

# Public Document Pack



Tuesday, 12 October 2021

To: Members of the MCA - Transport and the Environment Board and Appropriate Officers

You are hereby invited to a meeting of the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority to be held at **Virtual Meeting**, on: **Thursday, 21 October 2021** at **10.00 am** for the purpose of transacting the business set out in the agenda.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D. Smith'.

Dr Dave Smith  
**Chief Executive**



You can view the agenda and papers at [www.sheffieldcityregion.org.uk](http://www.sheffieldcityregion.org.uk) or use a smart phone camera and scan the QR code

## Member Distribution

Councillor Chris Read (Co-Chair)  
Peter Kennan (Co-Chair)  
Councillor Dominic Beck  
Councillor Joe Blackham  
Councillor Chris Lamb  
Councillor Douglas Johnson  
Karen Beardsley  
Sarah Norman  
Martin Swales  
Stephen Edwards

Rotherham MBC  
Private Sector LEP Board Member  
Rotherham MBC  
Doncaster MBC  
Barnsley MBC  
Sheffield City Council  
Private Sector LEP Board Member  
Barnsley MBC  
MCA Executive Team  
SYLTE

## MCA - Transport and the Environment Board

Thursday, 21 October 2021 at 10.00 am

Venue: Virtual Meeting



### Agenda

Agenda Ref No	Subject	Lead	Page
1.	Welcome and Apologies	Chair	
2.	Declarations of Interest by individual Members in relation to any item of business on the agenda.	Chair	
3.	Urgent items / Announcements	Chair	
4.	Public Questions of Key Decisions	Chair	
5.	Minutes of the last meeting	Chair	
6.	Active Travel Update (Verbal)	Dame Sarah Storey	
7.	Update on Public Transport Patronage (Verbal)	Steve Edwards	
8.	Bus Service Improvement Plan (BSIP)	Chloe Shepherd	5 - 10
9.	Rail Update	Pat Beijer	11 - 18
10.	Highways Capital Maintenance Allocation of the 21/22 Grant	Alex Linton	19 - 32
11.	Programme Approvals	Charli Taylor	33 - 112
12.	Any Other Business	Chair	
<b>Date of next meeting:</b> Thursday, 16 December 2021 at 10.00 am <b>At:</b> Virtual Meeting			

This page is intentionally left blank



## Transport and the Environment Board

21 October 2021

### South Yorkshire Bus Service Improvement Plan

---

<b>Is the paper exempt from the press and public?</b>	No
<b>Purpose of this report:</b>	Discussion
<b>Is this a Key Decision?</b>	Yes
<b>Has it been included on the Forward Plan?</b>	Yes

---

**Director Approving Submission of the Report:**  
Stephen Edwards, Executive Director (SYPTA)

**Report Author(s):**  
Chloe Shepherd  
Chloe.shepherd@sheffieldcityregion.org.uk

---

#### **Executive Summary**

This report seeks support for the South Yorkshire Bus Service Improvement Plan, which all Local Transport Authorities are required to produce by the end of October to gain access to further funding for local bus services.

#### **What does this mean for businesses, people and places in South Yorkshire?**

The Strategic Economic Plan and the Mayor's Transport Strategy both underline the importance of the bus network to businesses, residents and visitors in South Yorkshire, whilst the independent Bus Review commissioned by the Mayor indicated a number of issues with the current network. The contents of the Bus Service Improvement Plan include a range of short, medium and long term actions aimed at supporting the recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic and providing the bus network that South Yorkshire needs to achieve its aims for a stronger, fairer and greener region.

## Recommendations

It is recommended that the MCA Transport and Environment Board endorses the Bus Service Improvement Plan, subject to any minor changes requested, for delegated approval by the Chief Executive in consultation with the Leaders and Mayor, prior to submission to Government.

## Consideration by any other Board, Committee, Assurance or Advisory Panel

Transport and the Environment Board

02 September 2021

Mayoral Combined Authority Board

20 September 2021

---

## 1. Background

- 1.1 The National Bus Strategy, “*Bus Back Better*”, published in March 2021, required all Local Transport Authorities (LTAs) to produce a Bus Service Improvement Plan (BSIP) by the end of October 2021, in order to be eligible for transformational funding for local bus services from April 2022 onwards.
- 1.2 Guidance issued by the Department for Transport (DfT) suggested that the overall aim of the document is to “...*explain LTA ambition to improve buses and the plans and policies that will deliver them*”. The guidance also requires LTAs to set targets relating to service improvements and outline how they will be delivered in their plans, which will be monitored and reported on annually.
- 1.3 The independent South Yorkshire Bus Review (led by Clive Betts MP), published in June 2020, provided a strong baseline for the preparation of the South Yorkshire BSIP. The Bus Review laid bare many of the issues with the South Yorkshire bus system, highlighting eight key findings that need to be addressed.
- 1.4 In response to the Bus Review a 7 Point Plan was agreed in 2020 that would be used to drive improvements on the bus network. A comprehensive programme of analysis was established to guide the MCA’s understanding of what the future bus network should look like. The first three elements of this programme – Route Analysis, Quality Analysis and Environmental Analysis – were commissioned in February/March 2021 with the aim of reporting by the end of the year.
- 1.5 Evidence gathered in the Bus Review that sets out the current situation together with the outcomes to date of the analysis commissioned by the MCA, provide an indication as to what sort of bus network the region needs and has been used to prepare an Initial BSIP in advance of the Government’s deadline for submission.

## 2. Key Issues

- 2.1 The draft BSIP for South Yorkshire is included at Appendix A for the Board’s consideration – it has been developed alongside the four Local Authorities, bus operators and a number of the key stakeholders identified through the Bus Review. The Initial BSIP covers the following elements:

- A brief description of the current South Yorkshire bus network;

- A consideration on the wider social, economic and environmental context, and the links to the policies of the MCA and the constituent local authorities that will influence the bus network;
- An outline of what we want from the South Yorkshire bus network, in terms of the main outcomes and impacts, as well as including some headline targets;
- An indication of how the BSIP will be delivered, including the identification of a package of short-term improvements and the broad components of the Enhanced Partnership that will be used to deliver the improvements.

- 2.2 Section 4 of the Initial BSIP starts with the Vision for the Bus Network agreed with the Board in June/July 2021 and includes the completed logic map discussed at the meeting on 2 September 2021. The headline ‘outputs’ within the logic map relate directly to those set out in the National Bus Strategy, along with some more specific outputs that are directly applicable to South Yorkshire, in line with the agreed success criteria from the Mayor’s Transport Strategy.
- 2.3 Section 4 also contains a series of mandatory targets that measure journey time, reliability, patronage and customer satisfaction improvements, as required by the guidance. The suggested targets have been developed with a mind to the long-term ambition of the document, but also the short-term issues relating to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on patronage. This issue was discussed by the Board at its meeting on 2 September 2021, with the agreement that the targets should reflect the need to recover patronage as quickly as possible in the next two years.
- 2.4 Section 5 of the BSIP contains a series of 40 prioritised activities, policies and interventions for implementation by the MCA, the constituent Local Authorities and bus operators. The work done to date suggests these will influence and contribute to delivering the desired outcomes and impacts, locally, regionally and nationally. The intention is that these prioritised activities, interventions and policies included in the Initial BSIP should be seen as the collective response to the Bus Review and the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic and the means by which the bus network that South Yorkshire wants and needs can be delivered. A table showing these activities, interventions and policies, and their relationship to the objectives of the Strategic Economic Plan, is included at Appendix B.
- 2.5 It should be recognised that these prioritised activities, interventions and policies will take time to implement and monitor their impact. Some are suitable for immediate implementation, whereas some will take more time, either because further work will be required to understand what is actually needed in practice or to reflect the current status of the South Yorkshire bus network following the COVID-19 pandemic. Guidance suggests that BSIPs will be ‘living’ documents, and so these priorities will be updated, particularly as the final outputs are received from the analysis commissioned by the MCA.
- 2.6 The current legislation governing bus networks in England covers different models of delivery, each determining when and how activities, interventions and policies are implemented, with the most appropriate model selected based upon what an LTA is trying to achieve. The MCA agreed in June 2021 that the short-term priorities in our BSIP will be delivered through an Enhanced Partnership model, with the Partnership to be in place by April 2022.

2.7 The Enhanced Partnership documentation requires an Enhanced Partnership Plan and one or more Enhanced Partnership Schemes (the latter being the detail of how elements of the former will be delivered). The Initial BSIP will be used to produce the Enhanced Partnership Plan, taking in any feedback from DfT on the document submitted at the end of October and reflecting the final outputs from the analysis commissioned by the MCA.

2.8 The Enhanced Partnership Plan/BSIP (together with an Enhanced Partnership Scheme), will be subject to a statutory period of consultation with bus operators from mid-November 2021, followed by a period of public consultation as soon as possible thereafter, leading to the production of a Final BSIP in March 2022. This is why the current document is an 'Initial' BSIP, however, it is presented to the Board for endorsement, subject to any minor changes requested, for delegated approval by the MCA Chief Executive in consultation with the South Yorkshire Leaders and the Mayor, prior to submission to Government by the end of October.

### **3. Options Considered and Recommended Proposal**

#### **3.1 Option 1**

The TEB could decide not to submit a BSIP to DfT and instead continue with the existing voluntary partnership arrangements.

3.2 Click or tap here to enter text.

3.3 Click or tap here to enter text.

#### **3.4 Option 1 Risks and Mitigations**

This option is not recommended as the submission of a BSIP is linked to transformation funding and therefore opting out of the process could impact the options available to improve bus services in South Yorkshire. There would also be an associated reputational risk.

#### **3.5 Option 2**

The Board may decide to submit a BSIP to Government on 29 October 2021, with a view to reviewing the content and targets at regular intervals.

#### **3.6 Option 2 Risks and Mitigations**

The submission of a BSIP to Government on 29 October 2021 aligns with the timescales set out by the DfT and would reduce the risk of the SYMCA receiving reduced funding in future years, due to the link between the BSIP and accessing transformational funding. As the BSIP is a living document with public facing reporting against a set of mandatory targets, progress can be tracked and delivery adjusted to mitigate the uncertainty of travel patterns as we recover from the Pandemic.

#### **3.7 Recommended Option**

Option 2 is recommended to the Board.

### **4. Consultation on Proposal**

4.1 The BSIP has been developed following the Bus Review published in June 2020. The public consultation conducted as part of the Bus Review has been used as evidence in the development of the BSIP and therefore builds on that initial evidence base. The drafting of the BSIP has been undertaken collaboratively with Local Authority partners, bus operators in South Yorkshire and with input received from groups including Job Centre Plus and the Peak District National Park. Discussions have also been held with Derbyshire County Council and Nottinghamshire County Council due to the cross-boundary nature of some of the region's bus services.

4.2 The Enhanced Partnership Plan/BSIP will be subject to a statutory period of consultation with bus operators from mid-November 2021, followed by a period of public consultation as soon as possible thereafter, leading to the production of a Final BSIP in March 2022.

## **5. Timetable and Accountability for Implementing this Decision**

5.1 The deadline for submission to the DfT is 31 October 2021. With the submission date falling between the MCA meetings in September and November 2021, it was agreed by the MCA on 20 September 2021 that submission of the BSIP would be delegated to the MCA Chief Executive in consultation with the South Yorkshire Leaders and the Mayor.

## **6. Financial and Procurement Implications and Advice**

6.1 The delivery of the activities set out in the BSIP are highly dependent upon sufficient funding being secured and at the point of submission, the estimated funding gap is between £250 - £300m. By submitting a BSIP to the DfT the SYMCA will receive an amount of transformational funding from Government to support the delivery of our BSIP, the quantum of which is currently unknown. DfT have stipulated that the content of the first Enhanced Partnership scheme should reflect known funding sources only, therefore the intention is following submission of the BSIP at the end of October 2021, to propose a scheme based upon Gainshare and Levelling Up Fund (LUF), both of which are expected to be confirmed after the MCA Board on 15 November 2021.

## **7. Legal Implications and Advice**

7.1 Following SYMCA approval in June, a Notice of Intention to Prepare an Enhanced Partnership and related Scheme was published. Publication of a BSIP to the DfT by the end of October is the next key step required in accordance with DfT guidance to deliver bus service improvements. In accordance with DfT guidance the process for implementation for the Enhanced Partnership Plan and Scheme will continue enabling statutory consultation with operators from mid-November 2021 and then the public in early 2022.

## **8. Human Resources Implications and Advice**

8.1 None as a result of this paper.

## **9. Equality and Diversity Implications and Advice**

9.1 The BSIP sets out the region's plans for improving accessibility across the bus network and on board our services. Public consultation will be held on the initial scheme in the New Year and will involve consultation with passenger groups that represent a cross section of society to test the content of the plan, ahead of delivery.

## **10. Climate Change Implications and Advice**

10.1 The BSIP sets out the scale of change required to meet the regions net zero targets by 2035. At present the region does not have any zero emission buses and the BSIP identifies the trajectory, costs and initial projects that could begin the transition from diesel to alternative fuels.

10.2 The BSIP also recognises that modal shift from Private Car to Bus is vital to achieving the region's climate ambitions and as such additional measures will need to be taken, over and above fleet replacement to ensure they are met

## **11. Information and Communication Technology Implications and Advice**

11.1 None as a consequence of this paper.

## **12. Communications and Marketing Implications and Advice**

12.1 Should the Board approve the submission of a BSIP to Government, there will be a period of public consultation on the Enhanced Partnership Plan and Schemes we plan to deliver as set out in the BSIP in early 2022, which will require the support of the Communication and Marketing teams.

## **List of Appendices Included**

- A Draft BSIP (to follow)
- B Derivation of Key BSIP Activities (to follow)

## **Background Papers**

None



## Transport and the Environment Board

21 October 2021

### Rail Update

---

<b>Is the paper exempt from the press and public?</b>	No
<b>Purpose of this report:</b>	Discussion
<b>Is this a Key Decision?</b>	No
<b>Has it been included on the Forward Plan?</b>	Not a Key Decision

---

#### **Director Approving Submission of the Report:**

Martin Swales, Interim Director of Transport, Housing and Infrastructure

#### **Report Author(s):**

Melissa Farmer, Rail Development Manager, SYPTE  
Melissa.farmer@sypte.co.uk

---

#### **Executive Summary**

This is a briefing report to provide MCA Transport and Environment Board Members with an update on current rail related matters.

#### **What does this mean for businesses, people and places in South Yorkshire?**

Poor rail connections limit the flow of people, ideas and businesses both within our region and between South Yorkshire and other parts of the North and the rest of the country. The SCR Integrated Rail Plan sets out the network, services and investment that South Yorkshire requires to improve capacity, reliability, affordability, journey times and frequencies. Progress on key elements of this Plan is provided in this report.

#### **Recommendations**

It is recommended that Transport and Environment Board members review the Update report, discuss key issues and advise if there are items that should be considered in more detail at future Board meetings.

## **Consideration by any other Board, Committee, Assurance or Advisory Panel**

None

---

### **1. Background**

- 1.1 This report provides an update on a range of rail matters. It is anticipated that the Government's Integrated Rail Plan will be published in October 2021 and that this will provide greater clarity on Government's investment plans related to HS2 and Northern Powerhouse Rail (NPR) investment. Government is also embarking on the transition to Great British Railways, an arm's length railway body which will subsume the responsibilities of Network Rail, most rail functions of DfT and many operator roles.
- 1.2 In recent months there has been significant work by the Manchester Recovery Task Force on a new rail timetable as well as progress on key South Yorkshire schemes and stations. These are covered in more detail in the report.
- 1.3 Board Members are invited to comment on the issues in this report and to identify if there are topics that would benefit from more extensive discussion at future Board meetings.

### **2. Key Issues**

#### **2.1 Integrated Rail Plan**

The Government's Integrated Rail Plan (IRP) is anticipated imminently and will set out how HS2 and NPR will be phased and integrated. The IRP is likely to include the Government's position on the Eastern leg of HS2 Phase 2b in South Yorkshire alongside plans for NPR. The extent to which the IRP will support and fund the NPR 'preferred' network, endorsed by Northern leaders, is currently unknown. Also, in South Yorkshire NPR is closely linked to the HS2 Eastern Leg, as the NPR route from Sheffield to Leeds will use part of the HS2 line between Clayton Junction and Leeds.

#### **2.2 Williams-Shapps Plan for Rail and Great British Railways**

The 'Williams-Shapps Plan for Rail' was published as a White Paper on 20 May 2021 and sets out reform to achieve seven promises to passengers and freight customers, and 62 commitments that frame the reform proposals. There will be a fundamental restructuring of the railway with a new public sector arm's length railway body which will subsume the responsibilities of Network Rail, most rail functions of DfT, and many operator roles to ensure a more joined-up approach to running the railway. It will be called 'Great British Railways' (GBR), and assume the role of 'guiding mind', providing accountability and leadership.

The Transport Secretary has recently announced the core goals that will define GBR. These include changing the culture of the railways, putting passengers and freight first, attracting new people to travel and making travel easier, driving down costs and being more accountable. A GBR Transition Team has been set up and they have

started to engage with stakeholders across the whole industry about the strategy and plans for the new structure.

### **2.3 Manchester Recovery Task Force**

DfT and TfN have published a statement on the work of the Manchester Recovery Task Force (MRTF) and launched a consultation on a proposed new rail timetable. Aiming to address the longstanding congestion and reliability issues around Manchester, the new timetable should be implemented from December 2022.

The new timetable will mean that the current 18 trains per day, in each direction, between Cleethorpes – Doncaster - Sheffield-Manchester Piccadilly - Manchester Airport will run to Liverpool Lime Street instead of Manchester Airport. This rerouting will mean that Sheffield will gain a second direct train per hour to Liverpool Lime Street and Doncaster will gain one direct train per hour to Liverpool Lime Street.

