TRANSPORT EXECUTIVE BOARD

Date: **Via Email**
Venue:
Time:

AGENDA

Item	Subject	Method	Lead	Page
	Introduction			
1	Welcome and Apologies	Verbal	Chair	
2	Minutes and Actions of the Previous Meeting	Paper	Chair	1 - 8
3	Declarations of Interest	Verbal	All	
4	Urgent Items/Announcements	Verbal	All	
	Business Items			
5	SCR Input to the New East Midlands Rail Franchise	Paper	A Forrest	9 - 16
6	Appraisal Panel Business Case Recommendation	Paper	D Allatt	17 - 30
7	Access Fund	Paper	C Shepherd	To Follow
8	SCR Single Assurance Framework: Strategic Tools for Prioitisation and Appraisal	Paper	M Hellewell	31 - 34
9	The Creation of a Single LTA and Supporting Transition Plan	Paper	C Shepherd	35 - 38

Item	Subject	Method	Lead	Page
	Updates			
10	• HS2 • TfN/Northern Transport Strategy • Large Majors • SCR Integrated Infrastructure Plan	Verbal	J Hurley	
	Minutes			
11.1	Infrastructure Executive Board	Paper	J Hurley	39 - 46
11.2	Transport Committee	Paper	J Hurley	47 - 54
11.3	HS2 Programme Board	Verbal	J Hurley	
	Actions & Forward Planning			
12	Agree Actions	Verbal	Chair	
13	Agree Items for Combined Authority Meeting 12 September 2016	Verbal	Chair	
14	Any Other Business	Verbal	Chair	

Sheffield City Region

SCR TRANSPORT EXECUTIVE BOARD

14th JULY 2016

BROAD STREET WEST, SHEFFIELD

No.	Item	Action
1	**Welcome and Apologies** Present: <u>Board Members</u> Cllr John Burrows, CBC - Chair Martin McKervey, Nabarro / LEP Simon Carr, Henry Boot, LEP Apologies were received from Board Members: Cllr Julie Dore, SCC, Diana Terris, BMBC and Neil Taylor, BaDC <u>In Attendance / Advisory Members</u> Cllr George Lindars-Hammond, SCC Simon Green, SCC Peter Dale, DMBC Paul Woodcock, RMBC Matt Gladstone, BMBC Julie Hurley, SCR Executive Team David Allatt, SCR Executive Team Katie Jackson, SCC / SCR Executive Team Jim Seymour, DCC Craig Tyler, Joint Authorities Governance Unit	
2	**Minutes of the Previous Meeting** The minutes of the previous meeting held on 2nd June were agreed to be an accurate record.	
3	**Declarations of Interest** No declarations noted.	
4	**Urgent Items / Announcements** i. <u>Access Fund</u> It was noted DfT have released further guidance regarding the fund, for which the SCR (for SY) will bid for the maximum allocation of £7.5m over 3 years.	

	It was noted that the timescales to complete and submit bids are challenging (6 weeks) and consultancy support will be brought in to assist. It was noted the Chair will be asked to sign off the bid outside normal meeting cycles. It was confirmed the bid will be developed in partnership with the LTP Strategic Transport Group and the Cycling and Active Travel Project Group.	
5	**Transport Strategy Refresh** The Board was reminded that in June; the TEB approved the proposed scope and timescales of a 'light touch' refresh of the SCR Transport Strategy, originally published in 2011. Members were presented with the 1st draft of the refresh and informed this work is being undertaken in partnership with the LTP Strategic Transport Group to ensure and facilitate the capture of district thoughts on what form the refresh should take. Commenting on the draft, members suggested the strategy: • Would benefit from some 'TfN-style' conditional, aspirational (mode agnostic) outputs. • Needs to demonstrate how it aligns with the districts' own transport plans. • Needs to entwine with and be supportive of the SCRIIP • Should be split into short, medium and longer term objectives which in respect of the longer term, should extend beyond the current 2026 timeframe and perhaps align with the implementation schedule of HS2. • Would benefit from an enhanced section on connectivity • Needs to explain and explicitly allay any concerns regarding the governance overlap with Derbys and Notts CCs. • Could be more aspirational in some areas, perhaps elevating some of the 20 policy areas to a higher level of importance. • Should be presented in a manner which meets all parties' expectations. • Needs to comment on the potential impact of achieving the policies. Members were asked to remember this is essentially a refresh rather than a rewrite and this may limit the scope for substantially changing the underlying strategy. **Action: ALL to submit any more comment to Dave**	

6	**Transport for the North**	
	A report was presented to provide an update on Transport for the North (TfN) matters.	
	It was noted TfN is seeking to establish itself as a Statutory Body by April 2017. An outline of the high level proposal of TfN was provided at Appendix A to the report.	
	It was noted TfN is in the process of developing an Integrated Northern Transport Strategy and Investment Plan by spring 2018. The strategy will be more in-depth than previous versions, using the conclusions from the Northern Powerhouse Independent Economic Review as the evidence base.	
	It was noted the Northern Powerhouse Independent Economic Review was launched on 30 June and provides a new insight into the economy of the North and its future sectors for growth. The Northern Powerhouse Rail programme has recognised that there will be significant impacts on Sheffield Midland Station and a working group has been set up to determine the future capacity and capability needed to accommodate Northern Powerhouse Rail and other future rail services.	
	It was noted the next Trans-Pennine Tunnel Interim Report is due to be released in mid-July. The release of the Interim Report will outline a number of routes for further detailed investigation and will be coupled with a Stakeholder Reference Group to allow discussion and feedback to be captured. It was noted there is an overlap with the SCR Large Majors bid and confirmed the 2 initiatives will be 'twin tracked' pending any announcement.	
	Action: Julie to circulate the report on publication	
	Members were advised that the outline business case for the development the SmartNorth ticketing scheme is currently awaiting ministerial approval but no timeframe has been set out for a decision to be made.	**JH**
	It was agreed that DCC and NCC officers should be kept attuned with SmartNorth ticketing developments.	
	Action: Julie to make arrangements for sharing information	
	RESOLVED, that the contents of the report be noted.	
		JH
7	**HS2**	
	The Board appraised recent comments made by Sir David Higgins regarding revised plans to extend the HS2 Sheffield spur north of Sheffield (to create a loop), noting that HMT have apparently confirmed funding has been earmarked for this extension and would	

		be administered via TfN.	
		Members noted impending ministerial appointments and also potential revisions to government departments and considered the effects that these changes might have on government policy. To help address any potential uncertainty agreed that a letter should be sent to the new Minister as soon as he/she is in post. It was agreed the letter should:	
		• Be drafted in readiness to be sent as soon as possible once an appointment is made • Note the importance of HS2 and other inter and intra rail connectivity to the SCR • Request an early meeting with the Minister to present matters in more detail. • Be signed by the Chairs of the CA and LEP. • Be endorsed by the wider CA and LEP membership prior to submission.	
		Action: Julie to draft and circulate to TEB for comment	
		Members noted the need to address whether HS2's European Investment Bank funding status will be affected by brexit.	JH
		It was suggested this matter presents a good example of where the SCR CA / LEP need to be more attuned to TfN activity. Members were informed the next TfN Partnership Board will meet in Sheffield on 20th September (at Nabarro's offices) and it was agreed the opportunity for SCR's leaders to meet with John Cridland and David Brown and talk HS2 should be exploited.	
		Action: Julie / Craig to arrange a meeting for TfN reps and ideally, Sir Steve Houghton, Mayor Ros Jones, Cllr Julie Dore and LEP representatives either before or after the TfN Board meeting	JH / CT
		Members discussed what would be the best way to share briefings and key information to avoid creating any mixed messages on HS2 or misinformation. It was noted an email was circulated recently by Andy Gates which summarised the current status of HS2 plans. It was also noted there is a significant amount of information and maps available on-line.	
		Action: Julie to share the email with TEB members	
		RESOLVED, that the Board:	
		1. **Notes its support for the progression of the loop concept**	JH
		2. **Requests assurance be sought from government regarding the continuation of HS2 plans.**	
8	**LEP Visioning Workshop**		

		A paper was presented to provide an update on the early outcome of the LEP visioning workshop. It was noted the purpose of the workshop was to scope out and set a framework within which to take forward the SEP refresh and the LEP identified infrastructure as a key strategic theme alongside transport, housing, business growth, skills, rural and city/town centres. It was noted the LEP also identified Doncaster Sheffield Airport and the Advanced Manufacturing Innovation District (AMID) as important strategic projects It was suggested the LEP conclusions were generally in-keeping with the content of the SCR Infrastructure Executive Board-approved SCR IIP, which will provide a future mechanism to progress major transport schemes. It was also suggested the SCR IIP will require minor amends to ensure that the key strategic value of the AMID and airport is appropriately reflected as well as to emphasise the need for internal and external connectivity.	
9	**Key Thematic Links – Infrastructure, Transport and Housing** A paper was presented providing a first draft of a high level account of the key thematic links across all of SCRs Executive Boards. It was suggested the workstreams of the SCR Executive Boards are inextricably linked, with a number of work streams of key importance to multiple Boards and to clarify lead responsibilities, the SCR has assigned a 'Lead Board' for each thematic area, with the 'Lead Board' responsible for strategic direction and the oversight/ sign off of a range of project based activity. Members were also asked to note it has been recognised as essential that other Boards are involved and sighted on some activities of mutual interest. Members welcomed the suggestion that the Boards cannot work in isolation and the opportunity to look at a wider range of transport-related matters and schemes, but from a more partisan transport perspective. Members considered whether there would be any merit in combining the 3 SCRIIP Boards but recognised any such move would need to avoid the likelihood of unwieldly agendas. It was also suggested it would be timely to consider whether 'we' have the right skill sets to realise our ambitions. It was noted such questions will be considered by way of the review of the SCR Executive Team. Regarding the matrix of key themes, it was suggested that a lines needs adding in respect of buses	

	Members noted the current propensity for some types of SCRIF schemes to not score highly due to potential deficiencies in the FLUTE scoring methodology. It was suggested it would be beneficial to send a letter from 'TEB' to the wider CA / LEP Leaders to reiterate the importance of transport underpinning the SCR's regeneration aspirations. **Action: Julie to draft for comment**	
		JH
10	**York Aviation** Members were reminded of the intention to invite York Aviation to the meeting. York Aviation has been engaged by TfN to undertake aviation related research. However, members were informed York Aviation's reps were unavailable for today's meeting but would be invited to attend a future meeting. It was agreed it would be appropriate to ensure all TEB members are present before finalising arrangements with York Aviation. It was also noted that Peel Holdings (the owners of RHADS and other airports) are attending the LEP meeting on 1st August to provide members with more information regarding the plans for the airport. Members considered whether these 2 means of engagement might be accorded in some respect, such as Peel and York Aviation reps attending a future TEB meeting to discuss matters of mutual interest in respect of RHADS.	
11	**Strategic Update** Members were presented with the Strategic Transport Update Paper and reminded the tabular format report has been developed to report key transport issues to the TEB efficiently and effectively. Members requested more information on the DfT large majors bids. **Action: Dave to circulate** It was noted the bids will be signed off by the CA / LEP Chairs under delegated authority. It was noted the ask of DfT is for funding to develop full business cases, however, there will also be a local contribution requirement of c.£1m to cover the cost of development appropriate appraisal tools e.g. WebTag component models.	DA

12.1	**Rail North Update**	
	Members were infirmed Chris Grayling has just been made Secretary of State for Transport.	
	It was noted that this announcement, and other current matters, will continue to shape the Rail North initiative and its incorporation into TfN.	
12.2	**Devolution Update**	
	It was noted work continues to shape up the transport related aspects of the Devolution Deal (bus franchising and revisions to highways governance models) that would fall under the auspices of the mayor.	
13.1	**Infrastructure Executive Board**	
	The minutes of the meeting held on 3rd June were presented for information.	
13.2	**Transport Committee**	
	The minutes of the meeting held on 4th July were presented for information.	
13.3	**HS2 Programme Board**	
	Members were advised the Board continues to address matters related to the evolving nature of the initiative.	
14	**Items for the Combined Authority – 1st August**	
	Cllr Burrows noted he would be advising Members with details of the debate around the importance of avoiding silo working if we are to meet the objectives and aspirations of the SCRIIP.	
15	**Date of Next Meeting**	
	25th August, 2.00pm at Sheffield Town Hall	

This page is intentionally left blank

**Sheffield
City Region**

COMBINED
AUTHORITY

SCR COMBINED AUTHORITY TRANSPORT EXECUTIVE BOARD

25 AUGUST 2016

SCR INPUT TO THE NEW EAST MIDLANDS RAIL FRANCHISE

Summary

The East Midlands Rail Franchise provides services between Sheffield, Chesterfield and London and between Liverpool and Norwich via Sheffield and Chesterfield. The franchise also operates some local services in the SCR and the franchisee is the operator for Sheffield and Chesterfield Stations.

