

Public Document Pack



Friday, 15 October 2021

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

You are hereby invited to a meeting of the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority to be held at **Virtual Meeting**, on: **Tuesday, 26 October 2021** at **10.00 am** for the purpose of transacting the business set out in the agenda.

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

Dr Dave Smith
Chief Executive



You can view the agenda and papers
at www.sheffieldcityregion.org.uk
or use a smart phone camera
and scan the QR code

Member Distribution

Councillor Terry Fox (Co-Chair)
Gemma Smith (Co-Chair)
Damian Allen
Councillor Amy Brookes
Councillor Tim Cheetham
Michael Faulks
Councillor Glyn Jones
Councillor Paul Wood

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

MCA - Housing and Infrastructure Board

Tuesday, 26 October 2021 at 10.00 am

Venue: Virtual Meeting



Agenda

Agenda Ref No	Subject	Lead	Page
1.	Welcome and Apologies	Chair	
2.	Declarations of Interest by individual Members in relation to any item of business on the agenda	Chair	
3.	Urgent items / Announcements	Chair	
4.	Public Questions on Key Decisions	Chair	
5.	Minutes of Previous Meeting held on 13th September 2021	Chair	5 - 16
6.	Programme Approvals	S Sykes	17 - 52
7.	South Yorkshire Flood Catchment Plan Update	C Blackburn	53 - 94
8.	South Yorkshire Digital Infrastructure Strategy - Scoping the Delivery Plan	C Blackburn	95 - 102
9.	Programme Performance Report	S Sykes	To follow
10.	Forward Plan	C Blackburn	103 - 104
11.	Any Other Business	Chair	

Date of next meeting: Tuesday, 7 December 2021 at 1.00 pm
At: Virtual Meeting

This page is intentionally left blank

MCA - HOUSING AND INFRASTRUCTURE BOARD

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON:

MONDAY, 13 SEPTEMBER 2021 AT 1.00 PM

VIRTUAL MEETING



Present:

Councillor Terry Fox (Co-Chair)	Sheffield City Council
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
Damian Allen	Doncaster MBC
Martin Swales	MCA Executive Team
Colin Blackburn	MCA Executive Team
Daniel Wright (Observer)	MCA Executive Team

In Attendance:

Becky Guthrie	MCA Executive Team
Ryan Shepherd	MCA Executive Team
Laure Thomas	MCA Executive Team

Apologies:

Virginia Saynor	Environment Agency
-----------------	--------------------

1 Welcome and Apologies

Cllr Fox welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked them in advance for their time today, he then asked everyone present to introduce themselves due to this being his first meeting.

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 under Item 6 appendices A,F,H,I,L of the Agenda – Programme Approvals - by virtue of Doncaster MBC being a recipient of Gainshare funding and was then joined by all the Councillors present in declaring the same interest. Councillor Fox and Councillor Wood – item 6 appendices C, E, J. Councillor Brookes – item 6 appendix D. Councillor Cheetham – item 6 appendixes B and G.

3 Urgent items / Announcements

None.

4 **Public Questions on Key Decisions**

None received.

5 **Minutes of Previous Meeting**

Taken as read. CB confirmed actions were undertaken. CB also mentioned under Item 8 the wording was incorrect and relates to the previous item 7, so the minute itself does not reflect the decision. CB to send the correct minute for item 8 to the Co-Chairs after this meeting for confirmation that the minute is accurate.

Minutes taken as a true record subject to Co-Chair sign off of the item 8 amendment.

6 **Programme Approvals**

Laurie Thomas presented this paper which 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.

Gainshare Funding Programme. The MCA agreed in March 2021 to twenty interim schemes accepted on to the pipeline, nineteen fall within the remit of this Board. Ten schemes actually represent twelve of the nineteen, two lots of two have been amalgamated.

Housing Retrofit (Gainshare SBC)

Doncaster MBC is seeking £2.7m from the Gainshare cost 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 benefits and outcomes are at an early stage, but the proposed benefits are expected to include reduced emissions, health benefits, lower energy bills and 10-15 jobs supported. It is a strategic fit and it is anticipated to be able to demonstrate value for money at full approval stage.

Gemma Smith said moving forward it is really important for us to have a look at this in the outline business case to evaluate potential of lower energy bills that air source heat pumps bring when powered by electricity and that being more expensive than gas.

The board considered and approved the project to progress to MCA for

approval to proceed to outline business case (OBC).

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

1. Progression of ‘Housing Retrofit’ SBC to the MCA (Mayoral Combined Authority) for approval to proceed to OBC for Gainshare funding to Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council (DMBC) subject to the conditions set out in the Assurance Summary attached at **appendix A**.

Glassworks – Enhanced Capital Contributions (Gainshare SBC)

The project is seeking £2.60m from Gainshare funding towards total project costs of £17.37m. The Glassworks 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.

Considered to have a good strategic fit. A condition of the approval is that the Gainshare funding can only be used to assist in the capital costs that the tenant might have.

The board considered and approved the project to progress to MCA for approval to proceed to OBC.

RESOLVED – That the Housing and Infrastructure considered and approved:

1. Progression of ‘Glassworks – Enhanced Capital Contributions’ SBC to MCA for approval to proceed to OBC for Gainshare funding to Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council (BMBC) subject to the conditions set out in the Assurance Summary attached at **Appendix B**.

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 project is aiming to deliver 118 net additional jobs and a return of £1.64 for every £1 invested, and an additional 22 housing units. It is a strategic fit and additional work at OBC stage will demonstrate value for money.

The board considered and approved the project to progress to MCA for

approval to proceed to OBC.

RESOLVED – That the Housing and Infrastructure considered and approved:

1. Progression of 'Fargate Future High Street Fund' SBC to MCA for approval to proceed to OBC for Gainshare funding to Sheffield City Council (SCC) subject to the conditions set out in the Assurance Summary attached at **Appendix C**.

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 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.

It 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 board considered and approved the project to progress to MCA for approval to proceed to OBC.

RESOLVED – That the Housing and Infrastructure considered and approved:

1. Progression of 'Rotherham to Kilnhurst Flood Alleviation Scheme' SBC to proceed to OBC for Gainshare funding to Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council (RMBC) subject to the conditions set out in the Assurance Summary attached at **Appendix D**.
2. 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.

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.

Aiming to better protect 370 homes and 253 businesses. Anticipated the project will be able to provide expected value for money at approval. Good strategic fit. Can be claimed as capital expenditure. The Assurance Summary explains in further detail within Appendix E.

The board considered and approved the project to progress to MCA for approval to proceed to OBC.

RESOLVED – That the Housing and Infrastructure considered and approved:

1. 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**.

Doncaster Surface Water Mitigation (Gainshare SBC)

£400,000 total project costs £700,000 grant requested to mitigate long standing surface water flooding issues at Bawtry, Old Denaby and High Melton through improved drainage.

It 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 considered and approved the project to progress to MCA for approval to proceed to OBC.

RESOLVED – That the Housing and Infrastructure considered and approved:

1. 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**;

Cheapside Acquisition (Gainshare SBC)

Barnsley MBC 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 project is considered to have strategic fit. Further details will be needed at OBC/FBC stage to fully assess value for money.

Cllr Fox – Any questions – GS asked about the timing of this. Has this been independently valued because at the minute properties prices are soaring and not sure it is a time for buying. LT said as far as we are aware, BMBC have had discussions and agreed prices and detailed negotiations. The building itself is an old building and detracts from the Glassworks. Also, negotiations underway with the current retailers to relocate within Glassworks. Cllr Tim Cheetham said market value won't increase much at this point and doesn't seem to have increased over the last 18 months. Represents good value for money from BMBC point of view.

The Board considered and approved the project to progress to OBC

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

1. 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**;

Bentley Flood Alleviation Scheme (Gainshare SBC)

Doncaster MBC 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.

Considered to have a good strategic fit and the Board are asked to approve the project to move forward to develop an OBC.

The Board considered and approved the project to progress to OBC

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

1. 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**;

Natural Flood Management Conisbrough and Tickhill (Gainshare SBC)

Seeking £400,000 to construct natural flood defences along a brook with high flood risk.

Value for money cannot be assessed at this stage the project will protect 48 homes and other infrastructure. The project is considered to be a good 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 considered and approved the project to progress to OBC

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

1. 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**;

Councillor Fox asked whether we have done an overall assessment for ourselves on the amount of the money we are investing in the protection of residents, businesses and opening up building as well. Could we have an overall view of what actually we are developing for flood defences. From across the region we are opening up some real opportunities and if we take a more collective and comprehensive view it would be worthwhile for us as a Board to have look at that subject. LT said can report on a programme level and bring to the Board on a periodic basis.

Councillor Jones said regionally lots of schemes that mitigate against flooding, we need to be assured that strategically we are doing them in the correct order

so we don't get impacts in other places further down-stream. Needs to be done at the right time, in the right place, in the right order.

Cllr Fox – Any further questions/comments – none.

Colin Blackburn mentioned this links to the next item in terms of catchment plan and our intention to bring some of that detail and the wider perspective about all the good work that's happening already and the challenges ahead, also the amount of funding that's being spent (amount of partnership funding, local authorities, MCA as well), this is something we will be bringing to the next meeting in October.

Cllr Fox said that, whilst we are doing this work with public money, it would also be worthwhile seeing private sector investment too, the interactions and the partnerships are around this system. Looking forward to seeing this at the next meeting.

CB to get a comprehensive view to the Board and what land we are opening up and protecting.

Sheffield Heart of the City 2 (Gainshare SBC)

Sheffield CC 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 project is estimated to create 227 net additional jobs.

The project is considered to have strategic fit with the SEP and is well advanced for a start on site this year.

The Board considered and approved the project to progress to MCA to proceed to OBC

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

1. 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**.

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

SCR MCA are seeking £1.85m for 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 at public car park locations across South Yorkshire.

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 Net 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.

GS – Asked whether the Councils are going to keep hold of the responsibility for maintenance and running and any revenue from these charging points for the first five year. CB confirmed they are but some of the cost should be able to be capitalised and although we cannot say exactly at this time what the demand will be over the next five years in individual locations some revenue may be generated from fees for the use of the individuals EV's which will also contribute to the costs.

GS asked what is foreseen to be the longer-term plan after five years such as considering viability and whether to continue or let someone else take over responsibility and ownership. CB confirmed that we are doing this collaboratively, and arrived at a five year initial period after soft market testing and how the EV market works, but after five years there will need to be another procurement however it will be the decision of Authorities individually how they wish to proceed thereafter and whether they want to continue to do it collectively again.

GS asked whether this is the first of this kind of scheme? CB confirmed that it is the first South Yorkshire wide scheme although BMBC, RMBC and SYPTE all have small existing schemes and we have taken the lessons learned from those schemes to develop this joint EV scheme.

GS suggested that as there will need to be more EV chargepoints, it is worth us considering how we work more closely with the Transport and Environment Board on this, as its crucial to identify where we need these future charging points to help support public transport. It is also going to be a challenge in residential areas as more people adopt electric vehicles, particularly for the high density residential areas where people don't have drives. We will need to look at some kind of public charging opportunities.

CB noted that in terms of this £1.85m he has been working with the Local Authorities and SYPTE to identify locations for this first tranche, but the intention is to build into the procurement the allowance to enhance the programme should further funding be identified. Collectively, we are exploring where potentially we can leverage some of the Government's on-street funding and other transport funding to enhance the programme. In terms of delivery each Authority will have responsibility for their own element but a joint Project Board will be set up to oversee the whole programme and share good practice and support.

Cllr Tim Cheetham commented that the earliest they can begin the procurement for the supplier is the first week in October. The programme milestones are challenging, and we want to ensure that we deliver the schemes

in the first phase. CB noted that the timescales are very challenging and that we are working to confirming a preferred supplier in November with a view to preparing all the groundwork beforehand so that all the contracts are drawn down from the framework supplier in December; with mobilisation in January. It is unlikely that we will be able to deliver the whole programme by the end of March but we will seek to deliver as much as possible of the programme by then, and we are having discussions with MHCLG relating to this.

The Board considered and approved the project for award of a £1.85m grant from the GBF

RESOLVED – That the Housing and Infrastructure Board considered and approved

1. 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**;
2. 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

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

Doncaster MBC 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 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.

GS – It mentions a confusing point on whether gas boilers will be used or not, so seeking clarity. Becky Guthrie said last project in the phase 1 of the programme do have gas boilers but they have higher thermal efficiency and solar panels. The next phase does not have gas boilers. Damien Allen – Would like to get some assurance whether the spec of the gas boilers includes the ability to dual fuel in terms of hydrogen burn. Would be helpful in terms of the existing programme that there is the potential for this in the future. BG to follow that up.

The Board considered and approved the project for award of a £0.5m grant from the BHF

RESOLVED – That the Housing and Infrastructure Board considered and approved

1. 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**;
2. 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

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 its 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 20 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.

Cllr Fox said he was very disappointed not being able to deliver the Parkwood scheme and after three years might have heard this news sooner. The Board considered and approved the project to be recommended to MCA for inclusion in the GBF programme.

RESOLVED – That the Housing and Infrastructure Board considered and approved

1. Selecting the project ‘Heart of the City expansion’ project for inclusion in the GBF Programme.

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.

The Board considered and approved the project changes requests.

RESOLVED – That the Housing and Infrastructure Board considered and approved

1. 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.**

7 Draft South Yorkshire Flood Catchment Plan

Colin Blackburn presented the report and ran through the presentation. Work had been ongoing over the past 9 months with the Environment Agency, the four Local Authorities and Yorkshire Water to prepare the Flood Catchment. He noted that over the Summer a number of wider stakeholder workshops have been undertaken to obtain a wider input and views on the emerging draft Plan.

CB confirmed that the intention is to bring a draft Plan to the next meeting for consideration and comment, with a view to bringing the final document to the December Board meeting for endorsement. The emerging Plan is being developed around the following four key themes which were further detailed:

- Theme 1: Responding to the climate emergency
- Theme 2: SMART (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-based) investment
- Theme 3: Strengthening the use of technology and operational management
- Theme 4: Community engagement and resilience

Martin Swales commented that the presentation showed the significant extent of work that has clearly been undertaken by Local Authorities, MCA, Environment Agency, Yorkshire Water and others, working together to ensure a coherent and coordinated plan, which is welcomed.

DA also confirmed his support for the emerging Plan.

RESOLVED – That the Housing and Infrastructure Board note the emerging content of the South Yorkshire Flood Catchment Plan

8 Forward Plan

CB this was presented just for information. We have an October and then hopefully one in December to be confirmed.

Cllr Fox asked if there were any questions – none.

9 **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

26 October 2021

Programme Approvals

Is the paper exempt from the press and public? No

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 – Senior Programme Manager
carl.howard@sheffieldcityregion.org.uk

Executive Summary

This paper requests approval of one scheme subject to conditions set out in the Assurance Panel Summary. The paper also requests progression of five schemes to develop Full Business Cases (FBCs). One change request is presented for agreement.

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 Mayoral Combined Authority's (MCA's) aspirations.

Recommendations

The Board consider and approve:

1. Full approval and award of £0.25m grant for the "BHF Revenue Project" to SYMCA (South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority);

2. Progression of “Adwick Depot” project to proceed to FBC (Full Business Case) for BHF (Brownfield Housing Funding) to DMBC (Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council) subject to the conditions set out in the Assurance Summary attached at Appendix A
3. Progression of “Attercliffe Waterside” project to proceed to FBC (Full Business Case) for BHF (Brownfield Housing Funding) to SCC (Sheffield City Council) subject to the conditions set out in the Assurance Summary attached at Appendix B
4. Progression of “Park Hill Phase 4” project to MCA to proceed to FBC (Full Business Case) for BHF (Brownfield Housing Funding) to SCC (Sheffield City Council) subject to the conditions set out in the Assurance Summary attached at Appendix C
5. Progression of “Nightingale School” project to proceed to FBC (Full Business Case) for BHF (Brownfield Housing Funding) to DMBC (Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council) subject to the conditions set out in the Assurance Summary attached at Appendix D
6. Progression of “Small Sites” project to proceed to FBC (Full Business Case) for BHF (Brownfield Housing Funding) to DMBC (Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council) subject to the conditions set out in the Assurance Summary attached at Appendix E
7. Approval of the changes to the GBF (Getting Building Fund) project “Barnsley College Digital Sci-Tech Building”.
8. Delegated authority be given to the Head of Paid Service in consultation with the Section 73 and Monitoring Officer to enter into legal agreements for the schemes 1 – 7 covered above.

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

Assurance Panel

01 October 2021

Assurance Panel

11 October 2021

1. Proposals and Justification

- 1.1 This report seeks approval and progression for schemes funded from BHF. The paper also requests one project change to an existing GBF contract to allow a small time extension. The paper requests delegated authority to enter into legal agreement.

