

Public Document Pack

Sheffield
City Region

COMBINED
AUTHORITY

TRANSPORT EXECUTIVE BOARD

Date: Thursday 12 January 2017

Venue: Sheffield Town Hall, Pinstone Street, Sheffield

Time: 2.00 pm

AGENDA

Item	Subject	Method	Lead	Page
	<u>Introduction</u>			
1	Welcome and Apologies	Verbal	Chair	
2	Minutes and Actions of the Previous Meeting and Matters Arising	Paper	Chair	1 - 8
3	Declarations of Interest	Verbal	All	
4	Urgent Items/Announcements	Verbal	All	
	<u>Business Items</u>			
5	Transport Strategy	Presentation	Arup	
6	Appraisal Panel Business Case Recommendation - STEP	Paper	M Lynam	9 - 26
7	HS2 Update	Verbal	M Lynam	
8	Midland Mainline - Market Harborough Investment	Verbal	M Lynam	
9	Transport for the North	Paper	M Lynam	27 - 38
10	Local Large Majors Applications	Paper	C Shepherd	39 - 42
	<u>Actions & Forward Planning</u>			
11	Agree Actions & Summary for Resolution Log	Verbal	Chair	

Item	Subject	Method	Lead	Page
12	Business Plan Dashboard Update	Verbal	M Lynam	
13	Any Other Business	Verbal	All	

SCR TRANSPORT EXECUTIVE BOARD

17th NOVEMBER 2016

SHEFFIELD TOWN HALL

No.	Item	Action
1	<p><u>Welcome and Apologies</u></p> <p>Present:</p> <p><u>Board Members</u> Cllr John Burrows, CBC - CHAIR Diana Terris, BMBC Neil Taylor, BaDC Martin McKervey, Nabarro / LEP Simon Carr, Henry Boot / LEP</p> <p><u>In Attendance / Advisory Members</u> Tom Finnegan-Smith, SCC Steve Edwards, SYPTE Damien Wilson, RMBC Matt Gladstone, BMBC Neil Firth, DMBC Mark Lynam, SCR Exec Team Suzannah Rockett, SCR Exec Team Chloe Shepherd, SCR Exec Team Katie Jackson, SCC / SCR Exec Team Craig Tyler, Joint Authorities Governance Unit</p> <p>Apologies were received from Board Member Cllr Julie Dore (SCC) + Peter Dale (DMBC), Simon Green (SCC) and Mike Ashworth (DCC)</p>	
2	<p><u>Minutes of the Previous Meeting</u></p> <p>The minutes of the previous meeting held on 6th October were agreed to be an accurate record.</p> <p>It was reported that no response has been received from Chris Grayling MP (Secretary of State for Transport) regarding the letter sent by Cllr Dore expressing the Board's opinions on HS2.</p>	
3	<p><u>Declarations of Interest</u></p> <p>No declarations noted.</p>	

4	<p><u>Urgent Items / Announcements</u></p> <p>None requested.</p>	
5	<p><u>Northern Powerhouse Rail Sequence 2 Work</u></p> <p>The Board was provided with an update on TfN's Northern Powerhouse Rail (NPR) developments. It was noted this workstream feeds into TfN's wider Strategic Transport Plan which has a primary ambition to join up places to support growth as part of the rebalancing of the UK economy.</p> <p>It was noted that the NPR ambition is based around improving connections between 6 core cities (Liverpool, Manchester, Sheffield, Leeds, Newcastle and Hull) and also Manchester Airport, with frequency and trains per hour outputs. It was noted this will require new lines to be built and the latest phase of NPR preparatory activity (sequence 2) has therefore been concerned with engineering feasibility studies (sequence 1 considered current constraints and the role of HS2).</p> <p>It was noted that sequence 2 has concluded that outputs are feasible, albeit expensive and has identified a range of options for each intercity corridor.</p> <p>It was noted the next steps (sequences 2.5 and 3) will look at HS2 interfaces and relationships with other significant economic centres, and the further development of the corridor options identified during sequence 2.</p> <p>Action: ALL to send any further questions to Suzannah</p> <p>Consideration was given to whether the NPH work is the vehicle for realising the HS2 loop north of Sheffield. It was noted this is under technical consideration by TfN and HS2 Ltd. It was also noted that Sir David Higgins has previously provided his opinion that HS2 needs to be better integrated with the NPH ambition and similar sentiments have been expressed by SCR's representatives at TfN Partnership Board meetings. It was noted NPH leads are visiting the SCR on 23rd November and this may afford a good opportunity to raise the loop again.</p> <p>Regarding likely funding sources it was reassuringly noted the loop is catered for in the HS2 Command Paper and will be included in the Hybrid Bill.</p> <p>Consideration was given to the SCR's ambition for a HS2 parkway station and concerns caused by the government's lack of firm commitment for this were noted. Feedback from the HS2 Programme Board has noted the only commitment is to undertake feasibility studies in March/April next year. However, it was noted this is after the next HS2 consultation phase and therefore makes it difficult for evidence based comments to be incorporated into responses. It was noted Mark Lynam will be contacting HS2 representatives next week</p>	<p>ALL</p>