The current franchise, operated by Stagecoach-owned East Midlands Trains, expires in March 2018 and the process of procuring a new operator has commenced. The re-tendering process provides an important opportunity to influence the specification and provision of East Midlands rail services for the period of the next franchise, due to commence in March 2018. The report therefore sets out how the SCR can input into that process, and summarises the proposed SCR high level aspirations for the new franchise.

Several prospective bidders have approached the SCR seeking a discussion on its aspirations. These are initial and informal discussions. There will be a formal consultation on the franchise specification in due course to which the SCR intends to respond. That response will be the subject of further reports. It is likely that SCR local authorities and counties will be contact by prospective bidders. It will be beneficial to have agreed and consistent messages.

1.   **Issue**

    1.1. This report updates the Transport Executive Board (TEB) on the forthcoming re-tendering of the East Midlands rail franchise and sets out the proposed aspirations of SCR for the new franchise.

2.   **Recommendations**

    2.1. The Transport Executive Board is recommended to:

        2.1.1. Note the process and timescale for the re-tendering of the East Midlands rail franchise;

        2.1.2. Consider the proposed high level aspirations of the SCR for the new franchise and agree that these form the basis of any formal consultation response to the Department for Transport.

3.   **Background Information**

    3.1. The existing East Midlands (EM) rail franchise commenced in November 2007 and was originally due to end in March 2015. In March 2013 the Secretary of State for

Transport announced that the franchise would be extended by a direct award until October 2017. In September 2015 a further extension was granted until 4 March 2018.

3.2. The EM franchise is currently operated by East Midlands Trains Ltd, a subsidiary of Stagecoach Group, which also operates the Sheffield Supertram, South West Trains, and has a 90% stake in Virgin Trains East Coast. It also operates bus services in the SCR and many other parts of the UK.

3.3. The EM franchise plays a significant role within the SCR, as it includes the Midland Mainline inter-city services to London, together with a number of key inter-regional and local services. As well as linking Sheffield to London, the Midland Mainline (MML) also provides a key link between Sheffield and the East and South Midlands. The inter-regional service between Liverpool and Norwich links Sheffield to the key regional cities of Manchester and Nottingham, as well as intermediate towns. There is also a limited EM service linking Lincoln and Doncaster which provides the fastest journey time between those two important centres.

3.4. Two local EM routes, the Robin Hood Line and the Derwent Valley Line, provide key links between Nottingham and Worksop and Matlock respectively, both within the SCR. The EM franchise also has a significant interface with other franchises within the SCR, including Northern, TransPennine Express and Cross Country. The EM franchise also plays an important role in providing station facilities as the operator of Sheffield and Chesterfield Stations, as well as local stations on the Robin Hood and Derwent Valley Lines.

3.5. The Department for Transport (DfT) has commenced the re-tendering process for the new franchise. In July 2016 it invited expressions of interest in the new franchise from prospective bidders. Bidders will soon be shortlisted and an Invitation to Tender (ITT) setting out the service specification will be issued to shortlisted bidders in December. Following the bid submission deadline, bids will be assessed and the contract awarded to the successful bidder in October 2017. The new franchise will then commence in March 2018, although the Secretary of State reserves the right to extend the existing franchise by a further year.

3.6. It is expected that there will be a stakeholder consultation by the DfT on the ITT document in the autumn, although no details of this have so far been set out. SCR will wish to respond to any consultation as this offers the best opportunity to get its aspirations incorporated into the new franchise specification. This response will be the subject of a future report to the Transport Executive Board.

3.7. Prospective bidders are starting to approach SCR and other stakeholders with requests for meetings to discuss local aspirations for the new franchise. This is an opportunity to discuss SCR's aspirations with bidders at an early stage and influence their thinking. At these meetings it is proposed to give a document summarising the initial draft SCR franchise aspirations to prospective bidders, as set out in Appendix A. This document represents initial SCR officer thoughts.

3.8. The current EM franchise operator has made considerable progress in enhancing its services and stations, including several significant improvements that were delivered and funded through joint working with SCR, SYPTE and local partners. This included funding the extra hourly semi-fast train between Sheffield and London. The progress on achieving faster journeys to London and greater reliability across the network is also very welcome. It is important that the new franchise operator continues to improve frequency, connectivity, capacity and the overall passenger experience.

3.9. Sir David Higgins report on South Yorkshire options for HS2 was published in July 2016. This report suggests that Sheffield Midland would be the HS2 station, although the report is advice to the Secretary of State and not necessarily endorsed by Government. The TEB is asked to consider whether it wishes to comment on any integration with HS2 and long distance trains to London and the West Midlands as part of these discussions and response.

4. Summary of SCR Aspirations

4.1. The key SCR aspirations for the new EM franchise, set out in more detail in Appendix A, are:

- Provision of two 'fast' trains per hour between London and Sheffield, evenly spaced, with consistent stopping patterns and sub 2-hour journey times;

- Provision of additional late evening and Sunday trains between London and Sheffield;

- Extension of some peak London services to Barnsley and Rotherham;

- Provision of good connections with other services at key interchanges;

- Effective planning and timetabling during the MML electrification work;

- Timely rolling stock procurement for the post-electrification network;

- Provision of the Liverpool-Norwich service in a form that maintains and improves connections between Sheffield and Manchester and Nottingham;

- Continued enhancement of local routes and services;

- Continued improvement of stations and on-board facilities;

- Improved fares and ticketing offers, including smart, mobile and digital ticketing.

5. Implications

i. Financial
There are no financial implications as this franchise will be let by the Department for Transport. The SCR role is limited to responding to a public consultation exercise.

ii. Legal
There are no legal implications as this franchise will be let by the Department for Transport. The SCR role is limited to responding to a public consultation exercise.

iii. Diversity
None

iv. Equality
None

REPORT AUTHOR **Alex Forrest**
POST **Strategic Rail Officer, SCR Executive Team**

Officer responsible: Julie Hurley
Director of Transport, Housing, Infrastructure and Planning
SCR Executive Team. Julie.hurley@sheffieldcityregion.org.uk
0114 220 3445

DRAFT Sheffield City Region Aspirations for the new East Midlands Rail Franchise

Sheffield City Region covers the four South Yorkshire local authorities of Sheffield, Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham, together with Bassetlaw in North Nottinghamshire and Bolsover, Chesterfield, Derbyshire Dales and North East Derbyshire districts.

This document sets out the Sheffield City Region's initial high level aspirations for the new East Midlands rail franchise. The Sheffield City Region (SCR) Transport Strategy sets out the region's wider transport policy context. The Strategy's primary goal is for the transport system to support the economic growth of SCR, which is attracting substantial new investment and business relocation. Sheffield City Centre in particular is set for major regeneration and development, including several sites close to the station. In addition, the advanced manufacturing sector is growing, with the development of the Advanced Manufacturing Park between Sheffield and Rotherham.

SCR is a member of Transport for the North and of Rail North. We consider that Transport for the North's aspirations for rail serving Sheffield, which include 6 trains per hour to both Leeds and Manchester with journey times of 30 minutes, are essential to support economic transformation in the SCR. Achievement of these is a long term process however franchising and other rail planning processes are important stepping stones on the journey.

The higher education sector is particularly significant in Sheffield, with two large universities attracting considerable numbers of students. Sheffield Hallam University is the 6th largest in the UK in terms of student numbers, with over 30,000 students and 5,000 staff, and continues to expand. Sheffield University has around 27,000 students including 8,000 postgrads. This sector therefore generates strong demand for longer distance rail travel.

The East Midlands (EM) franchise plays a significant role within the Sheffield City Region, incorporating the Midland Mainline inter-city services to London, together with a number of key inter-regional and local services in the region. As well as linking Sheffield to London, the Midland Mainline (MML) also provides a key link between Sheffield and the East Midlands, including Chesterfield, Derby and Leicester.

The inter-regional service between Liverpool and Norwich links Sheffield to the key regional cities of Liverpool, Manchester and Nottingham, as well as intermediate towns such as Stockport and Warrington.

There is also a limited East Midlands Trains service linking Lincoln and Doncaster (from Peterborough or Sleaford) which provides the fastest journey time between these two important centres. Two local EM routes, the Robin Hood Line and the Derwent Valley Line, provide key links between Nottingham and Worksop and Matlock respectively, both within the SCR.

The EM franchise also has a significant interface with other franchises within the SCR, including Northern, TransPennine Express and Cross Country.

In addition, the EM franchise plays an important role in providing station facilities, as the operator of Sheffield and Chesterfield inter-city Stations, as well as local stations on the Robin Hood and Derwent Valley Lines.

SCR welcomes the progress that the current EM franchise operator has made in enhancing its services and stations, including several significant improvements that were delivered and funded through joint working with SCR and local partners. This included the funding of the extra hourly semi-fast train between Sheffield and London. SCR is committed to developing rail provision further and we would expect the new operator to work with us on schemes we may develop during the course of the franchise. The progress on achieving faster journeys to London and greater reliability across the network is also very welcome.

It is important that the new franchise operator continues to improve frequency, connectivity, capacity and the overall passenger experience.

The following summarises SCR's key aspirations for the new EM franchise:

Inter-City (Sheffield to London) Services

- Provision of two fast trains per hour between Sheffield and London, each with the same journey time rather than the current fast/semi-fast pattern. All London trains should call at Chesterfield. The aim should be for sub-2 hour journeys for all trains pre-electrification, and for significantly faster trains than at present in the morning peak towards London so that current off-peak journey times apply all day.

- Ensuring that the two London trains are evenly spaced at 30 minute intervals, to provide a regular and convenient service offer to passengers.

- If the current 'semi-fast' service is converted to 'fast', ensuring good connections are provided between inter-city, inter-regional and local services at key interchanges such as Derby and Leicester, and that connections and through fares from local services at Sheffield are maintained.

- Later weekday and Saturday evening services from Sheffield to London. Currently the last 'fast' service leaves Sheffield at 19:29 (which is the last direct service on Saturdays), and the last 'semi-fast' service at 20:49. SCR would like to see a later southbound departure to London leaving Sheffield around 21:30.

- A later Saturday evening train from London to Sheffield. Currently the last train leaves London at 20:57, which is too early for people visiting London for an evening out. SCR would like to see a later train to Sheffield leaving London around 22:00.

- Earlier northbound London to Sheffield trains on Sundays. Currently the first train leaves London at 09.30 and calls at all main stations, arriving in Sheffield at 12:23. SCR would like to see an earlier northbound departure around 08:30, arriving into Sheffield before 11:00. Currently, there is only an hourly stopping service for most of the day on Sundays, enhanced by a number of hourly fast services in the late afternoon / early evening. This presumably reflects the fact that the main passenger demand is later in the day. Nevertheless, SCR would like to see the introduction of an hourly all-day fast service to meet growing demand for Sunday travel.

- Consideration of the case for extending some peak London services to / from points beyond Sheffield, particularly Barnsley and Rotherham. A feasibility study into a new station at Parkgate to allow longer distance trains to serve Rotherham has been carried out and initial design work is now underway.

