

## 1 – SCHEME DETAILS

<b>Project Name</b>	Rotherham Integrated Station: Outline Business Case Development	<b>Type of funding</b>	Grant
<b>Grant Recipient</b>	RMBC	<b>Total Scheme Cost</b>	£107.6m
<b>MCA Executive Board</b>	TEB	<b>MCA Funding</b>	£107.6m (-£10m?)
<b>Programme name</b>	CRSTS	<b>% MCA Allocation</b>	100%
<b>Current Gateway Stage</b>	SBC	<b>MCA Development costs</b>	£1.0m
		<b>% of total MCA allocation</b>	1%

## 2 – PROJECT DESCRIPTION

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

Yes.

Development costs (£1m) for:

1 x new rail station on the Midland mainline (£99.5m including platforms, lifts, land (?)) + £1m development costs

1 x tram-train stop (£7.1m)

## 3. STRATEGIC CASE

<b>Scheme Rationale</b>	<i>Does the scheme have a clearly stated rationale and provide a strong justification for public funding?</i> The scheme is a new railway station on the Midland mainline adjacent to industrial and potential new housing developments, with the aim of making public transport more accessible to new and existing adjacent residents otherwise using their car for most journeys. The proposal includes a tram-train stop to attract more usage to the tram and rail networks.
<b>Strategic policy fit</b>	<i>How well does the scheme align with the strategic objectives of the SEP and RAP?</i> The scheme is specifically mentioned in the SEP

<i>Contribution to Carbon Net Zero</i>	<i>Does this scheme align with the strategic objective to achieve Carbon Net Zero?</i> Yes, although not clearly stated in the modelling as this is not focussed on mode switch. Such benefits are likely to be small.
<i>SMART scheme objectives</i>	<i>State the SMART scheme objective as presented in the business case.</i> 1. Faster journey time to local centres 2. Additional rail services to Rotherham 3. More direct connections to regional economic centres 4. Effective public transport alternative for commuters <i>Is there a 'golden thread' between the strategic objectives (see 3.2) and the scheme objectives (see 3.8)?</i> Yes
<i>Options assessment</i>	<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> Workshops with “provider” experts have been held to sift out the best site, operationally, structurally and in terms of access to new developments, for the station. The existing Rotherham Central station is on a branch line that is best served by tram-train using the old Great Central line rather than the Midland mainline via 2 at-grade junctions. (Holmes Chord and Aldwarke) which impacts on mainline operations. The inclusion of a tram-train stop and additional infrastructure and the revised services to the existing station will need to be appraised.
<i>Statutory requirements and adverse consequences</i>	<i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i> Not stated – detail to be provided at OBC <i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i> Noise – more trains stopping and starting at the site of the station rather than continuous noise.
<i>FBC stage only – Confirmation of alignment with agreed MCA outcomes (Stronger, Greener, Fairer).</i>	<i>Does the scheme still align with strategic objectives?</i> N/A <i>Have the conditions of approval granted at OBC been complied with?</i> N/A

#### 4. VALUE FOR MONEY

##### Monetised Benefits:

<i>VFM Indicator</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>R/A/G</i>
<i>Net Present Social Value (£)</i>	£189m	G
<i>Benefit Cost Ratio / GVA per £1 of SYMCA Investment</i>	1.77	G
<i>Cost per Job</i>	N/A	G

##### Non-Monetised Benefits:

<i>Non-Quantified Benefits</i>	Reliability improvements (less usage of junction turnouts) Regeneration (encouragement for relocation to station area)
--------------------------------	---

Reduced tailpipe emissions (with modal shift)  
Landscape and townscape improvements (potentially)

*Taking into consideration the monetised and non-monetised benefits and costs, does the scheme represent good value for money?*

Not known at this stage – OBC to clarify modelling done to date and to update this.

## 5. RISK

*What are the most significant risks ?*

1. Land not secured for station development
2. Adverse impacts to existing services at Sheffield and Leeds as a result of new station calls
3. Passive provision for future operational rail requirements may change, affecting station design
4. Changes to station design and number/type of platforms due to capacity analysis or potential for future requirements to change
5. Benefit : Cost Ratio is not of sufficient value to gain approval / funding

*.....and is there evidence that these risks are being mitigated?*

Mitigation measures are being taken (1 and 2) or have been planned (3-5)

*Do the significant risks require any contract conditions? (e.g. clawback on outcomes)*

N/A at this stage

*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?*

Development of the FBC will take until summer 2025 and a further 3 years is estimated for procurement and construction. The constraining factor on acceleration is Network Rail.

*Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?*

Development will be procured on the open market but project delivery will be by Network Rail who will identify and support the most effective route to market and delivery.

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

60%. Yes

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

No. However they have indicated that £10m could be available for land purchase, from other funding.

*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?*

Not clear from the SBC

*Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?*

No.
<b>7. LEGAL</b>
<i>Has the scheme considered Subsidy Control compliance or does the promotor still need to seek legal advice?</i>
Yes. No.

<b>8. RECOMMENDATION AND CONDITIONS</b>	
<b>Recommendation</b>	Proceed to OBC
<b>Payment Basis</b>	Defrayal
<b>Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)</b>	
This is a DfT retained scheme so appraisal and assurance will be conducted by DfT.	