Passengers for the airport will need to change at Manchester Piccadilly where there will be a train approximately every ten minutes to the airport from the adjacent platform. Journey times between Sheffield and Doncaster to/from Manchester Airport should take no longer than an additional ten minutes compared with current direct services.

Throughout the MRTF process, the Mayor has worked tirelessly to secure the first and last trains of the day running to Manchester Airport, providing direct connectivity for early and late travelling passengers. This is far from ideal and work will continue to advocate for full reinstatement of hourly direct services.

In the longer term, from the early 2030s, NPR will provide two faster trains per hour between Sheffield and Manchester Airport.

### **2.4 Network Rail Continuous Modular Strategic Planning (CMSP)**

Network Rail have carried out a CMSP study on both Sheffield Midland area (2019) and Doncaster Station area (2021) looking at what infrastructure enhancements are required to accommodate current and future rail services and to improve performance.

A package of shorter term, smaller scale capacity and performance enhancements has been developed for Sheffield Midland, which will enable the station to work more flexibly and handle more trains from both north and south. This is being presented to the DfT for funding with a view to delivery in the next five years. A further package of longer term and more substantial interventions in the wider Sheffield area will be developed following the publication of the IRP once there is certainty on HS2 and NPR.

Two packages of interventions to enhance capacity and performance are also being developed arising from the Doncaster CMSP study – one for the area around Doncaster station and one for the South Kirkby and Hare Park area on the ECML branch to Leeds. These are also seeking funding from the Government.

## **2.5 Hope Valley Line capacity scheme**

This scheme - to add a second platform and track at Dore and Totley station, extend the Dore South curve and build a new passing loop for freight at Bamford - is starting to get underway. Preparatory work has commenced, and work will start on site in early 2022. The contractors have been liaising closely with the MCA as well as the local community.

The scheme is due to be completed by the end of 2023 and the main output of the scheme will be much needed improved reliability along the Hope Valley Line. The other original output of the Scheme was a third fast train between Sheffield and Manchester. However, due to congestion at both the Sheffield and Manchester ends of the line, at present there is no guarantee that the third fast train will be delivered from this scheme alone. The Sheffield CMSP work will assist with capacity issues at Sheffield, but further work is required to address capacity issues in Manchester. The Mayor continues to firmly make the case with DfT officials and directly with the Transport Minister and work will continue to secure this train as soon as possible after the scheme is completed.

## **2.6 East Coast Mainline Timetable Consultation**

All the franchised passenger train operators that currently use the East Coast Mainline recently consulted on their proposals for the May 2022 timetable changes. SYMCA submitted a combined response covering all operators. Following the consultation, and in response to considerable opposition to the removal of a TPE service between Liverpool and Edinburgh, and other proposals, the timetable changes were paused by the Government and will not be implemented in May 2022. There will be a further review of the proposals with a view to introducing them in 2023. MCA officers are keenly awaiting and, working with the Mayor, ready to act to ensure that the improvements that were proposed for Doncaster and Sheffield still materialise.

## **2.7 Second train per hour on Penistone Line**

In June 2021, Kirklees Council (with support from WYCA and SYPTE) submitted a bid to the Levelling Up Fund (LUF) for a package of works to improve travel along the Penistone Line between Huddersfield, Barnsley, and Sheffield. Combined, this package of improvements will provide passengers with a seamless end-to-end journey and will encourage more people along the line to take the train. The bid focuses on investment into three key elements: Major infrastructure improvements to facilitate two trains per hour, line speed and reliability infrastructure improvements and Mobility Hubs at all stations along the route. It is anticipated that successful bids to the LUF will be announced as part of the Spending Review in October.

## **2.8 Second express Sheffield – Leeds service**

At present there is only one express train per hour between Sheffield and Leeds (in both directions) operated by Cross Country, with a journey time of 40 mins. In Northern's original franchise agreement there was a commitment to introduce a

new second Sheffield - Leeds express train and this commitment should have been delivered in December 2019. For various reasons delivery of the additional service did not happen.

When Northern changed to Operator of Resort in March 2020, franchise obligations were renegotiated with DfT and this commitment to the second fast train did not transfer across into the new Service Agreement. Over the last 18 months, SYPTE and WYCA have been working jointly with TfN to get this commitment reinstated. The proposal is for a second hourly express service between Sheffield and Leeds, in both directions, on the opposite half hour to the Cross Country service.

Recent announcements regarding the postponement of the ECML timetable looked initially to put this service once again at risk. However, TfN have confirmed they are still on track to submit the business case for the new service to DfT this month and Northern are continuing to work through the resourcing implications. Planned delivery is hoped to be December 2022.

## **2.9 Cross Country**

SYMCA officers are engaging with Cross Country to seek the restoration of the Reading to Newcastle via Doncaster service, which was withdrawn during the Covid pandemic due to low demand. Demand is now recovering, especially the leisure market, and some trains on the remaining service via Leeds are quite crowded. SYMCA have requested the reinstatement of the service via Doncaster and have a meeting arranged with Cross Country to discuss this shortly, along with the reinstatement of the Chesterfield stop in all of the Plymouth – Edinburgh services.

## **2.10 Restoring Your Railways**

SYMCA submitted the Strategic Outline Business Case (SOBC) for the Barrow Hill Line scheme in February 2021. It is anticipated that the outcome of this will be known around the time of the Spending Review. Work is continuing on the SOBC for a new station at Waverley, which was a successful second round Restoring Your Railways bid. An announcement on the third round Restoring Your Railways bids, which includes the Stocksbridge (Don Valley) Line, the North Midland Line from Barnsley to Wakefield, and the Askern Line from Doncaster to Knottingley, is also expected in October as part of the Spending Review.

## **2.11 Station Improvements**

SYPTE and Northern were successful in securing £1M to improve the accessibility of 10 stations via the Access for All (Mid-Tier) programme. It should be noted that these 10 regional stations differ from the 11 being improved via the Transforming Cities Fund. Works will begin in late 2021.

Whilst funding is still being sought via local allocations, SYPTE is working with partners to strengthen its previously unsuccessful bids to the Access for All (Major) scheme programme – Submissions to this fund are expected to be made in 2022.

Work is underway with delivering the Transforming Cities Fund(ed) rail station improvements package. This will see over £3M spent on improving the station accessibility and environment of 11 stations.

SYLTE was successful in securing a portion of the Northern Accessibility Fund (as a result of Pacer withdrawal delay), which will see improvements to signage for visually impaired people, making stations much more inclusive and welcoming.

## **2.12 Community Rail activity**

SYLTE has been working in partnership with communities and Network Rail over lockdown to better understand the motivations behind track trespass, track-access methods and potential mitigation measures for hotspots across South Yorkshire.

Subsequently SYLTE has been leading a number of projects including connecting with local people to form new station adoption groups in hotspot areas to help promote rail safety within their local community as well as being a familiar calming presence at the station whilst they carry out their activities. Of the 29 stations within South Yorkshire, 14 of these now have station adoption groups.

SYLTE has also arranged for group members to attend the Samaritans Managing Suicidal Contacts training course to help them recognise, support and signpost people of concern on the platforms.

## **3. Options Considered and Recommended Proposal**

### **3.1 Option 1**

It is recommended that the Board consider the Update report and discuss issues of interest. This is only a briefing report and not a decision-making report.

### **3.13 Recommended Option**

N/A.

## **4. Consultation on Proposal**

4.1 Individual schemes and programmes referred to in this update report will each have their own arrangements for consultation and stakeholder engagement.

## **5. Timetable and Accountability for Implementing this Decision**

5.1 Individual schemes and programmes referred to in this update report will each have their own delivery and accountability arrangements.

## **6. Financial and Procurement Implications and Advice**

6.1 There are no financial and procurement implications arising from this report.

## **7. Legal Implications and Advice**

7.1 There are no legal implications arising from this report.

## **8. Human Resources Implications and Advice**

8.1 There are no Human Resource implications arising from this report.

**9. Equality and Diversity Implications and Advice**

9.1 There are no equality and diversity implications arising from this report. Equality and diversity are considered at a scheme and programme level.

**10. Climate Change Implications and Advice**

10.1 There are no climate change implications arising from this report. Climate change implications are considered at a scheme and programme level.

**11. Information and Communication Technology Implications and Advice**

11.1 There are no ICT implications arising from this report.

**12. Communications and Marketing Implications and Advice**

12.1 There are no communications and marketing implications arising from this report.

**List of Appendices Included\***

None

**Background Papers**

None

This page is intentionally left blank



## Transport and the Environment Board

21 October 2021

### Highways Capital Maintenance Allocation of the 21/22 Grant

---

<b>Is the paper exempt from the press and public?</b>	No
<b>Purpose of this report:</b>	Policy Decision
<b>Is this a Key Decision?</b>	No
<b>Has it been included on the Forward Plan?</b>	Not a Key Decision

---

**Director Approving Submission of the Report:**

Martin Swales, Interim Director of Transport, Housing and Infrastructure

**Report Author(s):**

Alex Linton, LTP Programme Manager  
alex.linton@syltp.org.uk

---

**Executive Summary**

In January 2021 the SYMCA Board approved the distribution of a predicted Highways Maintenance allocation for this financial year. On award the allocation had increased, there was a restructuring of the allocation breakdown but no changes to grant conditions. This paper proposes a method for distribution of the revised award.

**What does this mean for businesses, people and places in South Yorkshire?**

An efficient and effective highway network enables reliable movement of people and goods around the region for all purposes. Ongoing maintenance funding is essential to support this.

**Recommendations**

That the formula for distribution of funding which was agreed by MCA for the predicted allocation is applied to the full value of the actual award received.

**Consideration by any other Board, Committee, Assurance or Advisory Panel**

None

---

## 1. Background

- 1.1 At the time of MCA approving the capital programme for 2021/22 the annual settlement for Highways Capital Maintenance (HCM) had not been announced by DfT. To allow activity to continue a predicted value was included in the approval, based on previous years' settlement levels.
- 1.2 When DfT announced the settlement there was a variation in the structure and total value of the settlement for which a revised approval is now sought.
- 1.3 The predicted settlement had a total value of £12.219m, made up of £10.113m HCM Needs and £2.106m HCM Incentive. The settlement received has a total value of £15.692m and is made up of £6.974m HCM Needs, £1.744m, HCM Incentive and £6.974m Pothole funding. This is a total increase of £3.473m.
- 1.4 The grant conditions for the full settlement are the same as previous years conditions and DfT intentions for the funding have not been altered by the changes in the settlement. The settlement letter and conditions are attached as Appendix A
- 1.5 In previous years the DfT has provided the Pothole allocations as separate settlements to the annual HCM. These have also come with the same conditions so the addition of a Pothole element to the annual award does not create any diversion from past practice.
- 1.6 The proposal of this paper is that the formula for distribution of the original forecast settlement, as approved at MCA in January 2021 is applied to the actual settlement value.
- 1.7 Maintenance allocations from DfT are calculated by the Department using a formula that takes into account the length and number of highways assets within a local authority area. The full details of this calculation, or the base data used are not publicised by the department. Within SYMCA this formula is applied to BMBC, DMBC and RMBC only, SCC have a separate PFI arrangement for their Highways Maintenance funding requirements.
- 1.8 The result of this formula is a consistent distribution of the allocations across the three recipient authorities, Table 1 below shows how the forecast allocation was distributed and how the revised allocation would be allocated.

**Table 1 – Maintenance Allocation Distribution Values**

LA	% Share (to 2dp)	Total from forecast settlement	Equivalent Total from actual settlement
BMBC	30.20	£3.690m	£4.739m
DMBC	40.18	£4.910m	£6.305m
RMBC	29.62	£3.619m	£4.648m
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>£12.209m</b>	<b>£15.692m</b>

## 2. Key Issues

2.1 Levels of maintenance funding have been reducing continually throughout resulting in a significant backlog of work required to be completed. Although Government have provided some additional ad hoc maintenance allocations in recent years the levels remain low and this backlog continues to increase. An ongoing programme of network condition evaluation ensures that the most important regional routes, with the highest need for repair are prioritised. It remains essential though that all available funding is deployed to minimise the deterioration of the highway network condition.

### **3. Options Considered and Recommended Proposal**

#### **3.1 Option 1**

To apply the formula for distribution which was used when the original forecast allocation was approved by MCA to the revised settlement value and allocate the funding to the three recipient local authorities as per Table 1.

#### **3.2 Option 1 Risks and Mitigations**

The processes and functions to deliver maintenance programmes are well established in the region and there is the necessary capacity within these to manage delivery of the additional allocation so risk to delivery is negligible and mitigated by the existing arrangements.

#### **3.3 Option 2**

A competitive submission or needs based approach could be undertaken with authorities asked to present business cases for evaluation.

#### **3.4 Option 2 Risks and Mitigations**

The scale of the backlog of works required means that all of this funding is required. Allocating through a competitive process would detract from delivery of those core works and could divert this essential funding away to a more project-based allocation. DfT have provided additional competitive funds in recent years which have provided an opportunity to address these larger project requirements without reducing the level of commitment to fundamental maintenance.

#### **3.5 Recommended Option**

Option 1

### **4. Consultation on Proposal**

4.1 The proposed distribution has been discussed with the four South Yorkshire local highway authority Asset Managers.

### **5. Timetable and Accountability for Implementing this Decision**

5.1 TEB approval of a variation in allocation would need to be presented to MCA for approval. Once this has been completed the additional allocations could be added to the authorities' schedule of works immediately.

### **6. Financial and Procurement Implications and Advice**

6.1 The MCA Board agreed to the £3.473m increase noted in paragraph 1.3 when the MCA group revenue budget and capital programme was approved in March 2021.

6.2 The decision is therefore to agree the proposed formula for distribution between the three local authorities, the impact of which is fiscally neutral to the MCA.

## **7. Legal Implications and Advice**

7.1 None

## **8. Human Resources Implications and Advice**

8.1 No implications directly arising from this report.

## **9. Equality and Diversity Implications and Advice**

9.1 Equality, Diversity and Social Inclusion has been actively considered in the design of all local authority transport projects.

## **10. Climate Change Implications and Advice**

10.1 No implications directly arising from this report.

## **11. Information and Communication Technology Implications and Advice**

11.1 No implications directly arising from this report.

## **12. Communications and Marketing Implications and Advice**

12.1 There are no communications and marketing implications arising from this report.

### **List of Appendices Included**

A Sheffield City Region CA ITB & HCM Pothole Settlement

### **Background Papers**

n/a



Department  
for Transport

Jennifer Raynor  
Head of Local Infrastructure  
Division  
Department for Transport  
2/14 Great Minster House  
33 Horseferry Road  
London  
SW1P 4DR

Dr Dave Smith  
Managing Director  
Sheffield City Region Combined Authority  
Via email:  
Dave.smith@sheffieldcityregion.org.uk

Web Site: [www.gov.uk/dft](http://www.gov.uk/dft)

Our Ref:  
Your Ref:

Date: 22 April 2021

Dear Dr Smith

## LOCAL TRANSPORT CAPITAL FUNDING 2021/22 FINANCIAL YEAR

The Government is providing capital funding towards local transport from a number of different financial grants in 2021/22. This letter includes details of the capital funding that Sheffield City Region Combined Authority will receive. The Grant Determinations for each funding stream are attached, as is a declaration included in Annex B that you and your Authority's Chief Internal Auditor are required to sign and to return to the Department for Transport by 30 September 2022.

The Department paid 30% of the Pothole Fund in advance to give you some additional flexibility to assist with your plans to repair potholes and to protect your local road network from adverse weather. From your full allocation of £6,974,000 you should have received £2,092,000 on 31 March, this leaves £4,882,000.

The table below shows your allocations from the Pothole Fund, Integrated Transport Block and Highways Maintenance Block (incentive and needs elements). All of this funding will be paid on 23 April 2021.

Funding Stream	2021/22 Allocation
Integrated Transport Block	£8,493,000
Highways Maintenance Block needs element	£6,974,000
Highways Maintenance Block incentive element	£1,744,000
Pothole Fund after advance payment	£4,882,000
Total payment	£22,093,000

The allocations given in this letter do not include any highways maintenance or pothole fund capital allocation in respect of Sheffield City Council due to their 25 year highways maintenance PFI contract which became operational in 2012.

Please contact us at [LT.PLANS@dft.gov.uk](mailto:LT.PLANS@dft.gov.uk) for queries relating to the capital block funding allocations outlined in this letter.

## **Local Highways Maintenance Block Incentive Element**

The Department for Transport has assessed the results from the 2021/22 incentive element exercise. This categorises your authority as being Band 3 and your allocation is based on this. Please note the Department may undertake a sample audit of evidence from some authorities during the financial year. In addition, in the interests of transparency we may also publish full results of all authorities' results on the Department's website.

Yours sincerely



**Jennifer Raynor**  
**Deputy Director: Local Infrastructure**

Enclosed:

- Local Transport Capital Block Funding (Integrated Transport and Highway Maintenance Blocks) Specific Grant Determination (2021/22): No.31/5505
- Local Transport Capital Block Funding (Pothole Fund) Specific Grant Determination (2021/22): No.31/5506
- Annex A - Allocations
- Annex B - Grant Conditions and Declaration

**LOCAL TRANSPORT CAPITAL BLOCK FUNDING (INTEGRATED TRANSPORT AND HIGHWAY MAINTENANCE BLOCKS) SPECIFIC GRANT DETERMINATION (2021/22): No 31/5505.**

The Minister for Local Transport (“the Minister”), in exercise of the powers conferred by section 31 of the Local Government Act 2003, makes the following determination:

**Citation**

1) This determination may be cited as the Local Transport Capital Block Funding (Integrated Transport and Highway Maintenance Blocks) Specific Grant Determination (2021/22): No.31/5505.

**Purpose of the grant**

2) The purpose of the grant is to provide support to local authorities in England towards expenditure lawfully incurred or to be incurred by them.

