

Public Document Pack



Thursday, 2 September 2021

To: Members of the MCA - Housing and Infrastructure Board and Appropriate Officers

You are hereby invited to a meeting of the Sheffield City Regional Mayoral Combined Authority to be held **virtually**, on: **Monday, 13 September 2021** at **1.00 pm** 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 or use a smart phone camera and scan the QR code

Member Distribution

Gemma Smith (Co-Chair)
Councillor Terry Fox (Co-Chair)
Councillor Glyn Jones
Councillor Amy Brookes
Councillor Tim Cheetham
Councillor Paul Wood
Tanwer Khan
Damian Allen
Martin Swales

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

MCA - Housing and Infrastructure Board

Monday, 13 September 2021 at 1.00 pm

Venue: Virtual Meeting



Agenda

Agenda Ref No	Subject	Lead	Page
1.	Welcome and Apologies		
2.	Declarations of Interest by individual Members in relation to any item of business on the agenda		
3.	Urgent items / Announcements		
4.	Public Questions on Key Decisions		
5.	Minutes of Previous Meeting		5 - 16
For discussion/decision			
6.	Programme Approvals	S Sykes	17 - 86
7.	Draft South Yorkshire Flood Catchment Plan	C Blackburn	87 - 100
For Information			
8.	Forward Plan	C Blackburn	101 - 102
9.	Any Other Business		
Date of next meeting: Tuesday, 26 October 2021 at 10.00 am At: Virtual Meeting			

This page is intentionally left blank

MCA - HOUSING AND INFRASTRUCTURE BOARD

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON:

TUESDAY, 22 JUNE 2021 AT 10.00 AM

VIRTUAL MEETING



Present:

Gemma Smith (Co-Chair)	Private Sector LEP Board Member
Councillor Glyn Jones	Doncaster MBC
Councillor Amy Brookes	Rotherham MBC
Councillor Tim Cheetham	Barnsley MBC
Councillor Paul Wood	Sheffield CC
Martin Swales	MCA Executive Team

In Attendance:

Colin Blackburn	Assistant Director - Housing, Infrastructure and Planning	MCA Executive Team
Carl Howard	Senior Programme Manager	MCA Executive Team
Becky Guthrie	Senior Programme Manager	MCA Executive Team
Richard Sulley	Net Zero Project Director	MCA Executive
Laurie Thomas	Senior Programme Manager	MCA Executive Team
Helen Batt	Helen Batt	
Michael Snaith	Arcadis	
Tom Hawley	Homes England	
Andrew Shirt (Minute Taker)		

Apologies:

Councillor Terry Fox	Sheffield City Council
Tanwer Khan	Private Sector LEP Board Member
Damian Allen	Doncaster MBC

1 Welcome and Apologies

The Co-Chair, Gemma Smith welcomed everyone to the June meeting.

The Chair gave a warm welcome to new Board Members: Councillor Amy Brookes, representing Rotherham MBC, Councillor Paul Wood, representing Sheffield City Council and to the new Co-Chair, Councillor Terry Fox, who had recently been elected as Leader of Sheffield City Council. Councillor Fox had submitted his apologies for today's meeting, but would be attending the September Board meeting.

Martin Swales, Interim Director of Transport, Housing & Infrastructure for the MCA was also welcomed to his first meeting of the Board.

The Chair also placed on record her thanks to Councillor Bob Johnson and Councillor Julie Grocutt for the support they had given whilst being members of the Housing and Infrastructure Board.

Apologies for absence were noted as above.

2 Declarations of Interest by individual Members in relation to any item of business on the agenda

Councillor Jones declared an interest in matters to be considered at agenda Item 10 'Infrastructure Project Pipeline - Gainshare Schemes' by virtue of Doncaster MBC being a recipient of Gainshare funding.

3 Urgent items / Announcements

None.

4 Public Questions on Key Decisions

None.

5 Minutes of Previous Meeting

It was agreed that the minutes of the previous meetings of the Housing and Infrastructure Board held on 4th March 2021 are an accurate record and may be signed by the representative of the Head of Paid Service.

C Blackburn provided an update on the actions arising from the Board meeting held on 4th March 2021, and were noted as follows:-

- The Doncaster Town Centre – Quality Street (GBF) endorsed by the Board at the previous meeting, had been approved by the MCA for award of a £5.5m grant from the Getting Building Fund.

Two actions arising from the discussion on the emerging South Yorkshire Digital Infrastructure Strategy would be covered on today's agenda at Item 8 'Draft Digital Infrastructure Strategy'.

6 Net Zero Work Programme - Introduction to Project Director

The Chair gave a warm welcome to Richard Sulley, Net Zero Project Director for the MCA.

Richard Sulley informed the Board that he had been in post from 1st April 2021 and his role was to organise, mobilise and operationalise the existing Net Zero Programme to deliver on the pledges that had been made to be net zero by 2040.

Over the next few months R Sulley would be attending Board meetings and presenting more substantive reports on how it was intended to deliver on the pledges.

The Chair thanked R Sulley for his attendance at today's meeting.

7 **Housing Fund (Brownfield) Revised Programme SBC and MHCLG Pipeline**

For the benefit of new Board Members, C Blackburn provided an overview of the Housing Fund (Brownfield) programme.

The Board was reminded that, as part of the Government's 'Get Britain Building Fund', the MCA had been allocated £40.3m of capital funding and £841k revenue funding in 2020, for supporting the acceleration and development of housing schemes on brownfield land (up to end March 2025).

The funding criteria had set out that the brownfield programme must enable the delivery of a minimum of 2,500 homes by end March 2025, with start on sites by this timescale.

At the January 2021 meeting of the Board, the Board had endorsed the proposed Strategic Business Case which enabled the early deliverable schemes to enter the pipeline. This followed endorsement by the Board of the Housing Fund (Brownfield) Prospectus which set out the purpose of the Fund and the MCA processes for project sponsors to follow.

In January 2021, the Board also had allocated £567k of revenue funding to help support and accelerate business case development of the early deliverable schemes.

At the March 2021 Board meeting, four Phase 1 schemes (West Bar, Malthouses, Porter Brook and Small Sites in Rotherham) had been presented and approved by the Board. Contracts were currently being draw-up.

As part of the Phase 1 package of schemes, the Allen Street scheme would be considered separately on today's agenda.

Since January 2021, work had taken place to develop the Phase 2 schemes for delivery in 2021/22. In addition, work had also taken place to develop the longer term pipeline of schemes.

As part of MHCLG's requirements, the MCA is required to submit an indicative pipeline of all the schemes within the programme in June.

The table contained in the report at paragraph 2.6 set out the current status of the Phase 2 schemes. Of these, four schemes (Park Hill 4, Norfolk Park 10, Shirecliffe 2 and Phase 1 Council Build Programme in Doncaster) were being submitted to the Board for acceptance onto the Programme SBC pipeline, which if approved by the Board would allow the schemes to be progressed to the Outline Business Case (OBC) stage as soon as possible.

The proposed Phase 3 schemes for funding and delivery later in the programme from 2022-25 were set out in the table in paragraph 2.11. The table includes a proposed further twelve schemes to add onto the pipeline, noting that some of these schemes were at the very early stages of

development.

The Board noted that a total of £40.3m of capital funding was available in the programme. Taking account of all the schemes in Phases 1, 2 and 3, there was now an over-programme position, currently at a £65m 'ask'. It was highlighted that, due to the uncertainty with some of the schemes and their timescales, a number of schemes may fall out of the programme and other schemes could potentially come forward over the next four years.

In relation to the revenue allocation for 2020-22, paragraph 2.15 set out a proposed reprofiling of the revenue allocations between years to reflect the current situation with scheme's development.

Paragraph 3 of the report presented the Board with three options for their consideration together with the risks and mitigations for each option.

Following discussion, the Board recommended that 'Option 1' be progressed at this time, as follows:

'To continue to work with Local Authorities partners and their selected 'sponsored' scheme promoters on the prioritised pipeline, submitting this as the current known Programme to MHCLG, and updating the Housing and Infrastructure Board via the Programme SBC and subsequent business case submissions'.

The Chair noted that Phase 2 proposals totalled £18.8m, however, £17m needed to be spent in 2021/22. If a large scheme fell out of the programme there would be a risk and a challenge to spend to this level.

The Chair asked for clarification when Phase 2 schemes would need to be in a viable position to make progress with their scheme.

C Blackburn replied that the MCA Executive was currently working with all the local authorities to meet the end of July deadline for OBC submissions.

It was acknowledged that the timescales were challenging. To assist local authorities to complete their scheme OBCs, the MCA Executive had commissioned an expert consultant for the local authorities to draw down.

If the July deadline was achieved, the OBC's would be presented for approval at the Board's October meeting. The OBCs would then need to be worked-up to full Business Cases which would be presented at the earliest, to the January 2022 Board meeting for consideration and approval.

If the July deadline was not achieved there could be significant risk to the programme meeting the end of March 2022 spend deadline, which could have implications for securing MHCLG funding in future years of the programme.

The Chair asked if there would be an opportunity to invite an 'open call' for schemes during the summer period, if schemes missed the July deadline.

C Blackburn replied that this option was available for the Board to consider.

However, he noted that schemes would need to go through the full due diligence process involving SBC, OBC and FBC which would mean that they would not be ready until after March 2022. If actioned, an open call would therefore only be to support the pipeline in the 2022-25 period.

Councillor Cheetham queried if the timetable for submitting Phase 2 Business Cases was achievable. Furthermore, he queried if the MCA's governance structure and scheduled Board meetings were fit for purpose to achieve the deadlines set.

The Chair acknowledged Councillor Cheetham's concerns and requested that a separate meeting be arranged with herself, Councillor Fox, Martin Swales and C Blackburn to discuss whether further meetings should be arranged to consider scheme business cases as soon as they are ready to be considered.

ACTION: C Blackburn

T Hawley commented that a challenge with delivering the Housing Fund (Brownfield) programme was local authority resources. He was conscious that local authority colleagues were increasingly stretched due to the number of capital funding opportunities currently available. It was often the same individuals writing bids and delivering capital schemes for different programmes, and therefore, resource pressures available across the region were a significant risk. Furthermore, it could equally be a risk to further investment and projects that may be supported by Homes England in the region due to these potential schemes relying upon the same individuals.

T Hawley said he would be interested to understand the advice which had been given with regards to pursuing 'Option 1' over 'Option 2' as presented in the report, particularly in relation to Subsidy Control.

M Swales thanked T Hawley for his observations and agreed to provide comments outside of today's meeting. **ACTION: M Swales**

RESOLVED – That the Housing and Infrastructure Board:-

1. Approved the Revised Programme Strategic Business Case for the South Yorkshire Housing Fund (Brownfield) and accepted the additional schemes onto the pipeline as set out Paragraphs 2.6 and 2.11.
2. Approved the updated revenue spend profile for the Phase 2 schemes as set out in Paragraph 2.15.
3. Agreed that Phase 1, 2 and 3 schemes be submitted to MHCLG as the current known five year Housing Fund (Brownfield) Programme, noting the over programming approach being proposed and the risks associated with the 'Remaining Programme' schemes at this stage.

8 **Draft Digital Infrastructure Strategy**

For the benefit of new Board Members, C Blackburn provided an overview of the Housing Fund (Brownfield) programme.

The Board was reminded that, as part of the Government's 'Get Britain Building Fund', the MCA had been allocated £40.3m of capital funding and £841k

revenue funding in 2020, for supporting the acceleration and development of housing schemes on brownfield land (up to end March 2025).

The funding criteria had set out that the brownfield programme must enable the delivery of a minimum of 2,500 homes by end March 2025, with start on sites by this timescale.

At the January 2021 meeting of the Board, the Board had endorsed the proposed Strategic Business Case which enabled the early deliverable schemes to enter the pipeline. This followed endorsement by the Board of the Housing Fund (Brownfield) Prospectus which set out the purpose of the Fund and the MCA processes for project sponsors to follow.

In January 2021, the Board also had allocated £567k of revenue funding to help support and accelerate business case development of the early deliverable schemes.

At the March 2021 Board meeting, four Phase 1 schemes (West Bar, Malthouses, Porter Brook and Small Sites in Rotherham) had been presented and approved by the Board. Contracts were currently being draw-up.

As part of the Phase 1 package of schemes, the Allen Street scheme would be considered separately on today's agenda.

Since January 2021, work had taken place to develop the Phase 2 schemes for delivery in 2021/22. In addition, work had also taken place to develop the longer term pipeline of schemes.

As part of MHCLG's requirements, the MCA is required to submit an indicative pipeline of all the schemes within the programme in June.

The table contained in the report at paragraph 2.6 set out the current status of the Phase 2 schemes. Of these, four schemes (Park Hill 4, Norfolk Park 10, Shirecliffe 2 and Phase 1 Council Build Programme in Doncaster) were being submitted to the Board for acceptance onto the Programme SBC pipeline, which if approved by the Board would allow the schemes to be progressed to the Outline Business Case (OBC) stage as soon as possible.

The proposed Phase 3 schemes for funding and delivery later in the programme from 2022-25 were set out in the table in paragraph 2.11. The table includes a proposed further twelve schemes to add onto the pipeline, noting that some of these schemes were at the very early stages of development.

The Board noted that a total of £40.3m of capital funding was available in the programme. Taking account of all the schemes in Phases 1, 2 and 3, there was now an over-programme position, currently at a £65m 'ask'. It was highlighted that, due the uncertainty with some of the schemes and their timescales, a number of schemes may fall out of the programme and other schemes could potentially come forward over the next four years.

In relation to the revenue allocation for 2020-22, paragraph 2.15 set out a

proposed reprofiling of the revenue allocations between years to reflect the current situation with scheme's development.

Paragraph 3 of the report presented the Board with three options for their consideration together with the risks and mitigations for each option.

Following discussion, the Board recommended that 'Option 1' be progressed at this time, as follows:

'To continue to work with Local Authorities partners and their selected 'sponsored' scheme promoters on the prioritised pipeline, submitting this as the current known Programme to MHCLG, and updating the Housing and Infrastructure Board via the Programme SBC and subsequent business case submissions'.

The Chair noted that Phase 2 proposals totalled £18.8m, however, £17m needed to be spent in 2021/22. If a large scheme fell out of the programme there would be a risk and a challenge to spend to this level.

The Chair asked for clarification when Phase 2 schemes would need to be in a viable position to make progress with their scheme.

C Blackburn replied that the MCA Executive was currently working with all the local authorities to meet the end of July deadline for OBC submissions.

It was acknowledged that the timescales were challenging. To assist local authorities to complete their scheme OBCs, the MCA Executive had commissioned an expert consultant for the local authorities to draw down.

If the July deadline was achieved, the OBC's would be presented for approval at the Board's October meeting. The OBCs would then need to be worked-up to full Business Cases which would be presented at the earliest, to the January 2022 Board meeting for consideration and approval.

If the July deadline was not achieved there could be significant risk to the programme meeting the end of March 2022 spend deadline, which could have implications for securing MHCLG funding in future years of the programme.

The Chair asked if there would be an opportunity to invite an 'open call' for schemes during the summer period, if schemes missed the July deadline.

C Blackburn replied that this option was available for the Board to consider. However, he noted that schemes would need to go through the full due diligence process involving SBC, OBC and FBC which would mean that they would not be ready until after March 2022. If actioned, an open call would therefore only be to support the pipeline in the 2022-25 period.

Councillor Cheetham queried if the timetable for submitting Phase 2 Business Cases was achievable. Furthermore, he queried if the MCA's governance structure and scheduled Board meetings were fit for purpose to achieve the deadlines set.

The Chair acknowledged Councillor Cheetham's concerns and requested that a separate meeting be arranged with herself, Councillor Fox, Martin Swales and C Blackburn to discuss whether further meetings should be arranged to consider scheme business cases as soon as they are ready to be considered.
ACTION: C Blackburn

T Hawley commented that a challenge with delivering the Housing Fund (Brownfield) programme was local authority resources. He was conscious that local authority colleagues were increasingly stretched due to the number of capital funding opportunities currently available. It was often the same individuals writing bids and delivering capital schemes for different programmes, and therefore, resource pressures available across the region were a significant risk. Furthermore, it could equally be a risk to further investment and projects that may be supported by Homes England in the region due to these potential schemes relying upon the same individuals.