- Ensuring that a robust timetable is provided during the MML electrification work, maintaining current frequencies and journey times as far as possible, and planning effectively for the inevitable line closures in a way that puts passengers' interests first.

- Ensuring that new electric-compatible inter-city rolling stock is procured in sufficient time to be available for the completion of the MML electrification to Sheffield in 2023 and that it is able to take full advantage of electrification in terms of improved journey times. New rolling stock should be configured so as to maximise capacity and comfort, both in terms of train length and internal layout, with sufficient standard class and luggage / cycle space, catering facilities and free wi-fi.

Inter-Regional (Liverpool – Norwich) Services

- Maintaining the current hourly Liverpool-Norwich service via Sheffield in a form that retains the key links to /from Nottingham and Manchester that this service provides. Ensuring that the timetable for this service is co-ordinated with the TransPennine Express hourly fast service between Sheffield and Manchester to provide an evenly-spaced and consistent quality of service, with similar journey time and fare offers. This includes providing an evenly spaced timetable (currently the interval is not half-hourly in the eastbound direction). This should not however be at the expense of adversely impacting the current half-hourly Sheffield – Nottingham interval.

- SCR's short term aspiration is for at least three fast Sheffield–Manchester trains taking no more than 40 minutes with evenly spaced departures, in addition to an hourly stopping service on the Hope Valley Line, as soon as the Northern Hub infrastructure is in place to allow this. SCR does not support the introduction of new services between the East Midlands and Manchester via the Dore South Curve (avoiding Sheffield) unless the aspirations set out above are fully met.

- The Liverpool-Norwich service Sheffield uses 25-year old trains which, whilst they have been refurbished, will require replacement in due course. The operation of 4-car trains between Liverpool and Nottingham is a very welcome development, providing much needed capacity on this busy route. Additional capacity on this route may be required during the life of the franchise and should be planned for.

- Short term measures to reduce journey times on this service should be pursued with Network Rail, particularly between Sheffield and Manchester, as this service provides one of the two 'fast' trains per hour on this section, but takes longer than the TransPennine Express service. Sheffield–Nottingham journey times are also uncompetitive with road at present and should be improved, though not at the expense of removing stops.

Local Services
- Use of Dore and Totley station has grown significantly in recent years and we consider it has the potential to be an important gateway station serving the South West Sheffield and parts of North Derbyshire. Some feasibility work has recently been done to look at the case for reinstatement of the platforms on the MML, in addition to the committed junction improvement including new and longer platforms. We would expect the new franchisee to support further development of this and other locally-developed schemes that may come forward during the term of the franchise. Consideration should therefore be given to stopping additional EM Liverpool-Norwich trains there, particularly at peak times.

- Dronfield station has also been a success story since regular passenger services were reintroduced in 2008, with patronage increasing from 35,000 passengers per annum (ppa) in 2008/09 to 186,000 ppa in 2014/15 (ORR figures). SCR would like to see additional trains call at Dronfield. Most of these additional trains are likely to be provided by the Northern franchise. The current evening service is deficient, with the last departure from Sheffield at 2137. One option could be for the current EMT 21:37 Liverpool–Nottingham (23:37 ex Sheffield) to call at Dronfield to provide a later service that better serves the evening economy of the Sheffield City Region.

- The Derwent Valley Line service to Matlock has been improved considerably under the current franchise and the service has consequently seen a substantial increase in patronage. SCR would expect to see this level of service maintained and, where possible, enhanced. This could include later evening trains, additional trains on Sundays and the introduction of additional peak trains. Opportunities to improve journey times on this line should also be pursued and convenient connections to / from London trains at Derby provided.

- The Robin Hood Line has been a great success since it reopened in the 1990s. This line currently has an hourly service to Worksop and an hourly service to Mansfield Woodhouse.

Consideration should be given to extending the hourly Mansfield Woodhouse train to Worksop to provide a half-hourly frequency along the whole line. This would complement the doubling of the frequency on the Northern Sheffield-Retford service from December 2018. Connections between the two lines at Worksop are currently very poor, with long waits particularly in the northbound direction. Connection times at Worksop should therefore be improved to make rail journeys between North Nottinghamshire and Sheffield more competitive with the car, including seeking to reduce the journey times through line speed improvements. The Robin Hood Line Stations in the SCR do not have a Sunday service, as trains to do not operate north of Mansfield Woodhouse. We believe there is a case for a Sunday service, to complement the enhanced Sunday service on other SCR routes contracted under the new Northern Franchise, including Sheffield to Lincoln via Worksop.

<u>Stations and On-train Facilities</u>
- Sheffield Station is the city's 'front door' and the first impression for many visitors and potential investors so it is important that it creates a positive impression of the city. Whilst there has been considerable investment in the station under the current franchise, the opportunity for further improvements should be pursued. There are four specific issues that we would encourage bidders to consider with Network Rail:
    - o Improvements to the footbridge and platform access stairs to accommodate growth and the flow of pedestrians from Park Hill and the Supertram stop to the city centre, many of whom are not rail passengers.
    - o Greater collaboration between operators to ensure a consistent message is given to passengers about the railway as a whole, particularly at times of disruption
    - o Investigate whether it is possible to for longer distance services to use platforms nearer the station concourse and look at improving the experience for those passengers with luggage
    - o If Sheffield Midland is confirmed as the Government's preferred HS2 station, work with HS2 Ltd, Network Rail and other partners to accommodate HS2 services and provide high quality passenger facilities.

- Free wi-fi should be provided on all trains. On London and inter-urban services, other passenger benefits including improved on-train toilets and catering on longer-distance trains should be introduced. The existing free wi-fi provision at stations also needs to be improved to ensure reliable coverage.

- More flexible and competitive fares and ticketing should be considered to fill empty seats at less busy times, and encourage more off-peak usage. Operators need to get the right balance between cheaper advanced fares and walk-up fares. It is not uncommon for walk-up fares to be very expensive yet many seats remain empty at less busy times, including the 'shoulder peak'. The right balance between standard and first class capacity should also be struck to ensure efficient use of rolling stock.

- "Smart" ticketing, that is integrated with local products including the Smart and Integrated Ticketing work being led by Transport for the North, should be rolled out across the franchise by the next operator. EM currently operates a smartcard scheme and there are card readers at Sheffield station, however these have very limited use. There may be scope to better integrate this with the roll-out of smart ticketing on other forms of public transport in the Sheffield City Region.

- Introduction of more attractive off-peak car parking offers to encourage park-and-ride, such as cheaper evening and weekend tickets, as well as improvements to pick-up / drop-off arrangements and station access by non-car modes.

**Sheffield
City Region**

COMBINED
AUTHORITY

SCR COMBINED AUTHORITY TRANSPORT EXECUTIVE BOARD

25 August 2016

APPRAISAL PANEL BUSINESS CASE RECOMMENDATION

Summary

In line with the Sheffield City Region Single Assurance Framework projects seeking CA funding have been considered and recommended for Executive Board endorsement prior to presentation to the CA.

This cycle the business case for the Public Transport Connectivity Programme as part of the Sustainable Transport Exemplar Programme (STEP) Programme is seeking full approval has been reviewed by the SCR Appraisal Panel and the technical recommendations are now presented for consideration.

1.   **Issue**

   1.1.   The TEB are asked to consider the recommendations to progress the scheme business cases to Full Approval and endorse the entering into funding agreements for STEP – Public Transport Connectivity Programme at a cost of £4.195m.

   1.2.   In line with the Sheffield City Region Single Assurance Framework this project has been through a process of technical Appraisal, utilising where necessary external support, and consideration by a Panel of Offers representing the SCR Statutory Officers culminating in the recommendations presented for endorsement of the Executive board prior to seeking approval from the CA.

2.   **Recommendations**

   2.1.   Consider and endorse progression of STEP – Public Transport Connectivity Programme to Full Approval and Award of Contract at a cost £4.195M to SCR CA subject to the conditions set out in the Project Approval Summary Table attached at **Appendix 1**. This recommendation would be considered by the SCR CA.

   2.2.   Consider alternative approaches to project allocation within the STEP Programme in advance of submitting applications for future commissioning calls.

3.   **Background Information**

3.1.   SCR Assurance Framework requires that all schemes seeking investment undergo a thorough and proportionate scheme appraisal following the Treasury Green Book approach.

3.2.   Before papers are submitted to Executive Boards an independent technical appraisal has been undertaken and reviewed by a panel of Officers representing the Statutory Officers of the SCR Executive. Where appropriate due to the scale / risk and complexity of the project this is supplemented by external appraisal from a panel of Consultants referred to as Central Independent Appraisal Team (CIAT).

3.3.   The technical appraisal will scrutinise the business case documents submitted by scheme promoters to ensure completeness and test the responses to each of the 5 cases (Strategic, Economic, Financial, Management and Commercial) and will present their findings for each case and the project overall.

3.4.   These findings will inform the 151 Officers view regarding the Value for money Statement and the Monitoring Officers view regarding the relative risks of the scheme presented.

STEP – Public Transport Connectivity

3.5.   Following the schemes progression through the SCR Assurance Framework, the scheme promoter, the South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive (SYPTE) presents the STEP – Public Transport Connectivity Programme to the TEB for endorsement of Full Approval and Award of Funding.

3.6.   It should be acknowledged that the Section 31 flexibility of devolved funding allows SCR to spend on schemes which deliver the greatest benefit and are of greatest priority, irrespective of the original allocation government made to SCR. The CA can and do reallocate funds where Projects have not achieved full approval to reflect priorities and deliverability of the programme without need of further approval from government.

3.7.   In assessing the scheme, the Appraisal Panel has highlighted the risk that by seeking to achieve an equitable geographical split of spend within each programme, potentially high performing schemes may be excluded. This approach may not best facilitate the most impactful programme and is unlikely to score as well as possible against other programmes / projects under the likely single pot arrangements.

3.8.   The CA expects to receive requests for the best available schemes which are deliverable in the funding timescales.

3.9.   TEB are therefore asked to give consideration to alternative approaches to project allocation within the STEP Programme in advance of submitting applications for future commissioning calls.

3.10. Panel also highlighted the difficulty in translating the individual elements to the SEP outcomes and future calls will be required to meet the needs of a number of conditional outcomes and each scheme will need to demonstrate its individual contribution as well as the programmes contribution.

3.11. Further concerns were raised about the clarity of each projects costs and their contribution to the overall programme costs and outcomes as it was possible for stronger project to carry weaker projects that would otherwise not pass the approval process.

3.12.   As a part of a Programme of activity managed via the LTP team there isn't currently a version of the SCR dashboard to accompany this approval. The SCR performance team will work with the LTP team to agree the format of quarterly performance reporting, including a per project breakdown.

4.   **Implications**

i.   Financial

Financial implications have been fully considered by a representative of the S151 officer and included in the recommendations agreed by the Appraisal Panel as presented in this report.

ii.   Legal

Legal implications have been fully considered by a representative of the Monitoring officer and included in the recommendations agreed by the Appraisal Panel as presented in this report.

iii.   Diversity

None as a result of this report

iv.   Equality

None as a result of this report

REPORT AUTHOR   **Melanie Dei Rossi**
POST   Head of Performance

Officer responsible: **Ruth Adams, Interim Deputy Executive / Director of Skills & Performance,
Sheffield City Region Combined Authority
0114 2203441, Ruth.adams@sheffieldcityregion.org.uk**

Scheme Details		Appraisal Panel Comments		Recommendations / Conditions	
SCR Executive Board	Transport	**Strategic Case**	The programme presents a clear strategic case for the Public Transport Connectivity Programme (PTCP) 2015/16 to 2017/18 as part of the STEP programme, the promoter is up-front in acknowledging the supporting role public transport projects, such as those included in this programme, provide in facilitating the achievement of the strategic aims of SCR Growth Plan and SEP, rather than necessarily directly delivering them. As such, although this may be seen as a limitation in comparison to some of the other projects that are delivered using SCR funding, which do have a more direct impact, the promoter is still able to provide a clear link to how the programme will support SCR's strategic objectives. This is also framed within the wider context of where the programme fits with other national, sub-regional and local policies on public transport, linking to enhanced social and economic inclusion, reduced congestion and harmful emissions and improved health.	**Funding**	LGF
Project Name	Sustainable Transport Exemplar Programme (STEP) - Public Transport Connectivity Programme (PTCP) 2015/16 to 2017/18	**Value for Money**	The programme has an estimated benefit/cost ratio (BCR) of between 3.8 and 4.6, dependent on the level of optimism bias (OB) applied to costs (44% for the former and 15% for the latter) a range of this nature is appropriate given this is a programme rather than an individual project. (NB. OB is not included in the requested approval) As part of this calculation not all benefits were monetised, with road safety improvements, noise reductions and improved accessibility assessed to be positive, but not included in the BCR. Similarly, wider economic benefits are also not included in the BCR. Hence the final figure is likely to be higher and in all cases in excess of the high category score of 2.0	**Approval Requested**	Full approval and award of funding.