**Determination**

3) The Minister determines:

(a) that the authorities listed in Annex A are the authorities to which grant under this determination is to be paid;

(b) that the maximum amount of grant payable to each authority shall be the amount shown against the name of the authority in the accompanying spreadsheet at Annex A.

**Grant conditions**

4) Pursuant to section 31(3) and 31(4) of the Local Government Act 2003, the Minister determines that the grant will be paid subject to the conditions in Annex B.

**Treasury consent**

5) Before making this determination in relation to local authorities in England, the Minister obtained the consent of the Treasury.

Signed by authority of the Minister for Local Transport



Jennifer Raynor

A senior civil servant within the Department for Transport

April 2021

## **LOCAL TRANSPORT CAPITAL BLOCK FUNDING (POTHOLE FUND) SPECIFIC GRANT DETERMINATION (2021/22): NO.31/5506**

The Minister for Local Transport (“the Minister”), in exercise of the powers conferred by section 31 of the Local Government Act 2003, makes the following determination:

### **Citation**

1) This determination may be cited as the Local Transport Capital Block Funding (Pothole Fund) Specific Grant Determination (2021/22): No.31/5506.

### **Purpose of the grant**

2) The purpose of the grant is to provide support to local authorities in England towards expenditure lawfully incurred or to be incurred by them.

### **Determination**

3) The Minister determines:

(a) that the authorities listed in Annex A are the authorities to which grant under this determination is to be paid;

(b) that the maximum amount of grant payable to each authority shall be the amount shown against the name of the authority in the accompanying spreadsheet at Annex A.

### **Grant conditions**

4) Pursuant to section 31(3) and 31(4) of the Local Government Act 2003, the Minister determines that the grant will be paid subject to the conditions in Annex B.

### **Treasury consent**

5) Before making this determination in relation to local authorities in England, the Minister obtained the consent of the Treasury.

Signed by authority of the Minister for Local Transport



Jennifer Raynor

A senior civil servant within the Department for Transport

April 2021

**ANNEX A**

**LOCAL TRANSPORT CAPITAL BLOCK FUNDING (INTEGRATED TRANSPORT AND HIGHWAY MAINTENANCE BLOCKS) SPECIFIC GRANT DETERMINATION (2021/22): No 31/5505 AND LOCAL TRANSPORT CAPITAL BLOCK FUNDING (POTHOLE FUND) SPECIFIC GRANT DETERMINATION (2021/22): No 31/5506.**

<b>Transport Authority</b>	<b>Integrated Transport Block £000s</b>	<b>Highways Maintenance Block (needs element) £000s</b>	<b>Highways Maintenance Block (incentive element) £000s</b>	<b>Pothole Fund £000s</b>	<b>Total £000s</b>
Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council	-	-	-	-	-
Bath & North East Somerset Council	-	-	-	-	-
Bedford Borough Council	1,162	1,657	414	1,657	4,890
Birmingham City Council	-	-	-	-	-
Blackburn with Darwen Borough Council	1,435	1,070	268	1,070	3,843
Blackpool Council	1,733	667	167	667	3,234
Bolton Council	-	-	-	-	-
BCP Council	3,102	2,127	532	2,127	7,888
Bracknell Forest Borough Council	726	944	236	944	2,850
City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council	-	-	-	-	-
Brighton and Hove City Council	3,083	1,455	364	1,455	6,357
Bristol City Council	-	-	-	-	-
Buckinghamshire County Council	2,275	5,827	1,457	5,827	15,386
Bury Metropolitan Borough Council	-	-	-	-	-
Calderdale Council	-	-	-	-	-
Cambridgeshire County Council	-	-	-	-	-
Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Combined Authority	4,633	10,250	2,562	10,250	27,695
Central Bedfordshire Council	1,376	2,473	618	2,473	6,940
Cheshire East Council	2,003	5,799	1,450	5,799	15,051
Cheshire West and Chester Council	1,970	4,413	1,103	4,413	11,899
Cornwall Council	-	-	-	12,589	12,589
Coventry City Council	-	-	-	-	-
Cumbria County Council	2,566	15,028	3,757	15,028	36,379
Darlington Borough Council	-	-	-	-	-
Derby City Council	1,825	1,229	307	1,229	4,590
Derbyshire County Council	3,672	10,533	2,633	10,533	27,371

<b>Transport Authority</b>	<b>Integrated Transport Block £000s</b>	<b>Highways Maintenance Block (needs element) £000s</b>	<b>Highways Maintenance Block (incentive element) £000s</b>	<b>Pothole Fund £000s</b>	<b>Total £000s</b>
Devon County Council	3,628	23,477	5,869	23,477	56,451
Doncaster Council	-	-	-	-	-
Dorset Council	1,986	7,285	1,821	7,285	18,377
Dudley Metropolitan Borough Council	-	-	-	-	-
Durham County Council	-	6,596	1,649	6,596	14,841
East Riding of Yorkshire Council	1,653	6,130	1,533	6,130	15,446
East Sussex County Council	2,941	5,900	1,475	5,900	16,216
Essex County Council	6,324	13,638	3,409	13,638	37,009
Gateshead Council	-	1,520	380	1,520	3,420
Gloucestershire County Council	2,884	9,896	2,474	9,896	25,150
Greater Manchester Combined Authority	-	-	-	15,526	15,526
Halton Borough Council	-	-	-	-	-
Hampshire County Council	5,338	14,886	3,721	14,886	38,831
Hartlepool Borough Council	-	-	-	-	-
Herefordshire Council	1,077	6,395	1,599	6,395	15,466
Hertfordshire County Council	4,604	9,880	2,470	9,880	26,834
Isle of Wight Council	1,429	0	0	0	1,429
Kent County Council	6,914	15,137	3,784	15,137	40,972
Kingston-upon-Hull City Council	2,247	1,249	312	1,249	5,057
Kirklees Council	-	-	-	-	-
Knowsley Metropolitan Borough Council	-	-	-	-	-
Lancashire County Council	6,101	12,805	3,201	12,805	34,912
Leeds City Council	-	-	-	-	-
Leicester City Council	2,576	1,450	362	1,450	5,838
Leicestershire County Council	2,750	7,891	1,973	7,891	20,505
Lincolnshire County Council	3,337	17,210	4,303	17,210	42,060
Liverpool City Council	-	-	-	-	-
Liverpool City Region Combined Authority	10,147	9,386	2,347	9,386	31,266
Luton Borough Council	1,469	759	190	759	3,177
Manchester City Council	-	-	-	-	-
Medway Council.	1,602	1,412	353	1,412	4,779
Middlesbrough Borough Council	-	-	-	-	-
Milton Keynes Council	1,539	2,843	711	2,843	7,936
Newcastle City Council	-	1,506	377	1,506	3,389
Norfolk County Council	4,173	15,892	3,973	15,892	39,930

<b>Transport Authority</b>	<b>Integrated Transport Block £000s</b>	<b>Highways Maintenance Block (needs element) £000s</b>	<b>Highways Maintenance Block (incentive element) £000s</b>	<b>Pothole Fund £000s</b>	<b>Total £000s</b>
North East Combined Authority	14,057	-	-	-	14,057
North East Lincolnshire Council	1,490	1,107	277	1,107	3,981
North Lincolnshire Council	1,168	2,553	638	2,553	6,912
North Somerset Council	980	2,227	557	2,227	5,991
North Tyneside Council	-	1,253	313	1,253	2,819
North Yorkshire County Council	3,046	16,454	4,113	16,454	40,067
Northamptonshire West Council	1,550	4,742	1,185	4,742	12,219
Northamptonshire North Council	1,551	3,735	934	3,735	9,955
Northumberland County Council	-	9,680	2,420	9,680	21,780
Nottingham City Council	3,416	1,229	307	1,229	6,181
Nottinghamshire County Council	3,947	8,280	2,070	8,280	22,577
Oldham Council	-	-	-	-	-
Oxfordshire County Council	3,717	9,265	2,316	9,265	24,563
Peterborough City Council	-	-	-	-	-
Plymouth City Council	1,959	1,290	323	1,290	4,862
Portsmouth City Council	1,865	794	198	794	3,651
Reading Borough Council	1,592	817	204	817	3,430
Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council	-	-	-	-	-
Rochdale Borough Council	-	-	-	-	-
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	-	-	-	-	-
Rutland County Council	462	1,058	265	1,058	2,843
Salford City Council	-	-	-	-	-
Sandwell Council	-	-	-	-	-
Sefton Council	-	-	-	-	-
Sheffield City Council	-	-	-	-	-
Sheffield City Region Combined Authority	8,493	6,974	1,744	6,974	24,185
Shropshire Council	1,638	9,155	2,289	9,155	22,237
Slough Borough Council	1,360	502	125	502	2,489
Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council	-	-	-	-	-
Somerset County Council	2,227	12,494	3,123	12,494	30,338
South Gloucestershire Council	-	-	-	-	-
South Tyneside Council	-	859	215	859	1,933

<b>Transport Authority</b>	<b>Integrated Transport Block £000s</b>	<b>Highways Maintenance Block (needs element) £000s</b>	<b>Highways Maintenance Block (incentive element) £000s</b>	<b>Pothole Fund £000s</b>	<b>Total £000s</b>
Southampton City Council	2,140	946	236	946	4,268
Southend-on-Sea Borough Council	1,412	773	193	773	3,151
St Helens Council	-	-	-	-	-
Staffordshire County Council	3,449	11,141	2,785	11,141	28,516
Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council	-	-	-	-	-
Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council	-	-	-	-	-
Stoke-on-Trent City Council	1,679	1,321	330	1,321	4,651
Suffolk County Council	3,271	12,106	3,026	12,106	30,509
Sunderland City Council	-	1,835	459	1,835	4,129
Surrey County Council	4,821	9,275	2,319	9,275	25,690
Swindon Borough Council	1,389	1,554	388	1,554	4,885
Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council	-	-	-	-	-
Tees Valley Combined Authority	4,783	5,242	1,311	5,242	16,578
Telford and Wrekin Council	946	1,916	479	1,916	5,257
Thurrock Council	979	1,106	277	1,106	3,468
Torbay Council	1,071	809	202	809	2,891
Trafford Council	-	-	-	-	-
Wakefield Council	-	-	-	-	-
Walsall Council	-	-	-	-	-
Warrington Borough Council	1,505	1,773	443	1,773	5,494
Warwickshire County Council	2,657	7,187	1,797	7,187	18,828
West Berkshire Council	917	2,394	599	2,394	6,304
West of England Combined Authority	-	-	-	7,071	7,071
West Midlands Combined Authority	17,755	9,043	2,261	9,043	38,102
West Sussex County Council	3,763	7,616	1,904	7,616	20,899
West Yorkshire Combined Authority	13,206	16,212	4,053	16,212	49,683
Wigan Council	-	-	-	-	-
Wiltshire Council	2,198	9,212	2,303	9,212	22,925
Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead	858	1,209	302	1,209	3,578
Wirral Metropolitan Borough Council	-	-	-	-	-
Wokingham Borough Council	740	1,473	368	1,473	4,054
Wolverhampton City Council	-	-	-	-	-

<b>Transport Authority</b>	<b>Integrated Transport Block £000s</b>	<b>Highways Maintenance Block (needs element) £000s</b>	<b>Highways Maintenance Block (incentive element) £000s</b>	<b>Pothole Fund £000s</b>	<b>Total £000s</b>
Worcestershire County Council	2,423	8,328	2,082	8,328	21,161
City of York Council	1,582	1,260	315	1,260	4,417

## ANNEX B - GRANT CONDITIONS

1. Grant paid to a local authority under this determination may be used only for the purposes that a capital receipt may be used for in accordance with regulations made under section 11 of the Local Government Act 2003.

2. The Chief Executive and Chief Internal Auditor of each of the recipient authorities are required to sign and return to the team leader of the Local Transport Funding team<sup>3</sup> in the Department for Transport a declaration, to be received no later than 30 September 2022, in the following terms:

“To the best of our knowledge and belief, and having carried out appropriate investigations and checks, in our opinion, in all significant respects, the conditions attached to the Local Transport Capital Block Funding (Pothole Fund) Specific Grant Determination (2021/22): No.31/5506 and Local Transport Capital Block Funding (Pothole Fund) Specific Grant Determination (2021/22): No.31/5506 have been complied with.”

3. If an authority fails to comply with any of the conditions and requirements of paragraphs 1 and 2, the Minister may-

- a) reduce, suspend or withhold grant; or
- b) by notification in writing to the authority, require the repayment of the whole or any part of the grant.

4. Any sum notified by the Minister under paragraph 3(b) shall immediately become repayable to the Minister.

---

<sup>3</sup> Local Transport Funding team can be contacted at [LT.PLANS@dft.gov.uk](mailto:LT.PLANS@dft.gov.uk).



## Transport and the Environment Board

21 October 2021

### Programme Approvals

---

<b>Is the paper exempt from the press and public?</b>	No
<b>Purpose of this report:</b>	Funding Decision
<b>Is this a Key Decision?</b>	Yes
<b>Has it been included on the Forward Plan?</b>	Yes

---

**Director Approving Submission of the Report:**  
Gareth Sutton, Chief Finance Officer/s73 Officer

**Report Author(s):**  
Charli Taylor – Head of Controls  
Charli.Taylor@sheffieldcityregion.org.uk

---

#### Executive Summary

This paper requests: progression of 11 schemes with early release of development cost funding subject to conditions to be set out in the Assurance Summaries; release of development cost funding for 1 scheme; and approval of 2 project change requests. The paper also requests delegated authority to enter into necessary legal agreements for the schemes.

#### What does this mean for businesses, people and places in South Yorkshire?

This report is seeking approval to progress business cases and enter into contract for a number of investment proposals which will support the SYMCA's aspirations.

#### Recommendations

The Board consider and approve –

1. Progression of “T17 Doncaster Station to College” to full approval and award of £0.41m grant from Transforming Cities Fund (TCF2) to Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council (DMBC) subject to the conditions set out in the Assurance Summary attached at Appendix A1;

2. Progression of "O49 City Centre Cycle Hub" to full approval and award of £0.30m grant from Active Travel 2/Gainshare (ATF2/Gainshare) to Sheffield City Council (SCC) subject to the conditions set out in the Assurance Summary attached at Appendix A2;
3. Progression of "D29 Bus Shelters" to full approval and award of £1.11m grant from Gainshare to South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive (SYPTTE) subject to the conditions set out in the Assurance Summary attached Appendix A3;
4. Progression of "D30 Passenger Information Displays" to full approval and award of £0.67m grant from Gainshare to South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive (SYPTTE) subject to the conditions set out in the Assurance Summary attached Appendix A4;
5. Progression of "T13 A630 Bus Improvements" Outline Business Case (OBC) to Full Business Case (FBC) and the release of development cost funding of up to £0.27m from TCF2 to SYPTTE subject to the conditions set out in the Assurance Summary attached Appendix B1;
6. Progression of "T10 Barnsley Station Access Improvements" OBC to proceed to FBC and the release of development cost funding up to £0.19m from TCF2 to Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council (BMBC) subject to the conditions set out in the Assurance Summary attached at Appendix B2;
7. Progression of "T17/3 Bennethorpe to Hallgate Cycleways" OBC to proceed to FBC and the release of development cost funding up to £0.05m from TCF2 to DMBC subject to the conditions set out in the Assurance Summary attached at Appendix B3;
8. Progression of "O50 Netheredge Crookes" OBC to proceed to FBC and release of development cost funding up to £0.06m from ATF2/Gainshare to SCC subject to the conditions set out in the Assurance Summary attached at Appendix B4;
9. Progression of "T14 West of Doncaster Active Travel" OBC to MCA for approval to proceed to FBC and release of development cost funding up to £0.05m from TCF2 to DMBC subject to the conditions set out in the Assurance Summary attached at Appendix B5;
10. Progression of "O50 Sheaf Valley Route" OBC to MCA for approval to proceed to FBC and release of development cost funding up to £0.05m from ATF2/Gainshare to SCC subject to the conditions set out in the Assurance Summary attached at Appendix B6;
11. Progression of "T8/1&3 City Centre to Attercliffe and Darnall Active Travel" OBC to MCA for approval to proceed to FBC and release of development cost funding up to £1.2m from TCF2 to SCC subject to the conditions set out in the Assurance Summary attached at Appendix B7;
12. Release of development cost funding of £0.08m for "O45 Thorne and Moorends" from ATF2/Gainshare to DMBC in line with the details attached at Appendix C;
- 13.2 Project change requests as detailed in Appendix D;
14. Delegated authority be given to the Head of Paid Service in consultation with the Section 73 and Monitoring Officer to enter into legal agreements for the schemes covered above and enter into the necessary legal grant agreements.

**Consideration by any other Board, Committee, Assurance or Advisory Panel**

Assurance Panel	01 September 2021
Assurance Panel	15 September 2021
Assurance Panel	01 October 2021
Assurance Panel	11 October 2021

## **1. Background**

1.1 This report seeks approval for the progression of schemes funded from multiple funding streams. The paper also requests delegated authority to enter into legal agreements for the named schemes.

### **1.2 Progression of schemes to full approval and award of funding**

The paper is seeking progression to full approval and award of funding for 4 projects which are detailed in Appendix A. The total amount of funding requested is £0.71m grant; £0.41m from the Transforming Cities Fund 2 (TCF2), £0.30m from the Active Travel Fund 2/Gainshare (ATF2/Gainshare) and £1.77m from Gainshare. The projects are located across South Yorkshire. The assurance summaries include conditions of funding which must be met before contract execution.

Full details of the schemes and risks are included in Appendix A.

### **1.3 Progression of schemes to from OBC to FBC with release of development costs**

The paper is seeking progression from OBC to FBC with the release of development costs for 7 projects which are detailed in Appendix B. The total amount of funding requested is £1.87m grant; £1.76m from the TCF2 and £0.11m from the ATF2/Gainshare. The projects are located within Barnsley, Sheffield and Doncaster. The assurance summaries include conditions of funding which must be met before contract execution.