to see if the feasibility study works can be accelerated.

The Chair noted that under the latest proposals Chesterfield would also become a HS2 stop and suggested the additional economic and connectivity advantages this could bring to the region need to be recognised and studied.

HS2 Update

It was noted the SCR has access to a tranche of local growth strategy funding to look at interconnections between districts in more detail.

The Board suggested we need better engagements with Leeds City Region on HS2 to enable stronger, joint representations to be made.

Consideration was given to whether 'we' have the right skills sets and adequate resources to fully engage on HS2 matters (noting the additional resources other regions are investing in this area). It was acknowledged that we are perhaps light on resources and will need to address this matter.

It was noted HS2 update reports would be going to the next CA / LEP meetings and will highlight the need for additional resources.

It was noted work is about to start on the CA's request for a mitigation study on the HS2 route consultation. It was confirmed external support to assist with this work is being sourced.

Action: Mark to circulate the tender brief

It was noted HS2 have requested a meeting with BMBC, DMBC and RMBC to look at interconnectivity with HS2. It was suggested it would be useful for the SCR Exec Team to also be represented at the meeting.

Consideration was given to what additional support the private sector can provide to support the SCR's HS2 ambitions. It was suggested our LEP private sector members might wish to consider contacting HS2 directly and develop additional relationships and also that a LEP Board submission in support of the parkway station would be a worthwhile undertaking.

HS2 Programme Board Revised ToR

A report was received asking the Board to approve the revised ToR for the SCR HS2 Programme Board (attached to the report), setting out the role and work programme of the Programme Board.

It was noted the revised ToR set out the purpose and governance structure of the Board, and the relationship with task and finish groups to be set up to take forward specific tasks. They also set out the desired outcomes, roles and responsibilities and work

ML

	<p>programme for the SCR's work on HS2. The ToR also set out the frequency of meetings, methods of communication, principles of the group and suggested membership.</p> <p>It was agreed reference should be made the importance of PTE engagements in relation to connectivity work.</p> <p>Action: Mark to include</p> <p>Members discussed the complex requirements of having to avoid mission creep whilst ensuring the Programme Board is flexible enough to react to HS2 plans as they develop. It was agreed the Board may require additional resources going forward to ensure it can operate effectively.</p> <p>It was suggested that some of the role and remit of the Programme Board might overlap with other SCR non-HS2 rail ambitions and may necessitate the creation of a wider 'strategic rail connectivity' task and finish undertaking at some stage.</p>	
6	<p><u>Outcome of SCR IIP Launch at MIPIM UK and Next Steps</u></p> <p>A report was received to provide an update on the launch of the Sheffield City Region Integrated Infrastructure Plan (SCR IIP) at MIPIM UK in October 2016.</p> <p>It was reported the SCR IIP was welcomed by prospective investors and developers who generally found it to be an attractive proposition. Key questions were raised by delegates and this feedback (+ lessons learnt from SCRIF to date) will inform the work to be undertaken by the SCR Executive Team to support the next stage of the plan's development ahead of presentations to other international events such as MIPIM France in March 2017.</p> <p>It was noted that consideration still needs to be given to issues such as the funding mechanism and commissioning framework / process to enable prospective investors to support the development of schemes as part of the SCR IIP and a presentation was therefore provided in relation to the suggested 'next steps' required to work the SCR IIP up into what need to be genuinely investable propositions. It was suggested these will be based around the 8 existing strategic network infrastructure themes, focussing on the SCR's 'big ticket' opportunities.</p> <p>The Board was introduced to the proposed 'commissioning plus' model for getting schemes to fruition, whereby schemes will still be subject to the rigours of commissioning and the Assurance Framework, but will be worked up in a more collaboratively and less competitive manner to ensure schemes are in the best possible</p>	ML