T Hawley said he would be interested to understand the advice which had been given with regards to pursuing 'Option 1' over 'Option 2' as presented in the report, particularly in relation to Subsidy Control.

M Swales thanked T Hawley for his observations and agreed to provide comments outside of today's meeting. ACTION: M Swales

RESOLVED – That the Housing and Infrastructure Board:-

1. Approved the Revised Programme Strategic Business Case for the South Yorkshire Housing Fund (Brownfield) and accepted the additional schemes onto the pipeline as set out Paragraphs 2.6 and 2.11.
2. Approved the updated revenue spend profile for the Phase 2 schemes as set out in Paragraph 2.15.
3. Agreed that Phase 1, 2 and 3 schemes be submitted to MHCLG as the current known five year Housing Fund (Brownfield) Programme, noting the over programming approach being proposed and the risks associated with the 'Remaining Programme' schemes at this stage.

9 Programme Approvals

C Howard introduced a report which requested the Board's approval of a BHF (Brownfield Housing Fund) scheme for the Allen Street brownfield housing scheme subject to the conditions set out in the Assurance Summary and to give approval for delegated authority.

On 22nd of December 2020, the MCA received confirmation of £40.34m BHF award with the aim of creating more homes by bringing more brownfield land into development.

The Fund aimed to ease viability issues that brownfield projects face alongside wider interventions aimed at economic development.

In March 2021, the first four BHF projects with a total value of £2.539m were approved for funding at the Housing and Infrastructure Board.

The report on today's agenda presented the fifth project for a decision which, if approved, will take the total amount granted to £3.085m.

The Appraisal Panel Summary Table attached at Appendix A to the report asked the Board to take a decision whether to support the proposal of a BHF grant of £0.546m requested by Sheffield City Council for acquiring the leasehold interest in a site to bring forward development of 120 new homes to the market. The total project costs were £1.093m with match funding coming from the Council's own resources. The project costs included the purchase and demolition. Subsequent to the project activity it was hoped that the cleared site would be developed for up to an eight storey residential block.

The scheme aligned well with several local and regional policies, namely supporting the housing targets for Sheffield and the wider area.

The assessment had concluded that a value for money assessment based on information provided by Sheffield City Council would mean that the project was deliverable for a cost-benefit ratio of around 1:1.1, which means that for every £1 public investment there may be £1.10 worth of benefits derived.

This would meet the minimum standard set for the Brownfield Housing Fund.

The assessment did highlight that there was a level of uncertainty around whether further public funds may be needed to deliver the full scheme, which may affect any value for money calculation. However, if wider benefits such as improvement to the local area, are taken into account then this could improve the overall position.

The Board considered and approved the project for award of a £0.546m grant from the BHF.

RESOLVED – That the Housing and Infrastructure Board considered and approved:-

1. Progression of the "Allen Street" project to full approval and award of £0.546m grant to Sheffield City Council subject to the conditions set out in the Assurance Summary attached at Appendix A.
2. Delegated authority to 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.

10 **Infrastructure Project Pipeline - Gainshare Schemes**

L Thomas introduced a report to provide the Board with an update on progress with the Gainshare infrastructure and housing schemes, including an estimated timescale for consideration of Strategic Business Cases by the Board.

The Board noted that the MCA had agreed in March 2021 to the inclusion of a number of potential Gainshare investments for 2021/22 in each of the four South Yorkshire districts. A brief summary of each scheme was set out in Appendix 1 to the report.

Of the twenty infrastructure schemes accepted on to the pipeline, nineteen fall within the remit of the Housing and Infrastructure Board.

Following publication of the report, two schemes had been merged, namely, the Doncaster Natural Flood Management and the Conisbrough and Doncaster Natural Flood Management Tickhill scheme into one scheme named 'Doncaster Natural Flood Management programme.' The Doncaster Housing Retrofit Schemes had also been merged into one scheme. This now brought the total to seventeen schemes.

It was confirmed that all the schemes were in the process of, or had submitted Strategic Business Cases (SBC's).

A summary of the project assurance and decision stages were presented and noted by the Board.

The Board noted that the submitted and assured SBC's would be presented at the next Board meeting scheduled for 13th September 2021.

The Chair requested that the time of the Board meeting scheduled for 13th September 2020 be extended if necessary to allow Members to fully consider all the schemes and also consideration be given as to whether further meetings of the Board were required to consider business cases as and when they are ready to help accelerate scheme funding approvals . **ACTION: C Blackburn**

RESOLVED – That the Housing and Infrastructure Board:-

1. Noted the contents of the report.
2. Commented on the potential issues relating to the scale and timing of the Strategic Business Cases.

11 **South Yorkshire Flood Catchment Plan Update**

C Blackburn introduced a report to provide the Board with an update on ongoing work and emerging workstreams to prepare the South Yorkshire Flood Catchment Plan.

Helen Batt, Flood Risk Manager for South Yorkshire – Environment Agency was introduced and welcomed to the Board.

H Batt provided the Board with a presentation to update Members on the progress made in preparing the South Yorkshire Flood Catchment Plan.

The Board noted that a Steering Group had been established to oversee the preparation of the Plan comprising of senior officers from the MCA Executive, Environment Agency, four South Yorkshire Authorities, and Yorkshire Water. The outputs of the work of the Group are reported to both this Board and the South Yorkshire Flood Risk Partnership which are jointly overseeing the preparation of the Plan.

The aim of the Plan was for it to be a 'living document' to facilitate the

development of an integrated long term strategy for flood risk management and climate resilience. This would enable partners and communities to incorporate emerging data, knowledge and opportunities to continue to build and shape the Plan over time.

Importantly, the programme arising from the Plan would provide a clear programme of well-developed projects to secure the remaining investment that was required to alleviate and mitigate future flooding.

The preparation work was set around four key workstream themes, with one local authority leading on each of one of themes:

1. Responding to the climate emergency.
2. Ensuring investment is prioritised, smart and based on evidence using the best available data and intelligence.
3. Strengthening the use of technology and operational management to build the capacity of Local Authorities and other Risk Management Authorities (RMAs) to work together more effectively on an operational basis.
4. Community engagement and resilience

Work had now commenced to draft the initial Plan, which if ready would be submitted for consideration by this Board in September. It was anticipated that the final Plan would be launched by the end of the year.

M Swales congratulated and thanked colleagues and local authorities for the work which had been undertaken to develop a coordinated response to preparing the Plan.

Councillor Cheetham echoed M Swales' comment. Councillor Cheetham said he welcomed the idea that the Plan would be a 'living document', which introduces more flexibility in relation to joint working and solving specific issues.

The Board thanked H Batt for her presentation.

RESOLVED – That the Housing and Infrastructure Board noted and commented on the workstreams being undertaken to prepare the South Yorkshire Flood Catchment Plan.

12 **Forward Plan**

C Blackburn presented the Board's Forward Plan for Members' information.

RESOLVED – That the Housing and Infrastructure Board noted the contents of the Board's Forward Plan.

13 **Any Other Business**

None.

In accordance with Combined Authority's Constitution/Terms of Reference for the Board, Board decisions need to be ratified by the Head of Paid Services (or their nominee) in

consultation with the Chair of the Board. Accordingly, the undersigned has consulted with the Chair and hereby ratifies the decisions set out in the above minutes.

Signed

Name

Position

Date

Housing and Infrastructure Board

13 September 2021

Programme Approvals

Is the paper exempt from the press and public?	No
<i>Reason why exempt:</i>	Not applicable
Purpose of this report:	Funding Decision
Is this a Key Decision?	Yes
Has it been included on the Forward Plan?	Yes

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

Report Author(s):
 Carl Howard
 Carl.Howard@sheffieldcityregion.org.uk

Executive Summary

This paper seeks approval to progress ten SBCs (Strategic Business Cases) to development of OBCs (Outline Business Cases) which includes the release of development funding for one project. The paper also requests approval of grant for two projects. There is a request to include Heart of the City Expansion project in the GBF Programme. Finally, the report seeks approval for five change requests where projects that have already been approved but are now seeking changes to their existing agreements.

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 MCA's aspirations.

Recommendations

The Board consider and approve -

1. Progression of 'Housing Retrofit' SBC to the MCA (Mayoral Combined Authority) for approval to proceed to OBC for Gainshare funding to DMBC (Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council) subject to the conditions set out in the Assurance Summary attached at **Appendix A**;
2. Progression of 'Glassworks – Enhanced Capital Contributions' SBC to MCA for approval to proceed to OBC for Gainshare funding to BMBC (Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council) subject to the conditions set out in the Assurance Summary attached at **Appendix B**;
3. Progression of 'Fargate Future High Street Fund' SBC to MCA for approval to proceed to OBC for Gainshare funding to SCC (Sheffield City Council) subject to the conditions set out in the Assurance Summary attached at **Appendix C**;
4. Progression of 'Rotherham to Kilnhurst Flood Alleviation Scheme' SBC to proceed to OBC for Gainshare funding to RMBC (Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council) subject to the conditions set out in the Assurance Summary attached at **Appendix D**;
5. Progression of 'Sheaf Catchment' SBC to MCA for approval to proceed to OBC and release of up to £0.80m business case development costs from Gainshare funding to SCC subject to the conditions set out in the Assurance Summary attached at **Appendix E**;
6. Progression of 'Doncaster Surface Water Mitigation' SBC to proceed to OBC for Gainshare funding to DMBC subject to the conditions set out in the Assurance Summary attached at **Appendix F**;
7. Progression of 'Cheapside Acquisition' SBC to proceed to OBC for Gainshare funding to BMBC subject to the conditions set out in the Assurance Summary attached at **Appendix G**;
8. Progression of 'Bentley Flood Alleviation Scheme' SBC to OBC for Gainshare funding to DMBC subject to the conditions set out in the Assurance Summary attached at **Appendix H**;
9. Progression of 'Natural Flood Management – Conisbrough and Tickhill' SBC to OBC for Gainshare funding to DMBC subject to the conditions set out in the Assurance Summary attached at **Appendix I**;
10. Progression of 'Heart of the City 2 – Block A' SBC to OBC for Gainshare funding to SCC subject to the conditions set out in the Assurance Summary attached at **Appendix J**
11. Approval of 'South Yorkshire Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure' FBC for award of £1.85m GBF (Getting Building Fund) to SCR MCA subject to the conditions set out in the Assurance Summary attached at **Appendix K**;
12. Approval of 'Doncaster Council House Build Phase 1' BJC for award of £0.50m BHF (Brownfield Housing Fund) to DMBC subject to the conditions set out in the Assurance Summary attached at **Appendix L**;
13. Selecting the project 'Heart of the City expansion' project for inclusion in the GBF Programme.
14. Approval of five change requests for changes to their approved projects subject to any conditions set out in the Change Summary attached at **Appendix M**;
15. Delegated authority to be given to the Head of Paid Service in consultation with the Section 73 Officer and Monitoring Officer to enter into legal agreements for the points covered above.

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

Assurance Panel
Assurance Panel
Assurance Panel
Assurance Panel

28 July 2021
12 August 2021
13 August 2021
01 September 2021

1. Background

1.1 This report seeks approval for the progression of the development of schemes to be funded from the Gainshare Funding programme. It also requests project changes are agreed for projects from the Brownfield Housing Fund and the Getting Building Fund.

1.2 Gainshare Funding Programme

The MCA agreed in March 2021 to the inclusion of a number of potential Gainshare investments for 2021/22 in each of the four South Yorkshire districts. Of the twenty infrastructure schemes accepted on to the pipeline, nineteen fall within the remit of the Housing and Infrastructure Board.

The Strategic Businesses Case (SBC) has been submitted for each of the nine schemes below and corresponding assessment summaries of the projects can be found in the appendices.

1.2 Brownfield Housing Fund

In June 2020, the Government launched 'A New Deal for Britain' which is a key part of the Government's Strategy to rebuild Britain following Covid 19 and support the economic recovery across the UK. As part of this strategy, £40.3m of capital funding and £841k revenue funding was allocated to the Sheffield City Region MCA for supporting the development of housing schemes on brownfield land up to the end of March 2025.

The strategy for developing the Brownfield Housing Fund was set out in the Programme Strategic Business Case (SBC) endorsed by the Housing and Infrastructure Board in January and subsequently revised in June 2021. The spend profile agreed with MHCLG was for £20m of this to be spent by the end of March 2022. One project seeks full approval for grant.

1.3 Getting Building Fund

On 30th June 2020 the MCA was awarded £33.6m GBF to invest in 'shovel-ready' projects that will provide stimulus to local economies. The funds need to be defrayed by 31st March 2022.

Guidance received from Government states that Sheffield City Region will be expected to deliver the agreed projects and any significant changes to the projects will be discussed and agreed with the Government in advance. All investment decisions must be undertaken in line with locally agreed audit and scrutiny arrangements.

One project is seeking to replace another which will not now deliver within the GBF timeframe. One project seeks full approval for grant.

2. Proposal and Justifications

2.1 Housing Retrofit (Gainshare SBC)

The project is seeking £2.70m from Gainshare funding towards total project costs of £4.45m.

The project is a pilot which install Air Source Heat Pumps in 100 Council owned homes in order to test the effectiveness and impact of Air Source Heat Pumps in decarbonising the fuel supply to Council owned homes. The project will also part fund external wall insulation to 250 Council homes and fully fund external wall insulation to 50 privately owned homes.

The Proposed Benefits and Outcomes

Whilst the project is at an early stage of development, the proposed benefits are expected to include reduced emissions, health benefits, lower energy bills and 10-15 jobs supported.

The project is considered to have strategic fit. The proposed benefits will require additional work at OBC stage to better quantify although the project is anticipated to be able to demonstrate value for money at full approval stage. The Assurance Summary explains in further detail within Appendix A.

2.2 Glassworks – Enhanced Capital Contributions (Gainshare SBC)

The project is seeking £2.60m from Gainshare funding towards total project costs of £17.37m. The Glass Works is finalising construction on a 3.8-hectare site in the heart of Barnsley town centre. The £200m scheme is a major priority for the Council and will deliver a new high-quality mix of retail and leisure facilities that will preserve and enhance the long term sustainability of the town centre through the creation of a new urban quarter with a revitalised and accessible market at its heart. As a result of the COVID pandemic detailed negotiations with prospective tenants has revealed an increased funding gap in order to attract tenants. The Gainshare funding is requested to be used as inducements for prospective tenants to create a fully occupied development.

The Proposed Benefits and Outcomes

The project aims to protect proposed benefits for the Town Centre that are already being monitored through other agreements, the extent of this should be tested through project development. The project is considered to have strategic fit and is aligned with the SEP and RAP aims of creating a stronger economy. A condition of approval is that the Gainshare funding can only be used to assist with the capital costs of tenants in line with Gainshare requirements. The Assurance Summary explains in further detail within Appendix B.

2.3 Fargate Future High Street Fund (Gainshare SBC)

The project is seeking £3m from Gainshare funding towards total project costs of £31.1m. The MCA is asked to contribute £3m required to deliver the “New Front

Doors” element of the programme Sheffield Future High Streets Programme. The Gainshare monies will be used for access and refurbishment works to buildings on Fargate and High Street, with a further £2m from funding secured under the MHCLG Future High Streets Fund and potential to attract £26m of private sector investment.

The Proposed Benefits and Outcomes

The project is aiming to deliver 118 net additional jobs and a return of £1.64 for every £1 invested. Whilst the project is at an early stage of development and more detail will be required at OBC stage, this indicates an acceptable value for money position. As part of the works the project will also aim to create 22 additional housing units. The project is considered to have strategic fit. The proposed benefits will require additional work at OBC stage to better quantify although the project is anticipated to be able to demonstrate value for money at full approval stage. The Assurance Summary explains in further detail within Appendix C.

2.4 Rotherham to Kilnhurst Flood Alleviation Scheme (FAS) (Gainshare SBC)

The project is seeking £2m from Gainshare funding towards total project costs of £4.3m. The MCA is asked to contribute £2m towards RMBC’s strategic response to reduce the risk of flooding along the River Don corridor. The Gainshare monies will be used for new flood defences around Rotherham United FC stadium, plus flood defences and a new canal barrier around Forge Island. This is part of wider works along 5km of river through the town centre, Parkgate and Kilnhurst areas.