Full details of the schemes and risks are included in Appendix B.

### **1.4 Approval to release development costs**

The paper is seeking release of development costs to aid public consultation for 1 project which is detailed in Appendix C. The total amount of funding is £0.08m grant and is funded from ATF2/Gainshare. The project is located within Doncaster and the consultation will aid the scale and scope of the project.

Full details of the scheme and risks are included in Appendix C.

### **1.5 Project Change Control**

In recognition of unforeseen circumstances that can arise during the project delivery phase, the approved Assurance Framework establishes a formal process for the acceptance of change requests. These change requests could be financial, requiring reprofiling of funds, or could be to amend deliverables or timescales. Details of the 2 change requests can be found in Appendix D.

## **2. Key Issues**

2.1 Not applicable.

## **3. Options Considered and Recommended Proposal**

### 3.1 **Option 1**

Do not approve the recommendations in this report.

### 3.4 **Option 1 Risks and Mitigations**

Inability to approve the projects presented or release development costs may result in a slower pace of delivery and loss of activity/spend to the programmes.

### 3.5 **Option 2**

Award projects a smaller amount of grant funding.

### 3.8 **Option 2 Risks and Mitigations**

All funding awards associated with the projects have been fully appraised in line with the SYMCA Assurance Framework to ensure value for money. Funding for these projects is timebound by the funding bodies and any deliverability issues will be managed via alternative funding sources.

### 3.9 **Option 3**

Approve all recommendations

### 3.12 **Option 3 Risks and Mitigations**

By approving the recommendations, the available programme funding will reduce with funding beyond the original allocations secured from alternative funding sources. However, the projects were included in the bids submitted to the funding bodies and/or are considered a strong strategic fit in line with investment aims.

### 3.13 **Recommended Option**

Option 3

## 4. **Consultation on Proposal**

4.1 Once a project has been accepted onto a programme pipeline, the Value for Money Statement is published on the SYMCA website alongside a summary of the activity. This is updated periodically to include links to the key documents for each project and a record of progress. The SYMCA Executive Team collects any external comments on these schemes, and these are considered as part of the appraisal process. Project sponsors are also required to publish business cases on their own websites (or an appropriate summary of the submission) and must consider all comments received and reflect this in the next stages of the application process.

## 5. **Timetable and Accountability for Implementing this Decision**

5.1 Subject to the approval of the recommendations, the Head of Paid Service in consultation with the Section 73 Officer and Monitoring Officer will progress to enter into legal agreements with each promoter.

5.2 The promoter is responsible for the further development of projects that have gateway approval to the next stage of the SYMCA Assurance process.

## 6. **Financial and Procurement Implications and Advice**

6.1 The projects presented for approval today are profiled to drawdown up to £2.17m from the TCF2 allocation of £166.3m, up to £0.49m from the ATF2 allocation of £7.70m and up to £1.77m from the Gainshare allocation of £3.17m.

## **7. Legal Implications and Advice**

7.1 The legal implications of the projects have been fully considered by a representative of the Monitoring Officer and included in the recommendations agreed within the Assurance Summaries as presented in the Appendices.

7.2 Prior to awarding the grants, the SYMCA shall ensure contracts are put in place to ensure the recipients comply with the grant conditions.

## **8. Human Resources Implications and Advice**

8.1 Not applicable.

## **9. Equality and Diversity Implications and Advice**

9.1 Appropriate equality and diversity considerations are taken into account as part of the assurance of the project business cases.

## **10. Climate Change Implications and Advice**

10.1 A number of the programmes include new and/or enhanced active travel initiatives and improved infrastructure availability thereby shifting private vehicle use to more sustainable modes of transport. This aims to deliver huge benefits for health and the prosperity of cities, positively contributing to the SYMCA's climate change aspirations.

## **11. Information and Communication Technology Implications and Advice**

11.1 Not applicable.

## **12. Communications and Marketing Implications and Advice**

12.1 The approvals provide positive opportunities to highlight the difference the SYMCA's investments will make to people and passengers, businesses and places across South Yorkshire and how Members are taking action to support the region's recovery from COVID.

### **List of Appendices Included**

A	Progression of schemes to full approval and award of funding
A1	Assurance Summary T17-2 Doncaster Station to College (TCF2 FBC)
A2	Assurance Summary O49 Cycle Hub (ATF2Gainshare FBC)
A3	Assurance Summary D29 Bus Shelters (Gainshare FBC)
A4	Assurance Summary D30 Passenger Information Displays (Gainshare FBC)
B	Progression of schemes from OBC to FBC and release of development cost funding
B1	Assurance Summary T13 A630 Bus Improvements (TCF2 OBC)
B2	Assurance Summary T10 Barnsley Station Access Improvements (TCF2 OBC)
B3	Assurance Summary T17-3 Bennethorpe to Hallgate Cycleways (TCF2 OBC)

- B4 Assurance Summary O48 Netheredge Crookes (ATF2Gainsahre OBC)
- B5 Assurance Summary T14 West of Doncaster Active Travel (TCF2 OBC)
- B6 Assurance Summary O50 Sheaf Valley Route (ATF2Gainshare OBC)
- B7 Assurance Summary T8-1&3 City Centre to Attercliffe and Darnall (TCF2 OBC)
- C Approval to release development costs
- D Change Control

## **Appendix A - Progression of schemes to full approval and award of funding**

### **A.1 T17/2 Doncaster Station to College (TCF2 FBC)**

**Appendix A1** provides a summary of the project assurance and the suggested conditions of award.

This investment is for £0.41m from TCF2 to DMBC.

The project will deliver improvements for pedestrians from Doncaster College to Doncaster Interchange along Grey Friars Road and will help provide students and staff with a more attractive active travel route along with greater security. The underpass lighting will be upgraded to detect when in use, saving energy as well as providing greater reassurance to users.

#### **The Benefits and Outcomes –**

The project will deliver the following outputs-

- 1600 sqm of improved walking infrastructure
- 300 sqm of new walking infrastructure
- 2 junction improvements to benefit pedestrians

The project will also contribute to the following outcomes –

- More walking and cycling journeys
- Improved air quality

The project has a clear strategic rationale, demonstrating strong linkage the SEP, the Transport Strategy, the TCF2 programme and national policies to encourage urban living and active travel.

The Assurance Summary notes some conditions of approval that will need to be resolved prior to contract execution, these are detailed in full within Appendix A1.

### **A.2 O49 City Centre Cycle Hub (ATF2/Gainshare BJC)**

**Appendix A2** provides a summary of the project assurance and the suggested conditions of award.

This investment is for £0.30m from ATF2/Gainshare towards total project costs of £0.33m to DMBC.

The project will deliver a facility which will provide secure short term bike storage (for a limited number of hours per user) to enable visitors to the city centre to leave their cycles in confidence. The unit would be leased to a commercial operator for an easily accessible rent and would also include a retail unit for lease as a bike repair centre. This could also include bike hire and sales. The grant requested would cover the cost of fit out of the hub.

#### **The Benefits and Outcomes**

The project will deliver the following outputs -

- 35 sqm of commercial floorspace created
- 200 new cycle parking

- 3 jobs created
- 3 apprenticeships

The project will contribute to the following outcomes -

- Increased walking and cycling journeys

The project aligns well with local and national policies and is considered good value for money. The Assurance Summary notes some conditions of approval these are detailed in full within Appendix A2.

### A.3 **D29 Bus Shelters (Gainshare FBC)**

**Appendix A3** provides a summary of the project assurance and the suggested conditions of award.

This investment is for £1.11m from Gainshare to SYPTE.

The project will replace 148 dilapidated and life expired bus shelters across South Yorkshire where structures have become uneconomical to repair and represent an inferior customer offer. The replacement bus shelters will be modern fully glazed barrel roof structures and include illumination and seating, new information display units will be used to house timetable information.

#### **The Benefits and Outcomes**

The project will deliver the following outputs -

- 148 new bus shelters
- 600 sqm of public realm improvements

The project aligns well with local and national policies. The Assurance Summary notes some conditions of approval these are detailed in full within Appendix A3.

### A.4 **D30 Passenger Information Displays (Gainshare FBC)**

**Appendix A4** provides a summary of the project assurance and the suggested conditions of award.

This investment is for £0.67m from Gainshare to SYPTE.

The project will deliver 193 new passenger information displays across South Yorkshire. The system enables customers to access live departure predictions, logged cancellations and delays in real-time for those operators which are real-time enabled. Priority roll out will see low income areas initially targeted, where there are a larger number of residents that are digitally poor and have no other access to this information.

#### **The Benefits and Outcomes**

The project will deliver the following outputs -

- 193 new passenger information displays

The project aligns well the Transport Strategy. The Assurance Summary notes some conditions of approval these are detailed in full within Appendix A4.

## Assurance Summary



### Scheme Details

<b>Project Name</b>	T0017/2 – Doncaster College to Doncaster Station - FBC	<b>Type of funding</b>	Grant
<b>Grant Recipient</b>	DMBC	<b>Total Scheme Cost</b>	£418,850
<b>MCA Executive Board</b>	Transport	<b>MCA Funding</b>	£418,850
<b>Programme name</b>	TCF	<b>% MCA Allocation</b>	100%

### Appraisal Summary

<b>Project Description</b>	
<i>Is it clear what the MCA is being asked to fund?</i> Unchanged since OBC –improvements to the walk link between the Interchange and College.	
<b>Strategic Case</b>	
<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 fits well with the SEP, the Transport Strategy, the TCF programme and national policies to encourage urban living and active travel. Specifically:</p> <p><i>“ the College have complained about the safety of the working route to the station. Some students have even said that they hire taxis for what is a 5-10 minute walk. A letter of support from the College notes that a consultation with students was undertaken into the issues surrounding the route in 2019 and their comments have fed into the design of the works. Investment has been also prioritised in this area to extend the reach of the high-quality walking and cycling infrastructure in the Town centre.”</i> (source: Doncaster TCF College to Station OBC v2.0 200421).</p> <p>The scheme will see improvements made for pedestrians from Doncaster College to Doncaster Interchange along Grey Friars Road and will help provide students and staff with a more attractive active travel route along with greater security. The underpass lighting will be upgraded to detect when in use, saving energy as well as providing greater reassurance to users.</p> <p>No change in cycling demand is expected.</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 scheme is promoted as a key part of plans to achieve these aims.</p> <p>The need for the scheme has been related to results from an informal consultation exercise of key users (students) which is now attached to the submission (Appendix 1). The issues are listed as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Lighting issues and intimidating, unclean environment particularly under the bridge.</i></li> <li>• <i>Security and safety concerns particularly related to individuals begging</i></li> <li>• <i>Better/safer crossing facilities on Grey Friars Road.</i></li> <li>• <i>Improvement of facilities to improve mobility and access for disabled students;</i></li> </ul>
<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><b>Yes.</b> The walking uplift expected will very slightly reduce the amount of Noise and carbon emissions from road traffic, according to the AMAT tool.</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 Applicant has set out two broad SMART objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To create a cultural shift towards making cycling and walking the natural choice for shorter journeys</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To achieve the above in ways that address current health issues and improve air quality across the SCR.</li> </ul> <p><b>Outputs are:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1600 sq m of improved walking infrastructure</li> <li>300 sq m of new walking infrastructure</li> <li>2 junction improvements to benefit pedestrians.</li> </ul> <p><b>Outcomes (measurable)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More walking and cycling journeys</li> <li>Improved air quality.</li> </ul> <p>Distributional Impact Analysis now complete. This showed that the area around the scheme has a higher than average proportion of one or multiple vulnerable socio-demographic groups likely to use the route and benefit from increased personal security and safety as well as from the improved accessibility provided.</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><b>Yes.</b> Applicant has completed an options assessment, which includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A high level sift, primarily around geographical fit and deliverability within the TCF timeframe</li> <li>A more detailed sift, using the Department for Transport's Early Assessment Sifting Tool.</li> <li>further refinement of the assessment based on more detailed delivery factors and benefits analysis</li> <li>factoring in changes to SCR Active Travel standards to further prioritise specific scheme element</li> </ul>																										
<i>Statutory requirements and adverse consequences</i>	<p><i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i></p> <p><b>No.</b> Cabinet approval granted July 2021 (according to the bid) Temporary TROs during works. Could be a need for permanent.</p> <p><i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i></p> <p><b>No.</b> The promoter states <i>"short term disruption to local businesses and the transport network during construction will be managed by using a phased approach to the areas of construction, ensuring businesses can operate during normal working / operating hours, and any social distancing measures required by the guidance at the time can be managed and adhered to by the public and contractors."</i> In operation it is likely that the scheme will have minimal impact on other road users.</p>																										
<b>Value for Money</b>																											
Core monetised Benefits	<p>Following engagement with the promoter, the uplift factor has now been reduced from 30% to 9.6% and the BCR is now <b>1.45</b>. Benefits (in 2010 market prices and values) comprise:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="450 1142 1095 1468"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>£000</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Congestion benefit</td> <td>13.18</td> <td>3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Infrastructure maintenance</td> <td>0.04</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Accident</td> <td>1.24</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Local air quality</td> <td>0.22</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Noise</td> <td>0.08</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Greenhouse gases</td> <td>0.30</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Reduced risk of premature death</td> <td>249.03</td> <td>59%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		£000	%	Congestion benefit	13.18	3%	Infrastructure maintenance	0.04	0%	Accident	1.24	0%	Local air quality	0.22	0%	Noise	0.08	0%	Greenhouse gases	0.30	0%	Reduced risk of premature death	249.03	59%	Non-monetised and wider economic benefits	<p><i>[Values/description – supplementary form]</i></p> <p>Moderately beneficial: Severance</p>
	£000	%																									
Congestion benefit	13.18	3%																									
Infrastructure maintenance	0.04	0%																									
Accident	1.24	0%																									
Local air quality	0.22	0%																									
Noise	0.08	0%																									
Greenhouse gases	0.30	0%																									
Reduced risk of premature death	249.03	59%																									

Absenteeism	53.01	13%
Journey ambience	106.37	25%
Indirect taxation	-0.87	0%
<b>PVB</b>	422.57	100%

Source: 129 Doncaster Station to College - Preferred Option (Core Scenario) summary sheet  
The PVC reported in the AMAT result has OB input as well as base costs. This is an error as the tool ,adds OB internally. So the true PVC is £16,000 lower than the reported value (PVC=£303,470), which increases the core scenario BCR from 1.39 to **1.45**.

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

The revised BCR has been tested, by the Assessors, for a range of uncertainties. As shown below:

Test	BCR
Covid (25% reduction in uplift)	1.16
No Uplift in demand	0.35
Cost increase +15%	1.26
25% uplift red plus 15% cost increase	1.01

### Value for Money Statement

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

The uplift used in the original submission was based on a case study that was later considered over-optimistic and an alternative estimate (9.6%) has been agreed by the promoter. The OBC and AMAT calculations have now been revised by the promoter.

### Risk

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

The key risks from a delivery perspective relate to public consultation, working practices during COVID and skills shortages. The promoter has put forward adequate management and mitigation measures.

*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 – 100% TCF funded

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

Competition for resources across the TCF programme could add to delay and cost. Any cost increases to be funded by promoter.

### 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 – DLO to be used

*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?*

60%. This is as expected for an OBC. Financial case says if unforeseen risk eventuate these will be covered by the Council.