Scheme Promoter	SYPTE	Risk	Although a full Risk Log is still forthcoming from the promoter, the FBC outlines that a robust risk management approach is in place, linking to SYPTE's previous history of successfully delivering public transport projects and programmes. Consequently, the level of risk and uncertainty seems limited, given that leveraged match funding for the programme appears to be secured, and the majority of procurement for the various projects has already been completed. One potential area of concern is that this submission only forms part of the overall Sustainable Transport Exemplar Programme. The second part of the submission, which is being undertaken by the Local Transport Partnership (LTP) team on behalf of the four South Yorkshire local authorities, has still yet to be completed in full. As such, the limitations associated with this other non-SYPTE section could potentially impact on the overall programme. Nevertheless, it is possible to assess the programme presented here on its own merits, particularly given that SYPTE continue to work with the LTP Team to ensure the synchronisation of the two FBCs.	Grant Award	£4.195m Capital LGF
SCR Funding	£4.195m			Grant Recipient	SYPTE
Total Scheme Cost	£10.246m	State Aid	Neutral, Scheme promoter has sought their own legal advice in reaching the decision that the funding will be state aid neutral	Payment Basis	Defray in arrears
% SCR allocation	41%	Delivery	The promoter has a comprehensive and demonstrable history of successfully delivering capital based public transport projects similar to those presented in this funding application, including the 2015/16 STEP. This, combined with a robust programme management approach based around the recognised PRINCE2 methodology, gives a high level of confidence that the promoter will be able to deliver the programme over the next two years.	Claw Back Clauses	None

Description	Conditions of Award
The Public Transport Connectivity Programme (PTCP) is part of the overall Sustainable Transport Exemplar Programme (STEP), and will help to successfully deliver the aims of the Bus Partnerships across South Yorkshire and continue to drive up adult fare payer patronage. To be successful these Partnerships need to be financially sustainable and affordable, and deliver services that are easy for customers to use (as evidenced through patronage and satisfaction targets). They also need to support access to jobs and training, particularly in the economic areas as identified in the SCR Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) through delivery on a daily basis. The programme is comprised of a package of public transport and related interventions: - Bus priority measures based around the A18, connecting Doncaster town centre to Stainforth, specifically a major pinch point on bus routes at the rail over road bridge on the short stretch of the A18 between Wheatley Hall Road and the A630. Complementing these will be bus priority measures on the A630, which links Doncaster, Rotherham and Barnsley via Dearne Valley South, where a number of interventions will aim to reduce journey times and improve punctuality and reliability. - Small scale flexible highway improvements in Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham via Hotspots interventions, to address bus punctuality and reliability. Measures will include: revised waiting restrictions, minor changes to highway layouts and alterations to traffic signals. - Key Route Bus interventions implemented on particular high frequency bus routes, featuring: bus priority, traffic signal improvements, new and/or improved bus stops and information. These KBR interventions will be delivered on five routes: Barnsley/Wakefield (Phase 2), Chesterfield Road/Heeley Bottom, North Sheffield, Sheffield/Chapeltown, and Sheffield/Gleadless. - A contribution towards the purchase of scooters for the South Yorkshire Wheels to Work scheme, which provides the low cost loan of these scooters for individuals seeking to access work or training, when public transport is not a viable option. This part of the programme was delivered during 2015/16. - The Sheffield Urban Traffic Control Upgrade, which will see Intelligent Transport Systems (ITS) utilised to help manage the road network by improving communications with traffic signal equipment, while reducing ongoing maintenance costs. This technology will allow SCC to implement more flexible traffic management strategies that will improve journey time reliability and smooth traffic flows at known congestion hot spots for all road users, including buses.	Continued liaison between SYPTE and LTP team in completion of FBC for other STEP element, to maintain synchronisation and ensure overall funding requirement does not exceed currently agreed maximum. Provision of minor updates and clarifications, as outlines in feedback on FBC, none of which are sufficient to prevent approval of funding. Engagement with other SCR Executive Boards, via SCR officers to be undertaken. Programme evaluation to be submitted to SCR following completion of delivery phase.

Record of Approvals

Sustainable Transport Exemplar Programme (STEP) - Public Transport Connectivity Programme (PTCP) 2015/16 to 2017/18

Appraisal Panel		Executive Board		CA	
Date of Meeting	26/07/2016	Date of Meeting	25/08/2016	Date of Meeting	12/09/2016
SCR Officer Presenting Paper	Edward Fletcher	SCR Officer Presenting Paper		SCR Officer Presenting Paper	
Signature	*[signature]*	Signature		Signature	
Approving Officer	Gareth Sutton	Approving Officer		Approving Officer	
Signature	*[signature]* FINANCE MANAGER	Signature		Signature	
Date	26/07/2016	Date		Date	

Full Business Case

1 - SCHEME DETAILS

1.1 - SCHEME INFORMATION

Scheme Name:	Public Transport Connectivity Programme (PTCP) 2015/16 to 2017/18 – Part of the Sustainable Transport Exemplar Programme (STEP)

STRATEGIC CASE ASSESSMENT (TO BE COMPLETED BY THE ASSESSOR)

Does the programme have a clear strategic rationale and align to SCR Growth Plan objectives and the SEP?

The programme has a very clear strategic rationale, which is based around broad and fundamental aims in terms of increasing public transport usage and the associated benefits related to this. Although these objectives may not align exactly with all those of the SCR Growth Plan and the SEP, the promoter is able to provide a clear link to how they will support both these strategic documents.

Does the programme effectively align with other SCR Executive Boards and other policies locally, sub-regionally and nationally?

The programme shows a clear alignment with local, sub-regional and national policies, linking to existing priorities regarding the facilitation of increased public transport use, and the positive economic and environmental impacts this can create. The programme is less clear about the specific ways it aligns with other SCR Executive Boards (other than Transport, which is its primary theme), although does acknowledge the potential links it has.

Are SMART objectives clear and consistent with the nature of the programme and is there a clear plan for the delivery of key activities?

SMART objectives are, for the most part, well explained, linking to the promoter's previous experience of successfully delivering similar projects. For this reason, the promoter also has a clear understanding of the key activities required for delivery, which provides additional confidence in their ability to be successful, at least in terms of outputs.

Are there any adverse consequences if the programme goes ahead / does not go ahead?

The promoter has been clear about the potential negative impacts of the programme not going ahead, specifically the non-achievement of core goals, and a potential detrimental impact on the broader public transport agenda for South Yorkshire. The promoter has also linked this to the match contributions that the programme will not attract if SCR funding is not provided and the programme does not go ahead.

In terms of adverse consequences of the programme going ahead, there is less consideration, with the suggestion that there should be no negative consequences associated with delivery. Although the promoter has given a clear explanation of the benefits of the programme, which would be lost in the case of non-delivery, it could potentially do more to consider any dis-benefits associated with delivery, even if it is to say that any such negatives are greatly outweighed by the positives.

Has a robust assessment of the alternative options been considered?

The assessment might not be as robust as expected, due to the programme already being part way through delivery, prior to submitting this FBC (meaning that there is a certain assumption that the full funding ask will be made available). However, the promoter still provides a decent explanation of the dependencies associated with the programme in terms of deliverables and the broader strategic goals

which it will contribute towards, and how these might be reduced, or disappear entirely, if the full funding ask is not provided.

COMMERCIAL CASE ASSESSMENT (TO BE COMPLETED BY THE ASSESSOR)

Is the programme feasible and has market potential / demand been adequately assessed / evidenced?

The promoter has given a strong explanation of the market demand for this programme, including the broader strategic requirements that it should address, and how it supports its commercial partners (the bus operators), which in turn helps demonstrate its feasibility.

Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?

All projects that form part of this programme appear to have a clear procurement strategy, with defined milestones. The vast majority of projects have also already completed the necessary procurement.

ECONOMIC CASE ASSESSMENT (TO BE COMPLETED BY THE ASSESSOR)

Have gross and net economic impacts of the programme been assessed appropriately?

Evidence provided in this section suggests that the economic impacts, with the exception of GVA (see below), have been assessed appropriately.

Does the programme offer reasonable value for money?

Yes, factoring differing levels of optimism bias, the programme offers a benefit-cost ratio (BCR) of between 3.8 and 4.6.

Is the programme's contribution to GVA proportionally substantive?

The programme is currently unable to provide a GVA contribution estimate, and is seeking more guidance from SCR about how to potentially complete this section. However, it does currently provide a brief outline of the potential impacts it will have on GVA.

Assess the wider contribution of the programme.

The programme acknowledges that it mainly provides a supporting role to the strategic goals of SCR, and as such it is focused on the 'wider contribution' it is making. Within this, there is a clear explanation of the potential benefits of the proposed programme, in terms of increasing public transport patronage and thus reducing car usage. In turn this is expected to reduce congestion, thus making journey times more efficient and businesses potentially more productive. This modal shift should also make positive contributions to harmful emissions, health and also is anticipated to provide better access to opportunities for areas of deprivation where car ownership is lower than average.

What are the key risks, sensitivities, and uncertainties relating to the programme?

Given the history the promoter has of successful delivery of similar public transport projects, and the fact these projects are linked to existing strategies and programmes, the level of risk and uncertainty seems limited. This is compounded by the fact that the majority of procurement for the various projects has already been completed. For these reasons, there is limited concern about the ability of the promoter to deliver the programme.

However, there is one sensitivity of note, that being that the STEP funding application is being submitted as two separate FBCs, and the other complementary document currently has some significant gaps in information.

Furthermore, the combined total of funding requested between the two separate FBCs exceeds the total amount of money available to the overall STEP. Subsequent feedback has suggested that this 'over-programming' is intentional, due to the programme's aspiration to secure more funding. However, the promoters are reminded that no additional funding for STEP is currently available and as such everything costed in the two FBCs should be fully deliverable with the current allocation.

Are there any significant environmental and/or social impacts, including dis-benefits?

The programme is expected to provide connections to areas of significant deprivation, as well as promoting healthier modes of transport, which are anticipated to have a positive social impact. The projected shift from car use to public transport is also expected to reduce harmful emissions, which in turn should have a positive environmental impact.

In terms of dis-benefits, none have been identified by the promoter, although they have been asked to consider this further, to confirm if this is definitely the case.

Does any significant data seem to be missing from the information provided?

Aside from the GVA estimate, there are some occasional gaps in terms of citations of certain sources, but these are all relatively minor.

FINANCIAL CASE ASSESSMENT (TO BE COMPLETED BY THE ASSESSOR)

Have programme finances been assessed appropriately?

Yes, a detailed breakdown of finances has been provided, although there are some issues regarding the inclusion of over-programming (see comments in section 5, relating to the assessment question '*What are the key risks, sensitivities, and uncertainties relating to the programme?*').

Has other funding been confirmed or what is the timescale for confirmation?

Based on other responses on this form, as well as this specific section, it would appear that other funding has already been confirmed, or there is a clear expectation of when it will be if it hasn't been confirmed yet.

