



Assurance Summary

Scheme Details

Project Name	O44 – Elsecar Active Travel Lane FBC	Type of funding	Grant
Grant Recipient	Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council	Total Scheme Cost	£592,506.38
MCA Executive Board	Transport and the Environment Board	MCA Funding	£575,177
Programme name	Active Travel Fund / Gainshare (ATF2 / Gainshare)	% MCA Allocation	97%

Appraisal Summary

Project Description													
<p><i>Is it clear what the MCA is being asked to fund?</i> Yes. Outputs shown below.</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> 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.</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 scheme is promoted as a key part of plans to achieve these aims.</p>												
<i>Contribution to Carbon Net Zero</i>	<p><i>Does this scheme align with the strategic objective to achieve Carbon Net Zero?</i> The AMAT tool has been used to indicate that there is a good potential for the scheme to encourage more cycling and walking in the area. Whilst a small proportion of the total travel demand, any increase in active travel at the expense of motorised, contributes to reducing emissions.</p>												
<i>SMART scheme objectives</i>	<p><i>State the SMART scheme objective as presented in the business case.</i> <i>Is there a 'golden thread' between the strategic objectives (see 3.2) and the scheme objectives (see 3.6)?</i> Table 3.7 in the FBC lists the scheme's five general and specific objectives and how success will be measured against these. (Note that the strategy date refers to the span of the strategy – outcomes will be known by 2024.)</p> <p>Short-Term</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr style="background-color: #d9534f; color: white;"> <th>Objective</th> <th>Specific</th> <th>Measurable</th> <th>Achievable</th> <th>Relevant</th> <th>Time Related</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: top;">1. Encourage more cycling and walking;</td> <td style="vertical-align: top;">Improvements to this active travel route will lead to increases in walking and cycling.</td> <td style="vertical-align: top;">Increase the number of walking and cycling trips on the existing Elsecar route over the 2019 figures. 2019 Figures Cycling – 19719; Walking – 63793. Targets</td> <td style="vertical-align: top;">TPT counts will determine if this has been achieved</td> <td style="vertical-align: top;">SCR Transport Strategy Policy 5. 3.2km of enhanced active travel route, of which 0.85km will be new. Provision of Zebra Crossing</td> <td style="vertical-align: top;">SCR Transport Strategy Success Criteria by 2040</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Objective	Specific	Measurable	Achievable	Relevant	Time Related	1. Encourage more cycling and walking;	Improvements to this active travel route will lead to increases in walking and cycling.	Increase the number of walking and cycling trips on the existing Elsecar route over the 2019 figures. 2019 Figures Cycling – 19719; Walking – 63793. Targets	TPT counts will determine if this has been achieved	SCR Transport Strategy Policy 5. 3.2km of enhanced active travel route, of which 0.85km will be new. Provision of Zebra Crossing	SCR Transport Strategy Success Criteria by 2040
Objective	Specific	Measurable	Achievable	Relevant	Time Related								
1. Encourage more cycling and walking;	Improvements to this active travel route will lead to increases in walking and cycling.	Increase the number of walking and cycling trips on the existing Elsecar route over the 2019 figures. 2019 Figures Cycling – 19719; Walking – 63793. Targets	TPT counts will determine if this has been achieved	SCR Transport Strategy Policy 5. 3.2km of enhanced active travel route, of which 0.85km will be new. Provision of Zebra Crossing	SCR Transport Strategy Success Criteria by 2040								

		39% - uplift in cycling by 2040. 65% - uplift in walking by 2040.		on Wentworth Road. Improved crossing on Wath Road Lower speed limit to 30mph on Wentworth Road from 60mph.	
2. Create an environment that is safer for both walking and cycling to replace journeys made by car;	Improvements to the Elsecar AT and provision of safe crossing points will make it safer to travel between Elsecar and Cortonwood and reduce car travel between the two.	39 accidents 2015-2020 - 50% reduction after 2 years of scheme opening and a 75% reduction after 5 years of scheme opening. Appendix L indicates the route these accidents occurred on. (Blue Line).	STATS 19 returns will determine whether this objective has been achieved	SCR Transport Strategy Policy 4.	SCR Transport Strategy Success Criteria by 2040