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

**Yes. No.**

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

**No**

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

Yes. Elected members advised of proposal, College has provided letter of support, adjacent businesses, cyclists and disability groups will be engaged

*Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?*

**Yes**, a clear and comprehensive approach, with a detailed BRP, to be managed at Programme level has been outlined.

### **Legal**

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

The promoter has stated that the proposed works do not affect trade between member states and therefore State Aid rules do not apply. (As for most transport infrastructure)

## **Recommendation and Conditions**

<b>Recommendation</b>	Approval to proceed to contract
<b>Payment Basis</b>	Defrayal
<b>Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)</b>	
<b>Prior to contract execution -</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Appendix A and B (Cash flows and Value contribution)</li><li>• SRO signature on FBC</li></ul>	
<b>Conditions in contract –</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Standard clawback</li></ul>	



This page is intentionally left blank

## Assurance Summary



### Scheme Details

Project Name	O0049 City Centre Cycle Hub BJC	Type of funding	Grant
Grant Recipient	SCC	Total Scheme Cost	£352,989
MCA Executive Board	Transport	MCA Funding	£300,540
Programme name	ATF	% MCA Allocation	85%

### Appraisal Summary

<b>Project Description</b>	
<i>Is it clear what the MCA is being asked to fund?</i> <b>Yes.</b> The project aims to deliver a facility which will provide secure short term bike storage (for a limited number of hours per user) to enable visitors to the city centre to leave their cycles in confidence. The unit would be leased to a commercial operator for an easily accessible rent and would also include a retail unit (possibly at a subsidised rent) for lease as a bike repair centre. This could also include bike hire and sales. The grant requested would cover the cost of fit out of the hub – electrics, plumbing, lighting, windows, doors, bike stands, security measures, monitoring measures, storage, shelving, display units.	
<b>Strategic Case</b>	
<i>Scheme Rationale</i>	<i>Does the scheme have a clearly stated rationale and provide a strong justification for public funding?</i> <b>Yes.</b> Section 3.2 sets out the various ways in which the proposed hub would support SCR objectives, including the economic plan and transport strategy.
<i>Strategic policy fit</i>	<i>How well does the scheme align with the strategic objectives of the SEP and RAP?</i> <b>Reasonably</b> – but local and national level documents need to be referred to. Section 3.2 sets out the various ways in which the proposed hub would support SCR objectives, including the economic plan and transport strategy. Section 3.3 goes on to discuss how the proposed hub will contribute to the delivery of net zero. Section 3.1 briefly discusses the projects alignment with the SCC Transport Strategy. Section 3.3 references the UK Government's commitment to a bolder vision for cycling and walking.
<i>Contribution to Carbon Net Zero</i>	<i>Does this scheme align with the strategic objective to achieve Carbon Net Zero?</i> <b>Yes.</b> Section 3.3 goes on to discuss how the proposed hub will contribute to the delivery of net zero.
<i>SMART scheme objectives</i>	<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 3.8)?</i> SMART objectives are set out at Section 3.5. They are clear and well developed, however a number of them relate to the wider programme of works, not the specific scheme being proposed as part of the submission. <b>It would be beneficial if more of the objectives relate specifically to the active travel hub</b> , in order to establish its use and effectiveness. For example, the number of bicycles parked or rented over a given time period, or the amount of respondents to questionnaires (post engagement) who say they are more likely to cycle as a result of the information and facilities provided. It is noted that the timescale against which objectives are measured is '2040'. <b>Assessment should be undertaken well in advance of that, in the year of opening and a handful of years succeeding opening.</b>

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><b>Yes.</b> The problem is well described (Section 4.2) as a lack of safe storage for cyclists in the city centre and associated theft issues. Section 3.6 and Appendix 6 describe several options in terms of permanency and location for a bike hub and it is clear these have been considered against a set of criteria based on need for location in city centre, a short walk from the main retail area, manageable, economical (a funding stream is required) and near a route. Section 4.5 describes how the preferred option was selected. Section 4.4 states that: “ <i>the location is conveniently situated and easily accessible from existing and planned cycle infrastructure, such as the TCF funded schemes. Other locations are suitable for less extensive storage, so do not present the same opportunity. Designs have been produced and demonstrate that the unit available at Telephone House has sufficient space available to provide the required storage capacity. The unit would be leased to a commercial operator for an easily accessible rent and would also include a retail unit (possibly at a subsidised rent) for lease as a bike repair centre. This could also include bike hire and sales.</i>”</p>		
Statutory requirements and adverse consequences	<p><i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i></p> <p><b>Yes.</b> Planning consent required for “Change of Use”. Retrospective application may be acceptable – depending on external changes made to the existing building as part of hub development.</p> <p><i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i></p> <p><b>No</b></p>		
<b>Value for Money</b>			
Core monetised Benefits	<p><i>[Core BCR – table 4.22]</i></p> <p><b>7.61</b></p>	Non-monetised and wider economic benefits	<p><i>[Values/description – supplementary form]</i></p> <p><b>Supplementary form states environmental impacts “neutral” No wider impacts.</b></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><b>Yes.</b> The BCR has been calculated in AMAT and has been tested for low growth and increased cost – which together reduce the BCR to 2.34. This seems reasonable</p>	<p><i>Do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?</i></p> <p><b>No</b> – scheme not reliant on these for success.</p>		
<b>Value for Money Statement</b>			
<p><i>Taking into consideration the monetised and non-monetised benefits and costs, does the scheme represent good value for money?</i></p> <p><b>Yes</b></p>			
<b>Risk</b>			
<i>What are the most significant risks and is there evidence that these risks are being mitigated?</i>			
<p><b>Risk</b></p> <p>[State the risk and identify both its probability and impact on a scale of high-medium-low]</p>	<p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <p>[State how you will mitigate the risk]</p>	<p><b>Owner</b></p> <p>[State who is responsible for mitigating this risk]</p>	
Cost of works exceed budget	Cost estimate prepared Mar 2021. will be opportunities to reduce scope of offer if necessary	Cost manager	
Utility supply costly to connect to. Increased cost or design changes	Project exceeds available budget	Designer	
Lack of take up / use by public	Unsustainable closure	BMBC/Operator	
Building control request design changes to the design.	Impact on funding timescales	Designer	

Change of use required	Impact on funding timescales	BMBC
<p><i>Do the significant risks require any contract conditions? (e.g. clawback on outcomes)</i>  <b>No</b>  <i>Are there any significant risks associated with securing the full funding of the scheme?</i>  <b>No</b> (10% LTP)  <i>Are there any key risks that need to be highlighted in relation to the procurement strategy?</i>  <b>Not really.</b> Lack of interest is possible (a low risk).</p>		
<b>Delivery</b>		
<p><i>Is the timetable for delivery reasonable and has the promoter identified opportunities for acceleration?</i>  <b>Yes</b> - milestones clarified in Section 5.4  <i>Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?</i>  <b>Yes.</b> The strategy is well-developed – two options are possible for construction– adding works to an existing HOC2 contract or via YORbuild2 framework. The bike hub operation is expected to be let competitively in the next 2 month for a discounted market rent + service charge and (potentially) business rates related to the potential profitability of the proposal.  <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>  <b>60%</b>  <i>Has the promoter demonstrated clear project governance and identified the SRO?</i>  <b>Yes. Yes. TFS</b>  <i>Has the SRO or other appropriate Officer signed of this business case?</i>  <b>Yes</b>  <i>Has public consultation taken place and if so, is there public support for the scheme?</i>  <b>No,</b> but market testing with 3 potential operators has taken place, indicating capacity is required. This is supported by market research in other cities.  <i>Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?</i>  <b>Yes.</b> Clearly laid out in Section 7.8</p>		
<b>Legal</b>		
<p><i>Has the scheme considered Subsidy Control compliance or does the promotor still need to seek legal advice?</i>  <b>Legal advice not clearly obtained</b> but the issue has been considered by the promoter. Section 7.4 asserts that all aspects will be commercially tendered. The below market rent is consistent with the situation for other SCC tenants running small businesses in the locality.</p>		

## Recommendation and Conditions

<b>Recommendation</b>	Approve for contract
<b>Payment Basis</b>	Defrayal
<b>Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)</b>	

- **The following conditions have to be satisfied before contract execution.**

Satisfactory explanation of the projects sustainability and how the ongoing revenue costs will be met in future years.

**The deadline for confirming all pre-conditions are met is 19th November 2020**

- **Conditions within contract**

Standard clawback



This page is intentionally left blank

## Assurance Summary



### Scheme Details

Project Name	D0029 Bus Shelters	Type of funding	Grant
Grant Recipient	SYPTE	Total Scheme Cost	£1,117,253
MCA Executive Board	TEB	MCA Funding	£1,117,253
Programme name	Gainshare	% MCA Allocation	100%

### Appraisal Summary

Project Description	
<p><i>Is it clear what the MCA is being asked to fund?</i>  <b>Yes.</b> Replacement of 148 dilapidated and life expired shelters</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>  <b>Yes</b>, to fulfil the Mayor's pledge in the Transport Strategy "to ensure people feel safe when they travel and invest in our streets to make them more attractive places" <b>Yes</b> – the responsibility for shelters has always rested with SYPTE and this is essentially a capital renewal scheme.</p>
<i>Strategic policy fit</i>	<p><i>How well does the scheme align with the strategic objectives of the SEP and RAP?</i>  <b>Well aligned</b> – especially re access to employment, Fairer and Greener.</p>
<i>Contribution to Carbon Net Zero</i>	<p><i>Does this scheme align with the strategic objective to achieve Carbon Net Zero?</i>  <b>Implicitly</b>, although there is no quantification/monetisation of this impact</p>
<i>SMART scheme objectives</i>	<p><i>State the SMART scheme objective as presented in the business case.</i>  <b>No commitment</b> to measuring outcomes against objectives is made</p> <p><i>Is there a 'golden thread' between the strategic objectives (see 3.2) and the scheme objectives (see 3.8)?</i>  <b>No</b></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>  <b>Yes, partially.</b> The decision to have bus shelters is part and parcel of the decision to provide bus services and this is a proposal to replace facilities that are not performing as required, such that to not replace/renew them would tangibly worsen the service, although no analysis of actual demand for these particular shelters is given in quantified terms. It is stated that many more are needed (Option 4), so this will not by itself provide a complete solution to the problem.</p>

<i>Statutory requirements and adverse consequences</i>		<i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i> <b>No</b> <i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i> No although optimum location of shelters need to be considered by the promoter before installation.			
<b>Value for Money</b>					
Core monetised Benefits		<i>[Core BCR – table 4.22]</i> <b>None calculated</b>		Non-monetised and wider economic benefits <i>[Values/description – supplementary form]</i> <b>None provided</b> other than “Customers will be presented with a better customer offer” (p9)	
<i>In your view do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?</i> <b>Unknown.</b> The risks once the units are installed is that patronage at these stops continues to drop in line with trends prior to the pandemic. This is being mitigated by actions elsewhere to promote and support public transport. The assumption is made that the contractor (DSL) can make and deliver the units by the end of Feb 2022. Discussions have been ongoing.			<i>Do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?</i> <b>Unknown.</b> There is no doubt that shelters provide users with basic comfort and some security, but whether they will be sufficient to retain/improve other aspects of bus service is another question. The importance of them to users is well established however, so that not renewing them when due would be viewed adversely. The risks that they will not be used would normally be avoided by siting appropriately, which is the PTE’s area of expertise.		
<b>Value for Money Statement</b>					
<i>Taking into consideration the monetised and non-monetised benefits and costs, does the scheme represent good value for money?</i> <b>Yes</b>					
<b>Risk</b>					
<i>What are the most significant risks and is there evidence that these risks are being mitigated?</i>					
This is provided in section 6.8. Clearly it is considered by the promoter that there are no risks at all other than delays due to the Assurance process. There must also be risk that even if ordered at the end of October, the units cannot be delivered in time for the funding.					
No.	Risk	Likelihood (High, Med, Low)	Impact (High, Med, Low)	Mitigation	Owner
1	Conditions of Gainshare funding dictates delivery by 31st March 2022 and therefore could place funding at risk.	H	M	SYLTE are working through the MCA assurance process as quickly as possible to mitigate risk. Relevant contractors have also been made aware of the need for products and services, however, are unable to commence manufacture until orders are raised with a required lead time of 3 months.	Steve Mumford / Jim Coe
2	The Mayoral Combined Authority has an expectation for delivery to be completed within these timescales, therefore placing the MCA at reputational risk.	H	M	SYLTE are working through the MCA assurance process as quickly as possible to mitigate risk. Relevant contractors have also been made aware of the need for products and services, however, are unable to commence manufacture until orders are raised with a required lead time of 3 months.	Steve Mumford / Jim Coe

3	Adverse public and political reaction to non-achievement of delivery project delivery within timescales.	H	M	SYLTE are working through the MCA assurance process as quickly as possible to mitigate risk. Relevant contractors have also been made aware of the need for products and services, however, are unable to commence manufacture until orders are raised with a required lead time of 3 months.	Steve Mumford / Jim Coe
---	--	---	---	---	-------------------------

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

We do not have complete assurance that no problems will emerge in producing the new shelters and delivering them within the available time.

*Are there any significant risks associated with securing the full funding of the scheme?*

**No – 100% Gainshare**

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

**No** – the existing contract to be extended.

**In**

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

**Yes**

*Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?*

**Yes**

*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?*

**100%**

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

**Yes**, an organogram is provided

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

**No**

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

**Yes** - the Mayor's Bus Review 2019 identified this problem but specific locations have not been consulted on

*Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?*

**No**

**Legal**

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

**Not clearly** – but it is unlikely that the subsidy to any person is involved as the goods to be provided are for the benefit of the public generally.

## Recommendation and Conditions

<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Proceed to Contract</b>
<b>Payment Basis</b>	<b>Defrayal</b>
<b>Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)</b>	
<b>Conditions in contract –</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Standard clawback</li> </ul>	





## Assurance Summary

### Scheme Details

<b>Project Name</b>	<b>D0030 Passenger Information Displays</b>	<b>Type of funding</b>	<b>Grant</b>
<b>Grant Recipient</b>	<b>SYPTE</b>	<b>Total Scheme Cost</b>	<b>£675,000</b>
<b>MCA Executive Board</b>	<b>TEB</b>	<b>MCA Funding</b>	<b>£675,000</b>
<b>Programme name</b>	<b>Gainshare</b>	<b>% MCA Allocation</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Appraisal Summary

Project Description	
<i>Is it clear what the MCA is being asked to fund?</i>	
<p><b>Yes</b> – 193 new PIDS are proposed. However, the preferred option includes the scrappage of 243 “obsolete” units that could be refurbished for a 10 year life at a cost equivalent to the cost of 44 new units.</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><b>Yes</b>, to fulfil the Mayor’s pledge in the Transport Strategy “to ensure people feel safe when they travel and invest in our streets to make them more attractive places”</p> <p>Whilst bus timetable and real time information is generated from private bus and tram operators the responsibility for its coordination and publication traditionally rests with SYPTE/MCA. Information is high on bus users’ list of priorities according to market research. (Transport Focus)</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><b>Well aligned</b> – especially re Access to employment and Fairer and Greener 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></p> <p><b>Implicitly</b>, although there is no quantification/monetisation of this impact</p>
<i>SMART scheme objectives</i>	<p><i>State the SMART scheme objective as presented in the business case.</i></p> <p><b>No commitment</b> to measuring outcomes against objectives is made</p> <p><i>Is there a ‘golden thread’ between the strategic objectives (see 3.2) and the scheme objectives (see 3.8)?</i></p> <p><b>No</b></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><b>Yes</b>. There is a cost effectiveness analysis of 4 options including the Do Minimum, but the most effective option has not been selected for reasons that are unclear.</p>

<i>Statutory requirements and adverse consequences</i>	<p><i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i> <b>No</b></p> <p><i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i> No although optimum location of displays need to be determined.</p>
--	---

### Value for Money

Core monetised Benefits	<p><i>[Core BCR – table 4.22]</i> <b>None calculated</b></p>	Non-monetised and wider economic benefits	<p><i>[Values/description – supplementary form]</i> <b>None provided</b></p>
-------------------------	--	---	--

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

Promoter considers that a shortage of microchips could delay manufacture. It is not clear what this risk is nor how it would be avoided. The Assessor considers that a bigger risk is that the existing units if renewed fail at a rate higher than 13% p.a. after contracting for their refurbishment. This may be the reason why scrapping them in year 2 is preferable to refurbishment although this is not clear from the bid.

*Do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?*

**Unknown.**

### Value for Money Statement

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

**Unknown** – although likely to be so.

### Risk

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

This is provided in section 6.7. The first two risks are considered by the Assessor to be irrelevant. The end March deadline is self-imposed.

No.	Risk	Likelihood (High, Med, Low)	Impact (High, Med, Low)	Mitigation	Owner
1	Deliver project within desired timescales - i.e.31st March 2022.	High	Med	SYLTE are working through the MCA assurance process as quickly as possible to mitigate risk. Relevant contractors have also been made aware of the need for products and services, however, are unable to commence manufacture until orders are raised with a required lead time of 3 months.	Rebecca Roe
2	Failure to deliver the project by the 31st March 2022 may cause an unwelcomed reputational risk via various media sources	High	Med	SYLTE are working through the MCA assurance process as quickly as possible to mitigate risk. Relevant contractors have also been made aware of the need for products and services, however, are unable to commence manufacture until orders are raised with a required lead time of 3 months.	Rebecca Roe

3	A shortage of microchips to enable manufacture of new displays	Med	Low	SYPTE are working with suppliers to secure stocks of microchips to enable them to fulfil the orders.	Rebecca Roe
---	--	-----	-----	--	-------------

*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 – 100% Gainshare**

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

**No** – existing FW contract to be used

**In**

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

**Yes**

*Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?*

**Yes**

*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?*

**100%**

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

**Yes**, an organogram is provided

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

**No**

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

**Yes** - the Mayor's Bus Review 2019 identified this problem but specific locations have not been consulted on

*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?*

Applicant considers the question "not applicable"

It is unlikely that the scheme would be considered a subsidy to any person as the goods to be provided are for the benefit of the public generally.

## Recommendation and Conditions

<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Proceed to Contract</b>
<b>Payment Basis</b>	<b>Defrayal</b>
<b>Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)</b>	
Clarity on the reasons why all 243 existing units will be scrapped rather than refurbished for a 10 year life to give a greater coverage from the available funding.	
<b>Conditions in contract –</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Standard clawback</li> </ul>	





This page is intentionally left blank

## **Appendix B - Progression of schemes from OBC to FBC and release of development cost funding**

### **B.1 T13 A630 Bus Improvements (TCF2 OBC)**

**Appendix B1** provides a summary of the project assurance and the suggested conditions of award.

This investment is for £1.6m from TCF2, with development costs to be released of £0.27m to SYPTE.

This project will improve 15 junctions on a key link between Sheffield and Doncaster using the latest enhanced traffic signal technology strategies based on Microprocessor Optimised Vehicle Actuation (MOVA M8). This is to provide flexible priority for buses potentially reducing delays by 30% - 60% without taking road space.

#### **The Benefits and Outcomes**

The project will deliver the following outputs -

- 15 new bus priority at traffic signals

The project will also contribute to the following outcomes –

- Reduce average bus journey times
- Increase accessibility
- Drive Investment
- Increase bus patronage
- Improve passenger perception of bus services
- Enable new employment and residential growth
- Broaden PT connectivity
- Contribute to modal shift from car
- Reduce congestion
- Reduce emissions

The project is considered a good strategic fit the SEP policy objectives of Growth, Inclusion and Sustainability. The Assurance Summary notes some conditions of approval that will need to be resolved within the submitted FBC, these are detailed in full within Appendix B1.

### **B.2 T10 Barnsley Station Access Improvements (TCF2 OBC)**

**Appendix B2** provides a summary of the project assurance and the suggested conditions of award.

This request is for £1.34m, £1.09m is currently available from TCF2, with development costs to be released of £0.19m to BMBC.

The project will deliver 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.

### **The Benefits and Outcomes**

The project will deliver the following outputs -

- 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.

The project has a clear strategic rationale and risks are considered manageable at this stage. The Assurance Summary notes some conditions of approval that will need to be resolved within the submitted FBC, these are detailed in full within Appendix B2.

### **B.3 T17-3 Bennethorpe to Hallgate Cycleways (TCF2 OBC)**

**Appendix B3** provides a summary of the project assurance and the suggested conditions of award.

This investment is for £0.92m from TCF2, with development costs to be released of £0.05m to DMBC.

