

Assurance Summary



Scheme Details

Project Name	T0010 Barnsley Station Access Improvements OBC	Type of funding	Grant
Grant Recipient	BMBC	Total Scheme Cost	£1,344,069
MCA Executive Board	TEB	MCA Funding	£1,344,069
Programme name	TCF	% MCA Allocation	100%

Appraisal Summary

Project Description	
<p><i>Is it clear what the MCA is being asked to fund?</i> Yes - a package of measures which seeks to improve walking and cycling connectivity to local Railway Stations at Goldthorpe, Bolton on Dearne, Thurnscoe, Darton and Elsecar. Full details provided in OBC. Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 24km of improved walking and cycling infrastructure; • 72km of new walking and cycling infrastructure; • 20 junction improvements to benefit non-car modes, with 7 bus gates. 	
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> Yes, Yes</p>
<i>Strategic policy fit</i>	<p><i>How well does the scheme align with the strategic objectives of the SEP and RAP?</i> The promoter states that scheme is consistent with the aims of the TCF, SEP, SCR Transport strategy and ATIP, NPPF and with Barnsley's Local Plan.</p>
<i>Contribution to Carbon Net Zero</i>	<p><i>Does this scheme align with the strategic objective to achieve Carbon Net Zero?</i> Yes</p>
<i>SMART scheme objectives</i>	<p><i>State the SMART scheme objective as presented in the business case.</i> The five scheme objectives are shown here, beneath the overarching strategic objective:</p> <p>Growth</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 <p>Inclusion</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. To better connect the areas of transport poverty with areas of opportunity in a safe and sustainable way 3. To improve the safety of transport corridor <p>Sustainability</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. To create a cultural shift towards making cycling and walking the natural choice for shorter journeys 5. To improve air quality and environmental impacts along the corridor <p><i>Is there a 'golden thread' between the strategic objectives (see 3.2) and the scheme objectives (see 3.6)?</i> Yes</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. An OAR is presented (Appendix J) to specifically address the need, in view of demand predictions for +0.5m more journeys, to improve access by active modes to rail stations in the borough. The scheme focuses on those stations that are located on key strategic corridors – Darton (B6131), Elsecar (B6097), Bolton Upon Dearne (B6098), Goldthorpe (A635), Thurnscoe (B6411). A range of options for improvements was compiled for each station and assessed on the basis of their likely success in achieving improved access, serve development, increase cycling, reduce emissions, cost within allocation and deliver value for money. A shortlist of 3 Do Something options was then identified. The preferred option was to “Do Most” but not all, of the identified interventions.</p>		
Statutory requirements and adverse consequences	<p><i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i></p> <p>No</p> <p><i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i></p> <p>No</p>		
Value for Money			
Core monetised Benefits	<p><i>[Core BCR – table 4.22]</i></p> <p>1.19 (OB 15%)</p>	Non-monetised and wider economic benefits	<p><i>[Values/description – supplementary form]</i></p> <p>Enviro/social Moderate beneficial GHG Slight beneficial: Noise, LAQ, Landscape, Slight adverse: Townscape, Biodiversity, Water enviro.</p> <p>DIA Moderate beneficial User benefits, Accessibility Slight beneficial: Journey Quality, accidents, security, severance</p> <p>Wider Impacts Not calculated</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 - There is substantial uncertainty regarding PT demand in the current pandemic situation, so forecasts are conservative and based on relevant evidence. However, local rail travel demand has potential to expand but access to stations will become increasingly difficult by car.</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 – as for monetised benefits</p>		
Value for Money Statement			
<p><i>Taking into consideration the monetised and non-monetised benefits and costs, does the scheme represent good value for money?</i></p> <p>Low value for money.</p>			
Risk			
<p><i>What are the most significant risks and is there evidence that these risks are being mitigated?</i></p>			

Risk	Mitigation	Owner
1. COVID and the impacts – potential issue around delivery of materials, contractors working on site	Watching brief on the impacts – particularly Tier levels Safe Working practices on site	Project Manager / Site Supervision
2. Land not dedicated / secured	Early negotiations with land owners once detailed design is secured. Provision for alternative alignments	Project Manager -
3. Statutory Undertakers Apparatus	Early submissions for stats information	Design Team / Project manager
4. Old Mine Workings	Most of the borough is made of old mining villages, so ground investigation surveys will be required where any deep excavation is required	Design Team / Project manager
5. Part 1 Claims	Given the impact on AT schemes have had in the news - this will need to be carefully monitored should any Part 1 claims be forthcoming	Project Manager / Legal team

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.

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

No

Delivery

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

Yes

Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?

Yes, but detail needed for FBC as decision points remain.

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

60%. Basis is previous similar schemes. **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, 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?

No. Only at a high level

Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?

Yes.

Legal

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

Yes. The promoter's legal team consider that the scheme does not meet the State Aid test

Recommendation and Conditions

Recommendation	Proceed to FBC
-----------------------	----------------

Payment Basis	Defrayal

Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)

FBC to contain:

- More detail on how scheme meets specific objectives and who will monitor “success”.
- Costs to be 75%-95% certain
- Confirmed procurement route

- At FBC the TCF grant will be capped at £1.09m which is maximum amount available.