The Proposed Benefits and Outcomes

The project aims to avoid £20m of flood damage costs to people, property and infrastructures which would result in a £76m loss of GVA (Gross Value Added) for the local economy. The project is considered to have strategic fit. Whilst at an early stage of development, it is anticipated that the scheme will be able to demonstrate value for money at approval stage. The Assurance Summary explains in further detail within Appendix D.

2.5 Sheaf Catchment Flood Alleviation Scheme (Gainshare SBC)

The project is seeking £0.80m development costs from Gainshare funding in order to develop the project and Outline Business Case. The full scheme is anticipated to cost £25m, with £15m already ringfenced from the Environment Agency. The future funding requirement is still to be determined. The project aims to reduce flood risk and deliver a range of benefits in Sheffield’s Sheaf and Porter valleys which contains a significant proportion of Sheffield’s employment and residential areas.

The Proposed Benefits and Outcomes

The projects is aiming to better protect 370 homes and 253 businesses. Whilst the project is at an early stage of development and more detail will be required at OBC stage, the project is anticipated to be able to provide an acceptable value for money position at approval. The project is considered to have strategic fit. The proposed benefits will require additional work at OBC stage to better quantify although the project is anticipated to be able to demonstrate value for money at full approval stage. The applicant needs to assure themselves that the £800,000 development costs can

be claimed as capital expenditure for eligibility through the Gainshare capital funding. The Assurance Summary explains in further detail within Appendix E.

2.6 **Doncaster Surface Water Mitigation (Gainshare SBC)**

The project is seeking £0.70m to mitigate long standing surface water flooding issues at Bawtry, Old Denaby and High Melton through improved drainage.

The Proposed Benefits and Outcomes

The projects is aiming to protect 50 residential and 10 commercial properties. If confirmed at Full Business Case stage the project is likely to demonstrate value for money. The project is considered to have strategic fit. The Board are asked to approve the project to move forward to develop an OBC. The Assurance Summary explains in further detail within Appendix F.

2.7 **Cheapside Acquisition (Gainshare SBC)**

BMBC are seeking £1m Gainshare funding to purchase the freehold site at 24-32 Cheapside in the town centre, with a view to eventually creating green space in place of the existing building.

The Proposed Benefits and Outcomes

Benefits of the project include opportunity for high quality public realm which may in turn increase footfall, dwell time and spend in the town centre. The project is considered to have strategic fit. Further details will be needed at OBC/FBC stage to fully assess value for money. The Board are asked to approve the project to move forward to develop an OBC. The Assurance Summary explains in further detail within Appendix G.

2.8 **Bentley Flood Alleviation Scheme (Gainshare SBC)**

DMBC are seeking £1m to contribute towards flood embankment and flood wall works in Bentley to alleviate the risk of large scale flooding which has occurred twice in the last 12 years.

The Proposed Benefits and Outcomes

The projects is aiming to improve resilience of public infrastructure and deliver protection for 47 residential properties and two businesses. The project is considered to have strategic fit. The Board are asked to approve the project to move forward to develop an OBC. The Assurance Summary explains in further detail within Appendix H.

2.9 **Natural Flood Management Conisbrough and Tickhill (Gainshare SBC)**

The project is seeking £0.40m to construct natural flood defences along a brook with high flood risk.

The Proposed Benefits and Outcomes

Whilst value for money cannot be assessed fully at this early stage, the project will protect 48 homes and other infrastructure. The project is considered to have strategic fit with flood relief being a key aim of the SEP. Further detailed costs and cost benefit analysis of options are requested as the project develops further. The Board are

asked to approve the project to move forward to develop an OBC. The Assurance Summary explains in further detail within Appendix I.

2.10 Sheffield Heart of the City 2 (Gainshare SBC)

SCC are seeking £3m towards the construction of Block A in a prominent location in the City Centre around Pinstone Street/Barkers Pool. The grant will contribute towards a much larger £52m scheme which includes demolition, façade retention, construction of a hotel and ground floor units and refurbishment of the Gaumont building.

The Proposed Benefits and Outcomes

The project is estimated to create 227 net additional jobs. Based on the MCA investment this would provide acceptable value for money, but further assessment should be done in developing the business case. The project is considered to have strategic fit with the SEP and is well advanced for a start on site this year. The Board are asked to approve the project to move forward to develop an OBC. The Assurance Summary explains in further detail within Appendix J.

2.11 South Yorkshire Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure (Getting Building Fund FBC)

SCR MCA are seeking £1.85m to purchase and installation of up to 109 charging points and associated infrastructure, providing up to 218 charging bays for use by battery-powered electric vehicles at public car park locations across South Yorkshire.

The Proposed Benefits and Outcomes

The core benefits and justification of the scheme are the environmental impacts appraised over a 20-year period from scheme opening (beginning of 2022/23). These have been assessed to deliver an overall Present Value of Benefits of c.£2.26m. Overall, the BCR is likely to be greater than 1 but less than 1.5 which places the scheme in a low but acceptable value for money category. However, there is a risk that the BCR could fall below one if the benefits are not as high as estimated. The scheme provides a clear rationale and alignment with the SCR Strategic Economic Plan. The Board are asked to approve grant of £1.85m for this scheme. The Assurance Summary explains in further detail within Appendix K.

2.12 Doncaster Council House Build Phase 1 (Brownfield Housing Fund BJC)

DMBC is seeking £0.50m to enable the delivery of 33 new high-quality, environmentally friendly affordable homes across 3 sites in Doncaster. The BHF funding will be used to close a viability gap and enable quality environmental features to be implemented on the scheme including PV panels, EV charging points and high thermal performance.

The Proposed Benefits and Outcomes

The Net Present Social Value of the project has been estimated to have a value of £1.77m, including £1.29m of Social and Environmental Benefits. The project also has a benefit cost ratio (BCR) of 3.65, representing a return of £3.65 per £1 of MCA investment. The project is therefore considered to deliver acceptable value for money

The assessment considers the project is deliverable and has clear governance structures. The Board are asked to approve grant of £0.50m. The Assurance Summary explains in further detail within Appendix L.

2.13 **Getting Building Fund Proposed Change to the Programme**

One Getting Building Fund project, 'Parkwood' will not now deliver their activity by March 2022. Sheffield City Council have proposed to replace the 'Parkwood' project with 'Heart of the City Expansion' activity. The new project costs £6m GBF and consists of three strands of activity:

1. **Purchase of additional empty properties** on Fargate.
2. **Improving Shop Fronts in the Heart of the City** – move away from a traditional 'shell' approach to 'white box' units which is designed to reduce fit out costs for end tenants.
3. **Improving John Lewis/Barkers Pool** – with projections and digital screens. Stalls and container units planned to be used as a temporary measure for future businesses locating in Heart of the City following wider regeneration.

The scheme is expected to create jobs and new/improved floorspace and public realm which will assist the MCA to meet it's agreement on output delivery with MHCLG. Value for money will be further tested fully on submission of the FBC.

The Board are asked to recommend 'Heart of the City Expansion' project to be part of the GBF Programme. The MCA will make the final decision on the change to the Programme at the meeting on the 20th of September. Agreement also needs to be reached with MHCLG for the change, who have already been approached and consulted during the development of this alternative project.

2.14 **Brownfield Housing Fund and Getting Building Fund Project Changes**

Appendix F highlights five schemes from the Getting Building Fund and Brownfield Housing Fund which have proposed changes to their existing approvals. The changes are proposed to allow schemes to progress and spend their financial commitments within their respective Programme periods.

The Board are asked to approve the proposed changes to the schemes as set out in Appendix M.

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 MCA Assurance Framework. Funding for the Brownfield Housing and Getting Building Fund projects is timebound by the funding bodies and any decreased funding offers is likely to affect viability of the schemes.

3.9 Option 3

Approve all recommendations.

3.12 Option 3 Risks and Mitigations

By approving the recommendations, the projects will enter contracts to deliver activity but there is a risk that delivery will be delayed. Close project monitoring with regular reports into the MCA Executive will mitigate impacts of any delays and help ensure maximum value can be obtained from grant funding the region receives.

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 MCA 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 MCA 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 MCA Assurance process.

6. Financial and Procurement Implications and Advice

6.1 Approval of the Getting Building Fund FBC will enable approval commitments to rise to £22.5m of the £33.6m available, with three remaining projects to consider for approval at a future Board.

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 MCA shall ensure contracts are put in place to ensure the recipients comply with the grant conditions.

8. Human Resources Implications and Advice

8.1 NA

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 The MCA funding is being used on a number of projects to increase environmental sustainability credentials. Specifically PV roof panels; high levels of thermal insulation; EV charging points and air source heat pumps will be included in the Doncaster Council House Build Programme and the Electric Vehicle Charging Points project aims to tackle the climate emergency by providing a more dense network of public charging points for electric vehicles.

11. Information and Communication Technology Implications and Advice

11.1 NA

12. Communications and Marketing Implications and Advice

12.1 The approvals provide positive opportunities to highlight the difference the MCA's investments will make to people, 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 Assurance Summary - Housing Retrofit
- B Assurance Summary - Glassworks – Enhanced Capital Contributions
- C Assurance Summary - Fargate Future High Street Fund
- D Assurance Summary - Rotherham to Kilnhurst Flood Alleviation Scheme
- E Assurance Summary - Sheaf Catchment
- F Assurance Summary - Doncaster Surface Water Mitigation
- G Assurance Summary - Cheapside Acquisition
- H Assurance Summary - Bentley Flood Alleviation Scheme
- I Assurance Summary - Natural Flood Management – Conisbrough and Tickhill
- J Assurance Summary - Sheffield Heart of the City 2
- K Assurance Summary - South Yorkshire Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure
- L Assurance Summary - Doncaster Council House Build
- M Assurance Summary - Five project change requests

Background Papers

NA



Assurance Panel Summary

Scheme Details

Project Name	Housing Retrofit - Thermal Efficiency and Heat Pump upgrades	Type of funding	Capital Grant
Grant Recipient	Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council	Total Scheme Cost	£4,450,000
MCA Executive Board	Housing and Infrastructure	MCA Funding	£2,700,000
Programme name	Gainshare	% MCA Allocation	60.67%

Part A - Appraisal Summary

Strategic Case	
<i>Project rationale</i>	<p>This is a pilot project which will install Air Source Heat Pumps in 100 Council owned homes in order to test the effectiveness and impact of Air Source Heat Pumps in decarbonising the fuel supply to Council owned homes. The project will also part fund external wall insulation to 250 Council homes and fully fund external wall insulation to 50 privately owned homes.</p> <p>The project will be concentrated on 10 postcode areas in Doncaster, with a preference to retrofit neighbouring houses or rows of houses to maximise cost efficiency. The project is targeted at low income communities and retrofitting the oldest and most inefficient housing stock, especially those with solid wall construction. Identified areas include Stainforth, Intake, Conisbrough/Denaby and Mexborough.</p> <p>Doncaster Council successfully bid for Green Homes Grant (GHG) funding to initiate a housing retrofit scheme. However, the qualifying criteria for the grant is restrictive and the existing Local Authority Delivery scheme (LAD) that is available to Doncaster, does not allow an area based approach to be taken. LAD can support the cost of installing external wall insulation but it is sporadic and only benefits a few households across a large geographical area. Insulation is effective but expensive and without grant support, it is an unaffordable energy efficiency measure for households in deprived communities.</p> <p>Doncaster want to retrofit housing stock in entire communities across the borough; enabling more social and some privately owned homes in an area to receive external wall insulation and improve the appearance of old housing stock. In order to achieve greater community impact, MCA funding is required to plug the funding gap between the GHG grant, LAD, Energy Company Obligation and the Council's capital funds to provide an area based response.</p> <p>MCA funding will accelerate work on Doncaster's Council homes scheme and the delivery of Doncaster's existing 5 year thermal improvement programme for social housing. MCA funding could also ensure that fuel and carbon savings will be realised much earlier in the programme (an estimated reduction in carbon emissions of 400 t/co2 per annum from domestic fuel consumption), whilst also addressing recognised fuel poverty for households in deprived areas (an estimated saving of £300 per household per annum). The project application states that MCA funding would allow for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A community based approach to delivering cross tenure support for external wall insulation. 2. Greater security within the supply chain initiated with other government funds.

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Housing to reach the standard able to receive a low carbon heating system which can decarbonise the future energy supply. 4. The trial low carbon heating in homes with onsite energy generation, reducing fuel poverty and decarbonising the energy supply. Enabling the Council to better understand how heat pumps should contribute to the future mix of low carbon heating technologies in its housing stock. 5. The Council to accelerate its thermal improvement programme, accelerate economic stimulus, create training and new job opportunities and allow residents to feel the impact of home improvement benefits sooner. <p>There is a clear rationale and justification for the project that will contribute to key performance indicators in the SEP. However, the impact on the supply chain in providing greater security appears tenuous.</p>		
<i>Strategic fit</i>	See Annex 1 at the end of this form.		
Value for Money			
<i>Core monetised Benefits</i>	To be further developed at OBC stage	<i>Non-monetised and wider economic benefits</i>	To be further developed at OBC stage
Value for Money Statement			
<p><i>Qualitative benefits of the project include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Reduced emissions</i> • <i>Health benefits – warmer homes, reduced cold related illness</i> • <i>Lower energy bills</i> • <i>10-15 jobs supported</i> <p><i>More work will be required to quantify these benefits at OBC stage.</i></p>			
Risk			
Risks of delays to delivery have been itemised to include adverse weather, issues with sub-contractor performance and supplier issues. Other notable key risks that have been identified include the requirement to remove asbestos and applicants/tenants refusing to grant access for the works. Mitigation measures have been identified and these appear to be appropriate and sensible.			
Delivery			
<p>Two contractors will be appointed to deliver the scheme on a restricted tender basis. Both contractors are living wage employers.</p> <p>Outputs are all scheduled for delivery in 2022/23 and appear reasonable and achievable given that the Air Source Heat Pumps will be installed on known properties that have already had solar PV installation. The project milestones are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appointment of PAS2035 Retrofit Coordinator – November 2021 • Evaluation of community-based approach – January to March 2023 • Publicity for the trails to raise awareness – January to March 2023 • 100 heat pump installations completed – March 2023 (or 10-12 months from the scheme start) • Evaluation of heat pump trial completed – March 2023 • 300 homes receive external wall insulation – March 2023 • Heat pump trial monitoring completed – December 2023 			

As the MCA funding is bridging a gap with other funding sources, there appears to be limited scope for accelerating the delivery of the outputs and milestones listed above.

Legal

The applicant states it is considered that receipt of the award may not be considered to create a State Aid within the meaning of Article 107(1) of the TFEU. This is because the Grant Recipient receives the award within their statutory duty/remit to improve the economic performance of an area.

Annex 1 – Strategic Policy Fit

To what extent does the project meet the MCA’s strategic objectives as set out in the of the MCA Corporate Plan 2021-22?