	<p>shape ahead of presentation to the Appraisal Panel.</p> <p>It was suggested this process will require the assistance of a ‘fund broker’ at some stage to ensure the investable propositions meet the expectations of the commercial market.</p> <p>It was noted that a more detailed paper on the commissioning plus model and further details of each investible proposition will go to the January IEB meeting (to be taken through a preceding Infrastructure Delivery Group meeting in December).</p> <p>It was noted that the SCR IIP may also be able to attract other sources of investment e.g. pension funds.</p> <p>RESOLVED, that the Board:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Notes the feedback from prospective investors and developers following the ‘soft’ launch of the Integrated Infrastructure Plan at MIPIM UK. 2. Endorses the development approaches for the plan as detailed in the report and presentation. 3. Notes the recommendation for the IEB to work with the SCR Executive Team and other partners to actively support and shape the detailed next stage of the SCR IIP’s development, including issues such as the funding mechanism and commissioning framework for the development of schemes as part of the plan. 	
7	<p><u>SCR Transport Strategy</u></p> <p>The Board was advised to expect a report to the next meeting to set out how the refresh of the Transport Strategy will be undertaken.</p> <p>It was acknowledged this will be a complex undertaking as the Transport Strategy needs to fit within the interlinked pantheon of SCR strategies (SEP led) which have various allusions to transport strategy. There is therefore a need to avoid duplication or contradiction.</p> <p>It was noted that external assistance is likely to be required to undertake the refresh and that the LTP Strategic Transport Group will be pivotal in helping steer the work as it progresses.</p> <p>RESOLVED, that the Board notes intentions to undertake the refresh of the SCR Transport Strategy</p>	
8	<p><u>East Midlands Rail Franchise and Midland Mainline Update</u></p> <p>A report was received to provide an update on East Midlands Franchise and Midland Mainline issues.</p>	

	<p>It was suggested that as the Midland Mainline is the key rail link between the western part of the City Region, including Sheffield, and London via the East Midlands, it is vital for the City Region's economy and connectivity.</p> <p>It was noted that a number of upgrades to the line are planned to improve journey times and quality, including electrification, but there has been some concern recently that some of these upgrades may be further delayed and it is therefore considered important that the SCR actively engages with the Department for Transport and Network Rail, as well as the franchise operator, to ensure the necessary improvements to this key rail line are implemented in a timely fashion.</p> <p>The Board acknowledged the concerns with the delays to the electrification programme.</p> <p>The Board was asked to note that in March 2015, an indicative commitment for SCR to contribute £5m to the Market Harborough line speed improvement scheme was made by the CA (linked to the receipt of STEP funding). It was suggested that the SCR should adopt a strong position that any such contribution is conditional on electrification coming to fruition.</p> <p>RESOLVED: that the Board:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Agrees that the SCR Executive Team should continue to engage with the relevant bodies to promote improvements to the Midland Mainline. 2. Agree to receive a further report on the SCR response to the East Midlands Franchise consultation in the new year. 3. Notes the indicative commitment of SCR to contribute £5m to the Market Harborough line speed improvement scheme and the further work being undertaken to present the scheme for future decision making by the SCR CA/LEP asserts that any such award should be conditional to the realisation of electrification. 	
9.1	<p><u>Feedback from the HS2 Programme Board on 26th October 2016</u></p> <p>Matters were addressed under agenda item 5</p>	
9.2	<p><u>HS2 Programme Board Terms of Reference (ToR)</u></p> <p>Matters were addressed under agenda item 5</p>	
10	<p><u>SCR Meeting with TfN Update</u></p> <p>It was noted that work is underway to review all engagements with TfN and consider what additional linkages are required to ensure the best interests of the SCR are being represented at every level.</p>	