The MCA received confirmation of £40.34m BHF award in December 2020 with the aim of creating more homes by bringing more brownfield land into development. The Fund aims to ease viability issues that brownfield projects face alongside wider interventions aimed at economic development. There is a target of £20m spend to be achieved by March 31st 2022.

- 1.2 In 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 which allows an 18-month delivery window.

1.3 Progression of activity to full approval and award of funding

This paper is seeking full approval and award of £0.25m funding for the BHF Revenue project. The funding aims to provide an extension of the ‘critical friend’ business case resource offered previously to scheme promoters, provide targeted support to LA (Local Authority) partners to identify the most viable/deliverable schemes in the town centres and create an 18-month internal capacity post within the SCC Housing Regeneration team to develop business cases for strategic brownfield land schemes. This revenue funding is complementary to the £40m BHF Capital Fund in that it will support the development of existing and new BHF capital

schemes. The activity will be delivered through SYMCA and local authority partners.

The project will deliver additional capacity support to LA Housing teams. It will validate the projects within Phase 3 of the Housing Fund pipeline and help develop better quality business plans for future BHF delivery. On this basis the project is anticipated to deliver value for money.

The project is recommended for approval and award of £0.25m grant.

1.4 Progression of schemes to from OBC to FBC

The paper is seeking progression from OBC to FBC for five projects which are detailed in Appendices A to E. The total amount of funding being brought forward in these projects is £11.14m BHF grant. Three schemes are based in Doncaster and two in Sheffield. The assurance summaries include some conditions which may need to be met prior to completion of an FBC.

Full details of the schemes and risks are included in Appendices A to E.

All projects are recommended to be progressed to develop an FBC. One project, 'Park Hill' is requesting £5.61m and will therefore go onward to the MCA with this Board's recommendation on whether to progress.

1.5 Project Change Requests

In recognition of unforeseen circumstances that can arise during the project delivery phase, the approved Assurance Framework establishes a formal process for the acceptance of change requests. The Barnsley College is requesting a change to their agreement for the Digital Sci-Tech Building project. The project is building new reception area and learning space at the Old Mill Lane site in Barnsley to better link with the workspace available at the adjoining Digital Media Centre. The project has experienced some delays during preparatory works and site investigations and as a result they request an additional five months to deliver the project, with a revised completion date of 4th of February 2022. The additional time requested still enables the project to complete within the GBF timescales.

The change is recommended for approval.

2.1 Do not approve the recommendations in this report.

2.2 **Option 1 Risks and Mitigations**

Inability to approve the projects presented may result in a slower pace of delivery and loss of activity/spend within the funding programmes.

2.3 **Option 2**

Award projects a smaller amount of grant funding.

2.4 **Option 2 Risks and Mitigations**

All funding awards associated with the projects have been fully appraised in line with the MCA Assurance Framework to ensure value for money. Any projects approved to develop FBC's will have their costs and funding tested on submission

of their FBC. Funding for these projects is timebound by the funding bodies and any reductions is likely to cause deliverability issues for the projects.

2.5 **Option 3**

Approve all recommendations

2.6 **Option 3 Risks and Mitigations**

By approving the recommendations, the available programme funding will reduce. The BHF approvals will mean that £15m worth of projects will be either developing FBCs or approved against the £20m spend target.

2.7 **Recommended Option**

Option 3

3. **Consultation on Proposal**

3.1 Project sponsors are 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.

4. **Timetable and Accountability for Implementing this Decision**

4.1 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.

4.2 The promoter is responsible for the further development of projects that have gateway approval to the next stage of the MCA Assurance process

5. **Financial and Procurement Implications and Advice**

5.1 In addition to the already approved BHF capital projects, the capital projects presented for approval today are profiled to drawdown up to £15m from the BHF allocation of £40.34m.

The £0.25m revenue funding request will mean that the full £0.84m BHF revenue allocation has been utilised.

6. **Legal Implications and Advice**

6.1 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.

6.2 Prior to awarding the grants, the MCA shall ensure contracts are put in place to ensure the recipients comply with the grant conditions

7. **Human Resources Implications and Advice**

7.1 N/A

8. **Equality and Diversity Implications and Advice**

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

9. Climate Change Implications and Advice

9.1 A number of the programmes include new and/or enhanced energy efficiency measures. This aims to deliver huge benefits for emissions, positively contributing to the MCA's climate change aspirations.

10. Information and Communication Technology Implications and Advice

10.1 N/A

11. Communications and Marketing Implications and Advice

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

List of Appendices Included*

- A Assurance Summary - Adwick Depot
- B Assurance Summary – Attercliffe Waterside
- C Assurance Summary – Park Hill Phase 4
- D Assurance Summary – Nightingale School
- E Assurance Summary – Small Sites

Background Papers

None

This page is intentionally left blank

Assurance Panel Summary



Scheme Details

Project Name	Adwick Depot	Type of funding	Grant
Grant Recipient	Doncaster Council	Total Scheme Cost	£7.17m
MCA Executive Board	Housing & Infrastructure	MCA Funding	£1.2m
Programme name	Brownfield Housing Fund	% MCA Allocation	16.7%

Appraisal Summary

Project Description

This £7.17m project will see Doncaster Council directly deliver 35 new high-quality, environmentally friendly and affordable homes on a site they will retain ownership of as a part of their social housing portfolio, bringing back 0.14 ha of green space into public use. The works will begin in June 2022 and be completed in Autumn 2023.

The OBC is clear in setting out that a total of £1.2m of MCA funding is required to bridge a viability gap. In addition to the Brownfield Housing Fund, other public funds will be used (subject to confirmation) including £970,000 of HRA funding and £1,230,000 from Homes England Shared Ownership Affordable Housing Programme (SOAHP). The OBC specifically states that MCA funding will contribute to the project achieving low carbon standards, including PV panels, EV charging point, air source heat pumps (no gas), high thermal performance, and an upgrade of an existing electricity sub-station to service the site. In addition to the high energy performance of the homes, MCA funding will also contribute to the costs of preparing the derelict brownfield site. Specific items to be funded include increased costs from conserving historic buildings, ground contamination and drainage attenuation.

Strategic Case

Options assessment

The OBC sets out three options: Do minimum, viable alternative option 1, and the preferred option. The preferred option has been selected as it meets all the SMART objectives. Specifically, it delivers much needed affordable housing, improves the quality of the housing stock, reduces fuel poverty and increases residents' health and well-being. The assessors view is that the preferred option has the best strategic fit with the councils' objectives and the other options have been discounted for legitimate reasons.

Statutory requirements and adverse consequences

The OBC states that the Council will submit a planning application for the project in October 2021 and expect a decision by the end of January 2022. The planning application will include stakeholder consultation engagement, transport and environmental assessments to ensure the project is compliant with policy and statutory plans (the site is allocated within the Doncaster Local Plan 2015-31). Due to the small number of units proposed, the project is below the threshold for a Traffic Impact Assessment. The assessors note that detailed design work is due to be completed by 30th September 2021 with a planning application submitted by 15th October 2021 and a decision expected in January 2022. MCA funding is estimated to be secured by 31st March 2022 preferably with planning approval secured.

The OBC states that a full Environmental Impact Assessment will be produced and submitted as part of the planning application process which will include a Biodiversity net gain consideration.

The OBC states that initial environment impact assessment has been carried out. The findings illustrate the positive impacts of developing brownfield land such as reducing the amount of greenfield land required to deliver the housing need, reduction of lifetime carbon due to the energy-efficient specification and delivering and maintaining 0.14 ha of public space. However, the OBC states that

there will be short-term negative environmental impact from development due to the resourcing and manufacturing of construction materials.

Value for Money

The economic dimension includes a series of monetised benefits to determine BCRs alongside non-monetised outcomes. For the preferred option the following have been considered:

1. An initial BCR – including direct Land Value Uplift (LVU), indirect spillover LVU, and carbon savings. This BCR has been calculated against the MCA BHF funding only, not all public funds.
2. An adjusted BCR – in addition to the initial BCR health benefits and societal fuel benefits have been added. Again this BCR has been calculated against the MCA BHF funding only, not all public funds.
3. An adjusted BCR – the same benefits have been included as number 2 above but this BCR has been calculated against all public sector funds.

The results of the BCR calculations for the preferred option is as follows:

1. Initial BCR: 2.45
2. Adjusted BCR: 3.11
3. An adjusted BCR (against all public sector funding): 0.84

BCR calculations against MCA funding have a BCR of greater than 1 and therefore provide acceptable value for money.

Risk

There are a series of risks identified in the OBC. The major risks identified include MCA funding not being approved, tender return prices higher than expected due to construction prices inflation, Historic England requirements to preserve elements of the heritage buildings, increased electricity demand requiring a sub-station upgrade, design changes resulting from consultations. All risks have been scored identifying the highest risk in terms of likelihood and impact. For each the OBC also identifies how the risk is to be mitigated and the individual owner. It is considered both the short list and full matrix of identified risks are reasonable. All scoring has been undertaken accurately and it is felt the quantitative conclusions represent the risks effectively.

The MCA should ensure that if procurement is not complete prior to FBC stage, then a funding condition is put in place to cap the tender return price at or less than a fixed price to ensure the cost of the scheme is not significantly greater than what was approved by the MCA.

The OBC states that there are no funding risks associated with the scheme. In addition to the MCA funding, the project has secured funding through the Council's Housing Revenue Account (HRA). The Council will apply for £35,000 per dwelling from Homes England SOAHP. The Homes England funding requires planning approval which presents a risk. Furthermore, Section 6.1 - key milestones shows Homes England SOAHP funding secured on 31st October 2021 when planning is estimated to be secured by 31st January 2022. The assessors recommend that securing Home England SOAHP funding should be moved to after planning approval given the dependency relating to funding approval. The OBC states that if Homes England SOAHP funding is not secured, the Council will meet the shortfall of funding through the HRA.

The envisaged scheme will be delivered by a main contractor who will enter a fixed-price contract with the Council. There are potential risks regarding selecting a main contractor that enters financial difficulty once appointed. Appropriate due diligence checks should be completed prior to the award to ensure the main contractor has a good financial standing. Further management controls could be introduced to regularly monitor the financial position of the contractor during the term of the contract along with regular updates as per contractual arrangements.

Delivery

Overall, the timetable for delivery is considered reasonable. Currently, procurement completion and securing MCA BHF funding both takes place on 31st March 2022. It is recommended that securing Home England SOAHP funding should be moved to after planning approval given the dependency relating to funding approval. The milestones also include evaluation reports in the middle of the works on 31st March 2023 and 3 months after completion on the 31st March 2024. It is deemed that the preference would be at FBC stage that there is known costs and procurement certainty with a main contractor secured. If timing is an issue and procurement is not completed before a decision then it is reasonable to put a condition on the funding. The condition should only approve funding if the contractor's tender price return is at or below a capped price to avoid significant cost increases that could affect the deliverability of the scheme.

The OBC states the procurement process is expected to start in October 2021 through a construction framework, with procurement of the main contractor complete by the end of March 2022.

Development costs are estimated at 75% certainty. The final level of contingency will be set with the contractor during the finalisation of the fixed price construction contract. The Council will accept responsibility for cost over-runs associated with any risks that are excluded from the construction contract.

A clear governance structure has been included from the Project Manager (main contractor that is yet to be appointed) to the Doncaster Council Cabinet. The OBC has not been signed by the identified SRO.

The OBC states that during the development of the strategy and build programme key stakeholder were consulted, including internal partners from education, leisure and highways, external public sector partners including health, local registered housing providers and St Ledger Homes of Doncaster (ALMO). Detailed public consultation will take place as part of the planning application process which will be in October 2021 in line with the Council's Site Development Proposals Consultation Protocol.

The OBC 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 main contractor to ensure that timescales, budgets, outputs/outcomes are all being met. An employers agent will be appointed to support the HMP ensuring that the build is a fair reflection of the costs involved. The main contractor must update social value outcomes progress monthly. Doncaster Council's 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. The evaluation will comprise of a mid-stage and end of project review. Additionally, if Homes England funding is secured, Homes England will require quarterly updates on scheme progress and completions per annum.

Legal

The OBC states that subsidy control 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	Proceed to FBC
Payment Basis	
Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)	
Submission deadline for the FBC of the 29 th of November 2021.	

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					
		Date:			

This page is intentionally left blank



Assurance Panel Summary

Scheme Details

Project Name	Attercliffe Waterside	Type of funding	Grant
Grant Recipient	Sheffield City Council	Total Scheme Cost	£137.7m
MCA Executive Board	Housing & Infrastructure	MCA Funding	£1.87m
Programme name	Brownfield Housing Fund	% MCA Allocation	1.4%

Appraisal Summary

Project Description

Attercliffe Waterside lies within the Advanced Manufacturing Innovation District between Sheffield City Centre and the M1 motorway. The vision for the site is to create a new neighbourhood of low-carbon homes aimed at skilled young workers and their families. This development builds on the success and momentum of the Sheffield Olympic Legacy Park, AMID and growth of investment and employment in the wider Lower Don Valley and should help change perceptions and drive the regeneration of Attercliffe and surrounding communities. Development of this large site will:

- Connect disparate land ownerships to bring forward a site of sufficient scale to drive regeneration and to create a 'neighbourhood' identity and sense of place.
- Deliver 750 innovative, high quality, ultra-low carbon and energy efficient 'eco homes' within a high quality environment with landscaped and communal areas using Modern Methods of Construction (MMC) with homes constructed off site.
- Refurbish character buildings on the canalside.
- 40,000sq ft of employment floorspace.
- 26,200sq m of new and improved public realm/open space together with 14,750sq m of amenity space in the retention of existing wooded areas.
- Improve pedestrian connectivity and permeability through what is currently a largely vacant site to and from Attercliffe high street and Supertram and the Darnall neighbourhood.

MCA funding will be used to acquire the land required for Phase 1 of the proposed development scheme to unlock a wider scheme which will deliver the full range of benefits set out in the OBC.

The land is to be acquired at its existing use value, which is evidenced by an independent valuation report prepared by SMC (which the assessors have not seen). This phase comprises a group of existing industrial buildings of 'considerable character' which are to be refurbished, but which have a value greater than the development value of the site. This viability challenge has led to delays with the development scheme not coming forward due to market failure. The application argues that MCA funding is required to allow Sheffield City Council to intervene and acquire the land with onward disposal to the Council's development partner, Citu, at a commercially viable price. This will allow the private sector to acquire the site on commercially acceptable terms and develop out the site, contributing to place making and raising residential values in a challenging location for residential viability and make the remaining phases commercially viable for the private sector to deliver.

Strategic Case

Options assessment

Overall, the rationale for the selection of short-listed options is inadequate as the only realistic viable options for intervention considered are the preferred option and the 'do nothing/do minimum option'. The options assessment will require further consideration to make the case for intervention more robust. It is recommended that the applicant considers a long list of potential interventions and from these considers two alternative options for intervention at the site that are viable and have a realistic alternative set of outcomes that can be

	<p>modelled. Potential shortlisted and longlisted options could include: delivery arrangements such as SCC acquisition of all land for all phases; larger public sector contribution to site remediation, infrastructure and de-risking; public sector contribution to bring forward reduced high-quality housing on part of the site or alternative development use mixes could be reasonable alternative options. A revised OBC which sets these out clearly will be required</p>
<p><i>Statutory requirements and adverse consequences</i></p>	<p>The site is the subject of an Informal Planning Advisory Notice prepared by the LPA in 2019 which accepts potential uses as residential, shops, small-scale offices, R&D, Light industrial, residential institutions and hotels. The IPAN highlights the need for a bat survey, further archaeological survey work, a heritage statement addressing the listed structures on the site, a land contamination study, noise survey, further consultation with the Canal and River Trust with regard to mitigation to the canal infrastructure, along with a number of other requirements. It is assumed that these have been progressed.</p> <p>Following responses to clarification questions put by the assessors to the applicant, it is understood that there have been three positive pre-application meetings between the appointed development partner and the LPA and that a planning application will be submitted once the development agreement between SCC and the development partner is exchanged.</p> <p>The OBC states that there are likely to be no adverse economic or social disbenefits in delivering the project but that there is potentially an issue with disruption to the existing businesses that occupy a small part of the site, affecting not more than 20 jobs at businesses in Phase 1 and a further 10 jobs on Phase 2. The applicant has said this adverse consequence will be mitigated through seeking to relocate the existing businesses to minimise disruption though it is recognised this cannot be fully guaranteed.</p>
<p><i>FBC stage only – Confirmation of alignment with agreed MCA outcomes (Stronger, Greener, Fairer).</i></p>	<p>The project aligns well with the objectives and desired outcomes of the SEP and REP and contributes across all three Strategic Outcomes: Stronger, Greener, Fairer.</p>
<p>Value for Money</p>	
<p>The economic dimension includes a series of monetised benefits to determine BCRs alongside non-monetised outcomes. For the preferred option the following have been considered:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. An initial BCR – including direct Land Value Uplift (LVU), indirect spillover LVU, and carbon savings. This BCR has been calculated against the MCA BHF funding only, not all public funds. 2. An adjusted BCR – in addition to the initial BCR health benefits and societal fuel benefits have been added. Again this BCR has been calculated against the MCA BHF funding only, not all public funds. 3. An adjusted BCR – the same benefits have been included as number 2 above but this BCR has been calculated against all public sector funds. <p>The results of the BCR calculations for the preferred option is as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Initial BCR: 4.36 2. Adjusted BCR: 7.93 3. An adjusted BCR (against all public sector funding): 3.8 <p>All BCR figures calculated and reported in the BCR are over 1 and therefore represent good value for money.</p>	
<p>Risk</p>	

There are a series of risks identified in the OBC in section 6.6 with a full matrix included as part of A.3. The major risks identified include MCA funding not being approved, achieved sales values being lower in phases 2 and 3 than being anticipated therefore challenging commercial viability, Covid 19 impacts, higher than expected abnormal costs, landowners not agreeing to sell the land, relocation of existing businesses leading to delays in start on site, supply chain difficulties resulting from Brexit, cost overruns, planning and governance delays. All risks have been scored identifying the highest risk in terms of likelihood and impact, risk owner and proposed mitigation. The short list and full matrix of identified risks appear are reasonable. All scoring appears to be reasonable and it is felt the quantitative conclusions represent the risks effectively.