Longer term

Objective	Specific	Measurable	Achievable	Relevant	Time Related
3. To create a cultural shift towards making cycling and walking the natural choice for shorter journeys. Note: This objective is linked to objective 1. The provision of the scheme will act as a demonstration effect where more	The scheme aims to increase the number of trips made by walking and cycling	March 2021 survey – appendix R: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Cycling – 15.2% ▪ Walking – 33.6%. Increase this to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Cycling – 20% ▪ Walking – 37%. 2 years after scheme opening. Increase this to:	Repeat of consultation to assess how much change has occurred since March 2021 survey.	SCR Transport Strategy Policy 5.	SCR Transport Strategy Success Criteria by 2040

	<p>cycling acts as a multiplier to encourage more cycling.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Cycling – 25% ▪ Walking – 40%. <p>5 years after scheme opening.</p>				
	<p>4. To effect 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</p>	<p>The provision of the Elsecar AT scheme will enable better access to employment sites on the A6135 Dearne Valley Parkway and Elsecar Heritage Centre.</p>	<p>Elsecar sits within Hoyland Milton ward. Increase the number of residents without access to a car from current 26.5% to 30% after 2 years and 35% after 5 years of scheme opening.</p>	<p>Manual/ video pedestrian cycle counts</p> <p>Fully functioning automatic cycle counts</p>	<p>SCR Transport Strategy Policy 5.</p>	<p>SCR Transport Strategy Success Criteria by 2040</p>	
	<p>5. Improving Air Quality and work towards City Regions Net Zero Carbon aspirations.</p>	<p>The Elsecar AT scheme aims to reduce levels of particulate matter (PM10 and Nitrous Oxide (NO₂))</p>	<p>Reductions in levels of pollutants within 2 years of opening to 37 µg/m³ Within 5 years to reductions to 34 µg/m³.</p>	<p>Detailed modelling will determine whether if this objective is achievable</p>	<p>SCR Policy 7</p>	<p>SCR Transport Strategy Success Criteria by 2040</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>The Applicant has used MCD analysis to identify the best combination of routes, measures and facilities to maximise net benefits to transport users and providers. All but the preferred option were discarded as failing to meet all objectives. In particular the high cost option was ruled out as taking longer than available within the programme.</p>						
Statutory requirements and adverse consequences	<p><i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i> Yes – temporary and permanent TROs required.</p> <p><i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i> No</p>						
Value for Money							

Core monetised Benefits	BCR = 1.65	Non-monetised and wider economic benefits	<p><i>[Values/description – supplementary form]</i></p> <p>In main OBC: On a scale -2 to +2: 2: Increased demand for AT, net zero carbon, health, economics. 0: Improved PT viability, Social value</p> <p>In transport Supplementary form: Mod. Beneficial: physical activity, accessibility Slight Beneficial: Noise, LAQ, GHG, Safety, security, severance Neutral: personal affordability</p>
-------------------------	-------------------	-------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

In your view do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?

Forecasts of cost are realistic and include a risk provision of 8%
If costs increase a further 10% - BCR falls to 1.52

Forecasts of demand are conservative / realistic based on current usage of the TPT and recent growth rates
If demand uplifts +25% - BCR increases to 2.05
If demand uplifts -25% - BCR falls to 1.26
If costs increase 10% and demand uplift fall 25% - BCR falls to 1.1

Value for Money Statement

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

Medium

Risk

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

The risks remain as below:

Risk	Mitigation	Owner
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
Failure to maintain political support	Ensure robust support and communication plan.	Project Manager
Statutory Undertakers Apparatus	Early submissions for stats information	Design Team / Project manager
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
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

Some further public consultation has taken place as requested – a survey of residents’ attitudes to the scheme (details in Appendix R). This shows that the great majority of respondents support the proposals.

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 – 100% ATF funded

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

Competition for resources across programmes could add delay and cost due to pressure on capacity of contractors.

Delivery

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

Yes. Start on site post 21/12/21 (DLO contract), completion March 2022. Some slippage likely.

Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?

Yes. DLO – contracted by 21/12.

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

90%. Yes.

Has the promoter confirmed they will cover any cost overruns without reducing the benefits of the scheme?

Yes (ITB)

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, a general surveys and virtual meetings with residents, visitors and business owners have taken place and a scheme-specific online survey was carried out in August 2021 which indicated a high level of local support for the scheme.

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 promoter still need to seek legal advice?

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

Recommendation and Conditions

Recommendation	Approved to proceed to Contract
Payment Basis	Defrayal
Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)	
<p>Prior to contract the following to be provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Risk Log • Appendix B (Social Value Outcomes) • Final signed version of Full Business Case <p>Conditions to be included in contract:</p> <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 	