Are additional costs associated with overruns or post-delivery revenue requirements adequately accounted for?

Yes, although there is some uncertainty about 'longer term' post-delivery revenue costs, overall there seems to be an adequate plan in place to cover any such overruns.

MANAGEMENT CASE ASSESSMENT (TO BE COMPLETED BY THE ASSESSOR)

Is there a clear project management and delivery plan?

Yes, the programme will utilise the established PRINCE2 methodology and draw upon the comprehensive experience of project and programme management that the promoter is able to offer.

3

Page 26

N:\Governance\Boards\Transport Executive Board\20160825 Agenda STEP Public Transport Connectivity Programme - Full Business Case - short.docx

Are programme milestones sufficiently mapped out and realistic?

Partially, individual project milestones are comprehensively mapped out, although could benefit from slightly more detailed dates. However, the overall milestones for the programme still require some attention, as several have not been completed.

Has the programme got an adequate understanding of State Aid requirements and an approach to deal with any obligations?

Yes, the programme has addressed the four core questions in terms of State Aid, in consultation with their legal representative, in order to confirm that it would not apply to this project.

Are the levels of risk acceptable and capable of being managed?

Yes, although the detailed Risk Log has yet to be supplied (however it is stated as being forthcoming by the promoter), information provided in the main FBC suggests that the level of risk is acceptable, and that suitable controls are in place to manage it.

Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?

Yes, the programme has clear understanding of key metrics to monitor and evaluate, and how this will be completed.

ASSESSMENT SUMMARY (TO BE COMPLETED BY THE ASSESSOR)

Please summarise your assessment of the programme's Strategic Case and set out any recommendations.

In terms of the Strategic Case that this programme presents, the promoter is clear and up-front in acknowledging the supporting role public transport projects provide in facilitating the achievement of the strategic aims of SCR Growth Plan and SEP, rather than necessarily directly delivering them. As such, although this may be seen as a limitation in the wider context of the various schemes that are delivered under the auspices of SCR which do have a more direct impact, it is nevertheless constructive that the promoter is acknowledging this, and also giving a focus to the positives that are being offered, including providing a wider context for where the programme fits within other national, sub-regional and local policies.

Having said this, there is still some uncertainty on the part of the promoter regarding specifically how the programme fits with the other SCR Executive Boards outside of Transport, with the recommendation that this be considered further.

Compared to the initial draft submission for this programme (version 1), greater consideration has now been given to potential alternative options, including the possible adverse impact on achieving the planned outcomes and benefits in the case of reduced funding. However, the programme is still heavily dependent on receiving the full allocation requested, and as such potentially could have done more to show the scalability of what it could achieve, particularly given that it is a series of smaller projects/interventions, rather than one larger activity.

SMART objectives are for the most part well explained, with the promoter being able to draw upon its comprehensive previous experience of delivering similar projects to be able to offer suitable reassurance that the programme will be deliverable.

Overall, aside from a few more minor issues, detailed with the promoter , the programme provides a clear and coherent explanation of its Strategic Case.

4

Page 27

N:\Governance\Boards\Transport Executive Board\20160825\06 - SCR and TEP Public Transport Connectivity Programme - Full Business Case - short.docx

Full Business Case

Please summarise your assessment of the programme's Commercial Case and set out any recommendations.

The Commercial Case draws extensively and effectively on local and national evidence to illustrate the demand case for the programme, linking this to the supportive role public transport can offer to the strategic objectives of SCR, as outlined in the Strategic Case section. This also involves consultation with bus operators, who provide a private sector response on all proposed interventions.

This said, the programme is not specifically reliant on private partners or stakeholders to deliver outputs, but longer term requires bus operators to continue to use the network for their commercial services, in order to be effective.

In terms of procurement, the programme has clearly defined milestones, with the process for many projects already completed. A plan is in place to manage any cost increases during the procurement stage, via the PTE's Integrated Transport Block (ITB) funding, although it should be noted that this would in turn have a negative impact on the ITB programme (as funding available is finite).

Please summarise your assessment of the programme's Economic Case and set out any recommendations.

The principal issue with the Economic Case is that the promoter has been unable to provide a GVA estimate for the programme, instead seeking further guidance from SCR about how this should be calculated. In this section, and elsewhere in the FBC, the promoter has been able to provide an outline of the potential ways in which these interventions should have a positive impact on GVA, but has been unable to translate this into a specific figure. This is a fundamental area that will need addressing before the FBC can proceed.

Although unable to provide a GVA estimate, the promoter has been able to produce a value for money calculation, with the programme expected to deliver a benefit-cost ratio (BCR) of between 3.8 and 4.6, depending on the level of optimism bias applied.

With one minor exception, which the promoter will be asked to re-examine, the anticipated deliverables for the programme (outputs, outcomes and benefits) are quantified, with a clear understanding of how the activities completed will result in them being achieved.

As part of this, the programme does not anticipate delivering any direct employment outputs, although it is acknowledged throughout the FBC, including in the Strategic Case section, that this was never anticipated to be the case, as the programme provides a supporting role through facilitation of job creation, rather than a direct impact.

In terms of anticipated environmental and social impact, the programme is expected to have a positive social impact by providing connections to areas of significant deprivation, as well as promoting healthier lifestyles through the use of public transport, which in turn is expected to have a positive environmental impact through reduced harmful emissions associated with congestion and single car user journeys.

In terms of dis-benefits, none have been identified by the promoter, although they have been asked to consider this further, to confirm if this is definitely the case.

5

Page 28

N:\Governance\Boards\Transport Executive Board\20160825\[...]SS 2b STEP Public Transport Connectivity Programme - Full Business Case - short.docx

Full Business Case

Although a transport scheme, none of the individual projects proposed under this programme exceed the £5m threshold which would trigger the need to complete a full WebTAG appraisal. However, the promoter has utilised the WebTAG Economic Appraisal section of the form to provide some additional background information around this area, which is useful in providing some additional context of what it anticipates to achieve economically.

Overall the promoter has a proven history of successfully delivering transport interventions similar to those included in this FBC, and as such has a high confidence in their ability to deliver this programme, whilst managing the minimal risks that have been identified. However, one potential sensitivity that could impact this programme is that it forms only part of the overall Strategic Transport Exemplar Programme (STEP). The other section of STEP is currently also in development, and any limitations of this complementary component could also potentially negatively impact on the programme presented here, in terms of the overall package it offers.

Please summarise your assessment of the programme's Financial Case and set out any recommendations.

The promoter has been able to provide a detailed cost breakdown for the programme, with a relatively high level of certainty about the accuracy of the figures provided.

Similarly, the other match funding for this programme appears to have already been confirmed, although there is some minor uncertainty about the potential for this to change in future, with specific reference to the Integrated Transport Block (ITB). The promoter will be asked to confirm the likelihood of any changes here.

However, the principal concern financially with the project remains the inclusion of potential over-programming, which would exceed the grant allocation available for the programme. The promoter will be asked to ensure that all projects included in the FBC are fully deliverable without an additional funding ask from SCR, with any ambitions beyond this noted, but kept separate.

In terms of potential overruns, the promoter has a robust management system in place to handle this, with a potential funding source identified. However, it will be asked to give more consideration to how utilising this other funding might affect the overall public transport offer in South Yorkshire.

As for post-delivery revenue costs, there is some uncertainty about how these will be met 'longer term', although in the short to medium term, there is a plan in place.

Please summarise your assessment of the programme's Management Case and set out any recommendations.

Overall the programme presents a strong management case. Use of the recognised PRINCE2 methodology, combined with the promoter's extensive experience of project and programme management, places them in a strong position to deliver. As part of this, detailed milestones have been mapped for the individual projects, although the promoter has been asked to fill in some current gaps in terms of overall milestones.

Similarly, there is also a clear and robust risk management strategy in place, although a copy of the detailed Risk Log the promoter has produced is still required.

The promoter's legal representative has been consulted regarding State Aid, with a clear explanation of why it would not be applicable for this programme.

In terms of monitoring and evaluation, the promoter also has a clear understanding of the core metrics that will be tracked and assessed.

Summarise your overall assessment of the programme and recommendations for SCR.

Throughout this Full Business Case it is clear that the proposed programme has limitations in terms of the direct contribution it will make to the strategic aims of SCR Growth Plan and SEP. The promoter is frank in acknowledging this, instead focusing on the positive facilitation role that public transport interventions, such as those presented here, can have in achieving these goals.

In order to address this potential vulnerability and justify investment in this programme, the promoter is able to draw a clear through-line from the proposed projects to the strategic aims of SCR, calling effectively on national data and local evidence to demonstrate the specific need for these actions and the anticipated impact they will have.

Nevertheless, the largest issue with this FBC remains the lack of an estimation of the GVA impact the programme is expected to have. This is mostly due to the 'non-standard' nature of the programme, compared to other projects that receive SCR funding, as suggested above. However, despite this fact it will still be necessary for the promoter to attempt this GVA estimate.

Another issue is that of over-programming. The promoter has been informed of the maximum funding level that will be available for this programme at the current time, and although it is acceptable for them to identify future ambitions, they should be clear that all projects featured in the funding ask for this FBC, including their associated deliverables, should be fully achievable without any additional SCR grant above the currently identified maximum.

Other than this, there are also some more minor gaps in terms of the some of the information provided, which are detailed in the summary sections for each of the five cases above, as well as throughout the FBC feedback. However, there is an overall confidence that the promoter should be able to provide this additional detail, and as such, it should not be enough to raise any significant concerns about the viability of the programme.

Furthermore, the promoter is able to clearly demonstrate the structures, systems and experience it can bring to bear in order to complete this programme successfully, which inspires a significant amount of confidence regarding its potential deliverability, an important factor given the relatively short timescales involved.

Nevertheless, the fact these projects form only part of the overall Sustainable Transport Exemplar Programme (STEP), does present a potential liability. For this reason, the promoter is advised to continue to work closely with those responsible for the development of the complementary STEP business case to ensure effective synchronisation and avoid any of the limitations from this other component negatively reflecting on their programme.

Consequently, the overall recommendation is that this programme be approved, pending the completion of a GVA estimate, confirmation regarding any over-programming and the provision of some of the other additional details or clarifications that have been requested. The second non-SYPTE component of the overall STEP will be considered separate from this.

7

Page 30

N:\Governance\Boards\Transport Executive Board\20160825 ... STEP Public Transport Connectivity Programme - Full Business Case - short.docx

Sheffield
City Region
COMBINED
AUTHORITY

TRANSPORT EXECUTIVE BOARD

25TH AUGUST 2016

THE SCR SINGLE ASSURANCE FRAMEWORK:
STRATEGIC TOOLS FOR PRIORITISATION AND APPRAISAL

The relevant SCR Executive Boards (Transport, Infrastructure & Housing) are asked to endorse the development of a Business Case for an update to their strategic testing tools and associated datasets. The strategic testing tools are required across multiple themes in order to ensure the effective prioritisation and appraisal of schemes which are funded via the SCR single pot.

It is proposed that this work will be delivered in phases, with clear opportunities to use common tools and datasets across the three areas of activity detailed below.

- **Transport: There is a pressing need to upgrade the transport component to harness the potential of the SCR Large Local Majors bid. A compliant model is required to allow progression of major transport schemes through the SCR Assurance Framework as well as the Department for Transport's Large Majors Competition.**

- **Infrastructure: More sophisticated testing tools are required to develop the next SCR infrastructure pipeline, informed by the SCR Integrated Infrastructure Plan.**

- **Housing: The development of the next SCR infrastructure pipeline needs to ensure that at a SCR-level we have effective tools in place to prioritise and appraise a range of housing projects/ interventions. Ahead of this, early work needs to be undertaken to support the SCR 'early commission for housing growth'.**

The Executive Boards are asked to endorse the development of a Business Case following the SCR Single Assurance Framework procedures, for an updated suite of testing tools/ associated data. The Business Case to be submitted will set out the need to bring this work forward in phases, as opportunities arise and in line with changes to national guidance/ best practice.

