

Assurance Summary

VERSION 1 24.11.2021



1 – SCHEME DETAILS

Project Name	Worsbrough – Wombwell TPT links	Type of funding	Grant
Grant Recipient	Barnsley MBC	Total Scheme Cost	£1,334,833.99
MCA Executive Board	September 2024	MCA Funding	£1,334,833.99
Programme name	CRSTS	% MCA Allocation	100%
Current Gateway Stage	BJC	MCA Development costs	£141,000 (granted)
		% of total MCA allocation	10.5%

2 – PROJECT DESCRIPTION

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

The applicant has provided a clear description of the project which is to deliver active travel infrastructure improvements to 3.4 km of a 4.6km section of the Trans Pennine Trail between Worsbrough and the principal town of Wombwell.

The scheme will also connect to the proposed improved active travel route from Oakwell to Stairfoot and the Stairfoot Bus Rapid Transit scheme.

The MCA is funding will be used for:

- Construction of 3.4km of improved active travel route amongst 4.6km route
- Improved crossings and access controls
- Monitoring & Evaluation
- Behaviour Change/promotion

3. STRATEGIC CASE

Options assessment	<p><i>Is there a clear rationale for the selection of short-listed options and the choice of the Preferred Way Forward?</i></p> <p>The justification for public funding is that the accessibility constraints due to the condition of the route are serving to restrict growth in the area and wider borough. Public funding will address this and support the growth aspirations of the Local Plan. Developer contributions are not viable as the scheme is not dependent on a specific site or development coming forward. Therefore, the amount bid for from SYMCA is the minimum necessary requirement, as without funding, the scheme would not proceed.</p> <p>The are two do something options which are, a segregated track on the route compared to the Preferred Option of a shared use track. The options are reasonable given that is an existing route that is to be brought up to LTN 120 standards. There is a sound rationale for the selection of the preferred option as the one most likely to meet the critical success factors.</p>	
Statutory requirements and adverse consequences	<p><i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i></p> <p>There are no statutory requirements as this an upgrade to existing trans Pennine route so is not in the highway and therefore doesn't require any TTRO's or other permissions.</p> <p><i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i></p> <p>There are not any adverse consequences that are unresolved.</p>	
FBC stage only – Confirmation of alignment with agreed MCA outcomes (Stronger, Greener, Fairer).	There is a very good alignment with a number of the key outcome areas of the SEP with logical qualitative impacts that the scheme will deliver.	
4. VALUE FOR MONEY		
Monetised Benefits:		
VFM Indicator	Value	R/A/G
Net Present Social Value (£)	£518k	
Benefit Cost Ratio / GVA per £1 of SYMCA Investment	1.68	
Cost per Job		
Non-Monetised Benefits:		
Non-Quantified Benefits		

Value for Money Statement

Taking consideration of the monetised and non-monetised benefits and costs, and the uncertainties, does the scheme represent value for money?

The economic analysis has been based on standard AMAT methodology for cycling and walking uplift which is appropriate for the nature of the project. The applicant has included wider impacts but these elements have already been monetised in the AMAT BCR calculation. The level of uplift assumed, particularly in cycling, is quite high but is based on actual uplift achieved on similarly upgraded routes in the borough.

Based on the analysis carried out the scheme produces a **BCR of 1.68** which puts it in the **medium value for money category**. Sensitivity analysis has been carried out which demonstrates that even with a significant increase in costs or reduction in uplift the BCR remains above 1.

5. RISK

What are the most significant risks and is there evidence that these risks are being mitigated?

No.	Risk	Likelihood (High, Med, Low)	Impact (High, Med, Low)	Mitigation	Owner
1	Increase in construction costs / inflation	High	High	Allowance within budget to be built in. Sufficient management of costs and inflation rates. Value engineer scheme to available funding in case of emergence of risk.	PM
2	Delays during construction due to adverse weather conditions	Med	High	Ensure delivery is programmed to avoid periods of more likely adverse weather. arrange nighttime or weekend working if required	PM
3	Actual inflation differs from that submitted either at SOBC / FBC or tender	Med	Med	Allowance within budget to be built in. Sufficient management of costs and inflation rates. Value engineer scheme to available funding in case of emergence of risk.	PM
4	Unforeseen circumstances causing suspension of scheme e.g covid, foot and mouth, fuel shortages etc.	Low	High	Nil possible as all external - Accept risk	PM
5	Failure of Project Manager to control costs leading to project over spend	Low	Low	Robust financial management plans to be put in place and constantly monitored	PM

The above risks are reasonable for the project and are taken from a more comprehensive risk register.

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

Clawback on achievement of outputs

Are there any significant risks associated with securing the full funding for the scheme?

No

Are there any key risks that need to be highlighted in relation to the procurement strategy?

There are no risks relating to the procurement strategy.

6. DELIVERY

Is the timetable for delivery reasonable?

The timetable for delivery is quite tight with an 8-month construction period but this is probably reasonable given the nature of the intervention.

Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?

There is no procurement strategy as the work is to be carried out by the DLO but there is no rationale as to why this is most appropriate to deliver best value.

What is the level of cost certainty and is this sufficient at this stage of the assurance process? Has the promotor confirmed they will cover any cost overruns?

The level of cost certainty is 95% which is appropriate for the scheme which is based on worked up designs.

The promoter has said that if there are cost overruns they would firstly seek to change the scope but if not possible then seek alternative MCA funding from the CRSTS programme.

Has the promoter demonstrated clear project governance and identified the SRO? Has the SRO or other appropriate Officer signed of this business case?

There is a clear governance structure with key personnel identified and links into BMBC cabinet illustrated. The SRO has been identified who is an Executive Director but the BJC has not been signed.

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

Public consultation was undertaken ahead of the development of the scheme and there was a high level of support. There is further consultation planned in August which had to be rescheduled because of the clash with the election. Whilst this is understood it does still present a risk that there could be some negative response to the final designs.

Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?

Appropriate M&E plans are in place.

7. LEGAL

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

Subsidy Control has been considered and it has been established that the funding for the project falls outside the scope of the Act as all four limbs of the test have not been satisfied. This is appropriate.

8. RECOMMENDATION AND CONDITIONS

Recommendation	Approve BJC and grant funding of £1,334,833.99 (inclusive of development grant previously awarded)
-----------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Payment Basis	Defrayal
Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)	
Conditions prior to drawdown of funding: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Successful completion of public consultation	