The project will deliver off road cycle facilities along both sides of the carriageway, running from the South Parade / Thorne Road junction to the Bennethorpe / Roman Road junction. Along the south side of South Parade the 2.0m wide cycleway will be set back from the carriageway and run along Hall Cross Hill, a quiet cul-de-sac which provides on street parking to adjacent buildings. Along the north side of South Parade the scheme provides an off road 2.0m wide cycleway with a 3m wide bi-directional cycleway between Town Fields and a proposed new toucan crossing. The bi-directional section allows connectivity with the proposed new Unity cycle scheme package, in order to take cyclists safely across the carriageway and into the town centre.

#### **The Benefits and Outcomes –**

The project will deliver the following outputs –

- 1km of new segregated walking and cycling infrastructure
- 1 new toucan crossing

The project is considered a good strategic fit with the SEP and TCF2 programme. The Assurance Summary notes some conditions of approval that will need to be resolved within the submitted FBC, these are detailed in full within Appendix B3.

### **B.4 O50 Netheredge Crookes (ATF2/Gainshare OBC)**

**Appendix B4** provides a summary of the project assurance and the suggested conditions of award.

This investment is for £0.79m from ATF2/Gainshare, with development costs to be released of £0.06m from ATF2 to SCC.

The project will deliver an active travel neighbourhood through a combination of modal filters and other traffic management tools. It falls within a location where strategic traffic movements use residential streets to bypass queuing on radial corridors.

### **The Benefits and Outcomes**

The project will deliver the following outputs -

- 4.2km of new active travel route
- 2 new crossings
- 5 improved crossings
- 1 new bus gate

The project is recommended for approval, noting that the scope of the project may change slightly due to the impact of public consultation that is currently underway. The Assurance Summary notes some conditions of approval that will need to be resolved within the submitted FBC, these are detailed in full within Appendix B4.

## **B.5 T14 West of Doncaster Active Travel (TCF2 OBC)**

**Appendix B5** provides a summary of the project assurance and the suggested conditions of award.

This request is for £4.5m, £4.04m is currently available from TCF2, with development costs to be released of £0.05m to DMBC.

The project will enhance accessibility within the Doncaster urban area so that active travel can become a viable alternative to the private car, specifically –

- In Balby the scheme will provide a combination of off-road cycle facilities and on road quiet ways, in particular enabling cyclists to avoid and cross Balby Road by using a quieter route that runs parallel towards the Doncaster Town Centre
- Around Mexborough the scheme will improve active travel links in and around the town, providing an off-road link from the town to the Trans Pennine Trail
- The Edlington scheme will provide an off-road cycle route which will connect the existing and future planned residential neighbourhoods, to employment opportunities within Warmsworth

### **The Benefits and Outcomes**

The project will deliver the following outputs -

- 11.1km of improved walking and cycling infrastructure
- 4.6km of new walking and cycling infrastructure
- 1 junction improvements to benefit non-car modes.

The project has a strong strategic rationale aligned to local and national policies. The Assurance Summary notes some conditions of approval that will need to be resolved within the submitted FBC, these are detailed in full within Appendix B5.

## **B.6 O50 Sheaf Valley Route (ATF2/Gainshare OBC)**

**Appendix B6** provides a summary of the project assurance and the suggested conditions of award.

This investment is for £2.3m from ATF2/Gainshare, with development costs to be released of £0.05m from ATF2 to SCC.

The project will deliver 4.2km of new active travel route between Sheaf Quay and Norton Hammer.

### **The Benefits and Outcomes**

The project will deliver the following outputs -

- 4.2km of new active travel route
- 2 new crossings
- 5 improved crossings
- 1 new bus gate

The project provides a clear rationale for the investment, relating to the ability of active travel infrastructure to support behaviour change and drive non-transport benefits to society. The Assurance Summary notes some conditions of approval that will need to be resolved within the submitted FBC, these are detailed in full within Appendix B6.

## **B.7 T8/1&3 City Centre to Attercliffe and Darnall Active Travel (TCF2 OBC)**

**Appendix B7** provides a summary of the project assurance and the suggested conditions of award.

This request is for £17.99m, £15.38m is currently available from TCF2, with development costs to be released of £1.2m to SCC.

The project will develop a core cycle route connecting the city centre towards Darnall, through Attercliffe and the Advance Manufacturing Park corridor. The route also includes a spur to the Olympic Legacy Park, with supporting measures to ensure comfort and safety of cyclists feeding into the core route from adjacent residential and employment areas.

### **The Benefits and Outcomes**

The project will deliver the following outputs -

- 7.2km of new cycle infrastrcutre
- 1.6km of new pedestrian infrastructure
- 10 junction improvements
- 1.4km of new bus lanes
- 25 improved crossings
- 25 bus stop upgrades

The project is clear and well evidenced with strong strategic fit. The Assurance Summary notes some conditions of approval that will need to be resolved within the submitted FBC, these are detailed in full within Appendix B7.

## Assurance Summary



### Scheme Details

<b>Project Name</b>	T0013 A630 Bus Improvements (Junction Technology Upgrade) OBC	<b>Type of funding</b>	Grant
<b>Grant Recipient</b>	SYPTE	<b>Total Scheme Cost</b>	£1,600,000
<b>MCA Executive Board</b>	Transport	<b>MCA Funding</b>	£1,600,000
<b>Programme name</b>	TCF	<b>% MCA Allocation</b>	100%

### Appraisal Summary

#### Project Description

*Is it clear what the MCA is being asked to fund?*

**Yes.** The scheme addresses the following demonstrable problems (pre-COVID) on the corridor:

- Slow bus speeds caused by congestion at junctions and pinch points
- Congestion leading to poor bus passenger experience.
- Significant deprivation along the A630.
- Poor air quality.

It is proposed to improve 15 junctions on a key link between Sheffield and Doncaster using the latest enhanced traffic signal technology strategies based on Microprocessor Optimised Vehicle Actuation (MOVA M8). (Basically, more, longer, green waves). The promoter expects this to provide flexible priority for buses potentially reducing delays by 30% - 60% without taking road space.

#### Strategic Case

*Scheme Rationale*

*Does the scheme have a clearly stated rationale and provide a strong justification for public funding?*

**Yes. Yes**

The current and potential future problems faced by buses on this growth corridor are clearly laid out and the opportunities for and the advantages brought by quicker bus journey times are well explained.

*Strategic policy fit*

*How well does the scheme align with the strategic objectives of the SEP and RAP?*

**Very well.** All three SEP policy objectives (Growth, Inclusion, Sustainability) are shown as being met. (The RAP is not mentioned). Eleven (11) separate policy documents at the national, regional and local level are listed and shown to have objectives in common with the scheme.

*Contribution to Carbon Net Zero*

*Does this scheme align with the strategic objective to achieve Carbon Net Zero?*

**Yes**

*SMART scheme objectives*

*State the SMART scheme objective as presented in the business case.*

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce average bus journey times</li> <li>• Increase accessibility</li> <li>• Drive Investment</li> <li>• Increase bus patronage</li> <li>• Improve passenger perception of bus services</li> <li>• Enable new employment and residential growth</li> <li>• Broaden PT connectivity</li> <li>• Contribute to modal shift from car</li> <li>• Reduce congestion</li> <li>• Reduce emissions</li> </ul> <p><i>Is there a 'golden thread' between the strategic objectives (see 3.2) and the scheme objectives (see 3.6)?</i>  <b>Yes</b>, the promoter presents a clear logic map in section 3.6 although there is no detailed discussion of the timeframe for the monitoring and evaluation plan except in Appendix M. This needs to be expanded in the form.</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>  <b>Yes</b> - within the identified corridor – acknowledged to be the main public transport corridor between Sheffield and Doncaster. It would be possible to provide longer bus lanes but this would not be physically possible along the entire route without drastically reducing space for general traffic and not significantly improving queuing/congestion in the shared sections and at junctions. DMBC oppose this. Rail and tram options have been considered and rejected on practicality/efficacy grounds.</p>												
Statutory requirements and adverse consequences	<p><i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i>  <b>No</b>. Works comprise mainly signalling equipment and processing units. No hard infrastructure so no TROs required.  <i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i>  <b>No adverse consequences</b> particularly in the form of opposition from other road users are expected.</p>												
<b>Value for Money</b>													
Core monetised Benefits	[Core BCR – table 4.22] <b>3.15</b> (OB = 15%)	Non-monetised and wider economic benefits	[Values/description – supplementary form] <b>Slightly beneficial:</b> Noise, LAQ, GHG										
<p><i>In your view do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?</i>  <b>No</b>.  Tests:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><b>BCR</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>-25%</td> <td>2.99</td> </tr> <tr> <td>+25%</td> <td>3.30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Forthcoming TAG changes</td> <td>2.96</td> </tr> <tr> <td>-25%+Forthcoming TAG</td> <td>2.00</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			<b>BCR</b>	-25%	2.99	+25%	3.30	Forthcoming TAG changes	2.96	-25%+Forthcoming TAG	2.00	<p><i>Do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?</i>  <b>No</b>.</p>	
	<b>BCR</b>												
-25%	2.99												
+25%	3.30												
Forthcoming TAG changes	2.96												
-25%+Forthcoming TAG	2.00												
<b>Value for Money Statement</b>													
<p><i>Taking into consideration the monetised and non-monetised benefits and costs, does the scheme represent good value for money?</i>  <b>Yes</b></p>													
<b>Risk</b>													

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

7.10 - Top 5 Risks on Risk Log

Risk	Mitigation	Owner
Contractor(DLO) availability to deliver scheme	DLO has the ability to appoint sub-contractor to carry out the civils works required. However minor civils work could be included in the signals tender.	DMBC
Delivery of scheme within TCF time frame	Engagement with DMBC including proposed procurement route to speed up delivery	SYPTTE
Implementation cost increases	Regular cost monitoring during implementation Allowance made in risk allocation for increase cost in implementation	SYPTTE
Brexit - procurement	Due to Brexit some signal equipment is taking longer to receive, currently 12-16 weeks, this delay will be allowed for in the procurement process.	DMBC
Covid-19	Should there be another full country lockdown, this may have an effect on delivery of signal equipment, although the signal companies have operated through previous lockdowns.	DMBC

*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** – DLO route to be used

**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.** Detailed design and procurement will be post OBC approval

*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?*

**60%.** Until detailed design undertaken, this is as good as can be expected

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

**Yes. Tim Taylor, PTE**

*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.** Appropriate stakeholder consultation has been undertaken

*Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?*

**Yes.** This is being managed centrally although the promoter has resources for undertaking the data collection and is aware of requirements.

**Legal**

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

**Yes, No.**

## Recommendation and Conditions

<b>Recommendation</b>	Approve to proceed to FBC
<b>Payment Basis</b>	Defrayal
<b>Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)</b>	
<p><b>FBC to include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 95% cost certainty</li><li>• Updated risk register and P50.</li></ul>	



This page is intentionally left blank



## Assurance Summary

### Scheme Details

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

### 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"> <li>• 24km of <b>improved</b> walking and cycling infrastructure;</li> <li>• 72km of <b>new</b> walking and cycling infrastructure;</li> <li>• 20 junction <b>improvements</b> to benefit non-car modes, with 7 bus gates.</li> </ul>	
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>  <b>Yes, Yes</b></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>  <b>Yes</b></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><b>Growth</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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</li> </ol> <p><b>Inclusion</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. To better connect the areas of transport poverty with areas of opportunity in a safe and sustainable way</li> <li>3. To improve the safety of transport corridor</li> </ol> <p><b>Sustainability</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. To create a cultural shift towards making cycling and walking the natural choice for shorter journeys</li> <li>5. To improve air quality and environmental impacts along the corridor</li> </ol> <p><i>Is there a 'golden thread' between the strategic objectives (see 3.2) and the scheme objectives (see 3.6)?</i>  <b>Yes</b></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><b>Yes.</b> 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><b>No</b></p> <p><i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i></p> <p><b>No</b></p>		
<b>Value for Money</b>			
Core monetised Benefits	<p><i>[Core BCR – table 4.22]</i></p> <p><b>1.19</b> (OB 15%)</p>	Non-monetised and wider economic benefits	<p><i>[Values/description – supplementary form]</i></p> <p><b>Enviro/social</b>  <b>Moderate beneficial</b>  GHG  <b>Slight beneficial:</b>  Noise, LAQ, Landscape,  <b>Slight adverse:</b>  Townscape, Biodiversity, Water enviro.</p> <p><b>DIA</b>  <b>Moderate beneficial</b>  User benefits, Accessibility  <b>Slight beneficial:</b>  Journey Quality, accidents, security, severance</p> <p><b>Wider Impacts</b>  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><b>Yes</b> - 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><b>Yes</b> – as for monetised benefits</p>		
<b>Value for Money Statement</b>			
<p><i>Taking into consideration the monetised and non-monetised benefits and costs, does the scheme represent good value for money?</i></p> <p><b>Low value for money.</b></p>			
<b>Risk</b>			
<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 of 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 promotor 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

<b>Recommendation</b>	Proceed to FBC
-----------------------	----------------

<b>Payment Basis</b>	Defrayal
<b>Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)</b>	
<p><b>FBC to contain:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• More detail on how scheme meets specific objectives and who will monitor “success”.</li><li>• Costs to be 75%-95% certain</li><li>• Confirmed procurement route</li> <li>• At FBC the TCF grant will be capped at £1.09m which is maximum amount available.</li></ul>	



This page is intentionally left blank



## Assurance Summary

### Scheme Details

<b>Project Name</b>	T0017/3 Bennethorpe to Hallgate (South Parade) Cycleways OBC	<b>Type of funding</b>	Grant
<b>Grant Recipient</b>	DMBC	<b>Total Scheme Cost</b>	£923,753
<b>MCA Executive Board</b>	Transport	<b>MCA Funding</b>	£923,753
<b>Programme name</b>	TCF	<b>% MCA Allocation</b>	100%

### Appraisal Summary

#### Project Description

*Is it clear what the MCA is being asked to fund?*

**Yes**, section 2.2 states:

“The scheme will provide off road cycle facilities along both sides of the carriageway, running from the South Parade / Thorne Road junction to the Bennethorpe / Roman Road junction. Along the south side of South Parade the 2.0m wide cycleway will be set back from the carriageway and run along Hall Cross Hill, a quiet cul-de-sac which provides on street parking to adjacent buildings. Along the north side of South Parade the scheme provides an off road 2.0m wide cycleway with a 3m wide bi-directional cycleway between Town Fields and a proposed new toucan crossing. The bi-directional section allows connectivity with the proposed new Unity cycle scheme package, in order to take cyclists safely across the carriageway and into the town centre.

The package will deliver the following:

- 1km of new segregated walking and cycling infrastructure
- 1 new toucan crossing

#### Strategic Case

*Scheme Rationale*

*Does the scheme have a clearly stated rationale and provide a strong justification for public funding?*

**Yes.**

The scheme is part of a strategy to break down some of the barriers in developing a coherent network of active travel routes including

- Poor quality or non-existent cycle facilities
- Poor quality or non-existent crossing facilities
- Incoherent routes to key facilities and/or existing active travel routes.

*Strategic policy fit*

*How well does the scheme align with the strategic objectives of the SEP and RAP?*

Section 3.2 adequately describes how the proposed scheme aligns with the relevant SEP and TCF aims i.e.

- **Active Travel – to develop further a coherent network** of active travel routes across SCR, but focusing initially between the areas of transport poverty and the areas of opportunity, the main urban centres and those corridors with the greatest opportunity for mode shift.

	<p>Section 3.3 indicates that the scheme aligns with other policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LCWIP</li> <li>• Active Travel Implementation Plan within the 2019 Transport Strategy</li> <li>• Doncaster Inclusive Growth Strategy</li> </ul>		
<i>Contribution to Carbon Net Zero</i>	<p><i>Does this scheme align with the strategic objective to achieve Carbon Net Zero?</i>  <b>Yes</b> – although effects are slight.</p>		
<i>SMART scheme objectives</i>	<p><i>State the SMART scheme objective as presented in the business case.</i>  Section 3.6 presents the principal objectives as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>To effect a mode shift away from the private car</b> on those corridors where new opportunities are likely to see an increase in demand or where growth could be stifled. Achieved by increasing the number of cyclists using South Parade by 68%.</li> <li>• <b>To create a cultural shift towards making cycling and walking the natural choice</b> for shorter journeys. Achieved by increasing the number of walking and cycling trips along South Parade by 68%.</li> </ul> <p><i>Is there a 'golden thread' between the strategic objectives (see 3.2) and the scheme objectives (see 3.6)?</i>  The strategic objectives are to improve the network; the scheme targets an area of the network where it is most likely to do this as well succeed in stimulating demand for cycling where it is already significant.</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>  <b>Yes.</b>  The LCWIP work developed an indicative programme of cycling and walking improvements across the SCR by identifying key cycle desire lines and two corridor level maps per local authority area, highlighting the preferred route and feeder areas for further development. This work was used to develop the initial options for the active travel elements of this bid where they overlap with the priority corridors and/or provide connections to the rail network.</p> <p>The assessor raised a number of queries related to the design and the method of developing the design.</p> <p>The promoter has responded providing surety that the characteristics and features of the design are appropriate and have been developed following a sifting process, at SOBC.</p>		
<i>Statutory requirements and adverse consequences</i>	<p><i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i>  <b>TROs only</b>  <i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i>  <b>Potentially yes.</b> Business stakeholders may object to the reduced on-street parking.  There may be minor delays at the proposed toucan crossing.</p>		
<b>Value for Money</b>			
Core monetised Benefits	[Core BCR – table 4.22] <b>1.94</b>	Non-monetised and wider economic benefits	[Values/description – supplementary form] <b>Slight positive: Noise, LAQ, GHG</b>
<p><i>In your view do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?</i>  <b>Some risk – BCR falls to 1.33</b> with low AT demand plus 25% reduction in uplift plus 15% cost increase.</p>		<p><i>Do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?</i>  <b>No</b></p>	

The assessor is concerned that no attempt has been made to validate the census data used to estimate daily demand. It is required that available ATC data be used instead, for the FBC

**Value for Money Statement**

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

**Yes**

**Risk**

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

Risk	Mitigation	Owner
1. Delays in funding and SCR MCA approval and Funding Agreement sign-off: Potential delay to start of works as cannot order materials at risk 25% probability <b>High risk</b>	Work with SCR to prepare draft FA documents to reduce approval timescale	Major Projects
2. Failure to consult, engage and inform stakeholders (internal and external) in a timely and effective manner: Negative impact on the proposals - lack of buy-in and support from stakeholders for the package requires re-design and/or removal of package elements 20% probability <b>High risk</b>	Engagement will be continuous with key stakeholders, and undertake early consultation with those most directly affected with revised scheme design. Corporate Communications team will be involved.	Major Projects / Corporate Communications
3. Traffic Regulation Orders: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objections to TROs will delay the start of the package and completion dates.</li> <li>Significant objections could result in the scheme being revised downwards and not achieving the desired outputs</li> </ul> 25% probability <b>High risk</b>	TROs will be prepared and submitted for each individual element of the package Any objections will be for specific location and minimise the impact of delay of delivery of the package	Major Projects
4. Delays due to ongoing COVID-19 restrictions: Impact on site management while delivering package adhering to social distance rules for workers 50% probability <b>Medium risk</b>	Workers maintain social distancing Limited measures can be undertaken due to proposed site and works involved	Contractor
5. Increased competition for resources across SCR TCF programme: Lack of available resources means a reduced ability to deliver within TCF timescales and potentially additional cost 20% probability <b>Medium risk</b>	Early contractor engagement	Major Projects / Contractor

*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?*

**Yes** - it is optimistic /risky to start the procurement process before funding /TRO surety (Nov 22) and complete 1-2 months after then.