---

1. **Issue**

    1.1   This paper seeks endorsement for SCR to develop a Business Case to update its strategic modelling tools for prioritisation and appraisal. A need has been identified across multiple themes and the work is key to progressing schemes through the SCR Assurance Framework. This is an essential part of the process required to test the Value for Money of schemes at the development stage.

    1.2   Following agreement to this approach by the SCR Combined Authority, the Business Case

will be subject to SCR prioritisation in line with the SCR Single Assurance Framework.

2. **Recommendations**

It is recommended that the Sheffield City Region Transport Executive Board:

2.1 Note the importance of developing robust tools/ datasets to prioritise and appraise a range of transport investments and interventions.

2.2 To endorse the development of a Business Case for the development of strategic testing tools in support of the Sheffield City Region's transport ambitions.

3. **Background Information**

3.1 Project testing tools are part of the SCR Single Assurance Framework. This Framework was developed in accordance with central Government guidelines[1] and is an essential part of the process required to test the Value for Money of schemes at the development stage.

3.2 During the development of the SCR Integrated Infrastructure Plan; the SCR Executive Team has previously communicated (to both the SCR Combined Authority and the Transport Executive Board) the need to invest in more sophisticated tools and updated data, in light of the need for forecast demand, impact and benefit to be robust.

3.3 The investment in technical tools to support and inform decision-making is the responsibility of the SCR. It is essential in order to ensure that devolved funds are managed in line with Government Guidance, as well as to ensure the compliance of bids for future Government support. There is also considerable benefit in developing these technical tools at a SCR-level, ensuring that schemes from across all nine Local Authority areas are tested in a consistent way in line with an approach endorsed by the SCR Combined Authority.

3.4 Transport

In the case of transport, the SCR Combined Authority has recently approved the submission of the Large Local Majors bid to DfT for the development of Outline Business Cases (OBCs) for three large transport schemes that the DfT may directly fund in the next few years, provided a compliant OBC is produced for each. Conditions for direct DfT support for the construction of these schemes are that:

- the OBC's must employ updated tools and models and
- the work involved be part locally funded.

Therefore, in June 2016, the CA *"[agreed] to the principle of SCR making an appropriate contribution to building a 'do nothing' model baseline to allow Outline Business Case development for the [DfT Large Majors] competition"*. This will also support the ongoing

[1] General guidance on these is provided by DCLG in
https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/516215/Single_Pot_Assurance_Framework.pdf

testing of other large schemes and options linked to SCR's Assurance Framework

Clearly, without the right tools in place, SCR will be unable to bid, later, for the construction costs of these Large Local Major transport schemes (or indeed any other major transport schemes under the SCR's Single Assurance Framework, which requires Government standards to be followed).

3.5 Infrastructure

The SCR Integrated Infrastructure Plan (IIP) sets out that testing tools will have a role to play in the development of an infrastructure pipeline. It is accepted that our tools need to be more sophisticated to be able to test schemes and options in more detail than previously (for example, to better understand the housing impacts of infrastructure investment).

3.6 Housing

As the SCR moves towards the development of city region level funding programmes and products, there needs to be robust tools in place to prioritise and appraise a range of housing investments/ interventions.

This will in part be achieved through the planned development work in support of the SCR infrastructure pipeline, however, it is acknowledged that future housing investments are likely to wider in scope than purely infrastructure schemes.

3.7 At the SCR CA meeting on 1st August a report it was agreed that 'an early commissioning process should commence as soon as possible to increase housing growth in the SCR for schemes that can start delivery and spend in the 16/17 FY'.

In view of this recommendation, the SCR Executive Team will need to commission consultancy/ technical support in order to assist with elements of process design and independent assessment/ appraisal in order to ensure compliance with the Governments national guidance on Single Pot Assurance Frameworks[2].

3.8 Business Case Development

In light of the above, the relevant Executive Boards are asked to endorse the development of a Business Case following the SCR Single Assurance Framework procedures, for an updated suite of testing tools/ associated data.

3.9 The updates are relevant to all themes and are estimated to cost in the region of £2m – £2.5m (cost certainty will be provided at Business Case stage) depending on coverage and detail required. Of this, the transport modelling work will cost about £1.6m over the next 2 years. The capital cost of the three transport schemes to be modelled and appraised exceeds £700m. The opportunity cost of not making the necessary upgrades is therefore significant, as SCR would be unable to deliver major infrastructure investment and therefore be unable to secure the benefits of transformational investment.

---

[2] DCLG will soon be publishing its DCLG Appraisal Guide which provides guidance on how the Department appraises residential and non-residential development which local partners may wish to follow, particularly if seeking central government funding

3.10 The Business Case to be submitted will set out the need to bring this work forward in phases, as opportunities arise and as guidance changes. The initial focus is on transport due to the relative complexity of transport modelling and the opportunity recently presented. In addition, early work will be required in order to support the 'early commission for housing growth'.

3.11 Land Use Data

SCR has not updated the land use component of its testing tools for approximately 18 months, and this data was based on relatively early Local Plan indications. SCR will therefore approach SCR Local Authorities for updated Land Use data to facilitate the update. Once received, this data will be provided to modellers as required to ensure the testing tools are up to date.

4. **Implications**

i. Financial

This activity is highlighted in the TEB business plan and subject to successful progression through the SCR Assurance Framework is expected to be capitalised against LGF funds.

The Business Case would be subject to full financial analysis as part of the Assurance Framework.

ii. Legal
None at this stage – The Business Case would be subject to full financial analysis as part of the Assurance Framework. Procurement of the work will be subject to a mini competition under the SCR framework agreement for SCR modelling services.

iii. Diversity

None

iv. Equality

None

REPORT AUTHOR	**David Allatt**
POST	**Planning and Sustainability Manager, SCR**
Officer responsible	**Ruth Adams**
Post	**Deputy Executive Director/ Director of Skills & Performance**
Organisation	**Sheffield City Region Executive Team**
Email	**ruth.adams@sheffieldcityregion.org.uk**
Telephone	**0114 220 3442**

Sheffield City Region
COMBINED AUTHORITY

TRANSPORT EXECUTIVE BOARD

25th AUGUST 2016

THE CREATION OF A SINGLE LTA AND SUPPORTING TRANSITION PLAN

Summary

This paper outlines the Sheffield City Regions (SCR) work on the creation of a Single Local Transport Authority (LTA) for an expanded Combined Authority (CA). The Single LTA workstream flows from the Governance Review and Scheme and specifically the proposal for Chesterfield and Bassetlaw to become fully constituent members of the SCR.

The SCR have appointed consultancy support to assist with the creation of an independent Transition Plan that will outline how services could be migrated to a Single LTA structure. The plan will also highlight the risks, how they will be mitigated and a suitable timeframe for the transition. This plan will then be submitted to the Secretary of State, alongside the summary of the consultation process, to support the proposal on the expansion of the constituent membership of the CA, a decision on which is expected to take place in mid-October.

1. **Issue**

1.1   To inform the TEB of the SCRs work on the creation of a Transition Plan to support the decision making behind the creation of a single LTA.

1.2   To inform the TEB of the timescales involved in the Single LTA decision making process.

2 **Recommendations**

2.1   That the TEB note the contents of this report.

3. **Background Information**

3.1. SCR Combined Authority was originally comprised of four Constituent Members (Sheffield, Doncaster, Barnsley, and Rotherham) and five Non-Constituent Members (Derbyshire Dales, North East Derbyshire, Chesterfield, Bolsover and Bassetlaw). However, the Cities and Local Devolution Act 2016 made two key changes which mean that Chesterfield and Bassetlaw now have an aspiration to join the SCR Combined Authority as Constituent Members.

3.2. In response, SCR is currently consulting on its Governance Review and Scheme to meet the Government's Statutory Tests for approving a revised Combined Authority (CA) footprint. Additionally, the Governance Review and Scheme identify the powers the Mayoral Combined Authority needs to deliver its Deal. The SCR will submit the summary of this consultation and the underlying Governance Review and Scheme to Government in September.

3.3. In its submission, SCR needs to demonstrate that a changed membership is likely to improve the economy, efficiency, and effectiveness of the Combined Authority's devolved statutory functions, and as such will an additional positive impact on the economy than would be the case otherwise.

3.4. As the LTA functions for Chesterfield and Bassetlaw are currently undertaken by Derbyshire County Council and Nottinghamshire City Council respectively, work is being undertaken to investigate the creation of a single LTA for the expanded SCR geography. It is recognised as part of this work, that the proposed arrangements create some short-term complexity, especially during the transition period, however government have expressed a preference for a single LTA and partners are working through this.

3.5 Consequently, to provide supportive information to meet the statutory test the SCR is currently developing a Transition Plan that will form part of its submission. The SCR proposes that, subject to the outcome of the decision by the Secretary of State, a measured, transitional approach is taken over the coming months. Working with our partners in the neighbouring County Councils we will consider the issues associated with this transition to co-design a suitable solution. This may mean a period of concurrent exercise of Local Transport Authority functions with protocols to regulate the exercise of those functions. This will all be set out in the Transition Plan papers we submit to Government in September 2016.

4. WORK TO DATE

4.1. Chesterfield and Bassetlaw are District/Borough councils operating within a two tier administrative model, their transport functions are currently undertaken by their respective County Councils (Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire). The SCR has begun work on the creation of a Transition plan with partners from the Counties and Districts, which will outline how we will transition from the current LTA model to a single LTA model for the proposed expansion of the CA.

4.2. In order to support the creation of a high quality, independent piece of work, Deloitte have been appointed to critique and challenge the creation of our Transition Plan. To facilitate this development process, Deloitte have hosted a series of workshops to test our assumptions and seek input from partners for inclusion in the plan.

4.3. The outputs from the workshops will go into the final plan that is submitted to the Secretary of State, to assist the decision making in September / October 2016. The Transition Plan will be considered alongside the other pieces of work that have been undertaken by the SCR including the Governance Review and Scheme and a summary of the public consultation exercise.

5. NEXT STEPS

5.1. The timeline below is indicative and subject to change, however has been included to provide an indication of the remaining activities and steps that need to be undertaken in this process.

Activity	Timescale
Governance Review, Scheme, Summary of Consultation and Transition Plan papers agreed by the CA and submitted to Government	September 2016

Secretary of State decision on Orders to be laid (including the membership of the Mayoral CA)	October 2016
Development and mobilisation of Implementation Plan	October 2016 – May 2018 (approx)
Mayoral Order(s) made	December 2016
SCR first Mayoral election	May 2017

7.   **IMPLICATIONS**

   i.   Financial

        The total cost of the specialist support to assist with the development of the Transition Plan, which will be submitted to the Secretary of State in September, is £40k.

        The budget for this activity was determined on a competitive basis under the direction of the Head of Paid Service, SCR Deputy Executive Director and finance officers.

        The wider financial implications of the transition to a single LTA for an expanded CA geography are being considered by Directors of Finance as part of the development of the Transition Plan.

   ii. Legal

        The Transition Plan is being developed to provide evidence to the Secretary of State on how functions and powers could be transferred in the creation of a single LTA for the proposed expanded geography of the CA. This is designed to inform the Orders that are scheduled to be laid in October.

   iii. Diversity

        None.

   iv. Equality

        There will be an Equality Impact Assessment and supporting text accompanying the Transition Plan submission, to the Combined Authority.

