



Assurance Summary

Scheme Details

Project Name	O43 Goldthorpe Station Access FBC	Type of funding	Grant
Grant Recipient	Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council	Total Scheme Cost	£603,585
MCA Executive Board	Transport and the Environment Board	MCA Funding	£550,176
Programme name	Active Travel Fund / Gainshare (ATF2 / Gainshare)	% MCA Allocation	91%

Appraisal Summary

Project Description	
<i>Is it clear what the MCA is being asked to fund?</i> Yes. Outputs shown below.	
Strategic Case	
<i>Scheme Rationale</i>	<i>Does the scheme have a clearly stated rationale and provide a strong justification for public funding?</i> Yes. The scheme fits well with the SEP, the Transport Strategy, the Active Travel Implementation plan and national policies to encourage urban living and active travel.
<i>Strategic policy fit</i>	<i>How well does the scheme align with the strategic objectives of the SEP and RAP?</i> Well. The scheme is promoted as a key part of plans to achieve these aims.
<i>Contribution to Carbon Net Zero</i>	<i>Does this scheme align with the strategic objective to achieve Carbon Net Zero?</i> Yes
<i>SMART scheme objectives</i>	<p><i>State the SMART scheme objective as presented in the business case.</i> SMART objectives are given as:</p> <p>Short term</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Encourage more cycling/walking; 2. Create an environment that is safer for both walking and cycling to replace journeys made by car; 3. To increase patronage on public transport 4. To provide safe, attractive and direct pedestrian and cycle routes to rail stations <p>Long term</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. To create a cultural shift towards making cycling and walking the natural choice for shorter journeys 6. To affect a mode shift away from the private car in those areas where new opportunities are likely to see an increase in demand or where growth could be stifled 7. To improve air quality and environmental impacts within the Dearne Valley Corridor <p><i>Is there a 'golden thread' between the strategic objectives (see 3.2) and the scheme objectives (see 3.6)?</i> Each of these is specified in detail with targets that are measurable, with timescale, metrics and plans for measurement detailed in Appendix A (BR and M&E plans).</p>

	<p>Outputs are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision of an Active Travel route along Nicholas Lane, Thurnscoe Bridge Lane and Shepherd Lane; • Provision of new bridleway; • Widening of existing shared footways; • Provision of 9 new uncontrolled crossings at junctions; • Provision of new lighting - everywhere; • New signage / wayfinding. • Bus stop improvements; • Speed limit advisory change to 20mph outside Highgate Primary. <p>Pedestrian and cycle counts, attitude surveys, and air quality measurement will be undertaken as part of the M&E of the scheme. Distributional Impact screening proforma completed - further analysis will need to be undertaken for FBC.</p>
--	--

<i>Options assessment</i>	<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 – See Appendix J. The applicant has followed a logical and systematic process to define the optimal features of the scheme in comparison to high and low-cost alternatives and shown that the preferred option best meets strategic and economic objectives.</p>
---------------------------	--

<i>Statutory requirements and adverse consequences</i>	<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>Core BCR = 1.25</p> <p>Sensitivity tests: +25% uplift BCR = 1.7 -25% uplift BCR = 0.79 Costs +10% BCR = 1.14</p>	Non-monetised and wider economic benefits	<p><i>[Values/description – supplementary form]</i></p> <p>On a scale -2 to +2: +2 For increased demand for AT, net zero carbon, health, economics. 0 For Improved PT viability, Social value</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</p> <p>An uplift has been used (*2) significantly lower than observed for similar schemes linking villages elsewhere (per Sustrans). Results are likely to be most sensitive to this. The nature of the scheme and experience of the Applicant in schemes of this type makes it likely that costs will not overrun.</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>No – low VfM (1.25)</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
------	------------	-------

Increase in price of construction materials, availability of materials, delivery	Watching brief on the impacts Robust costs	Project Manager / Site Supervision
Failure to maintain political support	Ensure robust support and communication	Project Manager
Statutory Undertakers Apparatus	Early submissions for stats information	Design Team / Project manager
Lack of Public Support for Goldthorpe Station Access Scheme	Public consultation already done. Further work will be resident led to avoid imposing on residents.	Design Team / Project manager
Traffic Management and the safety of road users	Stringent traffic management measures will need to be in place	Project Manager / DLO

The Applicant is keeping a QRA updated. The scheme cost includes a provision for risks eventuating at the p50 level.

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

Standard Conditions will apply

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, but perhaps 1 month slippage: FBC approval Nov 2021 may be premature.

Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?

Yes. DLO route chosen.

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?

90%.

Has the promoter demonstrated clear project governance and identified the SRO?

Yes.

Has the SRO or other appropriate Officer signed of this business case?

Yes.

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

Yes – two rounds of online public consultation have taken place.

Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?

Yes, a clear and comprehensive approach has been outlined.

Legal

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

Yes. Legal opinion is included within the OBC document (7.7)

Recommendation and Conditions

Recommendation	Approved to proceed to contract
Payment Basis	Defrayal
Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)	
Prior to contract the following to be provided: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Appendices A (including Risk Log) and B with details consistent with the costs shown in the FBC• Final signed version of Full Business Case	
Conditions to be included in contract: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Project will be subject to standard clawback conditionality clauses• The Recipient is liable to cover cost overruns beyond the grant award	