Page 29

Outcome	Strategic Objective	R/A/G Rating	Comments
Stronger Achieve sustained good growth, underpinned by productivity gains that exceed the UK average	Leading an economic transformation by: 1. creating not just a bigger economy but a better one: higher-tech, higher skill, and higher-value - backing wealth and job creators	R	By delivering this project, one of the local contractors will create/safeguard between 10 and 15 jobs for Doncaster residents in the low carbon construction sector.
	2. enabling businesses to survive, adapt and thrive and be more innovative and resilient as we come out of the pandemic and resulting economic downturn	N/A	
	3. stimulating local economies by investing in the infrastructure, transport and digital capabilities to create jobs and transform places	R	The project will assist in transforming up to 300 of the oldest and most inefficient housing stock in low income communities across the Doncaster borough.
Greener Drive forward environmental sustainability to	Leading a green transformation by: 4. decarbonising our economy, regenerating the natural environment and accelerating Net Zero Carbon transition	R	The project will reduce carbon emissions from 100 homes by replacing fossilised fuel heating sources with a natural source of heat. It is estimated that the project will reduce carbon emissions in each home by 1 tonne per annum (10,000 tonnes over the life of the measures).

achieve our net-zero carbon target by 2040	5. capitalising on technological and scientific capabilities to improve the resilience and quantum of clean energy supply, storage, distribution and usage	A	The project will pilot the use of Air Source Heat Pump technology as a natural heating source as a replacement for heating from fossilised fuel.
	6. revolutionising transport, getting South Yorkshire moving by foot, bike, bus, tram and train	N/A	
Fairer Unlock prosperity by eliminating the wage gap and health inequalities between South Yorkshire and the national average	Leading a wellbeing and inclusion transformation by: 7. raising quality of life, reducing inequality, and widening opportunity for South Yorkshire people	A	The project is targeted at low income communities and retrofitting those properties that are inefficient and expensive to heat. The project will therefore tackle issues of fuel poverty by installing more efficient and lower cost heat sources. It is estimated that the project will reduce the risk of cold related illness and improve comfort as well as reduce fuel costs by up to £300 per home per annum.
	8. equipping people to contribute to and benefit from economic prosperity	N/A	
	9. supporting people to improve their skills, get back to work, remain in or progress in work, or set up in business and thereby accelerate social mobility	N/A	

Part B - Recommendation and Conditions

Recommendation	Approve to develop an OBC
Payment Basis	
Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)	
<p><i>The following conditions must be satisfied before contract execution.</i></p> <p><i>The following conditions must be satisfied before drawdown of funding.</i></p> <p>The following conditions must be included in the contract</p>	

This page is intentionally left blank



Assurance Panel Summary

Scheme Details

Project Name	The Glass Works – securing occupiers	Type of funding	Capital Grant
Grant Recipient	BMBC	Total Scheme Cost	£17,372,000
MCA Executive Board	Housing and Infrastructure	MCA Funding	£2,600,000
Programme name	Gainshare	% MCA Allocation	15%

Part A - Appraisal Summary

Strategic Case	
<i>Project rationale</i>	Gap funding is required due to the impact of the pandemic and threatens the viability of the project, which has already had significant investment. MCA funding is needed to ensure sufficient inducement can be offered to attract the quality of occupier the project is targeting. The rationale for securing public monies to ensure the major Glass Works scheme remains viable should be strengthened, particularly on why a successful Glass Works is pivotal for the future success of Barnsley's inclusive economy.
<i>Strategic fit</i>	See Annex 1 at the end of this form.
Value for Money	
<i>Value for Money Statement</i>	
Significant work is required at OBC stage to present the outputs, outcomes and added value of MCA funding. This is because the project is already in receipt of MCA funding via LGF. This extra funding will not secure further outputs and outcomes but is intended to protect the investment that has already gone in and secure the promised returns. However, the extent to which this funding will actually do this needs to be fully tested and presented in the OBC.	
Risk	
Top 5 risks as present in the business case:	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The rise of new COVID-19 variants leads to lockdown measures being re-introduced which prevent the opening of non-essential retail and hospitality businesses (Likelihood: Med / Impact: High) 2. The request for financial support for the Glass Works is not approved at all, or at a lower level. (Likelihood: Low / Impact: High) 3. Given the on-going uncertainty around the lifting of pandemic lockdown restrictions, prospective tenants may ultimately choose not to conclude negotiations and not take space at the Glass Works. (Likelihood: Low / Impact: High) 4. Prospective tenants may be attracted to the Glass Works but demand higher level of inducements than anticipated at present (Likelihood: Low / Impact: High) 5. It takes longer to conclude individual negotiations than anticipated leading to some expenditure slipping into 2022/23 (Likelihood: Low / Impact: Med) 	

Delivery
Timescales for the delivery of the key project milestones appear reasonable.
Legal
The applicant will obtain up-to-date Subsidy Control advice as part of the development of the Outline Business Case.

Annex 1 – Strategic Policy Fit

To what extent does the project meet the MCA’s strategic objectives as set out in the of the MCA Corporate Plan 2021-22?

Page 34

Outcome	Strategic Objective	R/A/G Rating	Comments
Stronger Achieve sustained good growth, underpinned by productivity gains that exceed the UK average	Leading an economic transformation by: 1. creating not just a bigger economy but a better one: higher-tech, higher skill, and higher-value - backing wealth and job creators	G	The application says 14 jobs will be safeguarded with this investment.
	2. enabling businesses to survive, adapt and thrive and be more innovative and resilient as we come out of the pandemic and resulting economic downturn	G	The overall project is vital for creating more vibrant urban centres and increasing their leisure offer, which has been made even more important due to the pandemic’s impacts. It would bring new businesses into Barnsley. Its alignment with the strategic objective of the SEP and RAP of creating a stronger economy is very clear.
	3. stimulating local economies by investing in the infrastructure, transport and digital capabilities to create jobs and transform places	A	
Greener Drive forward environmental sustainability to achieve our net-zero carbon target by 2040	Leading a green transformation by: 4. decarbonising our economy, regenerating the natural environment and accelerating Net Zero Carbon transition	R	In the immediate term, opportunities for net-zero are limited. However, in the longer-term, there is potential for retail units to be consolidated in the Glass Works and this site being repurposed into green spaces, so there could be a modest contribution in the future.
	5. capitalising on technological and scientific capabilities to improve the resilience and quantum of clean energy supply, storage, distribution and usage	R	

	6. revolutionising transport, getting South Yorkshire moving by foot, bike, bus, tram and train	R	Not applicable
Fairer Unlock prosperity by eliminating the wage gap and health inequalities between South Yorkshire and the national average	Leading a wellbeing and inclusion transformation by: 7. raising quality of life, reducing inequality, and widening opportunity for South Yorkshire people	A	Despite the case being made strongly for Stronger, the same has not been made for Fairer. Appendix B says the investment will create more opportunities for disadvantaged people. This isn't referenced in the SBC, nor is any detail provided about how they would achieve this.
	8. equipping people to contribute to and benefit from economic prosperity	A	
	9. supporting people to improve their skills, get back to work, remain in or progress in work, or set up in business and thereby accelerate social mobility	A	

Part B - Recommendation and Conditions

Recommendation	Proceed to OBC
Payment Basis	
Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)	
<i>Project costs to be worked up in further detail during OBC development. Gainshare funding can only be used to assist with capital costs of tenants.</i>	



Assurance Panel Summary

Scheme Details

Project Name	Sheffield Future High Streets Fund – New Front Door Scheme	Type of funding	Capital Grant
Grant Recipient	Sheffield City Council	Total Scheme Cost	£31.1m
MCA Executive Board	Infrastructure	MCA Funding	£3m
Programme name	Gainshare	% MCA Allocation	9.5%

Part A - Appraisal Summary

Strategic Case			
Page 37	<i>Project rationale</i>	<p>The MCA will contribute £3m of the match funding required to deliver the “New Front Doors” element of the programme. The funding will be used for access and refurbishment works to buildings on Fargate and High Street. The other £2m will come from funding secured under the MHCLG Future High Streets Fund. SCC will not be investing any of their own funds in the New Front Doors project but will be investing £2m in total in the rest of the programme.</p> <p>The £26.1m of private sector funding at this stage is not committed or secured . This reflects the total amount the business owners intend to spend on their buildings upon receipt of public sector funds. Each building is still being reviewed to establish if there are any changes in costs/assumptions/design and assessed by SCC.</p> <p>The Front Door Scheme will operate by allocation of capital grants. The prioritised list is being reviewed to see if the outcomes are still achievable and if there is any change in the viability gap. Building owners are being engaged to establish the status of their proposition and understanding of the anticipated timescales.</p>	
	<i>Strategic fit</i>	See Annex 1 at the end of this form.	
	<i>Proposed outcomes</i>	<p>Under the “Stronger” Strategic Outcomes of the SEP, the Front Door Scheme will deliver against “Enterprise” and “Employment”, by bringing back into use 7,893m2 of vacant/underused commercial floorspace and 398 gross jobs.</p> <p>Under “Fairer”, construction tenderers will be required to submit Employment & Skills Plans. However, more detail is needed on what social outcomes this commits the contractor to.</p> <p>Contribution to ‘Greener’ objectives of the SEP claimed in the business case are currently unquantified (air quality/net zero) and will require further clarification at the next stage of business case development.</p>	
Value for Money			
<i>Core monetised Benefits</i>	£25,379 per net additional job £3.87m of GVA over 10 years Return of £1.64 per £1 of MCA investment	<i>Non-monetised and wider economic benefits</i>	22 gross additional housing units
Value for Money Statement			

Based on the information provided in Appendix A.4 and the 'note on outputs', the project is estimated to create 118 net additional jobs, at a cost of £25,379, per job to the MCA. The project is also estimated to generate £3.87m of GVA over 10 years. This equates to a return of £1.64 per £1 of MCA investment. Based on MCA investment VfM is acceptable.

The project is also estimated to deliver an additional 22 gross residential units with MCA investment. However, more detail is required at OBC stage to estimate the land value uplift. This would result in an additional improvement to the VFM position.

More detail is required at OBC stage to quantify and monetise the social and environmental impacts and benefits as part of the wider value for money assessment.

Risk

The top 5 risks as presented in the business case:

1. Capital Costs of delivering interventions are higher than budgeted for (Likelihood: Med / Impact: High)
2. Front Door Scheme dependent on private sector finance/timescales (Likelihood: Med/ Impact: High)
3. Co funding not secured (Likelihood: Low / Impact: High)
4. Construction disturbance (Likelihood: Med / Impact: Med)
5. Reputational risk associated with delays or non-delivery (Likelihood: Med / Impact: High)

Reasonable mitigation measures appear to be in place; however, risk impact for most items is high with a medium probability. This should be reviewed at OBC stage.

Delivery

Timescales need to be established. Most of the key milestones are to be confirmed.

Legal

A final 'Subsidy Control' opinion is awaited from the SCC Legal team. This will be shared with SCR when completed.

Annex 1 – Strategic Policy Fit

To what extent does the project meet the MCA's strategic objectives as set out in the of the MCA Corporate Plan 2021-22?

Outcome	Strategic Objective	R/A/G Rating	Comments
Stronger Achieve sustained good growth, underpinned by productivity gains that	Leading an economic transformation by: 1. creating not just a bigger economy but a better one: higher-tech, higher skill, and higher-value - backing wealth and job creators	R	
	2. enabling businesses to survive, adapt and thrive and be more innovative and resilient as we come out of the pandemic and resulting economic downturn	G	

exceed the UK average	3. stimulating local economies by investing in the infrastructure, transport and digital capabilities to create jobs and transform places	G	
Greener Drive forward environmental sustainability to achieve our net-zero carbon target by 2040	Leading a green transformation by: 4. decarbonising our economy, regenerating the natural environment and accelerating Net Zero Carbon transition	A	
	5. capitalising on technological and scientific capabilities to improve the resilience and quantum of clean energy supply, storage, distribution and usage	A	
	6. revolutionising transport, getting South Yorkshire moving by foot, bike, bus, tram and train	A	
Fairer Unlock prosperity by eliminating the wage gap and health inequalities between South Yorkshire and the national average	Leading a wellbeing and inclusion transformation by: 7. raising quality of life, reducing inequality, and widening opportunity for South Yorkshire people	A	
	8. equipping people to contribute to and benefit from economic prosperity	A	
	9. supporting people to improve their skills, get back to work, remain in or progress in work, or set up in business and thereby accelerate social mobility	A	

Part B - Recommendation and Conditions

Recommendation	Proceed to OBC
Payment Basis	
Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)	
None	



Assurance Panel Summary

Scheme Details

Project Name	D0015 Rotherham to Kilnhurst Flood Alleviation Scheme (RFKAS)	Type of funding	Capital Grant
Grant Recipient	RMBC	Total Scheme Cost	£4.3m (funding gap)
MCA Executive Board	Housing and Infrastructure	MCA Funding	£2.0m
Programme name	Gainshare	% MCA Allocation	27%

Part A - Appraisal Summary

Project Description			
<p>The project is seeking £2m from Gainshare funding towards total project costs of £4.3m. The MCA is asked to contribute £2m towards RMBC's strategic response to reduce the risk of flooding along the River Don corridor. The Gainshare monies will be used for new flood defences around Rotherham United FC stadium, plus flood defences and a new canal barrier around Forge Island. This is part of wider works along 5km of river through the town centre, Parkgate and Kilnhurst areas</p>			
Strategic Case			
<i>Scheme Rationale</i>	The scheme rationale is clear that flood alleviation would not be forthcoming from the private sector, therefore public sector is required to finance this. This rationale had already been accepted by SCR when it agreed an earlier grant, prior to this additional finance request.		
<i>Strategic policy fit</i>	See Annex 1		
<i>Options assessment</i>	There a clear rationale for the selection of short-listed options. The Preferred Way Forward is to expedite the development as much as possible with parallel works.		
<i>Statutory requirements and adverse consequences</i>	Not applicable		
Value for Money			
Core monetised Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Avoiding £20m of flood damage costs to people property and infrastructures Avoiding £76m loss of Gross Value Added to the local economy 	Non-monetised and wider economic benefits	
The full RKFAS extent needs to be completed to deliver these benefits.			
Value for Money Statement			
Whilst at an early stage of development, it is anticipated that the scheme will be able to demonstrate value for money at approval stage.			

Risk
<p>Top 5 risks as presented in the business case are::</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Full costs of construction works not affordable to RMBC, resulting in only part of Phases 2A and 2C being constructed (Likelihood: High / Impact: High) 2. Delays to programme due to external approvals being needed on 3rd Party land and assets within and adjacent to the Phase 2A and 2C working area (Likelihood: High / Impact: Med) 3. Limited resource availability due to demand in flood risk management supply chain to deliver Phase 2A and 2C (Likelihood: High / Impact: Med) 4. Construction costs increase from the initial £7.54m estimate (Likelihood: High / Impact: Med) 5. Impacts associated with the communities, businesses and infrastructure operators not seeing flood risk being reduced (Likelihood: Med / Impact: Med) <p>Risks and mitigation measures should be explored more fully at OBC stage. Four of the top 5 risks have a 'Likelihood' rating of 'High', including construction cost increases and delays to the programme. More robust mitigation measures should be implemented to reduce the likelihood of these occurring. Also, the top risk item, is not a risk, but an issue and should be removed</p>
Delivery
<p>Timescales appear tight given the complexity of the project. There are no opportunities for acceleration due to the sequential nature of the project build.</p>
Legal
<p>No legal opinion on Subsidy Control has been obtained. However, EU State Aid rules were tested as part of the ERDF/RMBC funded Phase 2A project. The independent legal opinion obtained in 2018 for Phase 2A concluded that the project would not be in contravention of EU State Aid rules.</p>

Annex 1 – Strategic Policy Fit

To what extent does the project meet the MCA's strategic objectives as set out in the of the MCA Corporate Plan 2021-22?