REPORT AUTHOR: **Chloe Shepherd**
POST: **Strategy & Policy Officer**
Officer responsible: **Julie Hurley**
                            Sheffield City Region
                            Julie.hurley@sheffieldcityregion.org.uk
                            0114 2211263

This page is intentionally left blank

**Sheffield
City Region**

SCR INFRASTRUCTURE EXECUTIVE BOARD

15th JULY 2016

AMP, WAVERLEY, ROTHERHAM

No.	Item	Action
1	**Welcome and Apologies** Present: Board Members Mayor Ros Jones, Doncaster MBC, CHAIR Cllr John Burrows, Chesterfield BC John Mothersole, Sheffield CC Chris Scholey, Doncaster Bassetlaw NHS Foundation Trust / LEP Apologies were received from Board Members Neil Taylor, Bassetlaw DC, Martin McKervey - Nabarro / LEP Also in Attendance Matthew Southgate, CBC Peter Dale, DMBC Ed Highfield, SCC Simon Ogden, SCC (for item 4e) Mark Lynam, BMBC Alison Westray-Chapman, NEDDC Neal Byers, ARUP / SCR Executive Team Dave Allatt, SCR Executive Team Veena Prajapati, SCR Executive Team Mel Dei Rossi, SCR Executive Team Paul Woodcock, RMBC Ben Morley, SCC Craig Tyler, Joint Authorities Governance Unit	
2	**Declarations of Interest** As Leader of the sponsoring Authority, Mayor Jones declared an interest in the SCRIF schemes to be considered at items 4b-d and took no part in the discussions.	
3	**Urgent Items / Announcements** None received	

4	**CIAT Business Cases**	
	A series of recommendations by the SCR Appraisal Panel, were presented for consideration.	
	The schemes presented, and associated requests were: • Sheffield City Centre: Knowledge Gateway – Full Business Case • DN7: Unity Park – Resolution of conditions • Doncaster Urban Centre: Civic and Cultural Quarter – Full Approval • Doncaster Urban Centre: Colonnades – Full Approval • Claywheels Lane Sustainable Industry Park – Request to resubmit a Full Business Case	
	Regarding the Sheffield City Centre: Knowledge Gateway scheme members requested an explanation of the 5% optimism bias figure. It was explained this is merely an appraisal technique to offset the propensity for the promoter underestimated the actual cost of the scheme and help ensure the appraisal metrics are accurate. It is expected this figure will reduce to zero prior to full award. This is different to the contingency fund figure which mitigates unforeseen cost increases post award.	
	Members requested this be better explained in future reports and suggested that tables of figures should ideally add up to 'total' figures.	
	Action: Neal to revise for future reports	**NB**
	Noting the importance of this and other schemes to other Executive Boards, members were advised of a matter discussed at the preceding Transport Executive Board at which it was suggested a means of ensuring the Executive Boards don't work 'in-silo' needs to be developed. IEB members voiced support for such an initiative.	
	At this point Cllr Burrows assumed the chair	
	Regarding the DN7: Unity Park, members were provided with an explanation of the revised conditions of award.	
	Regarding the Doncaster Urban Centre: Civic and Cultural Quarter scheme, it was noted that some public sector take up of some of the office space is planned.	
	Regarding the Doncaster Urban Centre: Colonnades scheme, an explanation was provided in respect of what is referred to as 'clawback'. It was suggested this in this instance this is actually	

a means of seeking the restitution of some SCR funding should the funding profile change.

Members discussed the pros and cons of applying clawback conditions and asserted their importance in terms of helping scheme promoters to maintain focus on agreed delivery profiles.

Mayor Jones reassumed the Chair.

Following on from discussing clawback, it was noted that all scheme promoters have been asked to confirm whether their schemes are predicated on the provision of any European funding (in the interests of identifying any potential post-brexit issues). It was confirmed no SCRIF schemes have any European funding and are not seen as at risk from brexit. Members reasserted the view that scheme promoters who find themselves with a funding shortfall, due to the withdrawal of a funder, can't assume SCRIF will fill any shortfall.

A presentation was delivered on the Claywheels Lane Sustainable Industry Park scheme. It was noted the specific planned outcomes of the project have changed since the project was originally approved as part of the SCRIF programme. Though reduced, the forecast GVA outcomes of the project appear to remain good value for money and early deliverability has improved. It was also noted the promoter's ask of the SCR has reduced from £4.63m to £4.4m (to fund enabling works (transport and power)).

Members noted the job creation totals has reduced from 554 to 216. It was explained this is due to a revision in the number of 'general' industrial jobs envisaged but actually includes an increase in the number of skilled jobs planned (as attested by the increase in the scheme's GVA).

It was confirmed officers are appropriately attuned to state aid considerations.

RESOLVED, that the Board:

1. **Approve the Sheffield City Centre: Knowledge Gateway Full Business case subject to the conditions set out in the Project Approval Summary Table**

2. **Approve the resolution of conditions for DN7 noting the remaining conditions set out in the Project Approval Summary Table**

3. **Approve the award of £0.635m for Doncaster Urban**

	Centre: Civic and Cultural Quarter subject to the conditions set out in the Project Approval Summary Table	
	4. Approve the award of £2.280m for Doncaster Urban Centre: Colonnades subject to the conditions set out in the Project Approval Summary Table	
	5. Note the changes to the proposal for the Claywheels Lane Sustainable Industry Park and endorse the resubmission of the Full Business Case (subject to CIAT review) and endorse the principle of SCR commencing discussions with the promoter regarding the likely Funding Agreement conditions.	
5	**M1 J36 Lessons Learnt** A paper was presented to share the outcome of a Lessons Learned session arranged by Barnsley MBC for the M1 J36 scheme. It was noted the lessons identified have been drawn into a wider lessons learned review that has been undertaken by Sheffield City Region (SCR). This wider delivery review will also be reported to the Infrastructure Executive Board (IEB) at a future meeting. Members noted a number of recommendations regarding improving engagements with utilities and discussed the role that was previously provided by the RDA – Yorkshire Forward in co-ordinating engagements. It was suggested the SCR Executive Team might position itself to take on a similar role for the benefit of all districts (and utilities) as part of its delivery of the SCRIIP. It was suggested the lessons learnt are also of interest to the developers. Members revisited comments on the importance of clawback, recognising the need to appropriately apply proportionality and flexibility. **RESOLVED, that the Board:** 1. **Note the summary of the key lessons learned.** 2. **Note that Sheffield City Region Executive is undertaking a wider review of delivery, with an update to be provided to the Board at a future meeting.**	
6	**Programme Dashboard Template** The Board was reminded of the SCR's intention to undertake a dashboard approach to managing the performance of SCR Investment Fund projects and programmes and was therefore	

		presented with the information that will feed into the final programme dashboard to be designed for usage by IEB.	
		Members were provided with an explanation of how information pertaining to various milestones would be presented i.e. time, cost, quality and project management controls i.e. risks, issues and change control.	
		Members requested that future reports provide a short narrative to explain what exceedances have been used to determine variance against baseline and thus the red, amber and green classifications.	
		Members also requested the inclusion of an additional 'direction of travel' indicator to show whether schemes are falling behind profile or recovering	
		Action: Mel to incorporate these changes	
		It was confirmed that baseline and delivery profiles can be changed if requested by the scheme promoter, subject to the submission of an appropriate change request form and the agreement of the SCR (i.e. the IEB).	**MDR**
		It was noted the IEB will be presented with summaries of all substantive change requests for consideration.	
		Members welcomed the dashboard and agreed this will be an excellent way to keep the Board informed of the status of all schemes.	
		RESOLVED, that the Board endorses the intended performance dashboard feedback format	
7		**LEP Prioritisation Workshop Impact on SCRIIP**	
		A paper was presented to provide an update on the early outcome of the LEP visioning workshop. It was noted the purpose of the workshop was to scope out and set a framework within which to take forward the SEP refresh and the LEP identified infrastructure as a key strategic theme alongside transport, housing, business growth, skills, rural and city/town centres.	
		It was noted the LEP also identified Doncaster Sheffield Airport and the Advanced Manufacturing Innovation District (AMID) as important strategic projects. However, members were asked to note the exercise to identify strategic projects is not complete and others are likely to be afforded this status i.e. rail connectivity.	
		It was confirmed the intention is still to present the SCRIIP to the 1st August CA and LEP.	
		RESOLVED, that the Board	

	1. Notes the initial outcome of the workshop. 2. Endorses the proposed changes to the SCR IIP and notes the next steps.	
8	**Key Thematic Links – Infrastructure, Housing and Transport** A paper was presented providing a first draft of a high level account of the key thematic links across all of SCRs Executive Boards. It was suggested the workstreams of the SCR Executive Boards are inextricably linked, with a number of work streams of key importance to multiple Boards and to clarify lead responsibilities, the SCR has assigned a 'Lead Board' for each thematic area, with the 'Lead Board' responsible for strategic direction and the oversight/ sign off of a range of project based activity. Members were also asked to note it has been recognised as essential that other Boards are involved and sighted on some activities of mutual interest. Members reiterated comments made at other Boards which suggested Boards cannot work in isolation and agreed 'we' need to continue work to identify and implement the most efficient and effective means of decision management governance, including whether it may be beneficial to revise the Executive Board structure. It was suggested that a Board being 'sighted' on a matter may not go far enough and it may be beneficial to joint-Board undertakings to be convened to look at specific projects in the round. **Action: Veena to investigate how decision management governance is discharged in other regions**. Regarding the Labour Market Review (Skills Board - led with 3 other Boards sighted), it was suggested this needs to be concerned with the mobility of all labour, not just occupations that are transport related. **RESOLVED, that the Board note the contents of the report**	VP
9	**Minutes of the Previous Meeting** The minutes of the previous meeting held on 3rd June were agreed to be an accurate record of the meeting. Regarding the request for a joint session with the SCR Inward Investment Team, it was noted some potential dates have been provided and suggestions for agenda items are invited. **Action: All to suggest agenda items for the joint meeting with the Investment Team**	ALL

	Action: Veena to confirm the date and venue		**VP**
	RESOLVED, that the Board agree the minutes of the previous meeting are an accurate record.		
10	**Any Other Business**		
	i. SCR Enterprise Zones – Development Fund Members questioned the now significant delay in getting the Fund up and running and asked why this is apparently predicated on the identification of EZ sites (with this work also taking longer than expected). It was requested that an update be provided to the next meeting, with the expectation that this report confirms timescales for the Fund's implementation and an outline explanation of what the Fund will be spent on. **Action: Veena to make arrangements for Andy Gates to present a report to the next meeting**		**VP**
11	**Date of the Next Meeting** 26th August – Broad Street West, Sheffield, 10.00am		

This page is intentionally left blank

SHEFFIELD CITY REGION COMBINED AUTHORITY

TRANSPORT COMMITTEE

4 JULY 2016

PRESENT: Councillor G Lindars-Hammond (Chair)
Councillors: , I Auckland, V Cusworth, D Leech, D Lelliott, R Miller, J Monks and B Mordue

Officers: S Edwards, A Linton, M McCarthy, K Platts, C Tyler, I Wilson and A Withill

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors J Blackham, S Cox, T Gilby, M Gordon, M Iqbal, D Pidwell and A Syrett

1   APPOINTMENT OF VICE CHAIR

Nominations were sought for the position of Vice Chair of the Committee.

It was noted that historically the Vice Chair position has been taken by the lead Sheffield CC Member. In his absence, Members therefore proposed that Cllr Mazher Iqbal by appointed.

It was requested that officers inform Cllr Iqbal of the Committee's decision as soon as possible to ensure this is accepted.

RESOLVED, that Cllr Iqbal be appointed Vice Chair of the SCR CA Transport Committee.

2   APOLOGIES

Members' apologies were noted as above.

3   ANNOUNCEMENTS

S Edwards infirmed Members of an incident at Rotherham Interchange on Sunday 15th May whereby a fire was started in a bus arriving at the Interchange at about 10.40pm. It was noted there we no injuries reported to any members of the public. One member of staff was taken to hospital suffering from smoke inhalation. It was reported the fire caused fairly substantial damage to the interior or the Interchange and work is still underway to assess the extent. The Interchange was partly open by

the next day and fully opened by the end of the week. It was noted that work is ongoing with RMBC colleagues to determine the effects of the fire in tandem with ongoing considerations regarding the structural viability of the Interchange car park which is currently closed on safety grounds.

