

Assurance Summary



Scheme Details

Project Name	T0009 - Better Barnsley Market Gate Bridge	Type of funding	Grant
Grant Recipient	BMBC	Total Scheme Cost	£7,619,061m
MCA Executive Board	TEB	MCA Funding	£4.8m
Programme name	Transforming Cities Fund	% MCA Allocation	63%

Project Description	
<p><i>Is it clear what the MCA is being asked to fund?</i></p> <p>The ask is for the incremental capital costs of an equality accessible pedestrian and cycling bridge over the main Sheffield to Leeds railway line to replace the existing level crossing but to provide an improved level of service than a standard footbridge.</p>	
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>The scheme has a strong strategic rationale in terms of supporting the economic growth and regeneration of the town centre by linking the east of the railway station with the west, now that the level crossing, which was in constant use by trains, pedestrians and vehicles, is no longer operational. A temporary bridge now allows pedestrians to cross safely, quickly and for more rail capacity. The preferred scheme extends these benefits to existing cyclists and the mobility impaired, reducing crowding and congestion and catering for future growth. Network Rail is providing funding for a standard footbridge (£2m) whilst SCR is asked to fund the cost difference for an iconic, accessible and “place-making” facility to complement the Glassworks and other town centre developments, encouraging active travel and public transport modes.</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>The Applicant provides a good overview of the alignment of the project to the SCR Transport Strategy and Mayoral goals and polices. In particular, connecting residents to economic opportunities; creating a cleaner and greener SCR; and creating a safe, reliable, and accessible transport network. As an iconic feature of the town centre it will advertise active travel and public transport.</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>The scheme contributes to Net Carbon as it reduces delays for bus and active travellers, encouraging their use. No calculations have been carried out for this but the likelihood is that impacts are Slight Beneficial.</p>
<i>SMART scheme objectives</i>	<p><i>State the SMART scheme objective as presented in the business case.</i></p>

	<p><i>Is there a 'golden thread' between the strategic objectives (see 3.2) and the scheme objectives (see 3.6)?</i></p> <p>The two SMART objectives cited are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 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. Specific - by providing improved access to new town centre attractors and increasing rail service capacity, encouraging a significant contribution to an expected 21% increase in walking trips and 350% increase in cycling (per SCR transport strategy) Measurable by means of traffic counters and video cameras by 2025 2. To improve air quality and environmental impacts Specific - reducing PM10 and NO2 – the latter to below 40µg/m³ It is not planned to measure the specific contribution of the scheme to this but to monitor overall programme impacts at existing sites, which are reported to DEFRA annually. The nearest measurement site also picks up traffic emissions on adjacent roads, which will be addressed through other interventions in the programme. <p>The role of the scheme in economic regeneration and placemaking is clear but no SMART objectives are provided in respect of these.</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></p> <p>Yes. Three alternatives are put forward and two have been fully appraised using AMAT and local growth assumptions clearly set out in Appendices.</p>		
Statutory requirements and adverse consequences	<p><i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i></p> <p>No. All complete November 2019</p> <p><i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i></p> <p>There will be some inevitable disruption during construction, requiring traffic management and diversion of pedestrians to alternative, longer routes for a short period.</p>		
Value for Money			
Core monetised Benefits	<p><i>[Core BCR – table 4.22]</i></p> <p><i>BCR (Public sector) = 1.60 (incl NR benefits)</i> <i>BCR (SCR spend only) = 1.63</i></p>	Non-monetised and wider economic benefits	<p><i>[Values/description – supplementary form]</i></p> <p>Genecon's Barnsley Growth model estimates that the bridge's pro-rata contribution to GVA will be +£6.31m and gross land value uplift £1.32m</p>

<p><i>In your view do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?</i></p> <p>Yes, the BCR as provided includes the NR cost but excludes the benefit so should be 1.60 as shown above. However, The BCR for the additional funding requested from the TCF programme is 1.63 (over 60 years) or 0.94 (over 30 years).</p>	<p><i>Do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?</i></p> <p>The risk register and QRA provides confidence that the scheme can be completed to budget. Uncertainties exist around the future of bus services, which are used by most of the pedestrian users of the bridge. The long term decline in town centre retailing elsewhere is also a (linked) cause for concern but the residential, educational, training and leisure developments underway are aimed at offsetting these forces.</p>
<p>Value for Money Statement</p>	
<p><i>Taking into consideration the monetised and non-monetised benefits and costs, does the scheme represent good value for money?</i> Medium</p>	
<p>Risk</p>	
<p><i>What are the most significant risks and is there evidence that these risks are being mitigated?</i> The residual risk provision is £0.3m with the largest item (£0.15m) arising from delays to construction arising from delays to the sewer diversion program. An up to date risk register with QRA is provided with the bid (Appendix 1) including mitigation, review dates, mean risk estimates and status.</p> <p><i>Do the significant risks require any contract conditions? (e.g. clawback on outcomes) ??????</i> Unlikely if a clearer timeline for the sewer diversion can be provided, although this is not a showstopper</p> <p><i>Are there any significant risks associated with securing the full funding of the scheme?</i> No – NR have provided £2m (as stated in the bid) and BMBC are contributing £0.82m</p> <p><i>Are there any key risks that need to be highlighted in relation to the procurement strategy?</i> No</p>	
<p>Delivery</p>	
<p><i>Is the timetable for delivery reasonable and has the promoter identified opportunities for acceleration?</i> Yes, No</p> <p><i>Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?</i> Contract completion awaits funding confirmation. A tender process is complete.</p> <p><i>What is the level of cost certainty and is this sufficient at this stage of the assurance process? Has the promoter confirmed they will cover any cost overruns without reducing the benefits of the scheme?</i> 95%, Yes, Yes.</p> <p><i>Has the promoter demonstrated clear project governance and identified the SRO? Has the SRO or other appropriate Officer signed of this business case?</i> Yes, Yes, Yes.</p> <p><i>Has public consultation taken place and if so, is there public support for the scheme?</i> Yes, but complaints are possible during construction</p> <p><i>Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?</i></p>	

This is being planned and carried out at programme level

Legal

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

Legal advice has not been provided

Recommendation and Conditions

Recommendation	Progress to funding award
Payment Basis	Defrayal
Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)	
<p>The following conditions/recommendations must be satisfied before contract execution</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. BMBC must provide a fully and accurately populated MCA appendices for each funding programme (TCF/GBF) in accordance with the details of the approved FBC.2. BMBC to confirm the selected contractor and/or to state if any processes for their appointment remain outstanding and a revised milestone for concluding procurement.3. BMBC to provide match confirmation letters.4. BMBC to confirm that they will cover all post-delivery revenue costs.5. In addition to the written FBC text, BMBC to provide a scheme management and governance organogram.6. BMBC to confirm regarding the sewer programme milestones given the implications for scheme commencement in June 2021.7. BMBC to confirm that the Council's legal advisers reviewed the scheme and their advice on State Aid compliance was provided. <p>The following conditions must be included in the contract –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">8. Standard clawback terms.	