The delivery of the scheme by the private sector is dependent on the continued commercial viability of the proposed scheme. All development funding beyond the initial MCA grant to unlock the land and the sum to be recycled by the Council back into the project from the revenues gained through disposing of the acquired land to the selected developer, is to be provided by the developer on a commercial basis with no further public sector funding anticipated. The MCA will need to be satisfied that sufficient allowance for all commercial risks has been made in the developer's appraisals and that risk is minimised as far as reasonably possible

There is some risk surrounding the current absence of a finalised development agreement which it is understood will be completed simultaneously with all parties once the FBC has been approved. It is understood that this risk is being mitigated through continuous communication between the parties and agreement in principle has been achieved. There is also a risk to delivery arising out of the proposed intervention, which is its dependence on improved sales values and real costs matching cost assumptions in the existing appraisals to ensure the viability of the scheme. These appraisals have not been finalised, so it is currently unclear what contingencies have been allowed for i.e. cost fluctuations, unforeseen remediation works or market volatility. The assessors accept that the applicant is aware of these risks and working to mitigate them. It is acknowledged that detailed and robust appraisal of the scheme is currently being undertaken and financial appraisals will be made available to the MCA at FBC stage.

Delivery

Overall, the timetable for delivery is reasonable, but note that the land is to be acquired by the Council in December 2021, prior to final approval by the MCA of the FBC.

A developer, Citu, has been appointed following a marketing campaign and two-stage bidding process carried out by CBRE in 2019. The developer has agreed in principle to a draft development agreement and a tripartite agreement between existing landowners that covers how they will deal with the selected developer and distribute the proceeds from the phased land sale. Detailed comments on the development agreement from Citu are still outstanding, however. The assessors have no concerns surrounding the procurement strategy, though it should be noted that there is some risk around the current absence of full acceptance by the preferred bidder of a finalised development agreement. It is understood that the development agreement will be completed simultaneously with the development agreement being entered into with Citu, but that this will be in advance of final sign off and contracting with the MCA for the funding agreement.

The OBC states a level of certainty of 75% which is the minimum required at this stage. Financial appraisals have been prepared by the selected developer and are being analysed and these will provide greater financial certainty at FBC stage. The applicant states that there is no expectation that MCA will be responsible for cost overruns.

The OBC states that strategic and political responsibility for the development and delivery rests with Sheffield City Council's Interim Executive Director of Place who will be required to approve acceptance of the MCA funding, the purchase and subsequent sale of the site, the development agreement and the use of capital receipt of sale for infrastructure works. Operational delivery of the development is to be delegated to Sheffield's Head of Property and Regeneration, reporting to SCC's Housing Delivery Group. The Senior Responsible Officer for the project has been named but he has not been signed the submission.

The OBC states that public consultation will take place as part of the planning application process which will be in April 2022, but that the scheme is consistent with local planning policies which have been subject to public consultation.

Monitoring and evaluation is to be led by the SRO who will report to SCC's Housing Delivery Group and Capital Delivery Group and meet monthly with the private sector developer's Project Manager to monitor progress of the development, review and update the risk register and take necessary coercive actions to ensure the scheme will be

delivered on time, on budget and to the required quality standards. The OBC states that Citu will be responsible for reporting social value results with social value outcomes monitored through the Council's Social Value Portal. The costs of M&E are to be met by Sheffield City Council.

Legal

The applicant intends to take legal advice in relation to subsidy control at FBC stage and do not believe subsidy control rules to apply to this development and the MCA grant. However, the proposal in the preferred option of disposing of land acquired at market value from the private sector to a private sector developer at below market value needs to be considered by the applicant's legal advisors. Considering the acquisition is to take place before the MCA has approved the FBC, the applicant should provide further evidence of the advice they have received in relation to the legal position before FBC stage as this represents a significant delivery risk.

Recommendation and Conditions

Recommendation	Proceed to FBC, with conditions
Payment Basis	
Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)	
Submission deadline for the FBC of the 29 th of November 2021.	
A more complete options assessment should be submitted and agreed by SYMCA prior to developing the FBC. The template provided for an OBC document can be used to complete the options assessment.	

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:

This page is intentionally left blank



Assurance Panel Summary

Scheme Details

Project Name	Phase 4 Park Hill, Sheffield	Type of funding	Grant
Grant Recipient	Urban Splash (Park Hill) Limited	Total Scheme Cost	£26m
MCA Executive Board	Housing and Infrastructure	MCA Funding	£5.6m
Programme name	Brownfield Housing Fund	% MCA Allocation	21.6%

Appraisal Summary

Project Description

Phase 4 Park Hill is a residential led mixed-use re-development of a Grade II* listed structure. Phase 4 is part of a wider long-term regeneration of the Park Hill flats estate transforming 5 iconic brutalist buildings that have suffered decay and dereliction into high quality and sustainable homes and vibrant workspaces for people to live, work and play. By the end of 2021 phases 1 to 3 will complete including 455 mixed tenure homes (including 93 social rent, 114 open market rent and 248 open market sales), circa 55,000 sq ft of active commercial workspace and 356 student bedrooms. Phases 1 to 3 will attract an active community of 1,500 people living and working within Park Hill. Phase 4 brings forward a further 95 new homes and shell space for a new cultural hub for S1 Artspace.

The OBC is clear in setting out that the total funding required from the MCA is £5,610,344 to fund a scheme to refurbish an existing Grade II* listed structure. The project will deliver 95 homes including 19 affordable, a further eleven shell units to be fitted out as live/work units, and c29,000 sq ft of shell space to fit out as artists' studios, workspace and community / learning space, 80 car parking spaces and external landscaping. The funding from the MCA is to unlock the proposed scheme by addressing a funding gap created by the high costs of renovating a Grade II* listed building and make the proposed scheme financially viable. Section 2.3 outlines the specific cost items the MCA grant would support. The assessors have found that the OBC is clear in setting out what the funding should be used for.

Strategic Case

<i>Options assessment</i>	The OBC sets out four main options: Do minimum, viable alternative options 1 and 2, and the Preferred option. It is considered that the preferred option is the best fit with the applicant's strategic objectives and the other options have been discounted for legitimate reasons.
<i>Statutory requirements and adverse consequences</i>	The OBC states that a reserved matters planning application has been submitted with approval granted in August 2019 for Phase 4. This application includes the refurbishment of the building to provide 95 residential units, education space, artists' studios, flexible workspaces, live/work and heritage flats and an extension to form a new art gallery with ancillary facilities. The planning approval is subject to a set out outline and reserve matters planning conditions which will be discharged. The applicant has submitted a design and access statement along with other documents required for the statutory consultation process, including a transport statement. The assessors note that the planning application is being progressed but that there is some risk in the absence of approval of reserved matters, though outline planning consent has been approved.

The applicant has considered adverse consequences through a 'sustainability agenda' submitted as part of the outline planning consent and an ecology report submitted for the reserved matters planning application which both considered potential adverse consequences arising out of the proposed development scheme and found there to be none.

Value for Money

The economic dimension includes a series of monetised benefits to determine BCRs alongside nonmonetised outcomes. For the preferred option an initial BCR has been considered, including Land Value Uplift (LVU), wider Land Value Uplift, health benefits of affordable housing, crime cost savings, amenity benefits and distributional benefits.

Also an adjusted BCR has been calculated to take into account active mode transport benefits, labour supply benefits, productivity benefits, wellbeing from attending arts and cultural events and volunteering benefits, heritage benefits. However, the applicant considers the adjusted BCR likely to be an overestimate as the fit-out, staffing and other costs of the S1 Artspace are not factored in and are to be funded separately. The applicant therefore suggests that it is the initial BCR that is the most appropriate to consider when assessing the project's value for money.

Based on the more conservative initial BCR calculation, the project results in a BCR of 2 and therefore represents acceptable value for money.

Risk

The OBC identifies a series of risks in section 6.6 and details the approach to mitigation of these risks. Risks identified include risk of cost increases, risk of not securing debt funding, not agreeing legals with the S1 Artspace operator, commercial risk of slow sales and declining values, and risk of delays to the construction programme. All risks are owned by the developer and the assessors are satisfied that appropriate and proportionate mitigation measures are in place and that risks are being managed. All scoring appears to be reasonable and it is felt the quantitative conclusions represent the risks effectively.

A major delivery risk is the current absence of secured debt funding which the developer will require to deliver the scheme. It is recognised, however, that private sector lenders are unlikely to agree to an unviable scheme and that therefore the award of the requested grant from the MCA is crucial to rendering the scheme viable and able to attract debt funding. It is also noted that the applicant has an existing relationship with a potential funder which is currently providing a loan for Phase 2 of the same project and that the applicant is confident finance can be agreed on similar terms once the viability of the scheme can be demonstrated. The MCA may consider it appropriate to make the grant conditional on an 'agreement in principle' or an indication from potential private sector lenders of their willingness to provide the required finance if the grant is approved.

The OBC identifies that there is a risk with the use of a design & build contract that the client may have to pay more if the contractor takes on an unreasonably high level of risk due to a lack of design clarity, that the contractor may exploit specification that is open to interpretation to choose the cheapest route leading to quality being compromised, but indicates that these risks are to be mitigated. The assessors are satisfied that the developer and professional team are experienced in their approach to procurement, having successfully delivered phases 1-3.

Delivery

The applicant, Urban Splash is the developer of the scheme and will procure subcontractors through a 2 stage design & build contract. The main contractor is to be evaluated during Pre-Contract Service Agreement (PCSA) stage. The assessors are satisfied that the procurement strategy is clear and milestones are defined and reasonable

The OBC states a level of certainty of 75% which is the minimum level of certainty in relation to costs that is required at this stage. The applicant states there is no expectation the MCA will be liable for cost overruns which will be owned by the developer.

The OBC sets out clear project governance, outlining the governance structure for the project, stating that the developer is Urban Splash (Park Hill) Ltd which is a 50/50 joint venture partnership between Urban Splash and Places for People. The Development Manager is Urban Splash Developments. The Senior Responsible Owner and key contact for the contract with the MCA is named for Urban Splash Developments.

The OBC sets out the applicant's approach to monitoring and evaluation, stating that a key set of principles for the professional team to adhere to in ensuring the scheme captures the benefits, outcomes and outputs of the projects will be set out, and that these principles will be set out within the Employers Requirements for the construction contract. All benefits, outcomes and outputs will be set out in a tracker which will be used to monitor progress through the delivery of the scheme and this will be reviewed and updated with project meetings.

Legal

The applicant has received advice from lawyers DWF on subsidy control with their advice letter appended to the OBC. This advice indicates that the requested grant is likely to be compliant with emerging Subsidy Control regulations.

Recommendation and Conditions

Recommendation	Proceed to FBC
Payment Basis	
Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)	
Submission deadline for the FBC of the 29 th of November 2021.	



Assurance Panel Summary

Scheme Details

Project Name	Former Nightingale School, Balby, Doncaster	Type of funding	Grant
Grant Recipient	Doncaster Council	Total Scheme Cost	£9.59m
MCA Executive Board	Housing	MCA Funding	£1.57m
Programme name	Brownfield Housing Fund	% MCA Allocation	16.4%

Appraisal Summary

Project Description

The Former Nightingale School site is located in Balby, a suburb in the south-west of Doncaster on Cedar Road. The 1.64 ha site, a former school which closed in August 2003, was used as temporary accommodation for Doncaster's Regimental Museum up until 2019 and was cleared in early 2021.

The £9.59m project will deliver 51 new high-quality, environmentally friendly affordable homes and will be retained by Doncaster Council as a part of their social housing portfolio. Circa 0.36 Ha of green space will also be brought back into public use. The works will begin in June 2022 and be completed in Autumn 2023

The OBC is clear in setting out that a total of £1,570,000 is required to bridge a viability gap. In addition to the Brownfield Housing Fund, other public funds will be used (subject to confirmation) including £6,234,647 of HRA funding and £1,785,000 from Homes England Shared Ownership Affordable Housing Programme (SOAHP). The OBC specifically states that MCA funding will contribute to the project achieving low carbon standards, including PV panels, EV charging point, air source heat pumps (no gas), high thermal performance, and an upgrade of an existing electricity sub-station to service the site. In addition to the high energy performance of the homes, MCA funding will also contribute to the costs of preparing the derelict brownfield site. Specific items to be funded include increased costs site preparation – cut and fill, incoming services and abnormal costs.

Strategic Case

Options assessment

The OBC sets out three options: Do minimum, viable alternative option 1, and the preferred option.

The Do minimum option, to put the site on the open market as a housing development opportunity for the private sector, limiting the provision of affordable housing to no more than 15% (The Local Plan Requirement), was discounted for several reasons, including the fact that a private sector led scheme would not deliver the same amount, type and specification of affordable housing.

The alternative viable option was discounted on the basis that it did not deliver the homes to the same energy efficient standard when compared to the preferred option resulting in the project not contributing to the Council's climate policies and fuel poverty ambitions.

The preferred option has been selected as it meets all the SMART objectives. Specifically, it delivers much needed affordable housing, improves the quality of the housing stock, reduces fuel poverty and increases residents' health and well-being. The assessors view is that the preferred option has the best strategic fit with the councils' objectives and the other options have been discounted for legitimate reasons.

Statutory requirements and adverse consequences

The OBC states that the Council will submit a planning application for the project in October 2021 and expect a decision by the end of January 2022. The planning application will include stakeholder consultation engagement, transport and environmental assessments to

ensure the project is compliant with policy and statutory plans (the site is allocated within the Doncaster Local Plan 2015-31). Detailed design work is due to be completed by 30th September 2021 with a planning application submitted by 15th October 2021 and a decision expected in January 2022. MCA funding is estimated to be secured by 31st March 2022 preferably with planning approval secured.

A full Environmental Impact Assessment will be produced and submitted as part of the planning application process which will include a Biodiversity net gain consideration. The OBC states that initial an environment impact assessment has been carried out. The findings illustrate the positive impacts of developing brownfield land such as reducing the amount of greenfield land required to deliver the housing need, reduction of lifetime carbon due to the energy-efficient specification and delivering and maintaining 0.36ha of public space. However, there will be short-term negative environmental impact from development due to the resourcing and manufacturing of construction materials.

Value for Money

The economic dimension includes a series of monetised benefits to determine BCRs alongside non-monetised outcomes. For the preferred option the following have been considered:

1. An initial BCR – including direct Land Value Uplift (LVU), indirect spillover LVU, amenity benefits, and carbon savings. This BCR has been calculated against the MCA BHF funding only, not all public funds.
2. An adjusted BCR – in addition to the initial BCR health benefits and societal fuel benefits have been added. Again, this BCR has been calculated against the MCA BHF funding only, not all public funds.
3. An adjusted BCR – the same benefits have been included as number 2 above but this BCR has been calculated against all public sector funds.

The results of the BCR calculations for the preferred option is as follows:

1. An initial BCR – 2.81
2. An Adjusted BCR – 3.56
3. An Adjusted BCR (against all public funding) – 1.01

All BCR figures calculated and reported in the BCR are over 1 and therefore represent acceptable value for money.