Members were informed that the £2.5m bid for Sustainable Travel Transition Year funding was successful. This will fund the continuation of a number of Local Sustainable Travel Fund (LSTF) projects. It was noted bids for the successor to LSTF (the Access Fund) will need to be submitted later this year.

It was noted that the 10p child bus fare increase (as included in the budget for 2016/17) will come into effect from 18th September with fares going from 70p to 80p with the exception of Barnsley where the MiCard child concessions will remain at 60p. It was noted that multi-fare, value for money tickets are available and offer significant discounts to the single fare option. A marketing campaign will be undertaken to encourage the further take up of these tickets.

Members were informed that a number of previously funded services to schools will be ending at the end of the school year. These are Sheffield services 788, 789 and 791 to All Saints, 798 and 799 to Notre Dame and St Mary's Primary School, in Barnsley service 456 to Outwood Academy, 484 to Darton College and 434 to Holy Trinity School, and in Doncaster services 496 to St Peter's School and 586 to McCauley High School. It was noted these changes are due to increased funding pressures and all the services are non-mandatory.

It was noted there will be some bus timetable changes implemented in September (as part of the 3XY arrangements with operators. All changes will be communicated by the usual means.

Regarding Bus Partnerships, it was noted that consultation continues to 31st July on the proposed Barnsley Bus Partnership. 302 responses have been received to-date and further publicity events are being arranged. It was noted that changes would be introduced from January 2017. The new network introduced by the Doncaster Bus Partnership was reported to be settling in well with few comments received. In Rotherham, the network review is planned for the 1st quarter of 2017 and changes will be introduced the following September.

It was noted the 16-18 pass issuing procedure is being amended to make the process easier for the PTE and service users. Much of the work will be automated, including the renewal process, and a number of pilots with schools are underway.

It was noted the Bus Rapid Transit (North) scheme is due to go into live operation on 5th September and will improve bus connectivity in the vicinity of the M1.

It was noted that 2 Freedom of Information requests have been received in relation to SuperTram track layout and subsidised services 23, 23a and 24. Both have been responded to.

Regarding the Rotherham Bus Interchange fire, A Withill (RMBC Interim Manager - Highways and Transportation Team) informed members that a recent inspection had determined that 16 cross beams have been badly affected and the structural

integrity of the car park is in question. Partners are considering redevelopment options. It was confirmed the Interchange is not unsafe in its current state. It was noted a 'plan B' is in place for the temporary relocation of interchange services if required. S Edwards confirmed the fire damage is covered by insurance and the PTE are working with the loss adjustors to address this matter.

4   URGENT ITEMS

None.

5   ITEMS TO BE CONSIDERED IN THE ABSENCE OF THE PUBLIC AND PRESS

None.

6   DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS IN RELATION TO ANY ITEM OF BUSINESS ON THE AGENDA

None.

7   REPORTS FROM AND QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS

Cllr Auckland commented on impending consultation on plans for the Sheffield City Region Mayor and noting intentions the Mayor will have 'transport powers', requested a debate on this matter at a future Transport Committee meeting to consider the potential effects on the PTE's remit and other implications. S Edwards noted he is working closely with colleagues in the SCR Executive Team in respect of this matter and offered to bring back a report to a future meeting.

Cllr Leech asked when consideration will be given to filling the vacancies on the Passenger Transport Pension Fund Board. M McCarthy confirmed a report would be brought to the next meeting and officers will be canvassing members for nominations in advance.

RESOLVED:

1. That S Edwards will report on the implications for transport of the introduction of the SCR Mayor to a future meeting.

2. That M McCarthy will present a report on Passenger Transport Pension Fund Committee nominations to the next meeting.

8   RECEIPT OF PETITIONS AND PUBLIC QUESTIONS

Members were informed of the receipt of 2 petitions.

A 75 signature petition has been received in relation to the withdrawal of service 420 (Doncaster to Pontefract).

A 66 signature petition has been received in relation to the number 10 service using Markham Road in Doncaster, requesting this be rerouted.

9   MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 11TH APRIL

RESOLVED, that the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 11th April are agreed to be an accurate record.

10   CENTRALLY MANAGED TRANSPORT PROGRAMMES 2015/16 QUARTER 4 DELIVERY

A report was received to provide Members with project delivery details of the three centrally managed transport programmes in 2015-16; Local Sustainable Transport Fund (LSTF), Sustainable Transport Exemplar Programme (STEP) and LTP Integrated Transport Block (ITB), and to introduce the revised programme reporting format.

It was reported that 100% of the Local Sustainable Transport Fund (LSTF) allocation has been claimed from DfT, continuing South Yorkshire's record of delivering fully against successful bid submissions.

Likewise, 100% of the Sustainable Transport Exemplar Programme (STEP) allocation was spent comparing favourably with other thematic boards within the Local Growth Fund.

It was further noted that 99% of the LTP Integrated Transport Block (ITB) allocation has been successfully claimed, including previous years' carried forward underspend. Members were asked to note that whilst this is a positive performance it has resulted in less funding being available and the 2016-17 programme having to be reduced accordingly.

In addition to the report, A Withill noted officers are currently determining the SCR's submission to the DfT's Major Majors Fund for schemes costing more than £75m. Bids for 3 schemes (Advanced Manufacturing Innovation District, SCR Mass Transport and TransPennine Connectivity links) are in development.

RESOLVED, that Members note the details of the successfully delivered programmes.

11   FINANCIAL MONITORING REPORT FOR 12 MONTHS ENDING 31 MARCH 2016

A report was received to provide Members with a summary of the financial outturn against approved budget for the 12 months ending 31 March 2016.

It was noted the revenue budget outturn for the 12 months to 31 March 2016 is £68.7m against a budget of £71.3m. £2.1m of the £2.6m variance is in respect of the reduction in costs for concessionary patronage.

Members were informed a total of £6.1m has been earmarked to support ongoing activity in SYPTE during 2016/17. £3m will be used to support Rotherham car park refurbishment and £1m to support the loss of Tates from the bus network.

Cllr Miller questioned whether the £3m allocated to Rotherham Interchange car park refurbishment was either enough or still needed, noting this was must be

dependent on what remedial works are decided for the interchange. It was agreed this matter is now somewhat compounded and a revised funding requirement will be determined in due course.

It was noted that in the interests of improving in-year forecasting and budget setting, a new joint monitoring and forecasting model has been developed by Finance and the Supported Bus Contract and Procurement Team.

RESOLVED, that the Transport Committee:

1. Notes the outturn position for the 12 months ended 31 March 2016

2. Notes the creation of more sophisticated models to support the robustness of future financial forecasting.

12   SHEFFIELD BUS PARTNERSHIP - NOVEMBER 2015 SERVICE CHANGES - LESSONS LEARNED

The Chair invited Mr Andrew Barclay to address the Committee in relation to matters initially discussed at the February Sheffield Bus Partnership public meeting. Mr Barclay commented on continuing concerns that the issues raised in February haven't been given appropriate attention, particularly in relation to the lack of services that now service the rail station.

Mr Barclay also requested an update regarding the tram-train pilot and urged members to learn from the mistakes of the Sheffield network changes ahead of making similar changes in other districts, noting that the imposition of January changes can deliver chaos if the weather is bad.

The Chair thanked Mr Barclay for his attendance and instructed officers to respond in writing to the points made.

A report was then presented in response to a request from Transport Committee meeting held on 23 November 2015, which asked that a report be brought back on lessons learned regarding the significant decline in bus service performance following implementation of a major network change in Sheffield on 02 November 2015.

The report acknowledged that bus service performance in Sheffield fell significantly during the 8 week period following implementation of major service changes on 02 November 2015, and manifested in a spike in customer complaints regarding punctuality, reliability and capacity.

Members were informed that root cause analysis has identified contributory factors to be driver route familiarisation, timetable and driver scheduling, major roadworks and congestion and a lack of operational reserves.

It was noted that corrective action has now been applied to bring performance above pre-change levels i.e. punctuality has risen to 88.1% (pre change – 84.6%).

It was noted the Partnership continues work to improve quality and performance of services for Sheffield, and to rebuild confidence in the network (see agenda item 13).

Members discussed and acknowledged there is no ideal time to introduce network changes and efforts by all Partnership Partners should be maintained to minimise disruption where possible.

RESOLVED, that the Transport Committee:

1. Notes the reasons identified for poor performance.

2. Notes the actions taken to recover and improve performance.

13   BUS PARTNERSHIP PERFORMANCE UPDATE

A report was received to provide information regarding the performance of the Rotherham and Sheffield Bus Partnerships, and plans in place to ensure continued success.

Using data to the end of April 2016, it was noted that in respect of the Rotherham Bus Partnership, journeys are 2.6% above target, punctuality is 2.6% below target and reliability is 0.2% below target

For the Sheffield Bus Partnership, journeys are 2.2% above target, punctuality is 0.6% above target and reliability is 0.3% above target

Members were asked to note the key actions planned for 2016/17. These include enhanced engagement between the Partnerships and local authority Highways Management Teams to provide greater potential during planning to reduce impacts on bus service, the development of an autumn performance plan, to help improve performance particularly in November and December when the network is most affected by highways congestion, the review of bus lane effectiveness, particularly at peak times, the review of bus timetable information, to ensure that it is clear and promotes services and increased marketing campaign activity to target lapsed and none bus users.

RESOLVED: that the Transport Committee notes the performance and planned actions.

14   REPORT ON PROGRESS OF THE TRANSPORT STRATEGY

A report was received to update the Transport Committee on the progress of the Transport Strategy in 2015/16 and overall since its launch in 2011. The report contained the latest data available as at April 2016.

It was noted this is the six-monthly Transport Strategy Progress Report which for the purpose of this report focuses on the key achievements and outcomes and will be the last report in the current format, to be replaced with a revised edition, to be produced by the SCR Executive Team, from 2016/17.

Regarding performance overall, it was noted that significant progress continues to be made in eighteen (69%) of the twenty six policy areas, particularly in supporting the economy through highways and rail activity; in social inclusion; and reducing emissions. Five policy areas are less advanced as they cover longer-term ambitions – including the promotion of efficient and sustainable means of freight transportation, and to support generation of energy from renewable sources – or have not yet fully matured and three of the policy areas are excluded as they are reported through the Safer Roads Partnership.

The report also commented on a number of recent highlight achievements.

Regarding the introduction of Smart Motorways, Cllr Miller requested more information on whether there have been any more accidents as a consequence of hard shoulder running. S Edwards offered to circulate more information on this matter.

RESOLVED, that the Transport Committee notes the key achievements and outcomes against the twenty six policy areas.

15   BUS SERVICES BILL

A report was received to brief the Members on the high level provisions of the Bus Services Bill that was introduced into the House of Lords in late May.

It was noted that following its introduction to the House of Lords on 20th May 2016, it is hoped it will be on the statute books as legislation by early 2017 in order that the Act and the required Regulations are all in place for the election of CA Mayors in May 2017.

Members were advised the Bill is split into 5 substantive sections:

1. Advanced Quality Partnership Schemes- the existing legislation is amended to increase the opportunities to utilise the power;
2. Franchising- a new franchising regime is introduced for Mayoral Combined Authorities (and other authorities authorised by the Secretary of State); allowing a route to franchising;
3. Advanced Ticketing Schemes- amendments to the existing ticketing scheme powers of LTA's updated to capture new technology (smart ticketing);
4. Enhanced Partnership Schemes- the introduction of new partnership arrangements powers to add to Quality Partnership schemes and Voluntary Partnership arrangements;
5. Open data provisions- provisions requiring operators to make data available on fares, punctuality etc.

It was noted that the implications of the legislation and the opportunities it offers are being considered by the SCR/PTE working in collaboration with the Urban Transport Group ("UTG"(Formally PTEG)).

It was suggested the Bill provisions are generally welcomed for delivery of bus strategies.

RESOLVED, that Members note the contents of the briefing note and the ongoing work to seek amendments to the Bill to further improve the legislation in terms of making the franchising and other provisions more useable.

CHAIR