**Delivery**

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

**It's optimistic.**

*Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?*

**Yes. Yes**

*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?*

**60%** - but not based on this scheme. It would be expected to be higher – and indeed at 90% for FBC.

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

**Yes.**

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

**No**

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

**No. Unknown**

*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, No**

**Recommendation and Conditions**

Page 82

<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Approved for FBC</b>
<b>Payment Basis</b>	<b>Defrayal</b>
<b>Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)</b>	
<p>FBC should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ATC data on cycle use on this corridor be used for baselining and AMATs re-run</li> <li>• Updated scheme drawing with legend, if not supplied earlier</li> <li>• the total quantity of reduced car parking spaces;</li> <li>• the impact of the proposed Toucan crossing,</li> <li>• results of consultation with businesses affected,</li> <li>• updated/corrected risk register,</li> <li>• updated/corrected section 4.22,</li> <li>• completed DIA (accidents, severance, accessibility).</li> </ul>	



This page is intentionally left blank

## Assurance Summary



### Scheme Details

<b>Project Name</b>	<b>O0048 SCC Netheredge Crookes ATN OBC</b>	<b>Type of funding</b>	<b>Grant</b>
<b>Grant Recipient</b>	<b>SCC</b>	<b>Total Scheme Cost</b>	<b>£795,154</b>
<b>MCA Executive Board</b>	<b>TEB</b>	<b>MCA Funding</b>	<b>£795,154</b>
<b>Programme name</b>	<b>ATF/Gainshare</b>	<b>% MCA Allocation</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Appraisal Summary

#### Project Description

*Is it clear what the MCA is being asked to fund?*

**Not entirely**, because this is promoted as a community project with details to be decided through a consultation process which will inform the design. Based on requests and comments received by the Council over many years it will; probably consist of point closures, improved crossing points for pedestrians, one-way streets, restricted access for cars etc.

#### Breakdown of spend per A2:

	<b>2021/22</b>
Preparatory Cost	£50,900
Professional Fees (Consultation)	£16,333
Acquisition of Land/ Buildings	
Delivery Cost construction materials construction costs, including traffic management costs etc. <b>(A detailed Bill of quantities will be appended to the FBC)*</b>	£561,921
Vehicles, Plant, Equipment	
Risk Allowance/ Contingency	£166,000
Inflation	
Other	
<b>Total</b>	<b>£795,154</b>

\* Further detail of the delivery cost was supplied 9/9:

C2/3/4 utility searches / Topo surveys, project management costs	£79,000
Construction, temp traffic management, traffic counts and parking counts	£445,000
road safety audits	£5,000
SCC staff time	£32,921

The precise scope and content of the interventions is to be determined, so cost is very uncertain.

**Strategic Case**

<i>Scheme Rationale</i>	<i>Does the scheme have a clearly stated rationale and provide a strong justification for public funding?</i> <b>Yes</b> – to reduce car dependency for short distance trips.
<i>Strategic policy fit</i>	<i>How well does the scheme align with the strategic objectives of the SEP and RAP?</i> <b>Adequately</b> – the scheme should contribute to 2 Strategic outcomes – <b>Fairer</b> by increasing opportunities for safer, active travel and <b>Greener</b> by reduced ICE traffic. Contribution to Growth depends more on the extent of unintended and unmodelled traffic congestion resultant from re-routing.
<i>Contribution to Carbon Net Zero</i>	<i>Does this scheme align with the strategic objective to achieve Carbon Net Zero?</i> <b>Yes</b>
<i>SMART scheme objectives</i>	<i>State the SMART scheme objective as presented in the business case.</i> <b>Short term</b> Improve cycling environment -> number/length of facilities -> reduced casualties (Stats19 records) Improve access to key city centre destinations for all modes-> number/length of facilities -> increased GVA (ONS stats) <b>Long term</b> Create a cultural shift to cycling -> number/length of facilities -> increased bike/reduced car trips (counts) Part of city-wide AT network (as above) <i>Is there a 'golden thread' between the strategic objectives (see 3.2) and the scheme objectives (see 3.8)?</i> <b>Yes</b> – as above
<i>Options assessment</i>	<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> <b>There is no OAR</b> and a long list of options has not been formally defined and appraised, due to the timescale of the funding allocation and required spend. The scheme includes detailed interactive public consultation (with Counter Context, who specialise in this) to determine the design of the scheme, with no hard and fast proposals upfront. Costs are therefore indicative and, as the promoter acknowledges, a maximum within which the scheme must fit. Lower and higher cost options are presented <u>that show higher returns</u> than the preferred option but the higher cost option may be impractical in the timescale (involving permit parking) or unmonetized disbenefits (for the lower cost alternative).
<i>Statutory requirements and adverse consequences</i>	<i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i> Potentially TRO's. <i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i>

**Yes**, adjoining roads may see an increase in traffic and removal/relocation of residential parking may be opposed. This will be monitored and mitigation measures will be considered.

**Value for Money**

Core monetised Benefits	[Core BCR – table 4.22] <b>3.99</b>	Non-monetised and wider economic benefits	[Values/description – supplementary form] Enviro impacts <b>Slight beneficial:</b> Noise, LAQ and GHG. No DIA carried out.
-------------------------	--	---	---

*In your view do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?*  
**No, on balance, although cycling base counts not done – census data and PCT used instead.**  
 The 2 parts of the scheme are presented with separate AMATs to reflect local conditions and differing baseline positions and uplifts. Reducing demand uplifts by 25% and increasing OB to 30% (together) reduces the BCR to 2.99.  
 The promoter has committed to installing new counters to measure traffic flows, at least “with” the scheme but if timescales allow, to set baselines.

*Do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?*  
**They shouldn’t**, if local public supports the measures in practice not just in theory. Rerouting unwanted traffic could counteract these benefits, but promoter hopes some traffic disappears.

**Value for Money Statement**

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

**Risk**

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

No.	Risk	Likelihood (High, Med, Low)	Impact (High, Med, Low)	Mitigation
1	<b>Traffic management restrictions</b> result in a delivery programme which cannot be accommodated within the funding timescales.	low	low	Early consultation with Traffic Management team – book road space
2	<b>Unusual design features</b> requested as part of community consultation result in concerns raised in the Road Safety Audit; create design difficulties or result in reluctance in adoption of the works under the PFI impacting on budget and programme.	med	med	Identify and flag up areas of potential concern at the earliest opportunity.
3	<b>Unexpected Utilities' costs.</b> Risk of delay and cost overrun.	med	med	Request C2, C3 and C4 stats and trial hole estimates as early as possible.
4	<b>Delivery timescales slip</b> Impact on scope and deliverability. Programme delays.	high	high	Review scope of project
5	<b>Insufficient access to materials and resources.</b> Competition from other projects being delivered locally through TCF, HOTC2, etc. Project delays impact on delivery timescales	med	high	Monitor and assess impact on programme. Consider in cost plan. Broaden supply chain if necessary

*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?*

**No** – consultation will need to complete mid-Sept (NOW) to allow detailed design/costing in Sept/October and procurement started in time to commence work in Jan 22. Slippage likely to be 1 month+ from OBC timeline.

*Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?*

**Yes – via existing contractor, AMEY**

*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?*

**30%** - Not adequate by TCF/GS standards, but a feature of the EATF stream that schemes not worked up in any detail prior to the announcement.

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

**Yes**, although the organogram is illegible. **Yes (TFS)**

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

**Yes** – TFS.

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

**Underway**

*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, No.**

## Recommendation and Conditions

<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Proceed to FBC</b>
<b>Payment Basis</b>	<b>Defrayal</b>
<b>Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)</b>	
FBC to provide:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 95% cost certainty</li><li>• Legible organogram</li><li>• Indication of when local baseline counts will be available</li></ul>	



This page is intentionally left blank



## Assurance Summary

### Scheme Details

<b>Project Name</b>	T0014 West of Doncaster Active Travel Link	<b>Type of funding</b>	Grant
<b>Grant Recipient</b>	DMBC	<b>Total Scheme Cost</b>	£4,520,631
<b>MCA Executive Board</b>	TEB	<b>MCA Funding</b>	£4,520,631
<b>Programme name</b>	TCF	<b>% MCA Allocation</b>	100%

### Appraisal Summary

#### Project Description

*Is it clear what the MCA is being asked to fund?*

**Yes. In 2.2:**

*“In **Balby** the scheme will provide a combination of off-road cycle facilities and on road quiet ways, in particular enabling cyclists to avoid and cross Balby Road by using a quieter route that runs parallel towards the Doncaster Town Centre. The scheme will also link cycles to Balby from neighbouring villages along segregated cycle facilities enabling more residents from Conisbrough, Warmsworth, Loversall and Wadworth a safer, more appealing cycle into the town centre. The scheme aims to take advantage of the existing high levels of walking and cycling in Balby, which is located within one mile of the town centre and is ideal to enable more active travel commuting journeys.*

*Around **Mexborough** the scheme will improve active travel links in and around the town, providing an off-road link from the town to the Trans Pennine Trail. Until recently usage of the Trans Pennine Trail has been in decline and the proposed scheme aims to continue the work already undertaken to reverse this decline in line with Doncaster Cycling Strategy.*

*The **Edlington** scheme will provide an off-road cycle route which will connect the existing and future planned residential neighbourhoods, to employment opportunities within Warmsworth. The facilities will also provide a route towards the proposed Balby scheme providing connections towards Doncaster town centre.”*

**Para 2.3 lists these outputs:**

- 11.1km of improved walking and cycling infrastructure
- 4.6km of new walking and cycling infrastructure
- 1 junction improvements to benefit non-car modes.

#### Strategic Case

*Scheme Rationale*

*Does the scheme have a clearly stated rationale and provide a strong justification for public funding?*

**Yes.**

Para 3.1, “the following are barriers to a coherent network of active travel routes:

- Poor quality or non-existent cycle facilities
- Poor lighting leading to a perception of insecurity
- Insufficient footway width for pedestrians
- Poor quality or non-existent crossing facilities
- Incoherent routes to key education facilities and/or existing active travel routes.”

Strategic policy fit	<p><i>How well does the scheme align with the strategic objectives of the SEP and RAP?</i></p> <p>Para 3.3 describes how the proposed scheme is aligned to local and national policies with reference to NPPF, LCWIP and SCR's Active Travel Implementation Plan.</p>		
Contribution to Carbon Net Zero	<p><i>Does this scheme align with the strategic objective to achieve Carbon Net Zero?</i></p> <p>The scheme is stated to be “key” to achieving Doncaster’s target of an 85% reduction in net greenhouse gas emissions by 2030 and zero by 2050 (para 3.3).</p>		
SMART scheme objectives	<p><i>State the SMART scheme objective as presented in the business case.</i></p> <p>The overall objectives of the TCF programme in Doncaster (per 3.6) are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Improved connectivity</b> for public transport users, pedestrians and cyclists</li> <li>• <b>Segregated cycle facilities</b> to enable more cycle journey stages</li> <li>• <b>Better connectivity</b> for cyclists</li> <li>• <b>More space for people</b> to feel safe from vehicles.</li> </ul> <p>The project’s aims are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>To effect a mode shift away from the private car</b> on those corridors where new opportunities are likely to see an increase in demand or where growth could be stifled. Achieved by increasing the number of cyclists using the routes by 68%.</li> <li>• <b>To create a cultural shift</b> towards making cycling and walking the natural choice for shorter journeys. Achieved by increasing the number of walking and cycling trips along the routes by 55% for walking and 68% for cycling.</li> </ul> <p><i>“These objectives should be achieved 5 years following completion of the works. <b>In order to measure these outcomes a survey will be carried out to collect data on the number of cyclists using the scheme.</b> The survey will be carried out on a weekday in June, both one and five years following completion of the works. The data will feed into the two evaluation reports.”</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><b>Yes.</b></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><b>Yes.</b> It is clear from 3.9 that substantial development work was undertaken in identifying the 2 options taken forward for detailed assessment.</p>		
Statutory requirements and adverse consequences	<p><i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i></p> <p><b>Yes – TROs.</b></p> <p><i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i></p> <p><b>Potentially, yes.</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Resistance to the priority given to active travel modes from car users.</li> <li>2. Short term disruption to local businesses and the transport network during construction.</li> </ol>		
<b>Value for Money</b>			
Core monetised Benefits	<p><i>[Core BCR – table 4.22]</i></p> <p><b>1.22</b></p>	Non-monetised and wider economic benefits	<p><i>[Values/description – supplementary form]</i></p> <p><b>Slight Positive:</b> Noise, LAQ, GHG</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><b>Yes</b>, the BCR would fall to 1.0 if walking uplift is reduced to +25% from the 55% used. (The 55% was based on a Sustrans study.)</p>	<p><i>Do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?</i></p> <p><b>No</b></p>		
<b>Value for Money Statement</b>			

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

**Low VfM**

**Risk**

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

**Apart from approval delay (updated timeline required for FBC):**

<b>Risk</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>	<b>Owner</b>
2. <b>Failure to consult, engage and inform stakeholders</b> (internal and external) in a timely and effective manner: Negative impact on the proposals - lack of buy-in and support from stakeholders for the package requires re-design and/or removal of package elements <b>20% probability</b> <b>High risk</b>	<b>Engagement will be continuous</b> with key stakeholders, and undertake early consultation with those most directly affected with revised scheme design. Corporate Communications team will be involved	Major Projects / Corporate Communications
3. Objections to Traffic Regulation Orders: <b>25% probability</b> <b>High risk</b>	<b>TROs will be prepared and submitted for each individual element</b> of the package. Any objections will be for specific location and minimise the impact of delay of delivery of the package	Major Projects
4. Delays due to ongoing COVID-19 restrictions: Impact on site management while delivering package adhering to social distance rules for workers <b>50% probability</b> <b>Medium risk</b>	<b>Workers maintain social distancing</b> Limited measures can be undertaken due to proposed site and works involved	Contractor
5. Increased competition for resources: a reduced ability to deliver within TCF timescales and potentially additional cost <b>25% probability</b> <b>Medium risk</b>	<b>Early contractor engagement</b>	Major Projects / Contractor

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

**No. (although abandonment risk needs considering)**

*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**, although not decided whether in-house or external suppliers to be procured. Risks may be different. Clarity required for FBC. The experience of the Council Team in carrying out similar work is set out in 5.1A.

**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.**

*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?*

**Yes.**

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

**Yes.**

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

**No.**

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

**Some – ward members. Outcome not clear. 7.3 states “6 weeks, to start June 2021” but that period is over. No information given on progress or results.**

*Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?*

Yes.
<b>Legal</b>
<i>Has the scheme considered Subsidy Control compliance or does the promotor still need to seek legal advice?</i>
Yes, No.

## Recommendation and Conditions

<b>Recommendation</b>	Approved for FBC
<b>Payment Basis</b>	Defrayal
<b>Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)</b>	
<p>Prior to contract execution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission of MCA Appendices A</li> </ul> <p>The following information is required for FBC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Breakdown of construction costs</li> <li>• 95% cost certainty</li> <li>• Results of public consultation</li> <li>• Likelihood of opposition to the scheme leading to abandonment and cost mitigation</li> <li>• Details designs</li> <li>• Monitoring and Evaluation Plan</li> <li>• Updated timeline</li> <li>• Updated appraisal results with sensitivity tests.</li> </ul>	



This page is intentionally left blank



## Assurance ummary

### Scheme Details

<b>Project Name</b>	O0050 Sheaf Valley Route OBC	<b>Type of funding</b>	Grant
<b>Grant Recipient</b>	SCC	<b>Total Scheme Cost</b>	£2,300,000
<b>MCA Executive Board</b>	TEB	<b>MCA Funding</b>	£2,300,000
<b>Programme name</b>	TCF	<b>% MCA Allocation</b>	100%

### Appraisal Summary

#### Project Description

*Is it clear what the MCA is being asked to fund?*

The applicant seeks funding for a 4.2 km Active travel route in the highway between Sheaf Quay and Norton. The following elements are required:

Segregation	400m
New controlled crossing	2 No.
Improved controlled crossing	4 No.
Improved uncontrolled crossing	1 No.
Point closure - new	2 No.
Point closure - relocated	1 No.
Point closure - upgraded	1 No.
Track widening	200m
Parking restriction	1780m
Bus gate	1 No.
Junction improvement/Remodelling	1 No.
20mph area	1

In addition, several minor interventions are also proposed to create Active Neighbourhoods (funded separately through ATF) that seamlessly link into the main arterial cycle route – e.g. point closures.