Risk

The major risks identified include MCA funding not being approved, tender return prices higher than expected due to construction prices inflation, increased electricity demand requiring a sub-station upgrade, design changes resulting from consultations. All risks have been scored identifying the highest risk in terms of likelihood and impact. For each, the OBC also identifies how the risk is to be mitigated and the individual owner. All scoring has been undertaken accurately and it is felt the quantitative conclusions represent the risks effectively.

The MCA should ensure that if procurement is not complete prior to FBC stage, then a funding condition is put in place to cap the tender return price at or less than a fixed price to ensure the cost of the scheme is not significantly greater than what was approved by the MCA.

The OBC states that there are no funding risks associated with the scheme. In addition, to MCA funding, the project has secured funding through the Council's Housing Revenue Account (HRA). The Council will apply for £35,000 per dwelling from Homes England SOAHP. The Homes England funding requires planning approval which presents a risk. Furthermore, Section 6.1 - key milestones shows Homes England SOAHP funding secured on 31st October 2021 when planning is estimated to be secured by 31st January 2022. It is recommended that securing Home England SOAHP funding should be moved to after planning approval given the dependency relating to funding approval.

The OBC states that if Homes England SOAHP funding is not secured, the Council will meet the shortfall of funding through the HRA.

The envisaged scheme will be delivered by a main contractor who will enter a fixed-price contract with the Council. The main contractor is responsible for appointing the sub-contractor. The main contractors are required to undertake due diligence checks on sub-contractors. There are potential risks regarding selecting a main contractor that enters financial difficulty once appointed. Appropriate due diligence checks should be completed prior to the award to ensure the main contractor has a good financial standing. Further management controls could be introduced to regularly monitor the financial position of the contractor during the term of the contract along with regular updates as per contractual arrangements.

Delivery

Overall, the timetable for delivery is considered reasonable. The Council should confirm they have the capacity to achieve planning for this project alongside other commitments, given that DMBC are bringing forward a number of other sites with similar timescales. It is recommended that at FBC stage, there is known costs and procurement certainty with a main contractor secured. If timing is an issue and procurement is not completed before a decision, then it is considered reasonable to put a condition on any funding approval such that if the contractor's tender price return is at or below a capped level to avoid significant cost increases that could affect the deliverability of the scheme.

The OBC states the procurement process is expected to start in October 2021 through either a compliant procurement exercise in line with UK procurement legislation; or a mini competition via a compliant third-party framework agreement. The procurement process will consider cost, quality and social value. It is estimated that the procurement of the main contractor will be complete by the end of March 2022.

Development costs are estimated at 75% certainty. This is considered reasonable due to the developed nature of the project and extensive internal knowledge of the site. For the same reason, the contingency allowance of 2.5% is reasonable as site investigations are complete with abnormalities identified with a detailed cost plan. It is noted that the final contingency figure may change once a main contractor is appointed and should be in place at FBC stage. The OBC clearly states that cost overruns will be dealt with by the Council.

The OBC names the Housing Programme Manager (Doncaster Council) as the Senior Responsible Officer. A clear governance structure has been included from the Project Manager (main contractor that is yet to be appointed) to the Doncaster Council Cabinet.

The OBC states that key stakeholders were consulted including, internal partners from education, leisure and highways, external public sector partners including health, local registered housing providers and St Ledger Homes of Doncaster (ALMO). Detailed public consultation will take place as part of the planning application process, which will be in October 2021 in line with the Council's Site Development Proposals Consultation Protocol.

The OBC 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 main contractor 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 involved. The main contractor 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. The evaluation will comprise of a mid-stage and end of project review.

Legal

The OBC 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	Proceed to FBC
Payment Basis	
Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)	
<p>Recommendations at FBC stage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Submission deadline for the FBC of the 29th of November 2021.- If procurement is not complete prior to the FBC stage, then a funding condition is put in place to cap the tender return price at or less than a fixed price to ensure the cost of the scheme is not significantly greater than what was approved by the MCA.- The programme estimates that MCA funding will be approved 3 months after the planning decision has been made. While there is expected to be low planning risk for this project, no public consultations have taken place to date which may result in design changes and delay planning approval. As planning approval is a key dependency for project delivery, a funding condition should be in place to make funding dependent on planning given the risk.- It would be preferable to have procurement certainty in place in time for MCA funding at the FBC stage.- The BCR relating to MCA funding only should include optimum bias when undertaken at FBC stage- All benefits should be appraised over the same period i.e., 30 years at FBC stage	

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					
		Date:			

This page is intentionally left blank



Assurance Panel Summary

Scheme Details

Project Name	Doncaster Small Sites	Type of funding	Grant
Grant Recipient	Doncaster Council	Total Scheme Cost	£8.33m
MCA Executive Board	Housing and Infrastructure	MCA Funding	£0.89m
Programme name	BHF	% MCA Allocation	10.8%

Appraisal Summary

Project Description

Doncaster Council are applying for £890,000 from the Brownfield Housing Fund to enable the delivery of the £8.33m Small Sites Housing Project which will see the development of 42 new high-quality, environmentally friendly affordable homes across 5 small sites in Doncaster. Provisional site layouts for each of the schemes have been provided.

The houses will be retained by Doncaster Council as a part of their social housing portfolio. A summary of the housing delivered at each site is outlined below:

The homes will be in line with Doncaster Council's Low Carbon Living house type range. Consequently, the scheme will deliver homes that exceeds current environmental regulations and standards by incorporating PV roof panels, high levels of thermal insulation, EV charging points and air source heat pumps into the designs. The scheme also aims to avoid the need to supply the site with gas. All homes will be connected to fibre broadband.

The project will bring 5 underutilised brownfield sites back into productive use and contribute to addressing a shortage of affordable housing in Doncaster, which has resulted in the Council recently approving a 5-year Housing Delivery Plan (2020-2025) which aims to deliver 500 new affordable houses.

The OBC is clear in setting out that a total of £890,000 is required to bridge a viability gap. In addition to the Brownfield Housing Fund, other public funds will be used (subject to confirmation) including £5,967,430 of HRA funding and £1,470,000 from Homes England Shared Ownership Affordable Housing Programme (SOAHP). The OBC specifically states that MCA funding will contribute to the project achieving low carbon standards, including PV panels, EV charging point, air source heat pumps (no gas) and high thermal performance. In addition to the high energy performance of the homes, MCA funding will also contribute to the costs of preparing the derelict brownfield sites. Specific items to be funded include increased site preparation costs – cut and fill, incoming services and abnormal costs (include fencing to adjacent properties and reinstatement of car parking).

Overall, the assessors have found that the OBC is clear in setting out what the funding will be used for.

Strategic Case

<p><i>Options assessment</i></p>	<p><i>Is there a clear rationale for the selection of short-listed options and the choice of the Preferred Way Forward?</i></p> <p>The OBC sets out three options: Do minimum, viable alternative option 1, and the preferred option. The Do minimum option, to put the sites on the open market as a housing development opportunity for the private sector, limiting the provision of affordable housing to no more than 15% (The Local Plan Requirement) was discounted for several reasons. Firstly, there was no guarantee that the private sector would respond to this opportunity. The sites were included on a database of HRA sites that was shared with the Council's partner RPs but received no sustained interest. Additionally, the do minimum option was discounted because the private sector would not deliver the same quantity (100%) or quality of affordable housing as the preferred option due to their need to maintain target profit margins.</p> <p>As this is a key objective of the programme the assessors agree that the do minimum option has rightfully been discounted.</p> <p>Alternative viable option 1 is to bring back into productive use the vacant, brownfield sites by delivering the proposed 43 houses and 0.36 ha of public green space to a lower specification which excludes the environmental / energy efficient design features valued at £1,089,119. The assessors recommend adjusting the options analysis to show that the alternative viable option fully meets the objectives noted above. The only difference should be the reduced energy efficiency.</p> <p><i>The preferred option has been selected as it meets all the SMART objectives.</i> Specifically, it delivers much needed affordable housing, improves the quality of the housing stock, reduces fuel poverty and increases residents' health and well-being.</p> <p>The assessors view is that the preferred option has the best strategic fit with the councils' objectives and the other options have been discounted for legitimate reasons.</p>
<p><i>Statutory requirements and adverse consequences</i></p>	<p><i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i></p> <p>The assessors note that detailed design work is due to be completed by 30th September 2021 with a planning application submitted by 15th October 2021 with a decision expected in January 2022. MCA funding is estimated to be secured by 31st March 2022 preferably with planning approval secured. The planning application will include stakeholder consultation engagement, transport and environmental assessments to ensure the project is compliant with policy and statutory plans (the site is allocated within the Doncaster Local Plan 2015-31). The sites are under the threshold for a transport assessment.</p> <p><i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i></p> <p>The OBC also states that an initial environment impact assessment has been carried out. The findings illustrate the positive impacts of developing brownfield land such as reducing the amount of greenfield land required to deliver the housing need, reduction of lifetime carbon due to the energy-efficient specification and delivering and maintaining 0.34 ha of public space. However, there will be short-term negative environmental impact from development due to the resourcing and manufacturing of construction materials. A full Environmental Impact Assessment will be produced and submitted as part of the planning application process which will include a Biodiversity net gain consideration.</p> <p>No adverse consequences were found when social and economic impacts were assessed.</p> <p>The assessors accept that the applicant has considered the wider implications of the project, and although we have not had sight of the documents submitted in support of the applicant's planning applications, it is accepted that sufficient and proportionate consideration has been given.</p>

Value for Money

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

The economic dimension includes a series of monetised benefits to determine BCRs alongside non-monetised outcomes. For the preferred option the following have been considered:

1. An initial BCR – including direct Land Value Uplift (LVU), amenity benefits, and carbon savings. This BCR has been calculated against the MCA BHF funding only, not all public funds.
2. An adjusted BCR – in addition to the initial BCR health benefits and societal fuel benefits have been added. Again, this BCR has been calculated against the MCA BHF funding only, not all public funds.
3. An adjusted BCR – the same benefits have been included as number 2 above but this BCR has been calculated against all public sector funds.

The results of the BCR calculations for the preferred option is as follows:

1. An initial BCR – 2.66
2. An Adjusted BCR – 3.73
3. An Adjusted BCR (against all public funding) – 0.72

Based on MCA investment, the project has a BCR of greater than 1 and therefore provides acceptable value for money.

Risk

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

The major risks identified include MCA funding not being approved, tender return prices higher than expected due to construction prices inflation, design changes resulting from consultations. All have been scored identifying the highest risk in terms of likelihood and impact. For each, the OBC also identifies how the risk is to be mitigated and the individual owner.

The assessors have considered both the short list and full matrix of identified risks and believe that all are reasonable. All scoring has been undertaken accurately and it is felt the quantitative conclusions represent the risks effectively.

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

The assessors have not identified any significant risks while undertaking our assessment of the OBC. The MCA should ensure that there are contractual conditions in place in relation to any project underspend. The MCA should also ensure that if procurement is not complete prior to FBC stage, then a funding condition is put in place to cap the tender return price at or less than a fixed price to ensure the cost of the scheme is not significantly greater than what was approved by the MCA.

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

The OBC states that there are no funding risks associated with the scheme. In addition to the MCA funding, the project has secured funding through the Council's Housing Revenue Account (HRA). The Council will apply for £35,000 per dwelling from Homes England SOAHP. The Homes England funding requires planning approval which presents a risk. Furthermore, Section 6.1 - key milestones shows Homes England SOAHP funding secured on 31st October 2021 when planning is estimated to be secured by 31st January 2022. The assessors recommend that securing Home England SOAHP funding should be moved to after planning approval given the dependency relating to funding approval.

The OBC states that if Homes England SOAHP funding is not secured, the Council will meet the shortfall of funding through the HRA.

The assessors believe that the main risk regarding securing full funding for the project is the planning approval dependency associated with the Homes England SOAHP funding. Whilst the OBC states that there is low planning risk for this project, if there is a delay in planning approval, there will also be a delay in securing full funding. However, the OBC assures that if this funding is not available, the Council is able to meet the schemes full funding requirements through the HRA which mitigates this risk.

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

The envisaged scheme will be delivered by a main contractor who will enter a fixed-price contract with the Council. The main contractor is responsible for appointing the sub-contractor. The assessors understand that the main contractors are required to undertake due diligence checks on sub-contractors. There are potential risks regarding selecting a main contractor that enters financial difficulty once appointed. Appropriate due diligence checks should be completed prior to the award to ensure the main contractor has a good financial standing. Further management controls could be introduced to regularly monitor the financial position of the contractor during the term of the contract along with regular updates as per contractual arrangements.

Delivery

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

Overall, the assessors consider that the timetable for delivery is reasonable but note that currently, procurement completion and securing MCA BHF funding both takes place on 31st March 2022. The assessors recommend that securing Home England SOAHP funding should be moved to after planning approval given the dependency relating to funding approval.

The milestones also include evaluation reports in the middle of the works on 31st March 2023 and 3 months after completion on the 31st March 2024.

The assessors also note that alongside these 5 sites, the DMBC are bringing forward a number of other sites with similar timescales. For each of these, the Council is leading on achieving planning with internal resources. At FBC stage, the Council should confirm they have capacity to simultaneously achieve planning on all these separate schemes.

The assessors deem the majority of the delivery timetable reasonable. The Council should confirm they have the capacity to achieve planning for this project alongside other commitments. The assessors deem that the preference would be that at FBC stage, there is known costs and procurement certainty with a main contractor secured. If timing is an issue and procurement is not completed before a decision, then the assessors believe it is reasonable put a condition on the funding. The condition should only approve funding if the contractor's tender price return is at or below a capped price to avoid significant cost increases that could affect the deliverability of the scheme.

Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?

The OBC states the procurement process is expected to start in October 2021 through either a compliant procurement exercise in line with UK procurement legislation; or a mini competition via a compliant third-party framework agreement. The procurement process will consider cost, quality and social value. It is estimated that the procurement of the main contractor will be complete by the end of March 2022. The strategy aligns with Section 6.1 which lists the procurement strategy.

The assessors believe the procurement strategy is clear with defined milestones.

What is the level of cost certainty and is this sufficient at this stage of the assurance process? Has the promoter confirmed they will cover any cost overruns?

Development costs are estimated at 75% certainty. The fixed-price contract for the scheme includes a 2.5% contingency totalling £196,600. The assessors asked for justification regarding the 2.5% contingency as we consider it to be low when the procurement strategy has not commenced, and the scheme has not progressed through planning. In response to our clarification question, the applicant agreed it appeared to be low but is appropriate for several reasons; site investigations are complete; the cost plan includes £172,000 of abnormal costs which relate to the drainage, sub-station, service diversions, additional demolition / site clearance / asbestos removal and retaining walls; standard house type designs allow for the Council to be accurate with cost estimates. Additionally, the final level of contingency will be set with the contractor during the finalisation of the fixed price construction contract.

The Council will accept responsibility for cost over-runs associated with any risks that are excluded from the construction contract.

The assessors agree with the stated level of certainty of 75% due to the developed nature of the project and extensive internal knowledge of the site. For the same reason the contingency allowance of 2.5% is reasonable as site investigations are complete with abnormals identified with a detailed cost plan. The assessors note that the final contingency figure may change once a main contractor is appointed and should be in place at FBC stage. The OBC clearly states that cost overruns will be dealt with by the Council.

Has the promoter demonstrated clear project governance and identified the SRO? Has the SRO or other appropriate Officer signed of this business case?

The OBC names the Housing Programme Manager (Doncaster Council) as the Senior Responsible Officer and contact details have been provided. A clear governance structure has been included from the Project Manager (main contractor that is yet to be appointed) to the Doncaster Council Cabinet. The OBC has not been signed by the identified SRO but by the Director of Economy and Environment (Doncaster Council) and the Assistant Director of Finance (Section 151) (Doncaster Council).

The assessors are satisfied that a clear governance structure has been put in place to manage the project along with an identified SRO.

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

The OBC states that during the development of the strategy and build programme the following key stakeholder were consulted:

- internal partners from education, leisure and highways
- external public sector partners including health, local registered housing providers
- St Ledger Homes of Doncaster (ALMO)

However, the OBC states that there is good local support for the development without providing clear evidence of support.

The assessors note that detailed public consultation will take place as part of the planning application process which will be in October 2021 in line with the Council's Site Development Proposals Consultation Protocol. The following stakeholders will be consulted:

- Tenants and residents living in the vicinity of the development.
- Businesses, institutions or owners of land within the vicinity of the development.
- Elected Members for the relevant ward.
- St Leger Homes of Doncaster.
- Doncaster Council Neighbourhood Management / Area Management.
- Local tenant representatives.

Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?

The OBC 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 main contractor to ensure that timescales, budgets, outputs/outcomes are all being met. An employers agent will be appointed to support the HMP ensuring that the build is a fair reflection of the costs involved. The main contractor 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. The evaluation will comprise of a mid-stage and end of project review.

