking and cycling to the local rail stations at Darton and Elescar.</p> |
| Strategic policy fit            | <p><i>How well does the scheme align with the strategic objectives of the SEP and RAP?</i></p> <p><b>It aligns well with the SEP, RAP and many other documents.</b></p>   |
| Contribution to Carbon Net Zero | <p><i>Does this scheme align with the strategic objective to achieve Carbon Net Zero?</i></p> <p><b>Yes.</b></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"> <li>• <b>To better connect the areas of transport poverty with areas of opportunity in a safe and sustainable way</b></li> </ul>   |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To effect 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</li> <li>To create a cultural shift towards making cycling and walking the natural choice for shorter journeys</li> <li>To improve the safety of transport corridor</li> <li>To improve air quality and environmental impacts along the corridor</li> </ul> <p><i>Is there a 'golden thread' between the strategic objectives (see 3.2) and the scheme objectives (see 3.8)?</i><br/>Yes</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><br/>Yes. Yes</p>   |
| Statutory requirements and adverse consequences  | <p><i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i><br/>Only a TRO for Darton. All 3 objections have been responded to.<br/><i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i><br/>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><br/>Yes<br/><i>Have the conditions of approval granted at OBC been complied with?</i><br/>Yes. These were (response in FBC):<br/>FBC to contain:<br/>More detail on how scheme meets specific objectives and who will monitor “success” – See the MEP and BRP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Costs to be 75%-95% certain – 90%</li> <li>Confirmed procurement route - the DLO will deliver the scheme</li> </ul>  |

#### 4. VALUE FOR MONEY

##### Monetised Benefits:

| VFM Indicator                                       | Value   | R/A/G |
|---|---------|-------|
| Net Present Social Value (£)                        | 366.66m |       |
| Benefit Cost Ratio / GVA per £1 of SYMCA Investment | 1.99    |       |
| Cost per Job  | n/a     | n/a   |

##### Non-Monetised Benefits:

##### Wider benefits not monetised

|                         |   |
|-------------------------|---|
| Non-Quantified Benefits | Moderate beneficial – Accessibility to public transport for active travellers |
|-------------------------|---|

|   |
|---|
| <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><br/> <b>Yes, although risk and inflation may have been underestimated – replacement of risk with 20% OB reduces BCR to 1.74 – still med vfm</b><br/> <b>The demand forecasts are reasonable, but if they drop by 25% the BCR falls below 0.</b></p>   |
| <b>5. RISK</b>  |
| <p><i>What are the most significant risks ?</i><br/> <b>Inflation.</b><br/> <b>COVID, other crises</b><br/> <b>Weather</b><br/> <b>Ground conditions</b><br/> <i>.....and is there evidence that these risks are being mitigated?</i><br/> <b>Yes, apart from inflation / fuel crisis (see award condition)</b><br/> <i>Do the significant risks require any contract conditions? (e.g. clawback on outcomes)</i><br/> <b>No</b><br/> <i>Are there any significant risks associated with securing the full funding of the scheme?</i><br/> <b>No</b><br/> <i>Are there any key risks that need to be highlighted in relation to the procurement strategy?</i><br/> <b>No</b></p>  |
| <b>6. DELIVERY</b>  |
| <p><i>Is the timetable for delivery reasonable and has the promoter identified opportunities for acceleration?</i><br/> <b>Yes. No</b><br/> <i>Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?</i><br/> <b>Yes</b><br/> <i>What is the level of cost certainty and is this sufficient at this stage of the assurance process?</i><br/> <b>90%. Yes.</b><br/> <i>Has the promoter confirmed they will cover any cost overruns without reducing the benefits of the scheme?</i><br/> <b>No</b><br/> <i>Has the promoter demonstrated clear project governance and identified the SRO?</i><br/> <b>Yes</b><br/> <i>Has the SRO or other appropriate Officer signed off this business case?</i><br/> <b>Individuals identified but no signatures provided</b><br/> <i>Has public consultation taken place and if so, is there public support for the scheme?</i><br/> <b>Yes, Yes</b><br/> <i>Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?</i><br/> <b>Yes</b></p> |
| <b>7. LEGAL</b>   |
| <p><i>Has the scheme considered Subsidy Control compliance or does the promotor still need to seek legal advice?</i><br/> <b>Yes</b></p>  |

## 8. RECOMMENDATION AND CONDITIONS

|   |                            |
|---|----------------------------|
| <b>Recommendation</b>   | <b>Proceed to contract</b> |
| <b>Payment Basis</b>  | <b>Defrayal</b>            |
| <b>Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)</b>   |                            |
| Applicant should consider if the inflation cost forecasts are realistic as any overrun will not be funded by SYMCA. |                            |

### Previous TEB Meetings

| <u>Meeting Date</u> | <u>Recommendation</u>   | <u>Minute Reference</u> | <u>Additional TEB Comments</u> |
|---------------------|---|-------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 21/10/21            | Progression of "T10 Barnsley Station Access Improvements" OBC to proceed to FBC and the release of development cost funding up to £0.19m from TCF2 to Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council (BMBC) subject to the conditions set out in the Assurance Summary attached at Appendix B2 | 11 vi                   | None                           |