	<p>It was noted STG will help co-ordinate this work in recognition that the Exec Team can't do everything.</p>	
11	<p><u>DfT Modelling Consultation</u></p> <p>It was noted DfT have launched a consultation exercise to look at whether WebTag's (DfT's primary scheme assessment model) capability to take appropriate account of the wider economic impacts of transport schemes (costing £5m+) could ne improved.</p> <p>It was noted Mark (assisted by Dave Andrews) will be circulating a draft response to the consultation for comment shortly.</p> <p>It was noted that any changes to WebTag will be taken account of in future revisions to the Assurance Framework.</p>	
12	<p><u>Forward Plan</u></p> <p>The Board was asked to consider the restructuring of future agendas to afford more quality time in consideration of fewer, more significant matters.</p> <p>It was noted that a dashboard performance report will also be presented to each meeting to provide more general update information, and from which matters requiring the Board's attention may be identified and addressed by exception.</p> <p>This approach was supported by the Board.</p>	
13	<p><u>Any Other Business</u></p> <p>No further matters requested.</p>	
9	<p><u>Date of Next Meeting</u></p> <p>12th January 2017, 2.00pm at Sheffield Town Hall</p>	

This page is intentionally left blank

SCR COMBINED AUTHORITY TRANSPORT EXECUTIVE BOARD

12th JANUARY 2017

APPRAISAL PANEL BUSINESS CASE RECOMMENDATION - STEP

Purpose of Report

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 Full Business Case (FBC) for this project, which is seeking Full Approval and Award of Contract, has been reviewed by the SCR Appraisal Panel and the technical recommendations are now presented for consideration.

Thematic Priority

The Business case for the Sustainable Transport Exemplar Programme is primarily focussed on achieving priority:

6. Secure investment in infrastructure where it will do most to support growth.

Freedom of Information

This paper is not exempt under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

Recommendations

Consider and endorse a request for change to reflect the updated spend profile resulting from the extended timescales to achieve Full approval in 16/17 noting that the total value of the project does not change.

Consider and endorse progression of Sustainable Transport Exemplar Programme (STEP) to Full Approval and Award of Contract at a cost of up to £11.88m, subject to the conditions set out in the Project Approval Summary Table attached at Appendix 1. Noting that endorsement of this recommendation is subject to consideration and approval by the SCR CA.

1. Introduction

1.1 Assurance Framework

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

- 1.2 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).
- 1.3 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.
- 1.4 These findings will inform the s151 Officers view regarding the Value for money Statement and the Monitoring Officers view regarding the relative risks of the scheme presented.
- 1.5 This cycle the Full Business Case (FBC) for this project, which is seeking Full Approval and Award of Contract, has been reviewed by the SCR Appraisal Panel.
- 1.6 The technical recommendation for the Sustainable Transport Exemplar Programme is now presented for consideration at cost of £11.88m to the SCRCA.

2. Proposal and justification

- 2.1 The Transport Executive Board (TEB) are asked to consider and endorse a request for change to reflect the updated spend profile resulting from the extended timescales to achieve Full Approval in 16/17, noting that the total value of the project does not change.

	15/16 m	16/17 m	17/18 m	Total m
Baseline	£3.08	£8.00	£5.00	£16.08
Current				
STEP PTE	£0.84	£2.06	£1.29	£4.20
STEP LTP	£2.24	£3.23	£6.41	£11.88
Total	£3.08	£5.29	£7.71	£16.08
Change	0	-£2.71	£2.71	0

- 2.2 The Transport Executive Board (TEB) are asked to consider the recommendation to progress the scheme business case to Full Approval and endorse the entering into Funding Agreement at a cost of £11,880,000.
- 2.3 TEB have previously approved the SYPTE-led element of the STEP, with a value of £4.2m, which complements the activity of this separate part of the STEP.
- 2.4 STEP is a sustainable and active travel programme designed to provide “enabling infrastructure” to improve accessibility, especially for the working population without access to a car, as well as improving connectivity and journey reliability, and making the region more attractive to employees and employers, thus supporting growth. There are also anticipated health benefits, in terms of increased active travel and reduced air pollution (as a consequence of reduced congestion), as well as a reduction in road traffic accidents.