Outcome	Strategic Objective	R/A/G Rating	Comments
Stronger Achieve sustained good growth, underpinned by productivity gains that	Leading an economic transformation by: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. creating not just a bigger economy but a better one: higher-tech, higher skill, and higher-value - backing wealth and job creators 	A	Increased economic activity won't specifically translate into high value work.
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. enabling businesses to survive, adapt and thrive and be more innovative and resilient as we come out of the pandemic and resulting economic downturn 	G	Land values will be increased and will increase business certainty

exceed the UK average	3. stimulating local economies by investing in the infrastructure, transport and digital capabilities to create jobs and transform places	G	Land values will be increased and will increase business certainty
Greener Drive forward environmental sustainability to achieve our net-zero carbon target by 2040	Leading a green transformation by: 4. decarbonising our economy, regenerating the natural environment and accelerating Net Zero Carbon transition	A	Depending on the scheme design this could contribute hugely to natural environment value
	5. capitalising on technological and scientific capabilities to improve the resilience and quantum of clean energy supply, storage, distribution and usage	R	This isn't being directly targeted
	6. revolutionising transport, getting South Yorkshire moving by foot, bike, bus, tram and train	A	Depending on the scheme design this could contribute to green transport 'corridor'
Fairer Unlock prosperity by eliminating the wage gap and health inequalities between South Yorkshire and the national average	Leading a wellbeing and inclusion transformation by: 7. raising quality of life, reducing inequality, and widening opportunity for South Yorkshire people	G	Scheme likely to contribute to 'placemaking' for communities around the Sheaf catchment
	8. equipping people to contribute to and benefit from economic prosperity	A	Value will be created through better flood protection – but this alone will not target people not currently benefitting from economic prosperity
	9. supporting people to improve their skills, get back to work, remain in or progress in work, or set up in business and thereby accelerate social mobility	A	Value will be created through better flood protection – but this alone will not target people not currently benefitting from economic prosperity

Part B - Recommendation and Conditions

Recommendation	Proceed to OBC
Payment Basis	
Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)	
<i>None</i>	



Assurance Panel Summary

Scheme Details

Project Name	Sheaf catchment flood alleviation scheme	Type of funding	Capital Grant
Grant Recipient	Sheffield City Council	Total Scheme Cost	£25m
MCA Executive Board	Housing and Infrastructure	MCA Funding	£0.8m for development costs.
Programme name	Gainshare	% MCA Allocation	3.2%

Part A - Appraisal Summary

Project Description			
<p>The project aims to reduce flood risk and deliver a range of benefits in Sheffield's Sheaf and Porter valleys which contains a significant proportion of Sheffield's employment and residential areas. This project is at a very early stage and all of the existing funding request relates to pre-construction work. The MCA is asked to contribute towards pre-construction activities that will require undertaking. Further detail about what these activities entail and whether funding from the other partners could be forthcoming should be explored as the project develops.</p>			
Strategic Case			
<i>Scheme Rationale</i>	Funding and investment will not be forthcoming without public sector intervention, and value can be created through intervention. There is a clear role for public sector intervention here, since realising the value potential will not be forthcoming from the private sector.		
<i>Strategic policy fit</i>	See Annex 1.		
<i>Options assessment</i>	The difference between the Viable alternative and Preferred option appears to come down to level of ambition; the preference being for infrastructure built to a higher standard. This doesn't have any bearing on the MCA contribution.		
<i>Statutory requirements and adverse consequences</i>	N/A		
Value for Money			
Core monetised Benefits	N/A	Non-monetised and wider economic benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 370 homes better protected from flooding - 253 businesses better protected from flooding - 05.km2 land better protected from flooding - 7,250 new jobs
Benefits have not been monetised at this very early stage. The funds requested would go towards developing this kind of detail. Currently there		These figures are likely very elementary estimates based on the potential <i>scale</i> rather than deliverable benefits.	

is a sense of the potential scale, along with an estimate for number of businesses and jobs supported through intervention.
Value for Money Statement
Further information on the full scheme costs and benefits will be required as the project develops.
Risk
<p>Top 5 risks as presented in the business case are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Unable to secure the necessary funding to deliver the project (Likelihood: Med / Impact: High) 2. Time constraints attached to different funding sources conflict (Likelihood: Med / Impact: High) 3. Stakeholder objections to elements of the proposed scope (Likelihood: High / Impact: High) 4. “overheating” in the construction sector (Likelihood: Med / Impact: Med) 5. Future mutation of Covid 19 causes severe impacts (Likelihood: Med / Impact: Med) <p>All risks appear to have appropriate mitigation measures in place.</p>
Delivery
The project is at an early stage of development. Preliminary timescales for delivery of the key milestones appear reasonable, but likely to change as the project develops.
Legal
The applicant makes the case that, as a public realm infrastructure project, the investment is not likely to be classed as a subsidy.

Annex 1 – Strategic Policy Fit

To what extent does the project meet the MCA’s strategic objectives as set out in the of the MCA Corporate Plan 2021-22?

Outcome	Strategic Objective	R/A/G Rating	Comments
Stronger Achieve sustained good growth, underpinned by productivity gains that	Leading an economic transformation by: 1. creating not just a bigger economy but a better one: higher-tech, higher skill, and higher-value - backing wealth and job creators	A	Flood resilience doesn’t specifically translate into high value activity
	2. enabling businesses to survive, adapt and thrive and be more innovative and resilient as we come out of the pandemic and resulting economic downturn	G	Higher land values and corresponding economic potential will be created through better flood protection

exceed the UK average	3. stimulating local economies by investing in the infrastructure, transport and digital capabilities to create jobs and transform places	G	Higher land values and corresponding economic potential will be created through better flood protection
Greener Drive forward environmental sustainability to achieve our net-zero carbon target by 2040	Leading a green transformation by: 4. decarbonising our economy, regenerating the natural environment and accelerating Net Zero Carbon transition	A	Depending on the scheme design this could contribute hugely to natural environment value – there is currently too little detail.
	5. capitalising on technological and scientific capabilities to improve the resilience and quantum of clean energy supply, storage, distribution and usage	A	Depending on the scheme design this could contribute to this element.
	6. revolutionising transport, getting South Yorkshire moving by foot, bike, bus, tram and train	A	Depending on the scheme design this could contribute to green transport ‘corridor’
Fairer Unlock prosperity by eliminating the wage gap and health inequalities between South Yorkshire and the national average	Leading a wellbeing and inclusion transformation by: 7. raising quality of life, reducing inequality, and widening opportunity for South Yorkshire people	G	Scheme likely to contribute to ‘placemaking’ for communities around the Sheaf catchment
	8. equipping people to contribute to and benefit from economic prosperity	A	Value will be created through better flood protection – but this alone will not target people not currently benefitting from economic prosperity
	9. supporting people to improve their skills, get back to work, remain in or progress in work, or set up in business and thereby accelerate social mobility	A	Value will be created through better flood protection – but this alone will not target people not currently benefitting from economic prosperity

Part B - Recommendation and Conditions

Recommendation	Proceed to OBC
Payment Basis	
Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)	
The applicant needs to assure themselves that the £800,000 development costs can be claimed as capital expenditure for eligibility through the Gainshare capital funding.	

Assurance Panel Summary



Scheme Details

Project Name	Doncaster Surface Water Mitigation Projects	Type of funding	Capital Grant
Grant Recipient	DMBC	Total Scheme Cost	£0.7m
MCA Executive Board	Housing and Infrastructure	MCA Funding	£0.4m
Programme name	Gainshare - Flood Relief	% MCA Allocation	57%

Part A - Appraisal Summary

Strategic Case	
<i>Project rationale</i>	<p>Doncaster Council is seeking to invest to mitigate against long standing surface water flooding issues which affect the public transportation network and absorb limited essential resources during flood response events.</p> <p>Resolving long standing surface water flooding issues and upgrading the existing network will mitigate the flood risk to residential and commercial properties and improve transportation routes during a flooding event, which also benefits the emergency services, residents and businesses within the area to ensure growth and investment within the region. The rationale for further public sector investment is internal revenue budgets are intended for the maintenance of existing assets and but do not include the required level of funding for capital replacement costs.</p> <p>By reducing the frequency, significance and duration of future flooding impacts, Doncaster Council will also be reducing incident response costs and operational costs (during future events) through resource deployment (e.g. sandbag distribution / collection / supply, pump supply). Other costs incurred frequently by Doncaster council following flooding events include highway infrastructure repair due to water damage (eg pot holes) and jetting/CCTV survey costs for highway drainage systems to remove silt/debris deposits. The savings could then be allocated to improving or maintaining other drainage assets to reduce/improve flooding within the local area.</p>
<i>Strategic fit</i>	See Annex 1 at the end of this form.
<i>Proposed outcomes</i>	<p>The proposed outcomes of the project have strong alignment with the desired outcomes of the Strategic Economic Plan, particularly the strategic outcome 'Greener' and indicator 'Flood Mitigation'.</p> <p>The project also makes contributions to 'Air Quality' in that the use of sustainable urban drainage systems promote the diffusion of harmful chemicals and provide green habitats which remove pollutants from the air, remove carbon and emit oxygen.</p>

Other outcomes of the project include:

- Ensure 2 local contractors are invited to tender for each works package and there is a minimum 30% quality aspect
- Mitigate the risk of flooding to the specified locations to a 1/30 year event by year 2023.
- Reducing the maintenance required post flood reduces carbon production associated with these activities.
- Improve transport infrastructure and associated costs (highway surfacing repairs, CCTV / Jetting) during and after a flooding event by reducing highway flooding.
- Reduce road closures and other temporary traffic controls by reducing the amount of highway flooding to 4km of the network.

Value for Money Statement

No benefits have been monetised. This detail would be needed for future progress of the proposal.

Non-Monetised benefits of the project include:

- Area of Land with Reduced Likelihood of Flooding as a Result of the Project = 51,000m²
- Homes with Reduced Flood Risk = 50
- Commercial Premises with Reduced Flood Risk = 10
- Increased enterprise to the area due to reduction of flooding which has a negative impact on local economy growth and investment.
- Reduced unemployment through the prevention of business relocation from the region, investment in flood resilience and employment through construction and design.

Risk

Top 5 risks as presented in the business case:

1. Not securing funding, which will result in scheme not going ahead, residential and commercial properties will remain at risk (Likelihood: Med / Impact: Med)
2. Delays due to adverse weather, the scheme would be affected by a flooding event, which will delay scheme delivery (Likelihood: Med / Impact: Low)
3. Delays due to further COVID impacts / restrictions (Likelihood: Med / Impact: Med)
4. Incomplete Design (Likelihood: Low / Impact: Med)
5. Inaccurate Project Spec (Likelihood: Low / Impact: Med)

The applicant has not identified any risks owners or mitigating actions.

Delivery

The timescales for the delivery of the projects key milestones appear reasonable at this stage, although the programme does not provide a target date for the submission of the Full Business Case to the MCA and should be clarified. The project is scheduled to commence on site August 2022 and complete March 2023.

The applicant has identified that delivery of the scheme (construction) may potentially be accelerated if there is no adverse weather or unforeseen issues on site once works commence.

Legal

No legal opinion on Subsidy Rules have been obtained for the project. The applicant states: “the scheme is an infrastructure project and as such:

- it would not give an advantage to a single beneficiary
- Community wide benefits would result from the project through reduction in the risk of flooding to transport networks and local/regional economy”

Annex 1 – Strategic Policy Fit

Page 51

To what extent does the project meet the MCA’s strategic objectives as set out in the of the MCA Corporate Plan 2021-22?

Outcome	Strategic Objective	R/A/G Rating	Comments
Stronger Achieve sustained good growth, underpinned by productivity gains that exceed the UK average	Leading an economic transformation by: 1. creating not just a bigger economy but a better one: higher-tech, higher skill, and higher-value - backing wealth and job creators	R	
	2. enabling businesses to survive, adapt and thrive and be more innovative and resilient as we come out of the pandemic and resulting economic downturn	R	
	3. stimulating local economies by investing in the infrastructure, transport and digital capabilities to create jobs and transform places	A	
Greener Drive forward environmental sustainability to	Leading a green transformation by: 4. decarbonising our economy, regenerating the natural environment and accelerating Net Zero Carbon transition	G	

achieve our net-zero carbon target by 2040	5. capitalising on technological and scientific capabilities to improve the resilience and quantum of clean energy supply, storage, distribution and usage	R	
	6. revolutionising transport, getting South Yorkshire moving by foot, bike, bus, tram and train	R	
Fairer Unlock prosperity by eliminating the wage gap and health inequalities between South Yorkshire and the national average	Leading a wellbeing and inclusion transformation by:	R	
	7. raising quality of life, reducing inequality, and widening opportunity for South Yorkshire people		
	8. equipping people to contribute to and benefit from economic prosperity	R	
	9. supporting people to improve their skills, get back to work, remain in or progress in work, or set up in business and thereby accelerate social mobility	R	

Part B - Recommendation and Conditions

Recommendation	Proceed to OBC
Payment Basis	
Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)	
None	

This page is intentionally left blank



Assurance Panel Summary

Scheme Details

Project Name	24-32 Cheapside acquisition	Type of funding	Capital Grant
Grant Recipient	BMBC	Total Scheme Cost	£2,583,250
MCA Executive Board	Housing and Infrastructure	MCA Funding	£1,000,000
Programme name	Gainshare	% MCA Allocation	38.7%

Part A - Appraisal Summary

Strategic Case	
<i>Project rationale</i>	MCA Funding is required to purchase the freehold for this site. The project is linked to another SBC to securing occupiers in the Glassworks. There is also a link to a Levelling Up Fund application to create green space in place of the existing building. In the longer term, this project has the potential to contribute to some of strategic objectives of the SEP, like creating more vibrant and greener urban centres, and improving the health and wellbeing of the local population
<i>Strategic fit</i>	See Annex 1.
Value for Money Statement	
The business case does not provide any quantified economic benefits and therefore it has not been possible to assess value for money in any meaningful way. This will need to be addressed at OBC stage	
Qualitative benefits of the project include:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rationalisation of town centre retail space • Opportunity for high-quality public realm • Opportunity for creation of greenspace • Public realm and green space could deliver increased footfall, dwell time and spend; and support a shift towards active travel throughout the town centre; with resulting physical and mental health benefits. 	
Risk	
The main risks identified in the business case are:	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The current owner may decide not to sell the property at all. (Likelihood: Med / Impact: Med) 2. The current owner may reject the offer agreed to date and seek a higher amount. (Likelihood: Med / Impact: Med) 3. Upon acquiring the property, two of the three tenants may choose not to take up space in the Glass Works. No firm commitments nor confirmation of intention to move to the Glass Works have been obtained. All it says is that they are "interested". (Likelihood: Med / Impact: High) 	

4. The URBED town centre spatial planning study may recommend an alternative use for the property which doesn't involve public realm and green space (Likelihood: Low / Impact: High)

The risks will need to be developed further at the next stage. In particular, the applicant needs to show how acquisition of the site will lead to a net gain in retail offer (and other related services) for the residents of Barnsley

Delivery

Timescales for the delivery of the key project milestones appear reasonable. The suggestion approach of linking it with the securing occupiers (Glassworks) SBC makes sense and could speed up the process.

Legal

The applicant will obtain up-to-date Subsidy Control advice as part of the development of the Outline Business Case.

Annex 1 – Strategic Policy Fit

To what extent does the project meet the MCA's strategic objectives as set out in the of the MCA Corporate Plan 2021-22?

Outcome	Strategic Objective	R/A/G Rating	Comments
Stronger Achieve sustained good growth, underpinned by productivity gains that exceed the UK average	Leading an economic transformation by: 1. creating not just a bigger economy but a better one: higher-tech, higher skill, and higher-value - backing wealth and job creators	A	
	2. enabling businesses to survive, adapt and thrive and be more innovative and resilient as we come out of the pandemic and resulting economic downturn	A	It would enable the possibility of major retailers in the town centre to move to a better site and enhance the viability of the major Glass Works project.
	3. stimulating local economies by investing in the infrastructure, transport and digital capabilities to create jobs and transform places	G	In the longer-term, it has the potential to transform the urban centre and stimulate more spend and investment in the economy.
Greener Drive forward environmental sustainability to achieve our net-	Leading a green transformation by: 4. decarbonising our economy, regenerating the natural environment and accelerating Net Zero Carbon transition	A	In the immediate term, this project is about acquiring a site and subsequent demolition of the existing buildings. Therefore, opportunities for net zero are limited. However, there is potential in the longer-term funding is secured to redevelop the site, as plans are for green space and other sustainable uses.

zero carbon target by 2040	5. capitalising on technological and scientific capabilities to improve the resilience and quantum of clean energy supply, storage, distribution and usage	R	
	6. revolutionising transport, getting South Yorkshire moving by foot, bike, bus, tram and train	R	
Fairer Unlock prosperity by eliminating the wage gap and health inequalities between South Yorkshire and the national average	Leading a wellbeing and inclusion transformation by: 7. raising quality of life, reducing inequality, and widening opportunity for South Yorkshire people	A	In the longer-term, it has the potential for creating more vibrant urban centres with high-quality public realm and green space. Which has the potential to improve the health and wellbeing of the local population. However, little detail is provided for the latter.
	8. equipping people to contribute to and benefit from economic prosperity	A	
	9. supporting people to improve their skills, get back to work, remain in or progress in work, or set up in business and thereby accelerate social mobility	A	

Part B - Recommendation and Conditions

Recommendation	Proceed to OBC
Payment Basis	
Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)	
<p><i>The following conditions must be satisfied before contract execution.</i></p> <p><i>The following conditions must be satisfied before drawdown of funding.</i></p> <p>The following conditions must be included in the contract</p>	



Assurance Panel Summary

Scheme Details

Project Name	D0018 NFM Bentley FAS	Type of funding	Capital Grant
Grant Recipient	DMBC	Total Scheme Cost	£4.5m
MCA Executive Board	Housing and Infrastructure	MCA Funding	£1m
Programme name	Gainshare	% MCA Allocation	22%

Part A - Appraisal Summary

Project Description			
MCA investment is needed due to a funding gap. The funds will contribute towards the total project cost, which includes the protecting the recreation ground, agricultural field, railway line and a property defence wall. More detail will be needed at the next stage on the specific activities to be funded by the MCA			
Strategic Case			
<i>Scheme Rationale</i>	The objectives provided are adequate at this stage. However, they are not yet SMART. The full application should provide more details to ensure they are timebound and measurable.		
<i>Strategic policy fit</i>	See Annex 1		
<i>Options assessment</i>	An alternative to the preferred option is presented, but this appears to be less effective in addressing flood risk.		
<i>Statutory requirements and adverse consequences</i>	N/A		
Value for Money			
Core monetised Benefits	N/A	Non-monetised and wider economic benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 0.5km² area has reduced flood risk - 47 residential properties protected - 2 business premises protected - Health benefits - Employment opportunities
No benefits have been monetised. This detail would be needed for future progress of the proposal.		The above benefits could be monetised, and this will be important in order to assess value for money of progressing the scheme.	
Value for Money Statement			
The objectives specify the need to protect homes and commercial properties and improve resilience of public infrastructure. These are reflected in the economic dimension outcomes. However, the other objectives are not reflected.			
Risk			

Multiple risks have been flagged (below) but only 1 has mitigation responses.