Additionally, if Homes England funding is secured, Homes England will require quarterly updates on scheme progress and completions per annum.

The assessors view the monitoring and evaluation procedures set out in the OBC in relation to the programme as proportionate and clear.

Legal

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

The OBC 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.

The OBC provides considered reasons as to why all the projects will comply with subsidy control however the assessors cannot provide legal advice as to whether these reasons satisfy subsidy control regulation.

Recommendation and Conditions

Recommendation	Proceed to FBC
Payment Basis	
Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)	
<p>Recommendations at FBC stage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Submission deadline for the FBC of the 29th of November 2021. - If procurement is not complete prior to the FBC stage, then a funding condition is put in place to cap the tender return price at or less than a fixed price to ensure the cost of the scheme is not significantly greater than what was approved by the MCA. - The programme estimates that MCA funding will be approved 3 months after the planning decision has been made. While there is expected to be low planning risk for this project, no public consultations have taken place to date which may result in design changes and delay planning approval. As planning approval is a key dependency for project delivery, a funding condition should be in place to make funding dependent on planning given the risk. - It would be preferable to have procurement certainty in place in time for MCA funding at the FBC stage. 	

- The BCR relating to MCA funding only should include optimum bias when undertaken at FBC stage
- All benefits should be appraised over the same period i.e., 30 years at FBC stage

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:



Housing and Infrastructure Board

26 October 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 the South Yorkshire Flood Catchment Plan and seeks views on the Draft 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 Draft 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 Presentations have been given at previous Board meetings on the Catchment Plan preparation, which has culminated in the attached Draft Catchment Plan for the Board's consideration.

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 Draft Catchment Plan (attached at Appendix A) outlines 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 The Catchment Plan is arranged around the following four Key Workstreams which have been 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.
 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 to work together more effectively on an operational basis
 4. Community engagement and resilience

2.4 The intention is to finalise the Draft Plan during November taking into account the comments of this Board, members of the South Yorkshire Flood Risk Partnership and wider stakeholders. The final Draft Plan is proposed to be presented to the next meeting of this Board for endorsement with a view to launch the Plan early in the New Year.

2.5 The Board's comments are invited on the Draft Catchment Plan.

3. Options Considered and Recommended Proposal

3.1 Option 1

To continue to support preparation of the South Yorkshire Flood Catchment Plan, subject to any comments and suggested improvements.

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 other 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 complex and difficult to understand at a strategic whole catchment wide scale. To minimise this risk, flood risk management specialists from a range of organisations have been engaged, as well as other key community stakeholders.
- That there is insufficient public and private funding and investment available to implement the Catchment Plan in a timely manner. To minimise this risk, work is underway to consider potential resourcing issues to deliver the Plan, 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 emerging Draft 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 an unco-ordinated way.

3.5 Recommended Option

Option 1 is recommended 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. It is intended to present the draft Catchment Plan to the MCA in early 2022 for 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. A Draft final Catchment Plan is anticipated to be presented to the next Board meeting in December 2021.

6. Financial and Procurement Implications and Advice

- 6.1 The Environment Agency is providing lead resources for preparing the Catchment Plan, with the MCA Executive and other partners providing in-kind support to the process. Additional resource is expected to further develop the Catchment Plan and support implementation in 2022/23. 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 Communication on DEFRA Grant in Aid funding is managed by the Environment Agency, with work by Local Authorities to communicate directly with impacted communities on individual schemes. It is intended to launch the Plan early in the New Year which will involve the MCA Executive Communications Team.

List of Appendices Included

- A Draft South Yorkshire Catchment Plan

Background Documents

None

Connected by Water Catchment Plan (Name TBC)

FRONT PAGE – Connected by Water Logo, plus strapline, plus all organisations logos (EA, SYMCA, 4 Councils, YW).

Insert a range of photos from around South Yorkshire

ADD CONTENTS PAGE

DRAFT

Why is a plan needed?

The flooding in November 2019 provided the catalyst for the creation of the Connected by Water Catchment Plan. One of the wettest Autumns on record led to unprecedented river levels, and widespread flooding across South Yorkshire. Communities were evacuated from their homes, precious belongings destroyed or ruined, businesses devastated, infrastructure severely disrupted and people unable to return to their homes for many months. As the flood water subsided, communities, businesses and senior leaders resolutely agreed that we need to work together to reduce the risk and impact of flooding in our region.

However, the stark reality is that climate change is leading to wetter winters with more intense rainfall. It will also lead to sea level rise. Both factors will increase the risk of flooding from the rivers, surface water and the public sewer network across South Yorkshire. **If we are to meet this challenge, and reduce both the risk and impact of flooding in the future, we cannot stand still.** Unless we do more, our communities will struggle to cope with the increasingly catastrophic impacts of more frequent and severe floods.

The region was devastated by flooding back in 2007, and much work has been done since then to better protect communities across South Yorkshire. However, the shock of the events of 2019, together with the stark reality of climate change, have galvanised a South Yorkshire wide alliance of partners, Connected by Water, who are determined to explore all measures to both adapt to and mitigate climate change in our region. Since November 2019, we have been working together, not only to deliver flood risk management schemes on the ground, but also to plan catchment wide measures for the future to help us meet the challenges that climate change will present us.

This plan is one of the products of this collaboration.

The Connected by Water Catchment Plan outlines the actions we will take in South Yorkshire to reduce the risk of flooding and develop more resilient communities who can adapt to the future impacts of climate change.

The landscapes and rivers which make South Yorkshire vulnerable to flooding, are also one of its most precious assets. South Yorkshire covers largely the same geography as the catchment for the River Don. The uplands of the River Porter, Rivelin, Loxley in Sheffield, and in the River Dearne in Barnsley, give us beautiful moorland landscapes. These uplands lead into wetland nature reserves along the Dearne and Rother in Barnsley and Rotherham and on to nationally significant lowland peat around the Lower Don in Doncaster.

Add map / image / artwork of area plan covers – could also be on inside of front cover potentially?

There is exciting potential to restore and develop these natural landscapes to slow and store water, help nature recover, and provide wildlife-rich environments for people to thrive in.

Nature-based solutions form a key element of this catchment plan. These measures will not only reduce flood risk, but will mitigate climate change and restore nature by storing carbon and protecting the environment that we all love and depend on.

This plan is a 'living plan'. We do not know all the answers. This plan is just the start. We will continue to incorporate emerging data, knowledge and opportunities so that we build and shape the plan in the coming months and years. It will evolve and change as we find out more and develop actions as a partnership.

This plan is a 'shop window' for showing the actions partners are currently taking to reduce flood risk and build climate resilience across South Yorkshire. This will provide visibility of the projects we are doing to support better collaboration, provide a compelling programme to attract potential investors and give communities confidence that work is happening in their area.

Why invest in reducing flood risk?

The impact of flooding is far reaching. Flooding can cause serious injury and loss of life. It leads to long term misery for those whose homes have flooded, severely affecting mental health and wellbeing. Flooding also disrupts businesses, transport infrastructure, utilities, workplaces and public services (including health care, emergency services, social care and schools). The risk of flooding can also prevent economic regeneration, stop new housing being built, cause businesses to close and result in people losing their jobs. For every one person whose home is flooded, sixteen further people are impacted.

Investing in flood risk management therefore provides numerous benefits. If you are an investor looking to support economic growth, business resilience, transport infrastructure, housing development, mental health and wellbeing, protecting and creating jobs...then investing in flood risk management supports all these and more.

Moreover, by using nature-based solutions as part of our approach to reduce flood risk, investment can also unlock further benefits in terms of carbon reduction, environmental improvements and re-connecting with nature.

For **every £1 spent** on protecting communities, we **avoid around £5** in property damages.

An overview of the South Yorkshire Flood Risk Management Investment Programme is provided in Appendix 1.

Successful project delivery case studies:

The partners leading South Yorkshire's response to flood risk are experienced and successful in delivering flood risk management schemes. Below are some examples of the projects which have recently been completed in South Yorkshire. In addition to these, in response to the 2019 floods, we collectively delivered over £20 million of flood repair works, from clearing drains to repairing flood walls, across South Yorkshire.

Case Study 1: Post 2019 South Yorkshire Flooding: Recovery and Investment

A. Fishlake, Doncaster: Investment to better protect 300 homes

Following the devastating impact of the 2019 flood, the flood defences in Fishlake were subject to a £3 million programme of recovery works. These works were completed in June 2021 and included including strengthening embankments and improving the condition of existing defences. With much of the work being carried out during the COVID 19 pandemic, a key part of the successful delivery of the works was the proactive use of different methods of communication between the contractors, the Environment Agency and the local community. Examples include regular attendance at the online Fishlake Parish Council and Flood Action Group meetings and the sending out of regular newsletters, which enabled key information and any questions/queries to be shared and dealt with on a timely basis. Overall, this investment will help to improve and sustain the future performance and condition of critical flood defences for the area.

Insert Fishlake Chinook photo.

B. Bentley Ings Pumping Station, Doncaster: Investment to better protect 1,669 homes

Bentley Ings Pumping Station was built in the early 1940s to manage surface water as a result of mining subsidence. It is a key flood defence which protects 1,669 local properties from surface water flooding. Following the completion of an £12 million refurbishment scheme in 2021, the Bentley Ings Pumping station has been totally transformed. The capacity of the pumping station has been increased by 20%, achieving a carbon saving of 24%. The site has now become significantly more flood resilient, allowing access to the site and the pumps to continue operating during flood events.

Insert BIPS Photo

Case Study 2: Rotherham Renaissance Flood Alleviation Scheme

When complete, the Rotherham Renaissance Flood Alleviation Scheme will extend along 5km of the River Don through Templeborough, Rotherham Town Centre and Parkgate. The Templeborough phase of the scheme was completed in 2008, at a cost of £15.7million. Between 2009 and 2011, £1.3 million was spent on the Rotherham Town Centre phase. Work continues on the Rotherham Town Centre phase, with construction ongoing currently at several sites. The initial phases of the scheme have provided the catalyst for this ongoing work and the future Parkgate phase.

To date, the scheme has reduced the risk of flooding to over 100 businesses, it has improved key employment areas in Rotherham through securing existing jobs and creating new ones and it has reduced the flood risk to key roads and the rail network in Rotherham.

Insert Forge Island Photo to show what the next phase will protect against or photo of completed works

Case Study 3: Sheffield Lower Don Valley Flood Alleviation Scheme

Completed in 2017, this £20 million scheme on the River Don in Sheffield better protects over 300 business, securing approximately 5,000 jobs. The scheme has been designed to allow for the provision of climate adaptation in the future.

The scheme was innovative both in its use of a Business Improvement District (BID) and in the use of a social enterprise, the River Stewardship Company, to provide channel maintenance and engage with volunteers to support river maintenance and riverside enhancement. Environmental enhancements delivered by the scheme include the installation of a fish pass at Sanderson's Weir on the River Don.

Insert Jessops photo

New project case studies

The partners at the forefront of the Connected by Water alliance have developed new, innovative actions as part of the plan. These are a couple of examples of the joint proposals which have emerged from this collaborate approach:

Case Study 5: Source to Sea – Nature Based Solutions Programme

We are collaboratively developing a multimillion-pound Source to Sea nature based solutions programme. This programme is split into three projects, the Upper Don (Peak District National Park and Sheffield), Middle Don (North East Derbyshire, Rotherham and Barnsley) and the Lower Don (Doncaster). Each of these projects will build upon existing

projects, partnerships, local strategies and initiatives to implement a variety of nature based solutions to slow the flow and create more space for water.

The Upper Don project is the first of these three projects being developed, primarily focusing on slowing the flow and storing water in Sheffield's hills. We are currently developing a series of demonstrator sites in the Limb Valley, Upper Don Valley and the Peak District, considering measures such as restoring upland peatlands, creating ponds and wetlands, and soil management. These demonstrator sites will test, trial and monitor different ways of delivering nature-based solutions, which will in turn inform the development of the wider Source to Sea programme.

Insert Source to Sea Photo

Case Study 6: South Yorkshire Flood Risk Investment Tool

We are working collaboratively to develop the concept of the South Yorkshire Flood Risk Investment Tool. This tool will bring together flood risk data and evidence from across the region, to inform future investment in flood risk management and ensure future investment is targeted to maximise flood risk benefits in South Yorkshire. This will also bring together information on wider investment and funding opportunities, to enable us to proactively identify additional sources of funding to enable flood risk management schemes.

Insert graphic / image of South Yorkshire Investment Tool

How is the plan going to be delivered?

The Plan is being led by the Environment Agency, Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council, Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council, Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council, Sheffield City Council, the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority and Yorkshire Water. The plan is also supported by a wide range of other partners and organisations, which will increase further as the plan develops.

Potential to do something with lead partners logos again here?

Each action in the plan has a lead organisation or organisations, who are responsible for completing that action. The action has an indicative timescale for when it will be completed. The lead organisation will report on progress on an annual basis to the South Yorkshire Flood Risk Partnership. The Connected by Water steering group will continue to meet on a monthly basis to review progress, address blockers and ensure support for delivery partners.

Some actions will lead on to other actions – for instance when some investigative or planning work is needed to determine the best course of action. When the plan is reviewed each year, these actions will be updated so there is always a current summary of the activity across the plan at any one time. This will also enable new information, technology or funding sources to be explored and integrated to ensure the partnership takes up new opportunities and innovation.

Plan Themes

The remainder of this plan is split into four themes, which we have collectively identified as our key priorities in order to reduce flood risk, mitigate climate change and support climate adaptation and resilience across South Yorkshire. These four themes are as follows:

1. Responding to the Climate Emergency
2. Smart Investment
3. Technology and Operational Management
4. Communication, Engagement and Building Resilience

An introduction to each theme is provided in the following four sections of the plan. Each section of the plan also contains an action table. The action tables are split into new, innovative actions that have been developed as part of the plan and actions we are already undertaking and developing as a partnership.

Current Key:

Grey - new, innovative actions that have been developed as part of the plan

Green – Approved ongoing projects/actions (e.g. Environment Agency's Medium Term Plan)

DRAFT

Theme 1: Responding to the Climate Emergency

We are facing the unprecedented and interdependent crises of climate change and biodiversity loss. These two challenges together are the most pressing issues of our time and an existential threat to human welfare, prosperity and life on earth.

Globally, nationally and regionally, biodiversity is declining faster than at any time in human history, and the world is still heading for a temperature rise in excess of 3°C this century – far beyond the Paris Agreement goals of limiting this increase to 1.5°C.

Around 1 million species already face extinction unless urgent action is taken to address the key drivers of biodiversity loss. More than three quarters of the Earth's land surface has been significantly impacted by human activity and just 16% of our natural ecosystems remain relatively intact. Climate change is both a direct driver of biodiversity loss and is itself exacerbated by it.

Urgent action is needed to mitigate further climate change, and halt and reverse biodiversity loss and environmental destruction.

A changing climate in South Yorkshire

The UK Climate Projections (UKCP18) national climate projections were developed by the national government, the Environment Agency and the Met Office. Headline findings from the 2018 edition which we can expect to see in our region are:

- By the end of the 21st century, all areas of the UK are expected to be warmer, more so in summer than in winter
- Hotter summers and hot spells (defined as daytime temperatures exceeding 30°C for two or more consecutive days) are expected to become more common
- The UK is expected to experience drier summers and wetter winters but there are also expected increases in the intensity of summer and autumn rainfall events
- Sea levels around the UK will continue to rise. In Yorkshire we can expect 0.83 - 1.1m in a 4^o rise in temperature by 2100. Given current trajectories it is likely we will see 0.3m rise by around 2050. With 0.35m of sea level rise we will see a decline in the level of protection offered by sea defences. The scale of flooding we currently consider infrequent and extreme, such as that seen on the Humber in December 2013, will occur more regularly and with growing consequences.

To become a region more resilient to a changing climate we need to take action to adapt now. This means we need to embrace the uncertainties around the likely impacts and adopt flexible approaches to building resilience. The alarm call of extinction is sounding loudly across our region with many species being pushed to the brink. It is not just something happening overseas but on our doorstep.

This theme seeks to reduce flood risk whilst delivering multiple benefits in terms of our response to the climate emergency in South Yorkshire. We will integrate policy, best practice and the latest research into our approach to this theme (E.g. the UK's third Climate Change Risk Assessment 2021 (CCRA3), Ciria Guidance on natural flood management practice (RP1094), Institute for Climate and Atmospheric Science at the University of Leeds, National Planning Policy and the Yorkshire and Humber Climate Commission). We will also align and complement existing and emerging national, regional and local level plans and strategies (e.g. Humber Flood Risk Management Plan, Humber Strategy, South Yorkshire Local Nature Recovery Strategy, individual organisations carbon strategies and each Council's Local Flood Risk Management Strategy and Local Plans).

