

Assurance Summary

Scheme Details

Project Name	T27 South Yorkshire Rail Station Improvements	Type of funding	Grant
Grant Recipient	South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive	Total Scheme Cost	£3,461,667
MCA Executive Board	Transport and the Environment Board	MCA Funding	£3,451,959
Programme name	Transforming Cities Fund (TCF2)	% MCA Allocation	99.7%



Appraisal Summary

Project Description	
<p><i>Is it clear what the MCA is being asked to fund?</i></p> <p>Yes. As stated in the OBC, facilities at 11 local rail stations need to be renewed/replaced/added that are outside Northern Rail's responsibility and are not normal maintenance. Two of the stations (Goldthorpe and Thurnscoe) are to be demolished and these have been replaced by Elsecar and Darton. This does not affect the strategic rationale or the approximate cost of the scheme.</p> <p>Assets to be replaced/renewed or added consist of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cycle storage - Street directional signage - Toilets - Lighting enhancement - Seating - Passenger information - CCTV - Shelters - Ticket office - Access improvements - Surfacing/renewal - Car park enhancement 	
Strategic Case	
<i>Scheme Rationale</i>	<p><i>Does the scheme have a clearly stated rationale</i></p> <p>Yes. The preferred scheme directly addresses the issues of low quality rail station infrastructure and facilities deterring people from using rail travel as an alternative to the private car. It also improves facilities at the stations for access by sustainable modes.</p> <p><i>...and provide a strong justification for public funding?</i></p> <p>Yes. The items are currently not within Network Rail or Northern's responsibilities.</p>
<i>Strategic policy fit</i>	<i>How well does the scheme align with the strategic objectives of the SEP and RAP?</i>

	All three strategic goals of the SEP are targeted, and the scheme is consistent with national and local policy to improve connectivity and encourage modal shift towards “greener”.		
Contribution to Carbon Net Zero	<i>Does this scheme align with the strategic objective to achieve Carbon Net Zero?</i> Yes.		
SMART scheme objectives	<i>State the SMART scheme objective as presented in the business case.</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Improved Quality of station environment 2. Access for all at rail stations 3. Improved perception of rail station 4. Increased rail patronage 5. Greater availability of secure cycle parking <p>These will be monitored by sample surveys, observation and ongoing data collection at stations. This is well described in the MEP (Appendix K)</p> <i>Is there a ‘golden thread’ between the strategic objectives (see 3.2) and the scheme objectives (see 3.6)?</i> Yes		
Options assessment	<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> Yes – all realistic options in terms of station improvements have been considered and refined between OBC and FBC using a structured process considering the pros and cons of all options.		
Statutory requirements and adverse consequences	<i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i> Yes – Landlords’ consent to the detailed designs to be drawn up by the D&B contractor. Network Rail is the landlord, as station owner. <i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i> No		
Value for Money			
Core monetised Benefits	Core BCR= 2.10	Non-monetised and wider economic benefits	<i>[Values/description – supplementary form]</i> Enviro: Slight beneficial: Noise, LAQ, GHG. D.I.A: Positive impact on Security, accessibility
<i>In your view do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?</i> None of the sensitivity tests undertaken at FBC stage give a BCR below 1.5 .		<i>Do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?</i> No	
Value for Money Statement			
<i>Taking into consideration the monetised and non-monetised benefits and costs, does the scheme represent good value for money?</i> Yes			
Risk			
<i>What are the most significant risks?</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Shortage of materials 2. Insufficient tenders are returned to award contracts due to uncertainty around labour markets/materials and longer-term impact on construction prices 3. Construction cost increases following approval of FBC (during implementation) 			

<p>4. Landlords consent (including station change)</p> <p>5. Covid pandemic escalates with a return to further lockdown measures</p> <p><i>....and is there evidence that these risks are being mitigated?</i></p> <p>Yes. These risks will be managed by Northern. Their cost estimates include a 30% risk allowance.</p> <p><i>Do the significant risks require any contract conditions? (e.g. clawback on outcomes)</i></p> <p>No</p> <p><i>Are there any significant risks associated with securing the full funding of the scheme?</i></p> <p>No</p> <p><i>Are there any key risks that need to be highlighted in relation to the procurement strategy?</i></p> <p>No. There is no alternative to the procurement route proposed, in which NR procures a D&B contractor on behalf of SYPTE.</p>
<p>Delivery</p> <p><i>Is the timetable for delivery reasonable and has the promoter identified opportunities for acceleration?</i></p> <p>Start on site is 13/6/22. Completion Dec 2022. This seems reasonable, being based on past experience and including consultation with other stakeholders (3 months) who whilst in principle may approve, will need to see the detail.</p> <p><i>Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?</i></p> <p>Yes</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></p> <p>75-95% but likely to be 75% currently, until tender prices received and reviewed (31/12/21). Cost overruns will lead to de-scoping (reduction in number of interventions) or additional MCA funding being requested.</p> <p><i>Has the promoter demonstrated clear project governance and identified the SRO?</i></p> <p>Yes</p> <p><i>Has the SRO or other appropriate Officer signed of this business case?</i></p> <p>Yes</p> <p><i>Has public consultation taken place and if so, is there public support for the scheme?</i></p> <p>This commenced 25/10 according to the Business Case. It is very unlikely that the proposals will be controversial.</p> <p><i>Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?</i></p> <p>Yes, there is an MEP.</p>
<p>Legal</p> <p><i>Has the scheme considered Subsidy Control compliance or does the promoter still need to seek legal advice?</i></p> <p>Yes. No.</p>

Recommendation and Conditions

Recommendation	Proceed to contract
Payment Basis	Defrayal
Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)	

Prior to contract the following to be provided:

- Appendices A and B with details consistent with the inputs and outputs shown in the FBC
- Scope of works for contracted activity to be procured
- Final signed version of Full Business Case

Prior to drawdown of funding the following to be provided:

- Final scope for each individual station and breakdown of costs by station.

Conditions to be included in contract:

- Project will be subject to standard clawback conditionality clauses
- The Recipient is liable to cover cost overruns beyond the grant award