1. Not securing funding, which will result in scheme not going ahead, residential and commercial properties will remain at risk.
2. Delays due to adverse weather, the scheme would be affected by a flooding event, which will delay scheme delivery
3. Failure to come to legal arrangements in regards to land, access and maintenance for the flood defence wall
4. Incomplete Design
5. Inaccurate Project Specification
6. Inadequate site investigation
7. Availability of materials and resources, including labour
8. Identification of major utilities/services which require removal or relocation in order to complete the scheme
9. Issues with tendering and appointing contractors

Delivery

The timescales provided are assessed to be already 'optimistic' so unable to be accelerated.

Legal

N/A

Annex 1 – Strategic Policy Fit

To what extent does the project meet the MCA's strategic objectives as set out in the of the MCA Corporate Plan 2021-22?

Outcome	Strategic Objective	R/A/G Rating	Comments
Stronger Achieve sustained good growth, underpinned by productivity gains that exceed the UK average	Leading an economic transformation by: 1. creating not just a bigger economy but a better one: higher-tech, higher skill, and higher-value - backing wealth and job creators	A	The project will not necessarily deliver high value jobs.
	2. enabling businesses to survive, adapt and thrive and be more innovative and resilient as we come out of the pandemic and resulting economic downturn	G	An aspect of this is business survival through reducing flood risk.
	3. stimulating local economies by investing in the infrastructure, transport and digital capabilities to create jobs and transform places	G	Reduced flood risk will stimulate greater investment and be beneficial overall for the local economy.
Greener Drive forward environmental sustainability to	Leading a green transformation by: 4. decarbonising our economy, regenerating the natural environment and accelerating Net Zero Carbon transition	A	Design of the scheme will carry potential to regenerate the natural environment, but this detail is not yet known.

achieve our net-zero carbon target by 2040	5. capitalising on technological and scientific capabilities to improve the resilience and quantum of clean energy supply, storage, distribution and usage	R	There is no specific aspect which achieves this.
	6. revolutionising transport, getting South Yorkshire moving by foot, bike, bus, tram and train	R	The scheme maintains the status quo before flooding – ensuring transport links keep open, but not “revolutionising” them
Fairer Unlock prosperity by eliminating the wage gap and health inequalities between South Yorkshire and the national average	Leading a wellbeing and inclusion transformation by:	G	Lower flood risk will provide greater community resilience.
	7. raising quality of life, reducing inequality, and widening opportunity for South Yorkshire people	G	
	8. equipping people to contribute to and benefit from economic prosperity	G	Lower flood risk will provide greater community resilience.
	9. supporting people to improve their skills, get back to work, remain in or progress in work, or set up in business and thereby accelerate social mobility	G	Lower flood risk will provide greater community resilience.

Part B - Recommendation and Conditions

Recommendation	Proceed to OBC
Payment Basis	N/A
Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)	
<p><i>The following conditions must be satisfied before contract execution.</i></p> <p><i>The following conditions must be satisfied before drawdown of funding.</i></p> <p>The following conditions must be included in the contract</p>	



Assurance Panel Summary

Scheme Details

Project Name	D0016 NFM Conisbrough and Tickhill	Type of funding	Capital Grant
Grant Recipient	DMBC	Total Scheme Cost	£4m
MCA Executive Board	Housing and Infrastructure	MCA Funding	£0.4m
Programme name	Gainshare	% MCA Allocation	10%

Part A - Appraisal Summary

Project Description			
The project would develop proposals and deliver construction of natural flood management (NFM) techniques along a brook prone to high flood risk with nearby properties. MCA funds would apparently only pay for construction activities, although several pre-construction activities are listed in the proposal for MCA funding. These include stakeholder engagement, surveys and so on.			
Strategic Case			
<i>Scheme Rationale</i>	Flood relief schemes of this nature are generally classed as a public good and are a justifiable use of public funds. In addition, flood relief is a key aim of the SEP. The status of DEFRA funds needs to be clarified at the next stage.		
<i>Strategic policy fit</i>	See Annex 1		
<i>Options assessment</i>	More work is needed to show why the preferred option is the best. Currently the SBC provides a high level assessment of options which pits a do nothing scenario (clearly unrealistic given the risk and recent history), against working with partners to raise hard barriers (viable alternative) and the preferred option which focuses on natural flood management. The scope and extent of the NFM option will be developed during the detailed design stage and design options will be assessed further. This will need to be presented in the Business Justification Case.		
<i>Statutory requirements and adverse consequences</i>	No detail has as yet been presented but the application does state that all statutory requirement will be met by April 2022		
Value for Money			
Core monetised Benefits	To be developed at OBC stage	Non-monetised and wider economic benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tree planting - Improved farming efficiency - Residential properties protected against flood - Business properties protected - Higher employment
No benefits have been monetised. This detail would be needed for future progress of the proposal.		The above benefits could be monetised, and this will be important in order to assess value for money of progressing the scheme.	
Value for Money Statement			

This cannot be fully assessed at this stage. However, the project will protect 48 homes and other infrastructure. The cost of flooding in recent years does provide a sharp focus for assessing the benefits of this project.
Risk
The top five risks have been set out in the SBC with some mitigation provided. Given the complexity of flood relief projects, more detail will be expected at the next stage including costing and detailed mitigation. Match funding is said to be available, but more info is needed as to whether this is dedicated to this scheme and what it includes. More information is needed with regards to the procurement strategy and the risks associated with this.
Delivery
The delivery timetable seems reasonable at this stage. The applicant should be encouraged to explore opportunities to acceleration. Procurement seems well advanced with DLO doing the work between August 2022 and March 2023. Cost certainty is high for this stage (60%) and it is unclear what is driving such optimism. Even though the project has high level backing at DMBC, the application is unsigned and SRO has not been specified.
Legal
N/A

Annex 1 – Strategic Policy Fit

Page 64

To what extent does the project meet the MCA's strategic objectives as set out in the of the MCA Corporate Plan 2021-22?

Outcome	Strategic Objective	R/A/G Rating	Comments
Stronger Achieve sustained good growth, underpinned by productivity gains that exceed the UK average	Leading an economic transformation by: 1. creating not just a bigger economy but a better one: higher-tech, higher skill, and higher-value - backing wealth and job creators	A	The project will not necessarily deliver high value jobs.
	2. enabling businesses to survive, adapt and thrive and be more innovative and resilient as we come out of the pandemic and resulting economic downturn	G	An aspect of this is business survival through reducing flood risk.
	3. stimulating local economies by investing in the infrastructure, transport and digital capabilities to create jobs and transform places	G	Reduced flood risk will stimulate greater investment and be beneficial overall for the local economy.
Greener Drive forward environmental sustainability to	Leading a green transformation by: 4. decarbonising our economy, regenerating the natural environment and accelerating Net Zero Carbon transition	G	The NFM method will provide multiple ecosystem service benefits beyond the core aim of reducing flood risk.

achieve our net-zero carbon target by 2040	5. capitalising on technological and scientific capabilities to improve the resilience and quantum of clean energy supply, storage, distribution and usage	A	NFM is an increasingly recognised approach for flood management. Delivering an NFM scheme can benefit from and contribute to the knowledge base of this technique.
	6. revolutionising transport, getting South Yorkshire moving by foot, bike, bus, tram and train	R	The scheme maintains the status quo before flooding – ensuring transport links keep open, but not “revolutionising” them
Fairer Unlock prosperity by eliminating the wage gap and health inequalities between South Yorkshire and the national average	Leading a wellbeing and inclusion transformation by:	G	Lower flood risk will provide greater community resilience.
	7. raising quality of life, reducing inequality, and widening opportunity for South Yorkshire people	G	
	8. equipping people to contribute to and benefit from economic prosperity	G	Lower flood risk will provide greater community resilience.
	9. supporting people to improve their skills, get back to work, remain in or progress in work, or set up in business and thereby accelerate social mobility	G	Lower flood risk will provide greater community resilience.

Part B - Recommendation and Conditions

Page 65

Recommendation	Proceed to OBC
Payment Basis	N/A
Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)	
<p><i>The following conditions must be satisfied before contract execution.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clarity on cost and match funding details, with cost plan. 2. Completed QRA from the MCA's perspective, with p50 costs and mitigation measures and responsibility for cost overrun identified. 3. Full CB analysis of all options considered and why preferred option is the best vfm, considering wider impacts 4. Revenue implications of preferred option 5. Evidence locals support details of preferred option 6. Organogram 7. DoF/CEO sign-off <p><i>The following conditions must be satisfied before drawdown of funding.</i></p> <p>The following conditions must be included in the contract</p>	



Part C - Approvals

Record of Recommendation, Endorsement and Approval					
Project Name					
Appraisal Panel Recommendation		Board Endorsement		MCA Approval	
Date of Meeting		Date of Meeting		Date of Meeting	
Head of Paid Service or Delegate	Ruth Adams Deputy CEX	Endorsing Officer (Board Chair)		Approving Officer (Chair)	
Signature		Signature		Signature	
Date		Date		Date	
S73 Officer or Delegate	Gareth Sutton Finance Manager	Statutory Finance Officer Approval			
Signature					
Date					
Monitoring Officer or Delegate	Steve Davenport SCR CA Solicitor				
Signature					
Date					

This page is intentionally left blank



Assurance Panel Summary

Scheme Details

Project Name	Sheffield Heart of the City 2 – Block A (Radisson Hotel and former Gaumont Building)	Type of funding	Capital Grant
Grant Recipient	Sheffield City Council	Total Scheme Cost	£51.8m
MCA Executive Board	Housing and Infrastructure	MCA Funding	£3m
Programme name	Gainshare	% MCA Allocation	5.8%

Part A - Appraisal Summary

Strategic Case			
<i>Project rationale</i>	<p>Yes. MCA funds will contribute towards the construction of Block A including: demolition, façade retention and strengthening, construction of hotel and ground floor retail units, strip out and refurbishment of Gaumont building.</p> <p>No evidence of need or market demand for the project in terms of business or customer demand for hotel space has been provided, and there is already a large hotel operator (Mercure) located on the Peace Gardens. Evidence of demand in the business case is purely based on tenders received by hotel operators. In addition, no evidence is provided in terms of demand for the flexible commercial/leisure space or the retail units.</p> <p>Evidence of need for MCA funding is unclear. The business case explains why there is a funding gap, but not why it the MCA is the best/only funding option, or why the gap cannot be met by SCC, the private sector or other partners.</p>		
<i>Strategic fit</i>	See Annex 1 below		
<i>Proposed outcomes</i>	By regenerating Block A and delivering a high quality hotel in this prominent area, the project aims to attract new business to the city. It will also deliver commercial floorspace and bring back into use current vacant units. The project therefore aligns with the economic strategic objectives of the SEP (Enterprise & Employment) although the contribution is indirect and the project only acts as the catalyst to achieving these objectives. The project also includes initiatives that contribute to both social and environmental objectives of the SEP.		
Value for Money			
<i>Core monetised Benefits</i>	The full job creation potential of the project is not yet fully understood. however, based on the information provided in Appendix A, the project is estimated to create 227 net additional jobs (excluding construction jobs) at a cost to the MCA of £13,233 per net job created. Based on total public sector funding, cost per job is £227,291.	<i>Non-monetised and wider economic benefits</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Photovoltaic array at rooftop • Hotel connected to Sheffield’s Energy from Waste district heating network • BREEAM target rating of Excellent • Tenderers to submit Employment & Skills Plans

The project is also estimated to generate £44.7m of GVA over 10 years. This equates to a return of £17.71 per £1 of MCA invest, or £1.03 per £1 of total public sector investment.

- Liaison with local schools / colleges /universities – work experience / internship opportunities
- Obligation for hotel to implement Real Living Wage
- The procurement will comply with SCC's Ethical Procurement Policy

Value for Money Statement

Given the initial estimates provided, cost per job based on MCA investment alone provides acceptable value for money, but this is poor based on total public funding. More work is needed at OBC stage to develop more reliable and comprehensive value for money estimates.

Risk

Top 5 risks as identified in the SBC are:

1. Asbestos bitumen discovery to existing floor slab
2. Public Realm/Highways works
3. Construction Condition of existing buildings; over and above provisional sums incorporated within tender sums
4. Party Wall agreements & any associated works beyond provisional sums and areas allowed for
5. Ground conditions; over and above £60k provisional sums incorporated within tender sums

Risks 1 & 2 are presented as having High likelihood and Medium impact; however, both appear to have already happened and are therefore now issues, not risks. Risks 3 to 5 all have Medium likelihood and High impact and relate to project costs. Provisional sums for these items have been incorporated in the tender sum as mitigation.

Delivery

Project appears to be very advanced with start on site proposed for July 2021. If the viability of the project is based on MCA funds, which only account for 6% of the project costs, then this would seem unrealistic, given the project is currently at SBC stage.

Legal

The SBC states the proposed funding is not deemed to be unlawful subsidy control by the Council. No official legal opinion provided.

Annex 1 – Strategic Policy Fit

To what extent does the project meet the MCA's strategic objectives as set out in the of the MCA Corporate Plan 2021-22?