However, the description in 3.10 is *“... route is a series of scalable interventions that bring the route up to international best practice standard. Approximately 14 interventions along the route will enable safer walking and cycling: ranging from widening a dropped kerb to complete junction remodelling. Interventions are ranked based on impact.”* The use of the word “scalable” indicates a lack of clarity as to the scope and therefore cost and impact of the proposal. More development work is required.

#### Strategic Case

*Scheme Rationale*

*Does the scheme have a clearly stated rationale and provide a strong justification for public funding?*

**Yes.** In 3.1 the applicant provides a clear rationale for the project, relating to the ability of active travel infrastructure to support behaviour change and drive non-transport benefits to society. It references the complementarity of the proposals to other schemes and developments.

Strategic policy fit	<p><i>How well does the scheme align with the strategic objectives of the SEP and RAP?</i>  <i>In 3.2 the applicant describes how the proposed scheme aligns with the SCR SEP, and the SCR Transport Strategy. It links the schemes outcomes to the objectives contained in these.</i></p>		
Contribution to Carbon Net Zero	<p><i>Does this scheme align with the strategic objective to achieve Carbon Net Zero?</i>  <b>Yes.</b> Small reductions are likely to be critical in terms of current levels that over the urban area are at the legal limit for NOx and particulates</p>		
SMART scheme objectives	<p><i>State the SMART scheme objective as presented in the business case.</i>  Short term</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase the use of existing and planned pedestrian and cycling facilities in the city centre</li> <li>• Improve the cycling environment that is safer for both walking and cycling to replace journeys made by car;</li> <li>• Improve access to key city centre destination for all modes including walking and cycling</li> <li>• Improve access to the Lower Don Valley employment zone (when combined with TCF AMID- city centre scheme)</li> </ul> <p>Long term</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To create a cultural shift towards making cycling and walking the natural choice for shorter journeys</li> <li>• That this route will form part of a local area network linking into the Nether Edge TCF and ATF proposals, and creating a longer much improved active travel route when combined with City Centre, HZN and AMID proposals. Ultimately forming a key piece of the citywide network so that all destinations within the city are accessible and safer by bike or foot.</li> <li>• To improve air quality and environmental impacts within city centre</li> </ul> <p><i>Is there a 'golden thread' between the strategic objectives (see 3.2) and the scheme objectives (see 3.8)?</i>  <b>Yes</b> – the number of cycling and car trips along the route will be expected to change in response and this will be measured by means of counts and surveys.</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>  <b>No.</b> It is not clear that all options were considered at the time the preferred option was defined and screened against non-engineering criteria adequately before selection of the preferred option; as no public consultation has occurred this is unlikely. However</p>		
Statutory requirements and adverse consequences	<p><i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i>  TROs only  <i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i>  <b>Yes.</b> In addition to “normal” levels of traffic disruption, severance, noise and emissions during construction (“for a scheme of this type”) route re-assignment and parking displacement are likely to occur with the scheme in place, although this is likely to be short term in duration based on experience elsewhere. The applicant has committed to monitoring these impacts with cycle and traffic counts and surveys of parking and speed.</p>		
<b>Value for Money</b>			
Core monetised Benefits	<p><i>[Core BCR – table 4.22]</i>  <b>2.4</b></p>	Non-monetised and wider economic benefits	<p><i>[Values/description – supplementary form]</i>  <b>Supplementary form states environmental impacts “neutral” No wider impacts.</b></p>
<p><i>In your view do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?</i>  This is acknowledged to only relate to £2m-worth of the concept scheme and the uplifts used are based on evidence that is not appropriate. Costs are below the level of certainty expected at OBC and this, together with any reduction in demand uplifts, will potentially impact the BCR detrimentally.</p>		<p><i>Do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?</i>  An EIA has not been conducted, but applicant prepared to do so for the FBC. The need for this will depend on the likely impacts of the final scheme.</p>	
<b>Value for Money Statement</b>			

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

**Yes**

**Risk**

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

<b>Risk</b> <i>[State the risk and identify both its probability and impact on a scale of high-medium-low]</i>	<b>Mitigation</b> <i>[State how you will mitigate the risk]</i>	<b>Owner</b> <i>[State who is responsible for mitigating this risk]</i>
1. Traffic management restrictions result in a delivery programme which cannot be accommodated within the funders timescales.	Early consultation with Traffic management team. Share draft programme with stakeholders to understand potential impacts and update programme.	Project lead / team
2. Unusual design features (i.e. segregation etc.) may result in concerns raised in the Road Safety Audit; create design difficulties or result in reluctance in adoption of the works under the PFI. i.e. Dutch style roundabout. May result in protracted negotiations which delay sign off of the designs. May result in design revisions, impacting on budget and programme.	Identify and flag up areas of potential concern with stakeholders at the earliest opportunity.	Project lead / team
3. Unexpected Utilities' costs. Risk of delay and cost over run.	C2, C3 and C4 stats estimates. GPR survey if deemed necessary by appointed contractor. Use of trial holes of appropriate.	Project lead / team
4. Cost estimations exceed budget. Impact on scope and deliverability. Programme delays.	Ensure cost estimates are robust and reflect latest data re market rates. Review scope of project	Project lead / team
5. Insufficient access to materials and resources. Competition from other projects being delivered locally through TCF, HOTC2, etc. Impacts of Brexit, Covid 19 on workforce and availability of materials. Project delays. Social distancing impact on carrying out construction, causes delays.	Monitor and assess impact on programme. Consider in cost plan. Broaden supply chain	Project lead / team

There is **no QRA** accompanying the bid and a flat 25% has been applied

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** although are "hopeful" and likely to change at FBC.

Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?

**Yes.** The procurement strategy is described at Section 5.1, and is clear. *"In this case the tender will be negotiated with a single developer - Amey LG. The works will be covered through the framework agreement of the Council's Highway None Core Contract. "*

Dates relating to procurement has been added in 7.1, addressing the assessor's comments.

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?

**60%**. The applicant has not committed to covering cost overruns without reducing the scope of the scheme. To some extent the scheme (and benefits) is scaleable, as stated in Section 6.5 *“.To allow for any changes that may be required as a result of the community consultation costs were broken down into interventions with a 25% risk allowance provided on the overall costs”*

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

**Yes.** The organogram has been updated to provide more clarity

*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

*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, No.**

## **Recommendation and Conditions**

<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Approved</b>
<b>Payment Basis</b>	<b>Defrayal</b>
<b>Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• An updated QRA</li><li>• A legible organogram</li></ul>	



This page is intentionally left blank

## Assurance Summary



### Scheme Details

<b>Project Name</b>	T00081&3 City Centre to Attercliffe and Darnall Active Travel OBC	<b>Type of funding</b>	Grant
<b>Grant Recipient</b>	SCC	<b>Total Scheme Cost</b>	£17,999,943
<b>MCA Executive Board</b>	TEB	<b>MCA Funding</b>	£17,999,943
<b>Programme name</b>	TCF	<b>% MCA Allocation</b>	100%

### Appraisal Summary

#### Project Description

*Is it clear what the MCA is being asked to fund?*

**Yes.** This scheme involves the development of a core cycle route connecting the city centre towards Darnall, through Attercliffe and the Advance Manufacturing Park (AMP) corridor. The route also includes a spur to the Olympic Legacy Park, with supporting measures to ensure comfort and safety of cyclists feeding into the core route from adjacent residential and employment areas.

Section 2.3 states that the SCR funds will be used to prepare and design the preferred options and deliver:

improved cycle infrastructure	7.2km
improved pedestrian infrastructure	1.6km
junction improvements	10
new bus lanes	1.4km
Signalised junction improvements	7
bus stop upgrades (shelter, boarders, bus box, etc):	25
segregated cycle track	4.12km
Traffic calming measures	3.6km
pedestrian crossing upgrades	14
segregated cycle crossings:	11

Only a modest reduction in road space is proposed

#### Strategic Case

<i>Scheme Rationale</i>	<i>Does the scheme have a clearly stated rationale and provide a strong justification for public funding?</i> <b>Yes.</b> The rationale is clear and well evidenced and justifies public funding
<i>Strategic policy fit</i>	<i>How well does the scheme align with the strategic objectives of the SEP and RAP?</i> <b>Fully</b>
<i>Contribution to Carbon Net Zero</i>	<i>Does this scheme align with the strategic objective to achieve Carbon Net Zero?</i> <b>Fully</b>
<i>SMART scheme objectives</i>	<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> <b>Partially.</b> A clearer set of directly measurable targets relating to model results would be a useful improvement in the FBC		
<i>Options assessment</i>	<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> <b>Apparently,</b> although capital costs of non-preferred options are not presented.		
<i>Statutory requirements and adverse consequences</i>	<i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i> <b>TROs only</b> <i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i> In gross terms <b>Yes.</b> The Assessor states <i>"The proposed reallocation of road space along the A1678 corridor trades improved safety and connectivity for people walking, cycling and using public transport for journeys along this route against maintaining convenient access to/parking immediately outside of some premises and journey times for general motorised traffic..... Enhanced enforcement of existing waiting and loading restrictions along Attercliffe Road (e.g. through the use of Red Routes) will further enhance the safety and journey time reliability for people cycling and using buses along Attercliffe Road, but may cause some minor inconvenience for local businesses that continue to local incorrectly and in contravention to existing restrictions. Construction impacts will be short-term, and mitigated through Traffic Regulation Orders and diversionary routes implemented prior to works commencing."</i>		
<b>Value for Money</b>			
Core monetised Benefits	<i>[Core BCR – table 4.22]</i>  <b>1.16</b>	Non-monetised and wider economic benefits	<i>[Values/description – supplementary form]</i>
<i>In your view do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?</i> There is always risk around a single measure of the BCR. TAG guidance has been followed. Optimism bias of 21% of base costs has been used. The result is sensitive to demand and future traffic levels and the impact of COVID, long term, on travel patterns and modes. The BCR takes full account of likely delays to a greater number of motorists than active travellers on the corridor resulting from the interventions. These are more than offset by the health benefits for the latter and reductions in accidents overall. The BCR seems conservative on the basis that walking 'environment quality' (amenity) benefits have not been appraised, and neither have wider economic benefits associated with the contribution the reprioritised corridor is expected to make in relation to the place function, and economic vitality, of Attercliffe High Street and the area around the Don Valley Bowl/Arena		<i>Do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?</i>  <b>No.</b> These have not been appraised but are an upside risk.	
<b>Value for Money Statement</b>			
<i>Taking into consideration the monetised and non-monetised benefits and costs, does the scheme represent good value for money?</i> <b>Medium,</b> but with potential to be high, taking account of non-monetised impacts of improving the environment for people to use the space for purposes other than passing through			
<b>Risk</b>			
<i>What are the most significant risks and is there evidence that these risks are being mitigated?</i> As below. The P50 residual risk is calculated at £2.756m (18% base costs) based on a QRA of the events in the risk register (see Risk register). There is clear awareness of the risks although the full responsibility lies with the client to mitigate. <i>"Levels of risk are considered to be proportionate to the status of the scheme, with clear project management protocols in place to manage identified risks as the scheme progresses – based on SCC's standard processes and its Capital Delivery Service (CDS)."</i> (Assessor's comment)			

<b>Risk</b> <i>[State the risk and identify both its probability and impact on a scale of high-medium-low]</i>	<b>Mitigation</b> <i>[State how you will mitigate the risk]</i>	<b>Owner</b> <i>[State who is responsible for mitigating this risk]</i>
Unexpected commuted sum can't be funded by SCC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to be factored into budget.</li> <li>• Early estimate required to allow discussions ref funding source to take place.</li> <li>• Need to factor into design and seek advice from HMD ref design changes to minimise sums.</li> </ul>	PM
Unexpected Utilities' costs. C2 stats complete shows minimal diversion required however cannot be certain until options finalised and C4's complete.	C2's to be shared with cost manager to allow some initial costing work to be done for contingency purposes. Need to factor in potential programme delay. Estimated costs confirmed by C3 and C4 checks.	PM
Road safety audit (stages 1-3) may identify unforeseen issues that require additional works over and above those already allowed for. (potential for additional crossing points?)	Potential design addition for crossing point	PM
Supply chain issues. Pressure on UK supplies from demand	Investigate supply chain and give advanced warning / pre-order.	PM
Traffic management restrictions result in a delivery programme which cannot be accomodated within the funders timescales.	Early consultation with Traffic Management team. Share draft programme with stakeholders (including HMD) to understand potential impacts and update programme.	Client

*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.** D&B contract to be tendered Jan 22.

Works assumed to be permitted development, so no Planning consent required. No match funding, no additional land.

## **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** – Appendix MC9 (Critical Path) provides a clear project delivery plan with milestones that are commensurate with the current stage of scheme design. There is some uncertainty as to when construction will commence (February and April 2023 are variously mentioned), but it is understood that SCC's intention is to commence construction prior to the end of March 2023 - subject to detailed design and engagement of design contractors in January 2022.

*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?*

**60% Yes** – unless de-scoped, from additional non-secured funding sources. Any currently unforeseen risks, that emerge pre FBC can be managed but thereafter are a risk to the achievement of expected benefits. For this reason the scope has been broken down into coherent packages.

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

**Yes.** Appendix MC7 gives this information, although it would be useful to have clarity in the OBC document

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

**No**

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

**Yes.** Detailed in Section 7.11

*Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?*

**Yes.** Detailed in Section 7.12. However *"Post implementation monitoring makes reference to counts, travel time and catchment analysis, and user/non-user surveys, but these are not directly linked to a set of SMART targets that are expressed quantitatively (in line with the anticipated benefits forecast in the economic appraisal for the*

scheme), as noted on previous comments. It is understood that the Promoter intends to develop these in conjunction with its preferred Design and Build contractor, and recommended that targets are developed based upon the outcome and benefit targets expressed section 7.14.” (Assessor report)

**Legal**

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

**Yes. No**

**Recommendation and Conditions**

<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Proceed to FBC</b>
<b>Payment Basis</b>	<b>Defrayal</b>
<b>Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Clarity on construction start dates</li><li>• A set of directly measurable targets</li><li>• Show base costs, residual risks, OB values in in table 3.</li><li>• A full DIA</li><li>• At FBC the TCF grant will be capped at £15.3m which is maximum amount available.</li></ul>	



This page is intentionally left blank

## **Appendix C – Approval to release development costs**

### **C.1 O45 Thorne and Moorends (TCF2 BJC)**

This investment is for £0.08m development costs from TCF2, towards total project costs of £0.38m, to DMBC.

The project will provide community consultation to residents in Thorne and Moorends and the capital works to implement the modal filter trial following the consultation.

Trial element of the modal filters may be removed if the scheme is not successful, but permeant fixtures of the scheme will remain. These include -

- Moorends crossing
- Junction improvements to benefit active modes
- Increased cycle parking.
- Placemaking

#### **The Benefits and Outcomes –**

The project will deliver the following outputs -

- Installation of modal filters to prevent rat running traffic in a minimum of three locations

The project will also contribute to the following outcomes -

- More walking and cycling journeys
- Increased use of the local cycling and walking network
- Increased percentage of population cycling to work

This page is intentionally left blank

Project Name	Project Description	Change/s Requested	Justification
O18 Access Fund Extension 2020/21	Sustainable Transport Access Fund (STAF) was a three-year DfT funded revenue activity running from 16/17, and an Extended Programme of £2.5m was agreed for delivery in 20/21. The Extended Programme 'Get Going, Keep Going' consists of four strands of activity; Get Active, Get Connected, Keep Active, Keep Safe, delivered via a range of projects across the region. Grant Agreements have been entered into with the 5 delivery partners (SYLTE plus the South Yorkshire Local Authorities).	<p>SYLTE were allocated £0.87m to deliver active and sustainable travel interventions, including: Business to Business engagement by a dedicated team, marketing and communications activity including events and promotions, Wheels to Work, and Job Connector bus services. MCA Board (item 18.v 07/06/2021) agreed reprofiling £0.43m of activity for all partners into 21/22, this left £0.07m of SYLTE funding unallocated, following individual project underspends.</p> <p>This Change Control relates to proposed use of the unallocated funding –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• £55,725 increase in SYLTE allocation for delivery of cordon counts, which will be conducted across South Yorkshire through 2021/22.</li> <li>• £11,976.35 to be sought via DfT as carry over for inclusion in Capability Fund programme delivery.</li> </ul>	<p>Cordon counts have been conducted annually in South Yorkshire for over thirty years and provide insight into the changing travel behaviours of private and commercial vehicles and public transport users. This resource is used by local authorities and SYLTE for several uses, who support its continuation.</p> <p>Annual cordon counts have been funded from STAF for each of its four consecutive years, beginning 16/17 and this change is to continue the counts for another year using STAF underspend.</p>

<p>T11 Bus Rapid Transit (North)</p>	<p>Passenger Transport journey time improvement scheme: Improvements along the Dearne Valley Routes between Barnsley and Doncaster (the A635 and A633) including major improvements at the Alhambra and Stairfoot Roundabouts, and Sheffield Road, Barnsley.</p>	<p>Change in Recipient, from SYPTE to BMBC.</p>	<p>Agreed between SYPTE and BMBC, that as the majority of the works falls under their control, it would make sense for the Grant Agreement to switch from SYPTE to BMBC.</p>
--------------------------------------	--	---	--