

## 1 – SCHEME DETAILS

Project Name	Town Centre to Oakwell Stadium Active Travel Scheme	Type of funding	Grant
Grant Recipient	BMBC	Total Scheme Cost	£2,000,000
MCA Executive Board	TEB	MCA Funding	2,000,000
Programme name	Mayor's Sustainability Fund (MSF)	% MCA Allocation	100%
Current Gateway Stage	SBC	MCA Development costs requested	315,000
		% of total MCA allocation	15.75%

## 2 – PROJECT DESCRIPTION

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

This scheme will connect the Town Centre, via the Interchange, the new Cycle / Footbridge at Jumble Lane and connects to two key leisure centres, the Metrodome and the football stadium at Oakwell.

The scheme will be approximately **1.2km** in length and comprise of a shared use footway/cycleway to current standards.

- 0.15km of improved walking and cycling infrastructure
- 1.05km of new walking and cycling infrastructure
- 3 improved crossings

MCA funding will fund:

- Feasibility studies – Option Assessments
- Consultation
- Traffic and Topographical surveys
- Ground Investigation (if required)
- Planning applications (if required)
- Outline / Full Business case documentation

- Feasibility / detailed design inc public realm / green infrastructure
- AMAT appraisal
- Stakeholder engagement
- Procurement and construction
- Promotion and implementation of any TRO's required
- Internal governance – cabinet reports etc
- Monitoring & Evaluation - including new traffic / ped counters
- Behaviour change promotion

### 3. 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</b> - As with most transport infrastructure it represents a “public good”, providing an active travel link between the town centre and the Metrodome Leisure centre and Oakwell stadium as well as to the A61 link. It aims to improve accessibility to work and leisure destinations as well as reducing motorised traffic congestion and emissions especially on match days.</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>It aligns well with the SEP, RAP and many other documents.</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> Dependent on appraisal results, but with modal shift, likely to be so.</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>• <b>To better connect the areas of transport poverty with areas of opportunity in a safe and sustainable way</b></li> <li>• <b>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</b></li> <li>• <b>To create a cultural shift towards making cycling and walking the natural choice for shorter journeys</b></li> <li>• <b>To improve the safety of transport corridor</b></li> <li>• <b>To improve air quality and environmental impacts along the corridor</b></li> </ul> <p><i>Is there a 'golden thread' between the strategic objectives (see 3.2) and the scheme objectives (see 3.8)?</i></p> <p><b>Yes</b></p>
<i>Options assessment</i>	<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. Yes. The preferred way forward avoids land acquisition whilst meeting strategic aims.</b></p>
<i>Statutory requirements and adverse consequences</i>	<p><i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i></p> <p><b>Only a TRO for Darton. All 3 objections have been responded to.</b></p> <p><i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i></p> <p><b>No</b></p>
<i>FBC stage only – Confirmation of alignment with agreed MCA</i>	<p><i>Does the scheme still align with strategic objectives?</i></p> <p><b>Yes</b></p> <p><i>Have the conditions of approval granted at OBC been complied with?</i></p>

outcomes (Stronger, Greener, Fairer).	N/A	
4. VALUE FOR MONEY		
Monetised Benefits:		
VFM Indicator	Value	R/A/G
Net Present Social Value (£)	TBC	
Benefit Cost Ratio / GVA per £1 of SYMCA Investment	TBC	
Cost per Job	n/a	
Non-Monetised Benefits:		
Wider benefits not monetised		
Non-Quantified Benefits		
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> Not yet known – to be developed in FBC. Costs seem high in proportion to the length of the scheme (£2m/1.2km) in comparison with similar schemes (eg A61 segregated AT route £1m per km and smaller schemes nearer £0.5m/km). Volume of usage likely to be significantly higher however. More clarity expected for OBC		
5. RISK		
<i>What are the most significant risks ?–</i> Inflation. COVID, other crises Weather Part 1 claims <i>.....and is there evidence that these risks are being mitigated?</i> Yes, apart from inflation / fuel crisis (see award condition) <i>Do the significant risks require any contract conditions? (e.g. clawback on outcomes)</i> No <i>Are there any significant risks associated with securing the full funding of the scheme?</i> No <i>Are there any key risks that need to be highlighted in relation to the procurement strategy?</i> No		
6. DELIVERY		

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

**Yes. No**

*Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?*

**Not decided. Intention is to use DLO**

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

**30%. Yes.**

*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?*

**Individuals identified, signature of Chief Finance Officer**

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

**No, to take place as part of FBC development.**

*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**

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