Outcome	Strategic Objective	R/A/G Rating	Comments
Stronger Achieve sustained good growth, underpinned by productivity gains that exceed the UK average	Leading an economic transformation by: 1. creating not just a bigger economy but a better one: higher-tech, higher skill, and higher-value - backing wealth and job creators	R	
	2. enabling businesses to survive, adapt and thrive and be more innovative and resilient as we come out of the pandemic and resulting economic downturn	A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To create 51,000 sqft of modern/flexible commercial space for Retail and/or Leisure uses.
	3. stimulating local economies by investing in the infrastructure, transport and digital capabilities to create jobs and transform places	G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To improve the appearance of the building and façades to better sit within the prominent position in the Heart of the City To create a 154 room upper class Hotel To create 51,000 sqft of modern/flexible commercial space for Retail and/or Leisure uses. To bring back into use current vacant units To contribute to the city centre retail, hotel and entertainment offer
Greener Drive forward environmental sustainability to achieve our net-zero carbon target by 2040	Leading a green transformation by: 4. decarbonising our economy, regenerating the natural environment and accelerating Net Zero Carbon transition	A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Photovoltaic array at rooftop Hotel connected to Sheffield's Energy from Waste district heating network BREEAM target rating of Excellent
	5. capitalising on technological and scientific capabilities to improve the resilience and quantum of clean energy supply, storage, distribution and usage	R	
	6. revolutionising transport, getting South Yorkshire moving by foot, bike, bus, tram and train	R	
Fairer Unlock prosperity by eliminating the wage gap and health	Leading a wellbeing and inclusion transformation by: 7. raising quality of life, reducing inequality, and widening opportunity for South Yorkshire people	A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Obligation for hotel to implement Real Living Wage The procurement will comply with SCC's Ethical Procurement Policy
	8. equipping people to contribute to and benefit from economic prosperity	A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creation of jobs: Estimated 567 FTE's

inequalities between South Yorkshire and the national average	9. supporting people to improve their skills, get back to work, remain in or progress in work, or set up in business and thereby accelerate social mobility	A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The requirement for construction tenderers to submit Employment & Skills Plans (needs to be understood what Social outcomes this commits the contractor to). • Liaison with local schools / colleges /universities (career talks, CV building, mock interviews, site visits and work experience/internship opportunities)
---	---	----------	--

Part B - Recommendation and Conditions

Recommendation	Procced to OBC
Payment Basis	
Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)	
<p><i>The following conditions must be satisfied before contract execution.</i></p> <p><i>The following conditions must be satisfied before drawdown of funding.</i></p> <p>The following conditions must be included in the contract</p>	

Part C - Approvals

Record of Recommendation, Endorsement and Approval					
Project Name					
Appraisal Panel Recommendation		Board Endorsement		MCA Approval	
Date of Meeting		Date of Meeting		Date of Meeting	
Head of Paid Service or Delegate	Ruth Adams Deputy CEX	Endorsing Officer (Board Chair)		Approving Officer (Chair)	
Signature		Signature		Signature	
Date		Date		Date	
S73 Officer or Delegate	Gareth Sutton Finance Manager	Statutory Finance Officer Approval			
Signature					
Date					
Monitoring Officer or Delegate	Steve Davenport SCR CA Solicitor				
Signature					
Date					

This page is intentionally left blank



Assurance Panel Summary

Scheme Details

Project Name	South Yorkshire Electric Vehicle Chargepoint Programme	Type of funding	Capital Grant
Grant Recipient	SCR Mayoral Combined Authority	Total Scheme Cost	£1,847,003
MCA Executive Board	Housing and Infrastructure	MCA Funding	£1,847,003
Programme name	Getting Building Fund	% MCA Allocation	100%

Appraisal Summary

Project Description	
<p>The proposed scheme comprises the purchase and installation of up to 109 charging points and associated infrastructure, providing up to 218 charging bays for use by battery-powered electric vehicles (BEVs) at public car park locations across South Yorkshire, including capitalisation of operations and maintenance costs over a 5-year term following installation.</p> <p>MCA funds will be specifically used to pay for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preparatory work • Cost of DNO's work to plan and provide a suitable electricity supply to the charging points • Procurement of charger units • Installation of charger units • Capitalisation of first 5 years' operating and maintenance costs 	
Strategic Case	
<i>Options assessment</i>	A comprehensive options assessment for the scheme has been undertaken with the purchasing model for 5 years being selected as the Preferred Way Forward (PWF). Other options have been considered including two alternative viable options which involves the supplier retaining the revenue generated from the scheme and fund operations and maintenance costs.
<i>FBC stage only – Confirmation of alignment with agreed MCA outcomes (Stronger, Greener, Fairer).</i>	The scheme provides a clear rationale and alignment with the SCR Strategic Economic Plan. The scheme aligns with the sustainability pillar for delivering more electric vehicle charging points in the Sheffield City Region over the next 20 years (SEP period). The scheme also provides access to infrastructure for the 20-30% of households without access to off-street car-parking who may be reluctant to switch to BEV / Plug in Electric Vehicle Charge Points without reliable access to charging facilities.
Value for Money	
Monetised Benefits:	

VFM Indicator	Value	R/A/G
<i>Net Present Social Value (£)</i>	c.£2.26m	A
<i>Present Value Social & Environmental Benefits (£)</i>	c.£2.26m	A
<i>Benefit Cost Ratio / GVA per £1 of SYMCA Investment</i>	1 to 1.5	A

Value for Money Statement

The applicant has quantified the economic benefits and costs associated with delivering the scheme in accordance with DfT's TAG guidance. A 20-year appraisal period has been used which is appropriate for this type of scheme.

The core benefits and justification of the scheme are the environmental impacts appraised over a 20-year period from scheme opening (beginning of 2022/23). The environmental benefits are split into three types: carbon saving, NOx and PM10. The assessors have made adjustments to the economic appraisal supplied (correction of the discount factors), the benefits are c.£1.09m, c. £0.88m and £0.29m providing an overall Present Value of Benefits of c.£2.26m.

Before adjustments to the BCR for the average mileage, we expect the BCR to be 1.88. However, we would recommend the BCR is more likely to be in the region of 1.0 – 1.5. Overall, the BCR is likely to be greater than 1 but less than 1.5 which places the scheme in a low value for money category.

The key risk is that the benefits will not be as high as those reported in the Business Case. The main driver of the benefits is the annual mileage of vehicles per annum for all three types of environmental benefits. The general trend for the last 10-15 years is a decline in car usage per annum and the impacts are highly sensitive to this input. The applicant has used a national level of car mileage per annum at 7,400 miles per annum. No evidence has been provided to confirm how this number is appropriate for the area, with our analysis showing the regional average mileage based on 2019 data at approximately 3,217 miles per annum. If we used this figure for the economic appraisal the BCR would drop to below 1.

Risk

There is a high level of risk that the scheme will not be completed by the end of March 2022. The procurement of the scheme has not been agreed and there is potential for costs to be higher than estimated because the DNO costs could exceed those budgeted. If the scheme delivers partial of the proposed programme, it will ultimately deliver partial outcomes. This has been given a risk rating of medium/high for both impact and probability and needs to be carefully monitored to ensure the project meets the expectations set out in the business case.

Additionally, there has been little mitigation surrounding how each site-by-site could be delivered upon the agreed timeframes. There is the added risk that not all sites have been confirmed with each local authority and the delay to selecting sites could potentially lead to overruns in the project timetable.

The economic appraisal does not provide data sensitivity testing and the impact on the Value for Money once key inputs are altered. The average national mileage per vehicle has been in decline (before COVID-19) and will likely have long terms impacts on the future usage of vehicles going forward. Given a baseline number of 7,400 miles (11,909km) per annum has been provided, little evidence has been provided to justify this value for future years or how this is appropriate for the Sheffield City Region with our analysis showing the regional level to be approximately 3,217 miles in 2019.

The biggest uncertainty of the scheme is delivery of the O&M costs. The applicant has asked for the first 5 years of O&M costs to be provided by the fund saying that the revenue generated will not cover the maintenance costs per annum. The supplementary report by Arup indicated that there would be enough revenue to cover O&M costs, but this should be confirmed with the applicant.

Furthermore, GBF is typically used to fund capital costs and the applicant should demonstrate to SCR the viability of the proposal without O&M funding. This may include looking at other viable funding options including partnering with a private provider from year 1. This would allow the 109 charging points to come forward by working with a private sector supplier.

The applicant has also stated that if there are cost overruns that they will reduce the number of EV charging points coming forward. This will have a negative impact on the benefit-cost ratio in two ways because the benefits associated with the scheme will decrease and the costs will increase.

Delivery

The applicant has put together a project management and delivery plan of how it will complete the scheme by the end of March 2022. Information in 7.1 is supported by additional information in the procurement strategy chapter. The scheme aims to have agreed funding and have all the approvals in place by September 2021 whilst site commencement will take place in January 2022.

Whilst the scheme has mapped out key dates and how it will be delivered, there is a high level of uncertainty about the deliverability of the proposed programme. Procurement is outstanding and there is uncertainty over the number of sites which can be built with the EV infrastructure over the time period. No float/contingency time has been factored into the programme leaving very little time for overruns or delays in the programme. After procurement, the applicant will have a better understanding of how many charging points can be delivered by the end of March 2022.

Additionally, it can take sites varying amounts of time to be completed with no site-by-site analysis being undertaken for how long it will take to complete the work once commencement has started. Build out duration can occur on multiple sites at once, but some sites can take as long as two months for work to be completed. This is also taking into consideration that no planning permissions are needed to install the charging points.

The procurement process will be conducted through an existing dynamic purchasing system after the awarding of the GBF with a timetable put in place of how the scheme will be delivered by the end of March 2022. A provisional list of key milestones has been provided including the following key dates:

- Procurement tender start date – 20th September 2021
- Procurement awarding of contracts – 3rd December 2021
- Contract commencement – 3rd January 2022

The applicant has set out a clear overview of how the proposed delivery and governance arrangements will monitor scheme progress and meet the budget set out in the Delivery Agreement for the capital costs of the scheme. The FBC also stated which factors would be measured and monitored as part of the assessment.

Legal

No State Aid legal advice from a solicitor has been received but the applicant has spoken to MCA Legal Team who have confirmed that they consider that there is no subsidy control issue with the project. This is because the project is providing publicly available infrastructure that will be available to the public generally without discrimination, and that the procured Supplier(s) will be appointed through a competitive tender process in compliance with procurement rules.

Recommendation and Conditions

Recommendation	Approve
-----------------------	---------

Payment Basis	Grant on defrayal
Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)	
<p><i>The following conditions must be satisfied before contract execution.</i></p> <p><i>The following conditions must be satisfied before drawdown of funding.</i></p> <p>The following conditions must be included in the contract</p>	

Record of Recommendation, Endorsement and Approval

Project Name

Appraisal Panel Recommendation

Board Endorsement

MCA Approval

Date of Meeting		Date of Meeting		Date of Meeting	
Head of Paid Service or Delegate	Ruth Adams Deputy CEX	Endorsing Officer (Board Chair)		Approving Officer (Chair)	
Signature		Signature		Signature	
Date		Date		Date	
S73 Officer or Delegate	Gareth Sutton Finance Manager	Statutory Finance Officer Approval			
Signature					
Date					
Monitoring Officer or Delegate	Steve Davenport SCR CA Solicitor				
Signature					
Date					
		Signature:			
		Date:			

This page is intentionally left blank



Assurance Panel Summary

Scheme Details

Project Name	Doncaster Council House Build Phase 1	Type of funding	Capital Grant
Grant Recipient	Doncaster Council	Total Scheme Cost	£7.71m
MCA Executive Board	Housing and Infrastructure	MCA Funding	£495,000
Programme name	Brownfield Housing Fund	% MCA Allocation	6%

Appraisal Summary

Project Description

Doncaster Council are applying for £495,000 to enable the delivery of the £7.715m Doncaster Council House Build Project Phase 1, which will see the development of 33 new high-quality, environmentally friendly affordable homes across 3 small sites in Doncaster. The houses will be retained by Doncaster Council as a part of their social housing portfolio.

The housing developed on the site will be in line with Doncaster Council's Low Carbon Living house type range (Attached at Appendix D). Consequently, the scheme will deliver housing that exceeds current environmental regulations and standards by incorporating PV roof panels, high levels of thermal insulation and EV charging points into the designs.

Other public funds (£1.155m) will also be used to bridge this gap but the BJC outlines that the MCA grant will fund low carbon elements and site preparation costs. Specific items to be funded include PV panels; EV charging points; high thermal performance; site preparation works; incoming services and abnormal costs (drainage, pumping station and reinstatement of parking spaces).

Strategic Case

Options assessment

The BJC sets out three options: Do minimum option; viable option 1; and preferred option. The preferred option has the best strategic fit with the Councils' and the Fund's objectives and thus the other options have been discounted for legitimate reasons.

Confirmation of alignment with agreed MCA outcomes (Stronger, Greener, Fairer).

The project has demonstrated strong alignment with the MCA outcomes. Specifically, the project will deliver the following outcomes

- Enterprise: the programme will use local supply chains and resources.
- Employment: the programme will create 50 jobs.
- Education: 3 apprenticeships will be provided as part of the construction process.
- Health: the programme will directly deliver 33 new homes. The BJC states that poor housing impacts the health of residents and that this scheme will help to improve health and life expectancy.
- Air quality: the specification of the build includes enhanced carbon reduction measures to minimise CO2 emissions and improve air quality.
- Net zero: the BJC states that the programme will include PV panels and EV charging points. It also states that the scheme will be gas free. It is assumed that this is an error as 2.1 states that this is the last phase of council development to include gas boilers. The programme could be improved to be gas free which would contribute more to the greener strategic outcome of the SEP and RAP. Overall however with gas boilers, there is a carbon saving of 235 tonnes per annum.

Value for Money		
Monetised Benefits:		
VFM Indicator	Value	R/A/G
<i>Net Present Social Value (£)</i>	£1,771,379	Green
<i>Present Value Social & Environmental Benefits (£)</i>	£1,286,609	Green
<i>Benefit Cost Ratio / GVA per £1 of SYMCA Investment</i>	3.65	Green
Value for Money Statement		
<p>The Net Present Social Value of the project has been estimated to have a value of £1,77m, including £1.29m of Social and Environmental Benefits. The project also has a benefit cost ratio (BCR) of 3.65, representing a return of £3.65 per £1 of MCA investment. The project is therefore considered to deliver acceptable value for money.</p>		
Risk		
<p>There are a number of risks identified in the BJC in section 6.6 with a full matrix included as part of A.3. The major risks identified include MCA funding not being approved, cost overruns, impact of Covid 19 on the construction phase, Brexit, and higher than expected abnormal costs. All risks have been scored identifying the highest risk in terms of likelihood and impact. Risk mitigation and the individual owner has also been identified.</p> <p>Both the short list and full matrix of identified risks are deemed reasonable. The risks around increasing costs due to overruns, Brexit or Covid are less likely to impact this project as a contractor has been procured on a fixed fee and construction is to begin very soon. All scoring has been undertaken accurately and it is felt the quantitative conclusions represent the risks effectively.</p>		
Delivery		
<p>There is no timetable included for land acquisition, planning and procurement as all these elements have already been completed. The first milestone is the securing of SOAHP funding and approval of the contract to Willmott-Dixon on the 8th of September 2021. Works are to commence soon after the 20th of September 2021 and complete on the 24th February 2023 which equates to a build period of 17 months. It is assumed that sites will be built out simultaneously and it is expected that the two smaller sites will complete by 30th November 2022. The milestones also include evaluation reports in the middle of the works on 30th September 2022 and 7 months after completion on the 30th of September.</p> <p>The delivery timetable is reasonable. Though it is noted that the works commencement date is imminent. Any delay could negatively impact the timetable.</p> <p>The stated level of cost certainty is 95% and this is in line with the expectations for a project at this stage, with the contractor already appointed. For the same reason the contingency allowance of 2.5% is reasonable as a contractor has been appointed on a fixed fee. More clarity could have been provided on how overruns will be dealt with though it is picked up in the management dimension.</p> <p>The BJC names Adrian Robertshaw, Housing Programme Manager (Doncaster Council) as the Senior Responsible Officer. A clear governance structure has been included from the Project Manager Willmott-Dixon to the Doncaster Council Cabinet.</p> <p>The BJC sets out how the programme will be monitored and who is responsible for undertaking and funding it. Monitoring will be the responsibility of Doncaster Councils Housing Programme Manager (HMP) who will report to the Councils Housing Delivery Group. The HMP will meet monthly with the contractor Willmott-Dixon to ensure that timescales, budgets, outputs/outcomes are all being met. An employer's agent will be appointed to support the HMP ensuring that the build is a fair reflection of the costs</p>		

involved. The contractor Willmott-Dixon must update social value outcomes progress monthly. Doncaster Councils Housing Delivery Group will evaluate the programme during the construction and on completion MCA will be provided with copies of reports. All costs associated with monitoring will be met by Doncaster Council.

Legal

The BJC states that subsidy control/state aid rules do not apply to this programme for a series of reasons. The grant is being made to Doncaster Council (a public body) who have gone through an open procurement route to appoint the most commercial and economically advantageous bidder. In addition, it is noted that the funding and projects will have no impact on international trade and the provision of social housing falls within the EUs Service of General Economic Interest.

Recommendation and Conditions

Recommendation	Full grant award subject to conditions
-----------------------	--

Payment Basis	Payment on defrayal
----------------------	---------------------

Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)

The following conditions must be satisfied before contract execution.

1. Confirmation that the profiled 2021/22 spend of MCA funds can be defrayed in year, as the MCA is unable to guarantee that this will be reprofiled beyond year end, and/or that DMBC will cover any additional works from alternate sources.
2. Agree detailed schedule of inclusive growth indicators and targets (e.g. % of [previously unemployed] locals offered permanent contracts and apprenticeships, mentoring and school engagement and engagement with the local supply chain) to ensure the project delivers wider socio-economic benefits and that these can be captured, monitored and reported.