The actions in the following table reflect our ambitions for this theme and how, by working collaboratively across our organisations, these will be achieved. Actions we are already undertaking and developing as a partnership to support this theme are also listed.

Action references to be finalised once action ordering is finalised.

RESPONDING TO THE CLIMATE EMERGENCY ACTION TABLE				
Action Ref	Action – What we are going to do	When will we do it by	Who's leading	Who's supporting
1.1	Undertake high level, regional, analysis of the UK's third Climate Change Risk Assessment 2021 (CCRA3). This analysis will consider how flood risk interacts and links with the other risks identified in this assessment. To identify threats and opportunities that need to be considered as part of this plan going forward.	2022	Environment Agency	Yorkshire Water Sheffield City Council
1.2	Step 1: To identify all regional climate plans and groups and map out the relationships between these groups. This will in turn establish how we can interact with these groups, by providing a regional structure and enable collaborative and streamlined ways of working.	Step 1: 2022	Environment Agency	Yorkshire Water Sheffield City Council
	Following completion of the South Yorkshire Natural Capital Mapping exercise, review this data in relation to flood risk benefits and future flood risk management activities. This review will identify any additional economic assessment work required.	2022	Environment Agency Sheffield City Council	South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority Yorkshire Water
	Following completion of the South Yorkshire Natural Capital Mapping exercise, consider what future land use changes mean for flood risk interventions in relation to Local Plans, the Local Nature Recovery Strategy, the Environmental Land Management Scheme and Biodiversity Net Gain. The overall aim of this action is to represent how we are going to deliver nature based solutions across South Yorkshire spatially on a map. Step 1: Initially consider two areas within Sheffield (one in the upper catchment and one in the lower catchment) to	Step 1: 2024	Environment Agency Sheffield City Council	South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority Yorkshire Water

	inform how to approach this on a regional scale.			
	<p>Develop a roadmap to set out how we want to decarbonise our multi-agency flood risk activities in South Yorkshire, aligning with our respective carbon targets.</p> <p>Step 1: To initially consider in Sheffield, to inform this roadmap / approach on a regional scale.</p>	Step 1: 2023	Environment Agency	Sheffield City Council Yorkshire Water South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority
	<p>Create a South Yorkshire wide strategy to inform to how flood risk investment can enable Biodiversity Net Gain, aligning with our collective targets, considering individual projects and the impact of management and maintenance on biodiversity.</p> <p>Step 1: Initially consider two areas within Sheffield (one in the upper catchment and one in the lower catchment) to inform the development of a strategic approach on a regional scale.</p>	Step 1: 2024	Environment Agency Sheffield City Council	Yorkshire Water
	<p>To develop a South Yorkshire Monitoring Plan, to monitor progress and impact in terms of actions in relation to the climate emergency across the region.</p> <p>Step 1: To determine what we want to know, how we start to bring this together and propose potential methods of monitoring this.</p>	Step 1: 2024	Environment Agency Sheffield City Council	Yorkshire Water Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council Sheffield City Council South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority
	<p>To create a collection of case studies to share with external audiences to showcase best practice and support the delivery of actions to respond to the climate emergency.</p> <p>Step 1: To scope the topics we want these case studies to cover and identify what already exists. E.g, case studies of partnership approaches, multiple objectives, sustainable drainage and initiative ways of assessing benefits.</p>	Step 1: 2022	Environment Agency Sheffield City Council	Yorkshire Water Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council Sheffield City Council

				South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority Yorkshire and Humber Climate Commission
	<p>As part of the Yorkshire Adaptive Pathways project undertake flood modelling to assess how climate change scenarios will affect the South Yorkshire region. This will in turn inform how we respond and manage the affects.</p> <p>Step 1: Scope the modelling work required, by undertaking gap analysis and identifying stakeholders to co-design the delivery of this work.</p>	Step 1: 2022	Environment Agency	
1.	<p>To develop and deliver flood risk benefits through the planning system.</p> <p>Step 1: To establish whether undertaking a water cycle study for South Yorkshire would be valuable in terms of flood risk opportunities and constraints in relation to new housing proposals.</p>	2022	Environment Agency	
1.	Develop and deliver the Houghton River Restoration and Fish/Eel Pass scheme to improve migratory fish populations in the River Dearne.	2027	Environment Agency	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
1.	<p>Develop and deliver project works with the Dearne Valley Green Heart Partnership to improve river habitats and deliver nature-based solutions to reduce flood risk.</p> <p>Step 1 - Deliver work on the Dearne at Smithies, Barnsley to reconnect the flood plain, create wetland habitat and improve in-channel habitat.</p> <p>Step 2 - Deliver work on the Dearne at the Fleets, Barnsley to reconnect the flood plain, create wetland habitat and improve in-channel habitat.</p>	<p>Step 1 2022</p> <p>Step 2 2023</p>	Environment Agency	<p>Yorkshire Wildlife Trust</p> <p>Royal Society for the Protection of Birds</p> <p>Don Catchment Rivers Trust</p> <p>Natural England</p> <p>Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council</p> <p>Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council</p>

				Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council Derbyshire County Council
1.	Align and support the catchment-based approach through the Don, Dearne and Rother catchment network. This catchment based approach, focusing on the Water Framework Directive and biodiversity, is outlined in The Catchment Plan for the Don and Rother Catchment (2021 – 2026).	2026	Environment Agency Don Dearne Rother Catchment Network (co-hosts)	Yorkshire Water
1.	Continue to develop and deliver the Source to Sea nature-based solutions programme on the Upper River Don (Sheffield) in collaboration with partners, landowners and communities.	2026	Environment Agency	Sheffield City Council Sheffield Wildlife Trust
1.	Develop and deliver the Source to Sea nature-based solutions programme on the Middle River Don (Barnsley, Derbyshire and Chesterfield) in collaboration with partners, landowners and communities.	2027	Environment Agency	Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council Derbyshire County Council Chesterfield Borough Council
1.	Develop and deliver the Source to Sea nature-based solutions programme on the Lower River Don (Doncaster) in collaboration with partners, landowners and communities.	2031	Environment Agency	Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council
1.	Develop and deliver the Hidden Rivers Secret Streams project, to improve river habitat and reconnect local communities with the river Rother in Chesterfield.	2022	Don Catchment Rivers Trust	Environment Agency Chesterfield Borough Council Derbyshire County Council
1.	Develop and deliver the Putting the Sheaf Back into Sheffield project, to improve river habitat and reconnect local communities with the River Sheaf in Sheffield City Centre. –	2023	Sheffield City Council	Environment Agency Sheaf and Porter Rivers Trust
	Continue to develop and deliver Sheffield city retrofit green blue infrastructure	Ongoing	Sheffield City Council	Yorkshire Water

1.	Develop and deliver the Sheaf and Porter River Restoration Project, to improve biodiversity and connectivity along the Porter and Sheaf in Sheffield. <i>(Link to Sheaf Flood Alleviation Action in Smart Investment)</i>	2028	Environment Agency	Sheaf and Porter Rivers Trust Wild Trout Trust Sheffield City Council
	Develop and deliver the Blackburn Brook Restoration and Natural Flood Management project to improve biodiversity, connectivity and nature based solutions that will complement the Blackburn Brook FAS. <i>(Link Blackburn Brook Flood Alleviation Scheme Action in Smart Investment)</i>	2027	Environment Agency	Sheffield City Council SRWT
1.	Develop and deliver the Sheffield Lakeland Landscape Partnership Project work, to improve biodiversity, create habitats, reduce flood risk and diffuse pollution in the valleys to the west of Sheffield.	2023	Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust	Sheffield City Council Environment Agency Natural England Yorkshire Water Bradfield Parish Council, Sheffield United Football Club Community Foundation, Hallam University Stocksbridge Town Council South Yorkshire Archaeology Service Steel Valley Project
1.	Develop and deliver the Wilder Waterways partnership project, a series of nature-based solutions in the Doncaster area (initial focus is the Bentley and Conisbrough) which includes wetland creation, tree planting and flood plain reconnection.	2023	Don Catchment Rivers Trust	Environment Agency Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council Yorkshire Wildlife Trust
1.	Develop and deliver the Sprotbrough Ings project to create and restore habitats, raise flood awareness and reconnect people in the Hexthorpe area with the River Don.	2025	Don Catchment Rivers Trust	Environment Agency Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council Yorkshire Wildlife Trust

1.	Develop and deliver a Natural Flood Management scheme in Conisbrough, Doncaster.	2025	Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council	Environment Agency
1.	Develop and deliver a Natural Flood Management Scheme in Tickhill, Doncaster.	2025	Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council	Environment Agency
1.	Develop and deliver the Rotherham River 3 Programme of environmental enhancement works to improve flood plain connectivity, create wetland habitat and address fish passage on the Lower River Rother.	2025	Environment Agency	Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust Highways England
	Investigate the Dale Dike catchment on the River Loxley, Sheffield, to identify the scope of peatland restoration works required for Yorkshire Water's seventh Asset Management Plan (AMP7) to meet the obligations of the Water Industry National Environment Programme (WINEP).	2022	Yorkshire Water	Moors for the Future
	Peatland Restoration in the catchments of Langsett, Ewden and Loxley Water Treatment Works	2024	Yorkshire Water	Moors for the Future
	Underbank reservoir tree planting to slow the flow, enhance water quality and increase biodiversity in Stockbridge, Sheffield.	2023	Yorkshire Water	Sheffield City Council Sheffield Lakeland Landscape Partnership
	Develop and deliver the Doncaster, Immingham and Grimsby Surface Water Resilience Project.	2027	Yorkshire Water	Anglian Water, Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council, North East Lincolnshire Council

Theme 2: SMART Investment

This theme is the foundation of this plan, ensuring investment is prioritised, SMART (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-based) and based on evidence.

We will be working collaboratively to bring together flood risk data and evidence on all sources of flooding (river, sea, surface water, groundwater and sewers) that impact communities and businesses across the region. This data and evidence will be used to inform future investment in flood risk management to ensure it is targeted to maximise flood risk benefits in South Yorkshire. This collective resource, will enable us to prove to potential investors how the funding of flood risk reduction contributes towards the successful delivery of regional and national priorities. Examples of these priorities include the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority's Strategic Economic Plan which seeks to 'pave the way to a stronger, greener and fairer economy' and the Government's 2020 National Infrastructure Strategy with its aim of 'transforming the UK infrastructure in order to level up the country and achieve net zero emissions by 2050'.

Our approach to SMART investment will consider and apply best practice from across the UK for example the Humber 2100+ Strategy, River Severn Partnership and Citizen Science. In turn, we will be sharing our collaborative learning with other organisations to ensure we are able to be respond and develop our own ideas by sharing our experiences.

The actions in the following table reflect our ambitions for this theme and how, by working collaboratively across our organisations, these will be achieved. Actions we are already undertaking and developing as a partnership to support this theme are also listed. The latter includes flood risk management schemes we are currently developing or delivering.

Action references to be finalised once action ordering is finalised.

SMART INVESTMENT ACTION TABLE				
Action Ref	Action – What we are going to do	When will we do it by	Who's leading	Who's supporting
2.1	Develop a business case to secure resources and funding to deliver the actions in this plan in future years.	2022	Environment Agency	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council Sheffield City Council Yorkshire Water
2.2	Develop a web based South Yorkshire Flood Risk Investment	Step 1: 2022	Environment Agency	Yorkshire Water

	<p>Tool to bring together flood risk data and evidence with wider information on investment opportunities across the region.</p> <p>Step 1: To consider what mapping systems and data already exist across South Yorkshire, so we can utilise and adapt existing best practice.</p> <p><i>Add to link operational data sharing in Ops theme.</i></p>		Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council	
	Produce a paper on new and emerging green sources of funding, including biodiversity net gain, carbon reduction and Green Finance initiative.	2022	Environment Agency South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority	Yorkshire Water
	Create a portfolio of flood risk management scheme case studies to support conversations with potential investors.	2022	Environment Agency	Rotherham Metropolitan Council, Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council, Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council, Sheffield City Council, Yorkshire Water, Regional Flood and Coastal Committee
2.	Develop a proposal to address our collective funding pressures. This will include considering a shared resource to co-ordinate flood risk funding bids and securing sufficient resources to deliver our flood risk management schemes.	2022	Environment Agency, Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council	Yorkshire Water, South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council, Sheffield City Council. Rotherham

				Metropolitan Council,
2.	To develop a prioritised list of partnership projects for Yorkshire Water's proposed Business Plan 2025 – 2030 (Price Review 2024). Step 1: Bring together the South Yorkshire programme and Yorkshire Water Drainage and Wastewater Management Plans to identify partnership investment opportunities.	2022	Yorkshire Water	Environment Agency Rotherham Metropolitan Council, Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council, Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council, Sheffield City Council.
2.	Develop the South Yorkshire shovel ready programme (as listed in Appendix 1) to enable the South Yorkshire Local Authorities to capitalise on future funding opportunities.	2024	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council, Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council Sheffield City Council, Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council	Environment Agency Yorkshire Water, South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority

<i>Table contd.</i>				
Action Ref	Action – What we are going to do	When will we do it by?	Lead	Support
2.	Develop and deliver a Flood Alleviation Scheme for Pastures Road in Denaby, Doncaster.	2027	Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council	Environment Agency
	Develop and deliver a scheme to reduce flood risk to Frank Road in Bentley, Doncaster.	2024	Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council	Environment Agency
	Undertake an initial feasibility study for Duftons Close, Conisbrough to assess flood risk alleviation options and inform any future works.	2023	Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council	Environment Agency
	Develop and deliver a surface water Flood Alleviation Scheme for Scawthorpe, Doncaster.	2027	Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council	Environment Agency
	Develop and deliver a Doncaster Borough Wide Surface Water Alleviation Scheme.	2025	Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council	Environment Agency

	Develop and deliver a Bentley Risk Management Scheme, Doncaster.	2027	Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council	Environment Agency
	Develop and deliver a Fishlake Risk Management Scheme, Doncaster.	2025	Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council	Environment Agency
	Barnsley			
	Develop and deliver a Flood Alleviation Scheme for Lang Avenue in Lundwood, Barnsley.	2023	Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council	Environment Agency Yorkshire Water
	Develop and deliver a Flood Alleviation Scheme for Low Valley, Barnsley	2027	Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council	Environment Agency
	Develop and deliver the Barnsley sewer flood alleviation scheme in Great Houghton.	2022	Yorkshire Water	
	Develop and deliver the Ingbirchworth sewer flood alleviation scheme.	2022	Yorkshire Water	
	Sheffield			
	Develop and deliver the Three Brooks Scheme to reduce flood risk to Car Brook and Kirk Bridge Dike in Darnall, Sheffield.	2022	Sheffield City Council	Environment Agency
	Develop and deliver a Flood Alleviation Scheme on Blackburn Brook, Sheffield. <i>Link to Blackburn Brook Restoration action in Climate Section</i>	2027	Sheffield City Council	Environment Agency
	Develop and deliver the Sheaf Catchment Flood Alleviation Scheme, Sheffield. <i>Link to Sheaf Restoration action in Climate Section</i>	2028	Sheffield City Council	Environment Agency
	Develop and deliver the Sheffield Upper Don Flood Alleviation Scheme, Phase 1, Loxley.	2022	Sheffield City Council	Environment Agency
	Develop and deliver the Sheffield Upper Don Flood Alleviation Scheme, Phase 2, Neepsend.	2027	Sheffield City Council	Environment Agency
	Develop and deliver the Sheffield Upper Don Flood Alleviation Scheme, Phase 3, Hillsborough to Stocksbridge.	2028	Sheffield City Council	Environment Agency
	Sheffield Upper Don Reservoir Storage	Step 1: 2023	Environment Agency	Sheffield City Council

	Step 1: Initial feasibility study to investigate potential to use of reservoirs for flood risk purposes.			Yorkshire Water
	Develop and deliver Philadelphia sewer flood alleviation scheme, Sheffield	2023	Yorkshire Water	
	Develop and deliver the Stocksbridge sewer flood alleviation scheme.	2022	Yorkshire Water	
	Develop and deliver the Crookesmoor sewer flood alleviation scheme.	2022	Yorkshire Water	
	Develop and deliver the Chapeltown sewer flood alleviation scheme, Sheffield	2022	Yorkshire Water	
	Rotherham			
	Deliver a project to reduce flood risk to the railway in Rotherham. The project is centred on the Greasborough Dyke, close to where it joins the River Don.	2022	Network Rail	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
	Develop and deliver the Parkgate and Rawmarsh Flood Alleviation Scheme, on Greasborough Dike and Old Sough/Boundary Dike, Rotherham.	2027	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Environment Agency
	Develop and deliver the Rotherham to Kilnhurst Flood Alleviation Scheme – Phase 2.	2027	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Environment Agency
	Develop and deliver the Broom and Clifton Flood Alleviation Scheme, Rotherham.	2027	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Environment Agency
	Develop and deliver the Swinton Flood Alleviation Scheme, Rotherham.	2027	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Environment Agency
	Develop and deliver the Todwick Flood Alleviation Scheme, Rotherham.	2027	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Environment Agency
	Develop and deliver a Whiston Flood Alleviation Scheme, Rotherham.	2026	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Environment Agency
	Develop and deliver an Eel Mires Dike Flood Alleviation Scheme (including Laughton Common), Rotherham.	2024	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Environment Agency
	NE Derbyshire and Chesterfield			
	Develop and deliver the Inkersall Green sewer flood alleviation scheme, Chesterfield.	2022	Yorkshire Water	

Theme 3: Technology and Operational Management

Aligning operational resources and technology is key in providing an agile and robust response to flood risk across South Yorkshire. This theme will bring together our collective, catchment wide information to shape and inform the future use of technology and operational resources. It will also build on all our ongoing flood risk maintenance and management activities.

