

1 – SCHEME DETAILS			
Project Name	A635 Active Travel Scheme	Type of funding	Grant
Grant Recipient	Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council	Total Scheme Cost	£2,404,481
MCA Executive Board	TEB	MCA Funding	£2,404,481
Programme name	TCF2	% MCA Allocation	100%
Current Gateway Stage	FBC	MCA Development costs	£406,322 (already received stage 1 and 2)
		% of total MCA allocation	16.5%
2 – PROJECT DESCRIPTION			
<p><i>Is it clear what the MCA is being asked to fund?</i></p> <p>Yes. The A635 Active Travel Scheme is a package of measures which seeks to promote walking and cycling connectivity on the A635 between Stairfoot Roundabout and Hollygrove Round in Goldthorpe.</p> <p>The Scheme comprises:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Widening footways that run parallel along the A635; 2. Improved bus stop facilities with real time information, shelters and seating for patrons; 3. Improved junctions along the route with side roads allowing active travel priority when crossing the junction; 4. Improved street lighting; 5. Way finder and signage; 6. Three uncontrolled crossings in Ardsley along the A635; 7. Reducing severance in Ardsley; 8. Prohibition of driving along Fitzwilliam Road in Ardsley; and 9. Resurfacing junctions with tactile paving to aid visually impaired pedestrians. 			
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, the scheme rationale is the need for Barnsley Council to encourage active travel between housing and employment/leisure sites on the A635 between Barnsley Cathill Roundabout in Darfield.</p>		
Strategic policy fit	<p><i>How well does the scheme align with the strategic objectives of the SEP and RAP?</i></p> <p>It aligns with all three overarching SEP objectives.</p>		

Contribution to Carbon Net Zero	Does this scheme align with the strategic objective to achieve Carbon Net Zero? Yes
SMART scheme objectives	State the SMART scheme objective as presented in the business case. <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 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 To create a cultural shift towards making cycling and walking the natural choice for shorter journeys To improve the safety of the A635 corridor To improve air quality and environmental impacts along the corridor Is there a 'golden thread' between the strategic objectives (see 3.2) and the scheme objectives (see 3.8)? Main scheme objective is to "Increase demand for active travel modes".
Options assessment	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? Yes, although the preferred option was chosen before detailed appraisal carried out, contrary to TAG. Practicality/likely impact were the main criteria for selecting only one option for detailed appraisal.
Statutory requirements and adverse consequences	Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements? No. Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter? No.
FBC stage only – Confirmation of alignment with agreed MCA outcomes (Stronger, Greener, Fairer).	Does the scheme still align with strategic objectives? Yes Have the conditions of approval granted at OBC been complied with? There were no conditions set at OBC. Recommendations including provision of more detail and confirmation of procurement route/timing have been followed.

4. VALUE FOR MONEY

Monetised Benefits:

VFM Indicator	Value	R/A/G
Net Present Social Value (£)	£0.903m	
Benefit Cost Ratio / GVA per £1 of SYMCA Investment	1.60	
Cost per Job	n/a	

Non-Monetised Benefits:

Non-Quantified Benefits	Noise, LAQ, Landscape, Journey quality, accidents, security, severance – Slight Beneficial
-------------------------	---

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. Monitoring & Evaluation – Failure to meet Outputs/Outcomes. Cost increase due to Part 1 claims.	This will be monitored throughout the scheme. Similar working times to be reviewed to limit disruption.	Project Manager
2. Compensation – Part 1 Claims relating to noise disturbance from construction works.	Works will be planned accordingly to minimise disruption.	Project Manager
3. Construction - Contractual - scheme delayed and increased cost due to Exceptionally Adverse weather. Increase in scheme cost due to programme delay.	Allow float within construction period. Ensure construction aligns with lower risk periods. Accurate measure of what is exceptional as per NEC contract procedures.	Project Manager / Senior Supplier
4. Construction - Delays during construction stage (including delays in performance by stats, works to the Strategic Road Network, adverse weather conditions etc). Increase in scheme cost due to programme delay.	Early engagement with statutory undertakers and funds available should a behaviour change to working practices be needed.	Project Manager
5. Construction - Stability of earthworks affected by weak materials - strengthening measures necessary. Delay in programme - possible grouting / underpinning / piling works required.	Site investigation to identify and mitigation processes to be developed as part of the design.	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. There is no other funding partner

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. Yes – an agreement for land to be purchased has been struck with the owner. Further consultation with stakeholders has taken place.

Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?

Yes. 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.

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

Yes. 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?

Yes. 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 to 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.