The conditions above should be fully satisfied by **##.##.####**. Failure to do so could lead to the withdrawal of approval.

The following conditions must be satisfied before drawdown of funding.

3. All required statutory consents including all planning conditions must be satisfied.
4. Submission of evidence of DMBC's Board approval for the scheme.
5. Formal confirmation of all other funding approvals required to deliver the project.
6. Formal confirmation of commitment to address any cost overruns without unduly compromising project outputs and outcomes.
7. Submission of acceptable Subsidy Control opinion

The following conditions must be included in the contract

8. Clawback will be applied on outputs at MCA discretion

Record of Recommendation, Endorsement and Approval

Project Name

Appraisal Panel Recommendation

Board Endorsement

MCA Approval

Date of Meeting

Date of Meeting

Date of Meeting

**Head of Paid Service
or Delegate**

Ruth Adams
Deputy CEX

**Endorsing Officer
(Board Chair)**

**Approving Officer
(Chair)**

Signature

Signature

Signature

Date

Date

Date

**S73 Officer or
Delegate**

Gareth Sutton
Finance Manager

Statutory Finance Officer Approval

Signature

Name:

Date

**Monitoring Officer or
Delegate**

Steve Davenport
SCR CA Solicitor

Signature:

Signature

Date

Date:

1. Change Requests		
RMBC	Small Sites (BHF)	RMBC have a project which includes three separate works over three schemes. They have commenced work on Scheme 1 and are currently finalising planning permission on sites 2 and 3. The request is to update the contract which will allow draw down of funding for early works in Scheme 1, but continues to require schemes 2 and 3 to be fully delivered.
BMBC	Goldthorpe Land Assembly (GBF)	<p>This change request is seeking to amend the delivery date stated in the FBC for this Work Package from 31 March 2022 to 31 March 2023.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ Moving condition 2 'Following the procurement of a contractor, BMBC to confirm the final tender price is in line with the FBC Financial Case.' to be monitored within the funding agreement, rather than being in place prior to the drawdown of funding ~ Moving condition 3 'Confirmation of planning approval and the successful negotiation of 3rd party land acquisition' to be monitored within the funding agreement, rather than being in place prior to the drawdown of funding ~ Transfer of the start on site date from 31 October 2021 to 05 September 2022 ~ Transfer of the works completion date from 31/03/2022 to 31/03/2023. ~ Increase to the total project costs from £1,610,759.04 to £2,999,972.43
BMBC	Active Travel Bridge (GBF)	<p>Due to an uplift in the cost of steel and other related items, and general uncertainty around the availability of materials, there has been a delay to the procurement process. Also the overall cost of the bridge has increased – BMBC will provide funding to cover the cost increase. Baseline figures below are as per the FBC, as the funding agreement is not yet finalised and signed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ Transfer of the project start on site date from 30/09/2021 to 28/03/2022 ~ Transfer of the project completion date from 31/12/2021 to 24/06/2022 ~ Increase of the total scheme costs from £1,500,00 to £1,892,466.40

SCC	Porter Brook Site (BHF)	Due to the London Road demolition needing to take precedence (due to nesting season), the dates for the Porter Brook site works have been set back. The demolition phase is also dependent upon when Northern Powergrid can schedule disconnection of the substation. It is envisaged that all phases, including pocket park improvements, can be completed before 31.3.22.
BMBC	M1 J36 Goldthorpe (LGF)	<p>Change 1. Workpackage C – Date of Practical Completion delayed Workpackage C – New roundabout/Access to D1 employment site – Completion delayed by 12 months (from March 2022 to March 2023)</p> <p>Change 2. Workpackage B – Date of Practical Completion delayed Workpackage B – Delivery of Employment land ES10 - Completion delayed by 12 months (from January 2023 to March 2024)</p> <p>Change 3. Increased overall scheme costs Increase of £2,071,274 in total scheme costs (to be fully funded by BMBC and GBF Grant, no change to SCR LGF contribution)</p> <p>Change 4. Workpackage C - output changed As the 8000sqm of new/resurfaced access road to employment site ES10 is included as an output within both the LGF and GBF projects, it is proposed that it should be split between the two projects (4000sqm each) to avoid double counting</p>

Housing and Infrastructure Board

13 September 2021

South Yorkshire Flood Catchment Plan Update

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

Director Approving Submission of the Report:

Martin Swales, Interim Director of Transport, Housing and Infrastructure

Report Author(s):

Ryan Shepherd
Ryan.shepherd@sheffieldcityregion.org.uk

Colin Blackburn
Colin.blackburn@sheffieldcityregion.org.uk

Executive Summary

The report updates the Board on progress in preparing a South Yorkshire Flood Catchment Plan.

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

The Catchment Plan aims to help identify and secure additional funding and investment to reduce flood risk to homes and businesses, as well as improving the resilience of places to future flooding.

Recommendations

The Board is asked to:

- Comment on the ongoing workstream themes being progressed to develop the South Yorkshire Flood Catchment Plan

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

N/A

1. Background

- 1.1 Following the 2019 flood event in South Yorkshire, Mayor Dan Jarvis and Local Authority Leaders submitted a South Yorkshire Business and Infrastructure Resilience Priority Flood Programme to Government, which included the proposal to prepare a catchment wide flood plan covering the whole of South Yorkshire.
- 1.2 The aim of this proposal was to develop a new more effective and integrated approach to future flood policy and investment, taking a holistic 'South Yorkshire' approach to cover all rivers and watercourses, rather than continuing to consider flood policy and investments in a less strategic way.
- 1.3 It would also enable the potential future impacts of climate change to be taken into account and better understand the contribution that Natural Flood Management can play in building resilience and reducing future flooding.
- 1.4 Work on the Catchment Plan has been ongoing and the attached presentation at Appendix A provides further detail. The Board's comments and suggestions on the emerging workstreams and outputs are invited.

2. Key Issues

- 2.1 The aim is for the Catchment Plan to be a 'living document' to facilitate the development of a long-term strategy for flood risk management and climate resilience.
- 2.2 The Plan will outline the actions to be undertaken to reduce flood risk, mitigate climate change and support climate resilient communities across South Yorkshire. It will support better joint working; provide a compelling programme to attract potential investors; and help give confidence locally that measures are being put in place to protect communities. Importantly, it will provide a clear programme of well-developed projects to help secure the remaining investment required across South Yorkshire to alleviate and mitigate future flooding.
- 2.3 Work is in progress with four key workstreams being developed in partnership between the MCA Executive, Environment Agency, the four South Yorkshire Authorities and Yorkshire Water. There has also been engagement with a wide range of stakeholders.
- 2.4 The attached presentation provides details about the emerging principles and actions arising from each of the workstreams that will inform the content of the Catchment Plan.

3. Options Considered and Recommended Proposal

3.1 Option 1

To support the continued preparation of the South Yorkshire Flood Catchment Plan, subject to any comments which may be provided.

3.2 Option 1 Risks and Mitigations

The key risks relate to the implementation of the Strategy as follows:

- That delivery partners are unable to commit to implementing the Catchment Plan once completed. To minimise this risk, the four workstreams are each being led by one of the South Yorkshire Authorities with wider partners also involved to ensure policy and proposals are aligned with partners' policies and are realistically able to be delivered.
- That the causes of flood events are too complex and difficult to understand at a strategic whole catchment wide scale. To minimise this risk, senior officer flood risk management specialists and flood modellers from a range of organisations have been engaged, as well as other key community stakeholders to provide a broader understanding.
- That there is insufficient public and private funding and investment available to implement the Catchment Plan in a timely manner. To minimise this risk, the key workstream themes include consideration of resourcing issues, and Mayor Jarvis, Local Authority Leaders and MPs will continue to lobby Government for further flood investment in South Yorkshire.

3.3 Option 2

To not support the development of a South Yorkshire Flood Catchment Plan.

3.4 Option 2 Risks and Mitigations

The key risk with this option is that there would continue to be no consistent approach adopted across South Yorkshire to address flood risk, and different partners and resources would approach flood policy and investment in a piecemeal way.

3.5 Recommended Option

Option 1 is recommended in order to seek to put in place a shared, joined-up strategic approach to flood mitigation and to maximise resource targeting and effectiveness.

4. Consultation on Proposal

- 4.1 Both the Housing and Infrastructure Board and the South Yorkshire Flood Risk Partnership (SYFRP) are jointly overseeing and are contributing to the development of the Catchment Plan. SYFRP continue to be consulted on development of the Catchment Plan. It is intended to present the draft Catchment Plan to the MCA by the end of the year for their consideration.

5. Timetable and Accountability for Implementing this Decision

- 5.1 The views of the Board are requested at this stage. The decision to approve the final document will be taken by both the MCA and the SYFRP (on behalf of the Department of Environment, Food, and Rural Affairs (DEFRA)) following consideration and recommendation by the Housing and Infrastructure Board. This is anticipated to be by the end of 2021

6. Financial and Procurement Implications and Advice

6.1 The Environment Agency (EA) is providing lead resources for preparing the Catchment Plan, with the MCA Executive and other partners providing in-kind support to the process. Further resource is expected to be required to further develop the Catchment Plan and support implementation in 2022/23 and beyond. Any future proposals and implications for MCA resources would be considered through the usual MCA processes.

7. Legal Implications and Advice

7.1 There are no legal implications directly arising from this report.

8. Human Resources Implications and Advice

8.1 Consideration will need to be given to the resources for implementing the Strategy, including the roles and resource requirements of the MCA.

9. Equality and Diversity Implications and Advice

9.1 Ensuring equality and diversity will be part of the Catchment Plan, aligning with the intentions of the Equality Act and Public Sector Equality Duty and the inclusivity policy approach of the Strategic Economic Plan.

10. Climate Change Implications and Advice

10.1 The climate and nature emergency requires a strong collective response to carbon reduction and be more resilient to the impacts of climate change. The Catchment Plan will contribute by capturing actions of partners to reduce flood risk and build climate resilience across South Yorkshire, improving information and evidence to support decision making, and support investment decisions and delivery. It may also support the delivery of net zero targets by the provision of carbon sequestration.

11. Information and Communication Technology Implications and Advice

11.1 None as a direct result of this report.

12. Communications and Marketing Implications and Advice

12.1 Communicating on Grant in Aid DEFRA funding is managed by the Environment Agency, with work by Local Authorities to communicate directly with impacted communities on individual schemes.

12.2 A wider communications plan will be prepared for the Catchment Plan, and the MCA Executive Communications Team will be involved in this work.

List of Appendices Included

A South Yorkshire Catchment Plan Update Presentation

Background Documents

None

South Yorkshire Catchment Approach

Catchment Plan Update September 2021



What does this cover?

- Context and Purpose of the catchment plan
- Catchment plan workstream themes
- Catchment plan preparation

Catchment plan context

- South Yorkshire suffered catastrophic flooding in November 2019. 1600 properties were flooded and there was extensive damage to infrastructure and the economy.
- Climate change is impacting the severity and frequency of flooding.
- Nature based solutions to reduce flood risk will be an important part of the solution as well as 'hard' defences.
- The catchment is an integrated environmental system which requires a whole catchment approach
- Working in partnership across South Yorkshire creates opportunities to build a stronger case for investment, to support and learn from each other, to be strategic and to identify efficiencies.
- Work has progressed this year with a range of partners around 4 key themes, with the Catchment Plan purpose and emerging outputs being outlined as follows.

Catchment plan purpose

- A 'living document' to **facilitate the development of a long term strategy** for flood risk management and climate resilience, capturing current partner actions to reduce flood risk and build climate resilience.
- Place-based, emphasising how South Yorkshire is connected and defined by it's network of rivers and habitats
 - Provide investors with a clear programme of well developed projects to secure the remaining investment that is required to deliver the capital programme
 - Create and drive opportunities to respond strategically to the climate and nature emergencies as part of a national pilot for long term strategic planning
 - Increase community awareness of flood risk and showcase projects to build community and political confidence in our progress and collective commitment to reduce flood risk and increase resilience.

Introduction

Catchment Plan Introduction will include:

- Brief outline of the context of flooding in South Yorkshire and the expected future increase in risk due to the impact of climate change.
- The purpose of the plan, governance and delivery mechanisms.
- The case for investing in flood risk and resilience, including examples of the wider economic, environmental and social benefits.
- A high level summary of the current capital programme of priority schemes across South Yorkshire and the funding 'gaps' still required to deliver the programme.
- Case studies of successful projects which have been completed or are currently under construction to demonstrate a strong track record of project delivery, partnership working and innovation from the delivery partners.

Theme 1

Theme 1: Responding to the climate emergency

- Flood risk driven but responding to the wider climate and nature emergency.
- Reducing flood risk at source and building climate resilience.
- Using nature based solutions to reduce flood risk, aid nature recovery and support the transition to net zero carbon.
- Contributing to a climate adaptive planning process.

Example action:

‘Carry out further economics assessment and wider natural capital analysis to support development and ongoing Nature Based Solutions investment in the catchment.’

Theme 2

Theme 2: SMART (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-based) investment

- Ensure all flood risk investment is prioritised, SMART and driven by the best available data, intelligence and evidence.
- Bring together information from stakeholders across South Yorkshire to map opportunities and unlock potential funding.
- Use information to enable flood risk management schemes to become 'shovel ready'.

Example action:

'Investment Tool: Create and develop a draft web tool, to bring together data from all flood risk management authorities to enable us to more easily plan where investment should be prioritised.'

Theme 3

Theme 3: Strengthening the use of technology and operational management

- Streamlining operational activities across different sectors and partners, so we can all work together more effectively on an operational basis.
- Strengthening the use of technology, sharing information and best practice in our operational activities.

Page 98

Example actions:

‘Research and investigate the feasibility of developing a GIS capable of capturing and displaying asset and other stakeholder information on a map format. This will offer one true source of data that can be used during times of flood response.

Collated information could include : Telemetry, pumping stations, gullies, sewers, critical infrastructure, main river regulators, evacuation centres, hostile areas / people, communities at risk, vulnerable peoples etc.’

Theme 4

Theme 4: Community engagement and resilience:

- Work collaboratively across all partners ensuring a 'one joined up voice' and promoting community leadership.

Example actions:

'Develop a South Yorkshire engagement strategy for public facing engagement on climate change and future risk supporting engagement on climate change mitigation, adaptation and resilience.'

'Co-ordinating the production of landscape visioning products to show places where the risk of flooding could potentially be reduced through nature-based techniques, and multiple benefits to people and the environment realised.'

Catchment plan Preparation

Jan - Mar: Initial Theme Development

- Individual theme development work, by each task and finish groups. With each LA championing one theme, working with the EA, MCA & YW.

April: Wider engagement on themes

- Workshop for local authorities to build awareness of and support for the Catchment Plan and secure input from wider sectors e.g planning, economic development, carbon

May - June: Strategic check-in

- Reporting on the initial theme development work and seeking support for progress so far and next steps from SY CEX, SYFRP and MCA H&I Board

June - Oct: Create brand and draft

- Draft content through the task and finish groups, and bring in wider partners, organisations and communities.
- Finalise brand for catchment approach

Oct - Nov: Leadership review draft Plan

- Sharing draft Plan for review, comment and supportt from SY CEX, SYFRP and MCA H&I Board

Nov - Jan: Finalise and launch

- Consideration and adoption of Plan
- Public launch to promote and build wider engagement
- A 'living plan' to be reviewed and updated. Delivery scrutinised, challenged and championed

Item 8

Housing and Infrastructure Board Forward Plan

13th September 2021

Meeting Date	Suggested Agenda items
Tuesday 26 th October 2021, 10am – 12pm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brownfield Housing Fund – Outline Business Cases & Business Justification Cases • Gainshare Major Capital Schemes – Strategic Business Cases and Outline Business Cases • Draft Digital Infrastructure Strategy Draft Delivery Plan • Draft Flood Catchment Plan • South Yorkshire One Public Estate Programme Update
December / January (date tbc)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brownfield Housing Fund – Outline Business Cases & Full Business Cases • Gainshare Major Capital Schemes – Strategic Business Cases and Outline Business Cases • Flood Catchment Plan • Growth Area Economic Blueprints • Electric Vehicle Chargepoint Programme Update • SCR Housing Review - Next Stage Activities • Modern Methods of Construction Next Steps

This page is intentionally left blank