We will work collaboratively to better understand each partner’s existing operational procedures (including incident management), individual priorities, existing data sets, roles and responsibilities, communication processes and available resource. In turn, this will allow us to work more efficiently and collaboratively on a daily basis and during flood incidents.

Establishing data sharing opportunities will allow us to explore innovative ideas, new technology and networks for operational use on daily basis and during flood incidents. This includes telemetry systems, to create simple and readily accessible ways of displaying how the Don catchment responds to rainfall. This also includes operational procedures in terms of our maintenance programmes, to identify opportunities to streamline these activities across all our organisations.

The actions in the following table reflect our ambitions for this theme and how, by working collaboratively across our organisations, these will be achieved. Actions we are already undertaking and developing as a partnership to support this theme are also listed. The latter includes flood risk maintenance and management activities, such as flood defence refurbishment works, that we are currently delivering or have planned for the future.

Action references to be finalised once action ordering is finalised.

TECHNOLOGY AND OPERATIONAL MANAGEMENT ACTION TABLE				
Action Ref	Action – What we are going to do	When will we do it by	Who’s leading	Who’s supporting
3.1	To streamline maintenance activities across South Yorkshire. Step 1: Capture our collective maintenance activities and requirements across Doncaster initially (e.g. gully maintenance, culvert inspection and grass cutting).	Step 1: 2022	Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council Environment Agency	Yorkshire and Humber Drainage Boards Doncaster East Internal Drainage Board
3.2	To collectively agree key flood risk infrastructure across South Yorkshire, to inform emergency response procedures and develop a shared understanding of how this infrastructure work.	2022	Environment Agency	Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council Barnsley Metropolitan

				n Borough Council Sheffield City Council Yorkshire and Humber Drainage Boards Doncaster East Internal Drainage Board
3.	To develop a plan that sets out how we will consider whether historical water infrastructure (e.g. old mill ponds, water tanks, dams and land drains) could be used to store water and reduce flood risk. Step 1: Initially consider in Doncaster. <i>Link to Lower Don Source to Sea project action in Climate section</i>	2023	Doncaster Metropolitan Borough	Yorkshire and Humber Drainage Boards Doncaster East Internal Drainage Board
3.	To create a simple and readily accessible way of displaying how the Don catchment responds to rainfall. Step 1: To pilot in Doncaster initially and then consider data sharing protocols across South Yorkshire.	Step 1: 2022	Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council	Environment Agency
3.	Develop an approach to better understand surface water flood risk and the links between surface water and the sewer network. With an aspiration for surface water separation and managing at surface water source. Step 1: To trial in Doncaster initially with Yorkshire Water, to develop best practice recommendations for the region.	Step 1: 2023	Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council Yorkshire Water	
3.	To create a multi- agency data sharing protocol for operational data can be shared and displayed across South Yorkshire.	2022	Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council	Yorkshire and Humber Drainage Boards Doncaster East

	Step 1: To trial in Doncaster initially to inform the development of sharing protocols across South Yorkshire. <i>Link to smart investment tool action in the Smart Investment theme.</i>		Environment Agency,	Internal Drainage Board
3.	To understand the potential for reservoirs to support flood risk management across South Yorkshire. Step 1: Spatially map all reservoirs in relation to flood risk across South Yorkshire.	Step 1: 2022	Environment Agency	Yorkshire Water
3.	Map flood flow routes in the Humber Head Levels and install real time monitoring systems (linked to telemetry) to inform pumping station operations and community warning.	2025	Yorkshire and Humber Drainage Boards	Environment Agency
2	Develop and deliver the Humber Head Level Capital Maintenance Strategy, which involves river and economic modelling of the Humber Head Levels to identify operational rationalisation opportunities (e.g. pumping stations).	2022	Yorkshire and Humber Drainage Boards	Environment Agency, Coal Authority
2	Refurbish the engineered river and watercourse channels in the Humber Head Levels.	TBC	Yorkshire and Humber Drainage Boards	Environment Agency
	Yorkshire sewer inspection chamber repair programme to proactively identify and repair defects, to reduce the risk of external flooding and pollution.	2025	Yorkshire Water	
	Sewer Repair Programme, to proactively inspect 355km of the public sewer network in high-risk flooding areas to carry out surveying, clear any blockages and identifying defects to be repaired to reduce Internal and External Flooding.	2025	Yorkshire Water	
	Combined sewer overflow refurbishment programme to reduce pollution and sewer flooding risk in 7 locations across Barnsley and Sheffield.	2023	Yorkshire Water	
	Sewer Maintenance Programme - proactively visiting 71,330 properties in high-risk flooding areas to carry	2025	Yorkshire Water	

	out surveying, clear any blockages and identifying defects to be repaired to reduce Internal and External Flooding.			
--	---	--	--	--

Action Table contd.				
Action Ref	Action – What we are going to do	When will we do it by?	Lead	Support
	Refurbish Dikes Marsh pumping station (inlet pumping station), Moorends, Doncaster.	2022	Yorkshire and Humber Drainage Boards	Environment Agency
	Refurbish St Mary's Bridge Wall, North Bridge Road, Doncaster.	2024	Environment Agency	
	Pumping Station Telemetry System Installation across the Don catchment.	2022	Yorkshire and Humber Drainage Boards	Environment Agency
	Refurbish Went Outfall (doors, penstock, and telemetry) on the River Went, Lower Don, Doncaster.	2025	Environment Agency	
	Refurbish Cheswold Culvert in Doncaster town centre.	2026	Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council	Environment Agency

Refurbish Kirk Sandall Pumping, Kirk Sandall, Doncaster.	2025	Environment Agency	
Doncaster Culvert Replacement Programme	2028	Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council	Environment Agency
Future refurbishment of flood defences on the Lower Don as identified and required.	2027 onwards	Environment Agency	
Barnsley			
Culvert replacement works on the A637 at Birthwaite Hill in Darton, Barnsley.	2022	Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council	Environment Agency
River clearance on the River Dearne between Church Street and Darton Business Park Bridge, Darton, Barnsley.	2024	Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council	Environment Agency
Bank strengthening and desilting at Netherwood Road in Wombwell, Barnsley.	2023	Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council	Environment Agency
Spillway Repairs on Worsborough Reservoir, near Worsborough Country Park, Barnsley.	2027	Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council	Environment Agency
Dearne Washlands Optimisation Study Any future works will be informed by the initial study, based on an improved understanding of how these washlands operate. This will inform whether they can be altered to provide any flood risk and / or environmental benefits.	Study: 2023	Environment Agency	Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council
Barnsley Wide Culvert Condition Investigation and Improvement Programme	2024	Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council	Environment Agency
Culvert Replacement and Channel Regrading Works on Bulling Dyke at Low Valley, Barnsley.	2023	Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council	Environment Agency
Sheffield			
Culvert removal at Staindrop View, Chapeltown, Sheffield.	2022	Environment Agency	Sheffield City Council
Refurbish culvert on Clough Dike at Deepcar, Sheffield	2027	Environment Agency	Sheffield City Council

Culvert removal on Ochre Dike, Beighton, Sheffield	2027	Environment Agency	Sheffield City Council
Broad Oaks Culvert refurbishment scheme, Sheffield.	2022	Yorkshire Water	Network Rail
Rotherham			
Refurbish the three Don Catchment Regulators. Woodhouse Regulator in Sheffield and Canklow and Meadowgate Mill Regulators in Rotherham.	2025	Environment Agency	
Rother Washlands Optimisation Study and Works. Any future works will be informed by the initial study, based on an improved understanding of how these washlands operate. To inform whether they can be altered to provide any flood risk and / or environmental benefits.	2025	Environment Agency	N/A
Upgrade the Catcliffe Pumping Station, from mobile pumps to permanent pumping station, in Catcliffe, Rotherham.	2026	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Environment Agency
Rotherham Culvert Renewal Programme.	2026	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Environment Agency
To work with partners to better understand the flood risk in the Mexborough and Denaby areas of the Lower Don Valley, specifically in relation to Network Rail infrastructure to inform the future management of this risk.	2022	Network Rail	Environment Agency Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
NE Derbyshire and Chesterfield			
Poolsbrook Reservoir decommissioning, Staveley, North Derbyshire. Including weir removal to improve fish passage and habitat improvements.	2022	Environment Agency	Derbyshire County Council

Theme 4: Communication, Engagement and Building Resilience

The aim of this theme is to build resilience across South Yorkshire, by working with all of our stakeholders to ensure they are at the heart of our decision making.

Together, with partner organisations, we will develop a communication and engagement strategy that all partners are responsible for delivering. We will work collaboratively, ensuring we have 'one joined up voice' for providing key messages. This will allow us to be more streamlined in the way we work, ensuring there is a consistent approach to the delivery of our communication, engagement and resilience measures.

We will continue to work with existing stakeholder groups, including but not limited to, flood action groups, landowners, farmers, flood wardens, parish councils and businesses whilst also developing new relationships with other key stakeholders. We will work with all these stakeholders to help and support them understand their own flood risk and how the Don catchment works.

Whilst we can work collectively to reduce the risk of flooding and the impacts of flooding, we can never prevent all flooding. This is why preparing and responding to flood incidents is an essential component of achieving greater resilience to flooding. We will work collaboratively to better prepare for and respond to flood incidents through timely and effective forecasting, warning and implementing property level resilience measures. This includes working with the South Yorkshire Local Resilience Forum and the Yorkshire and Humber Climate Commission to build resilience through improved emergency and recovery planning.

The actions in the following table reflect our ambitions for this theme and how, by working collaboratively across our organisations, these will be achieved. Actions we are already undertaking and developing as a partnership to support this theme are also listed.

Action references to be finalised once action ordering is finalised.

COMMUNICATION, ENGAGEMENT and BUILDING RESILIENCE ACTION TABLE				
Action Ref	Action – What we are going to do	When will we do it by	Who's leading	Who's supporting
4.	<p>Working in partnership with key stakeholders we will increase community resilience and preparedness by engaging with communities to raise flood awareness</p> <p>We will prioritise communities recently affected by river flooding and other identified high-risk communities.</p>	2030	Environment Agency	<p>Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council</p> <p>Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council</p> <p>Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council</p> <p>Sheffield City Council</p> <p>Yorkshire and Humber Drainage Boards</p>

				Doncaster East Internal Drainage Board
4.	<p>Working in partnership with key stakeholders we will increase community resilience and preparedness by increasing flood groups, where wanted</p> <p>We will prioritise communities recently affected by river flooding and other identified high-risk communities.</p>	2030	Environment Agency	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council Sheffield City Council Yorkshire and Humber Drainage Boards Doncaster East Internal Drainage Board
4.	<p>Increase community resilience and preparedness by increasing full registration to the Flood Warning Service.</p> <p>We will prioritise communities recently affected by river flooding and other identified high-risk communities.</p>	2030	Environment Agency	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council Sheffield City Council Yorkshire and Humber Drainage Boards
4.	<p>Working in partnership with key stakeholders we will increase community resilience and preparedness by registering Flood Wardens, where appropriate and wanted</p>	2030	Environment Agency	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council Doncaster Metropolitan

	We will prioritise communities recently affected by river flooding and other identified high-risk communities.			Borough Council Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council Sheffield City Council Yorkshire and Humber Drainage Boards
1.	Working in partnership with key stakeholders we will increase community resilience and preparedness by training and supporting volunteers and communities to be better prepared We will prioritise communities recently affected by river flooding and other identified high-risk communities.	2030	Environment Agency	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council Sheffield City Council Yorkshire and Humber Drainage Boards Doncaster East Internal Drainage Board
4.	Produce a South Yorkshire wide communication and engagement plan. Step 1: To understand who all our stakeholders are and engage with these stakeholders on this Connected by Water plan. Stakeholders will include communities, businesses, political figures and landowners. Step 1 will also include starting to build on shared information/material e.g. photos, key messages etc.to inform the development of the communication and engagement plan.	Step 1: 2022	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council Environment Agency	Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council Sheffield City Council Yorkshire Water Sheffield City Region
4.	Develop a strategy for public facing engagement on what climate change	2023	South Yorkshire	Sheffield City Council

	means for flood risk across South Yorkshire. <i>Links to modelling action in Climate section</i>		Mayoral Combined Authority	Environment Agency
4	Develop a specific landowner and farmer engagement plan, considering future climate change risks, commercial risks and food production risks to establish positive partnership working.	2022	Environment Agency	National Farmers Union Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council
4	Create engagement material to support the understanding of flood risk in South Yorkshire: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How the River Don Catchment works - How the funding process works for flood risk projects - How flood defence schemes are developed and implemented (including flood modelling) - How reservoirs work - Flood risk roles and responsibilities across organisations - 	2024	Environment Agency Yorkshire Water	
	Develop a stakeholder engagement plan to help partners understand Yorkshire Water's funding processes.	2022	Yorkshire Water	
4.	Review the Chesterfield modelling study and implement actions to improve flood warnings along the Rivers Upper Rother, Hipper, Drone and Doe Lea.	TBC	Environment Agency	
4.	Review the Humber modelling study to inform any updates to existing flood warnings in Doncaster.	2023	Environment Agency	Move to grey
4.	Implement Flood Warning updates along the Middle and Lower Don, in Rotherham, Barnsley and Doncaster, based on the modelling review completed in 2021.	2022	Environment Agency	Yorkshire and Humber Drainage Board East Doncaster Internal Drainage Board Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council Barnsley Metropolitan

				Borough Council Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
4.	Review the Blackburn Brook Flood Warnings in Sheffield to establish if any updates are required and implement as required.	2022	Environment Agency	Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council Sheffield City Council
4.	Introducing more 'impact thresholds' for our Flood Alerts. This involves having a greater understanding at what levels there are impacts across a Flood Alert area, e.g flooding to roads, farmland. We will use these levels to better inform our decision making on when Alerts are issued, to help give better information and preparation lead time to customers.	Ongoing	Environment Agency	Yorkshire and Humber Drainage Board Doncaster East Internal Drainage Board Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council Sheffield City Council Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
4.	Working in partnership with professional partners we will deliver training to help increase understanding of how at-risk communities can be better supported and prepared. Step 1 – This will be initially be with Rotherham and Doncaster Councils.	Step 1: 2022	Environment Agency	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council
4.	Working in partnership with stakeholders deliver annual training to existing Flood Warden's.	Ongoing	Environment Agency	Doncaster Metropolitan

				Borough Council Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council Sheffield City Council Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
	Working in partnership with stakeholders to deliver induction training for new Flood Wardens.	Ongoing	Environment Agency	Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council Sheffield City Council Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
4.	<p>Create 6 action plans for priority areas across Rotherham to engage with Parish Councils, community groups and businesses on Flood Risk, Resilience, and the council's future plans and commitment to reducing flood risk.</p> <p>The 6 priority areas are: Rotherham Town Centre Rawmarsh and Parkgate Kilnhurst Village Laughton Common Catcliffe Village Whiston Village</p> <p>Step 1 will be piloted with Laughton Common.</p>	Step 1 - 2022	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Environment Agency
4.	Develop and deliver Property Flood Resilience schemes at Riviera Parade, Willow Cottages, Fishlake Nab and Daw Lane in Doncaster.	2022	Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council	Environment Agency
4.	Develop and deliver Property Level Protection measures at Emmett Carr Lane, Renishaw, Derbyshire.	2022	Derbyshire County Council	Environment Agency

4.	Replace / Refurbish existing Property Level Protection measures in Denaby, Doncaster.	2030	Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council	Environment Agency
	Develop a Recreational infrastructure improvement strategy surrounding Langsett Reservoir to enhance community connection to nature and water.	2030	Yorkshire Water	Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council Sheffield City Council Highways England
	Community engagement pilot in Sheffield S5, looking at testing a new engagement model to understand customers' needs of us as an organisation and then work with community to build relationships	2022	Yorkshire Water	TBC

DRAFT

Appendix 1: Overview of the South Yorkshire Flood Risk Management Investment Programme

The South Yorkshire programme comprises of three levels:

- The Overall Programme:
 - Approximately 100 projects, with a total value of nearly £400 million.
 - To better protect over 17,000 homes and businesses, plus regionally significant infrastructure.
- The Priority Programme (sub set of the Overall Programme):
 - 27 priority projects, with an original total value of £217 million (now revised to £257 million).
 - To better protect over 10,000 homes and businesses, plus regionally significant infrastructure.
 - These 27 projects were collectively identified as regional priorities following the November 2019 floods.
- The Shovel Ready Programme (sub set of the Priority Programme):
 - 9 projects, with an original total value of £66 million (now revised to £63 million).
 - To better protect over 1,400 homes and businesses, plus regionally significant infrastructure.
 - These 9 projects were collectively identified as local priorities to get shovel ready from the Priority Programme.

Summary tables on the overall programme, the priority programme and the shovel ready programme are provided on the following pages. A list of the 27 priority projects and the 9 shovel ready projects, broken down by location, is also provided.

The Three Levels of the South Yorkshire Programme

Overall Programme								
Area	Number of Projects	Projects by Lead Organisation	Total Project Costs (£million)	UK Government Funding (£million)	Partnership Funding (£million)	Funding Gap (£million)	Homes better protected	Businesses better protected
Barnsley	12	7 Council 5 Environment Agency	17.2	4.9	1.2	11.1	1,986	29
Doncaster	47	14 Council 30 Environ	210.6	42.7	4.3	167.9	4,590	674

		ment Agency 8 Yorkshire and Humber Drainage Boards						
Sheffield	17	9 Council 8 Environment Agency	97.1	71.9	17.1	8.1	4,275	1,785
Rotherham	19	9 Council 10 Environment Agency	67.9	33.9	12.0	22.0	3,785	399
Catchment Wide	1	1 Environment Agency	2.0	0	0	2.0	0	0
Totals	96		394.8	153.4	34.6	211.1	14,636	2,877

Priority Programme: Updated Picture								
Area	Number of Projects	Projects by Lead Organisation	Total Project Costs (£million)	UK Government Funding (£million)	Partnership Funding (£million)	Funding Gap (£million)	Homes better protected	Businesses better protected
Barnsley	5*	4 Council 1 Environment Agency*	13.2	1.4	1.1	10.7	177	29

Doncaster	9	5 Council 4 Environment Agency	96.0	31.4	2.0	62.6	3,326	505
Sheffield	5	3 Council 2 Environment Agency	85.2	63.9	13.3	8	2,359	1,724
Rotherham	8*	6 Council 2 Environment Agency*	60.7	28.6	11.6	20.5	1,693	399
Catchment Wide	1	1 Environment Agency	2.0	0	0	2.0	0	0
Totals	27*	27*	257.1	125.3	28.0	103.8	7,555	2,657

* The Nature Based Solutions Programme in Mid Don (an Environment Agency led scheme), covers both Barnsley and Rotherham. This project has been counted in both areas, but the costs and funding have been split.

Shovel Ready Programme: Updated Picture								
Area	Number of Projects	Projects by Lead Organisation	Total Project Costs (£million)	UK Government Funding (£million)	Partnership Funding (£million)	Funding Gap (£million)	Homes better protected	Businesses better protected
Barnsley	2	2 Council	6.0	0.2	1.1	4.7	104	0
Doncaster	5	4 Council 1 Environ	11.4	4.7	1.9	4.8	424	71

		ment Agency						
Sheffield	1	1 Council	25.0	20.3	1.6	3.1	370	253
Rotherham	1	1 Council	21.0	12.3	7.7	1.1	20	245
Totals	9	9	63.4	37.4	12.3	13.7	917	569

List of the Priority Projects and Shovel Ready Projects

Bold text denotes a Shovel Ready Project

Barnsley

Barnsley led projects:

1. **Lundwood Flood Alleviation Scheme**
2. **Barnsley Culvert Programme**
3. Worsborough Reservoir
4. Church Street, Darton

Environment Agency led projects:

5. Nature Based Solutions Programme in Mid Don (Barnsley and Rotherham)

Doncaster

Doncaster led projects:

6. **Bentley Flood Alleviation Scheme**
7. **Conisbrough Natural Flood Management**
8. **Tickhill Natural Flood Management**
9. **Doncaster Borough Wide Surface Water Alleviation Scheme**
10. Fishlake Flood Alleviation Scheme

Environment Agency led projects:

11. Nature Based Solutions Programme in Lower Don
12. Refurbishment and Replacement of Lower Don Embankment
13. Wheatley Park Embankment Refurbishment
14. **St Mary's Bridge Wall Refurbishment**

Rotherham

Rotherham led projects:

15. **Rotherham To Kilnhurst Flood Alleviation Scheme**
16. Parkgate Flood Alleviation Scheme
17. Catcliffe Pumping Station
18. Eel Mires Dike Flood Alleviation Scheme Flood Alleviation Scheme
19. Rotherham Culvert Renewal Programme

Environment Agency led projects:

- 20. Don Catchment Regulators
- 21. Whiston Brook Flood Alleviation and Storage (Partnership project with Rotherham)
- Nature Based Solutions Programme in Mid Don (Rotherham and Barnsley) (Repeat of no 5)

Sheffield

Sheffield led projects:

- 22. Blackburn Brook Flood Alleviation Scheme
- 23. Sheaf Catchment Flood Alleviation Scheme**
- 24. Upper Don Flood Alleviation Scheme

Environment Agency led projects:

- 25. Upper Don Reservoir Storage
- 26. Nature Based Solutions Programme in Upper Don

South Yorkshire Wide

Environment Agency led:

- 27. South Yorkshire Catchment Plan (Barnsley, Rotherham, Sheffield and Doncaster)
Needs to be re-titled as Connected by Water Plan – TBC based on front page / branding.

BACK PAGE

Add contact page at end

*IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO KNOW MORE ABOUT CONNECTED BY WATER
PLEASE CONTACT SYPSO@environment-agency.gov.uk*

INCLUDE ALL PARTNER LOGOS

DRAFT

This page is intentionally left blank



Housing and Infrastructure Board

26 October 2021

South Yorkshire Digital Infrastructure Strategy – Scoping the Delivery Plan

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

To comment on the draft scope for the South Yorkshire Digital infrastructure Strategy Delivery Plan.

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

The Strategy aims to help improve business productivity and competitiveness; address digital exclusion and digital poverty; and make South Yorkshire places more attractive to inward investors as digitally enabled places to live and work.

Recommendation

The Board is asked to:

- consider and comment on the scope of the Delivery Plan to take forward implementation of the South Yorkshire Digital infrastructure Strategy.

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

Superfast South Yorkshire Programme Board 6th October 2021

1. Background

- 1.1 The South Yorkshire Digital Infrastructure Strategy was approved by the Mayoral Combined Authority on the 20th September 2021, and requested that the Housing and Infrastructure proceed to preparing a Delivery Plan for implementing the Strategy.
- 1.2 Appendix A sets out initial proposals for scoping the priority actions and interventions for the Delivery Plan. The Board's views are requested on these proposals to inform the preparation of the Delivery Plan.

2. Key Issues

- 2.1 There are a range of overarching policy activities that set out to implement the Strategy and deliver the ambitions of the Strategic Economic Plan. These take account of the strategic policies and actions also being developed for digital skills, digital innovation and business support by the MCA and partners.
- 2.2 The necessary resources will need to be secured to support the delivery of the Digital Infrastructure Strategy and take forward implementation of the Delivery Plan. It is essential that the Digital Strategy Delivery Plan sets out realistic and deliverable actions and interventions that can be properly resourced to ensure successful delivery of the Strategy.
- 2.3 Appendix A sets out the initial scoping ideas for these actions and interventions to inform the preparation of the Delivery Plan, including proposed priorities that are strategically important and/or need to be delivered in the short-term. These have been developed together with the Superfast South Yorkshire Programme Board.
- 2.4 The views of this Board are now sought on the scoping proposals and priorities set out in Appendix A to inform the preparation of the Delivery Plan itself. A Draft Plan will then be developed for consideration by the Board at the next meeting on the 7th December 2021.

3. Options Considered and Recommended Proposal

- 3.1 **Option 1**
To support the scoping and production of a Delivery Plan and contribute to identifying key priority actions.

3.4 **Option 1 Risks and Mitigations**

- A key risk with this Option would occur if partners are unable to commit to implementing the Strategy. Collaborative working in the development of the Delivery Plan should mitigate this by identifying actions, priorities and resource implications. However, implementation of the Strategy may carry additional risks still to be considered as we progress.
- A further risk would occur if there was Insufficient public and private investment to implement the Strategy in a timely manner to meet the delivery targets of the Strategy. A public funding source has been identified to support implementation of both the Strategy and the wider digital agenda, and the MCA Executive and local authorities continue to liaise and support digital infrastructure providers in delivering their roll-out plans

3.5 **Option 2**

Not to support the scoping and production of a Delivery Plan or contribute towards identifying key priority actions.

3.8 **Option 2 Risks and Mitigations**

The key risk with this option is that it may delay the implementation of the Strategy and thus the ability to address the digital infrastructure challenges and SEP digital ambitions.

3.13 **Recommended Option**

Option 1 is the preferred option to pursue.

4. **Consultation on Proposal**

- 4.1 The Housing and Infrastructure Board will oversee the preparation of the Delivery Plan, with the Superfast South Yorkshire Board acting as an Advisory Group at key stages.

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

- 5.1 Work to progress the Delivery Plan is underway, and the views of the Board will inform its development. It is envisaged that a draft Delivery Plan will be brought to the next Board meeting in December 2021.

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

- 6.1 There are no direct financial and procurement issues arising directly from this report. However, implementation of the Strategy will require financial and other resources(particularly within the MCA and local authorities) which have not yet been confirmed, although options are being explored. The Delivery Plan will assist by identifying the resource implications of proposed actions and interventions.

7. **Legal Implications and Advice**

- 7.1 There are no direct legal issues 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 roles and resource requirements of the MCA. The Delivery Plan will assist by identifying the resource implications of proposed actions and interventions.

9. Equality and Diversity Implications and Advice

- 9.1 Ensuring digital inclusion for all, is a key purpose of the Digital Infrastructure Strategy 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 Covid19 lockdown periods have shown the importance of good digital connectivity, particularly in relation to enabling people to effectively work from home and access both public health and other services online. A positive consequence of this has been a reduction in travelling. Improved digital infrastructure / connectivity could therefore be an important contributor to meeting net zero reduction targets related to transport.

11. Information and Communication Technology Implications and Advice

- 11.1 There are no IT issues as a direct result of this report.

12. Communications and Marketing Implications and Advice. Please also refer to consultation undertaken as per Section 4

- 12.1 There may be media opportunities related to when the proposed interventions are delivered to implement the Strategy.

List of Appendices Included

- A Digital Infrastructure Strategy Delivery Plan Draft Scope

Background Papers

None

South Yorkshire Digital Infrastructure Strategy Delivery Plan Scope

26th October 2021

Overarching Key Priority

The SYMCA and Local Authorities form a successful and productive relationship with all key digital infrastructure providers to ensure all South Yorkshire authorities develop productive working relationships that ensure as much gigabit coverage as possible by 2025. Specifically, prioritising additional actions and interventions to address the **c170,000 premises gigabit coverage gap** (based on current projections - to be refined through further data analysis).

Alongside this, it will be important to develop an ongoing communications plan for the development & delivery of the South Yorkshire Digital Infrastructure Strategy & associated activities.

Strategic Goal	Proposed Priority / Short-Term Actions and Interventions	Medium Term Actions and Interventions
1. Ensure South Yorkshire's superfast broadband and 4G success is repeated for Gigabit broadband and 5G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide non BDUK state aid friendly interventions where appropriate to incentivise or encourage industry to accelerate delivery of gigabit-capable broadband • Map the digital infrastructure industry providers, including smaller providers, and develop a holistic and continuous engagement programme. • Enhance ongoing dialogue / relationships with both major and smaller local digital infrastructure suppliers, and identify and oversee consistent 'barrier busting' measures being put in place to support the industry infrastructure roll-out; • Identify support requirements and secure the necessary officer resources to support the DCMS Project Gigabit (£61m - £103m) Programme in South Yorkshire. • Map public assets in relation to the premises not scheduled for gigabit connectivity by 2025 to identify potential 'anchors' and utilise enabling public assets to support industry gigabit connectivity roll-outs. • Close and monitor the SFSY Programme contracts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider a 'drive by' rural mobile survey across South Yorkshire to map the true state of rural mobile coverage, identify gaps, and seek industry resolutions. • Undertake further focussed mapping of the public assets across South Yorkshire including buildings and street furniture, to support further 4G and 5G coverage. • Undertake periodic 'Market' engagements to track progress by the industry in rolling-out and upgrading mobile coverage. • Work with Mobile Network Operators and Local Authorities to facilitate the appropriate location of new infrastructure, encouraging the sharing of infrastructure wherever possible, and educating decision makers and the public. • Explore funding a "top up" of the Gigabit broadband voucher system to further incentivise rural deployment • Explore potential to establish a "GigaHub" project approach.
2. Support the social and economic priorities set out in the SEP.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design and develop a demand stimulation programme for existing SME businesses and new start-ups aligned with and supporting gigabit connectivity roll-outs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commission activity to develop a South Yorkshire Digital Branding Strategy for the digital industry sector. • Explore further the potential business case, technical and resourcing requirements for the '5G in a box'

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explore proposals for a Gigabit Broadband Voucher Scheme to support and promote business and residential take-up of gigabit opportunity. • Continue to provide advice on connectivity for residents and businesses across South Yorkshire, including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Rural areas ○ Business connectivity issues ○ Community / Third sector connectivity issues ○ Multiple Dwelling Units 	innovation model to accelerate 5G adoption by the South Yorkshire manufacturing sector.
3. Form an inclusive platform that enables better outcomes for all sections of society.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commission research to fill the information gap relating to the real extent of digital poverty in South Yorkshire, and the actions to address this. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engage Local Authorities, Housing Associations and the Advanced Wellbeing Research Centre (AMRC) to maximise digital inclusivity within lower income tenants and explore the opportunity for ‘Social Connectivity’ pilots. • Commission joint work with health and care providers to explore digital infrastructure opportunities and requirements to support the growth of digital health and welfare.
4. Be supported by the Governance and data-driven approach needed to maximise the digital potential of South Yorkshire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commission and utilise consistent data sources to inform policy, delivery, and funding bids and programmes’ • Adopt consistent ‘best practice’ planning policies and ‘barrier busting’ approaches/measures across South Yorkshire to support and accelerate industry roll-outs. • Continue to provide consistent expert strategic advice and support to Local Planning Authorities and developers on digital infrastructure requirements within new developments as well as mobile telecommunications requirements and discharge of planning conditions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish a Digital Forum comprising representatives from the public sector, local businesses and digital infrastructure providers
5. Position South Yorkshire as a leading centre of applied digital innovation and adoption.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proactively work with the Department of Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) on future digital initiatives to capture funding and delivery opportunities for South Yorkshire, including demonstration ‘pilots.’ • Encourage and support new innovations / projects such as Yorkshire Water’s proposals to deploy fibre in water to access poorly served communities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explore the opportunities for accelerating 5G adoption by the South Yorkshire manufacturing sector • Commission research with the AMRC on future 5G business needs in South Yorkshire • Commission research to identify the extent of existing and future datacentre capability, and test viability,

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Explore the opportunities for rolling-out a digital flood warning system for the whole South Yorkshire flood catchment.• Work with public partners and utilities to identify and develop business cases, where applicable, to develop Internet of Things / Smart Cities pilot systems.	market appetite and business needs for future additional edge datacentre infrastructure.
--	---	--

This page is intentionally left blank

Item 10

Housing and Infrastructure Board Forward Plan

26th October 2021

Meeting Date	Suggested Agenda items
Tuesday 7 th December 2021, 13:00- 15:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brownfield Housing Fund – Outline Business Cases & Business Justification Cases • Gainshare Major Capital Schemes – Strategic Business Cases, Outline Business Cases, Full Business Cases • Final Draft Flood Catchment Plan • Digital Infrastructure Strategy Draft Delivery Plan • Housing Association Prospectus
Tuesday 18 th January 2021, 13:00-15:00	<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 • Electric Vehicle Chargepoint Programme Delivery • South Yorkshire One Public Estate Programme
Tuesday 15 th March 2021, 13:00-15:00	<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 • Modern Methods of Construction Next Steps

This page is intentionally left blank