- 2.5** The Full Business Case for STEP has previously been submitted / appraised however the earlier submission was not able to demonstrate a value for money indicator to allow a recommendation to be progressed to TEB and the CA.

The STEP programme is different to other more traditional infrastructure projects in that the benefits delivered are not jobs / GVA and as such cannot be directly compared to the outcomes the SRIF projects deliver.

To assist in the quantification of the benefits and the production of a benefit to cost ratio (BCR) the SCR CA Executive team brought independent consultancy services to calculate the expected benefits.

- 2.6** The business case represents good value for money with an indicative BCR of 5.3 as a sustainable transport scheme.

The scheme does not directly contribute to GVA or job outcomes, so the SCR cost per job / GVA cannot be presented.

- 2.7** Further sensitivity tests of the BCR indicate that it will remain greater than 2, therefore representing good value for money as a sustainable transport scheme.

- 2.8** A specific condition of approval is that further consideration is given to the longer-term assessment of outcomes and benefits associated with delivery of the programme. This in part is to ensure that a local evidence base is produced to assist in future scheme development and appraisal.

3. Consideration of alternative approaches

- 3.1** Alternative approaches including do nothing and do less were considered as part of the options appraisal in the Economic Case of the FBC, all of which were not viable alternatives or would significantly impact the value for money and potential benefits of the project.

4. Implications

4.1 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.

Endorsement is sought to progress the scheme business cases to Full Approval and endorse the entering into Contracts for the Sustainable Transport Exemplar Programme at a cost of £11,880,000.

The request for change moves £2.71m from 16/17 into 17/18 FY. This has been factored into the overall programme projections to year end.

	15/16 m	16/17 m	17/18 m	Total m
Baseline	£3.08	£8.00	£5.00	£16.08
Current				
STEP PTE	£0.84	£2.06	£1.29	£4.20
STEP LTP	£2.24	£3.23	£6.41	£11.88
Total	£3.08	£5.29	£7.71	£16.08
Change	0	-£2.71	£2.71	0

4.2 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.

4.3 Risk Management

The FBC presents a well-established governance structure with responsibility and oversight for all risk management and mitigation, coordinated by the Local Transport Partnership (LTP) Team.

4.4 Equality, Diversity and Social Inclusion

None as a result of this paper.

5. Communications

5.1 None as a result of this paper.

6. Appendices/Annexes

6.1 Appraisal Panel Comments / Record of Approval – Appendix 1

REPORT AUTHOR	Melanie Dei Rossi
POST	Head of Performance
Officer responsible	Mark Lynam, Interim Director of Transport, Housing, Infrastructure & Planning
Organisation	Sheffield City Region Combined Authority
Email	mark.lynam@sheffieldcityregion.org.uk
Telephone	0114 2203445

Background papers used in the preparation of this report are available for inspection at:

Other sources and references:

Scheme Details		Appraisal Panel Comments		Recommendations / Conditions	
SCR Executive Board	Transport	Strategic Case	<p>The strategic fit of this sustainable and active travel programme is related to providing “enabling infrastructure” to improve accessibility, especially for the working population without access to a car, as well as improving connectivity and journey reliability, and making the region more attractive to employees and employers, thus supporting growth. There are also anticipated health benefits, in terms of increased active travel and reduced air pollution (as a consequence of reduced congestion), as well as a reduction in road traffic accidents.</p> <p>Consequently, STEP is designed to address policy objectives of the SCR Transport Strategy rather than directly delivering the SEP outcomes, such as a GVA uplift, although the causal link between improved connectivity and the objectives of the SEP is recognised.</p>	Funding	LGF
Project Name	STEP	Value for Money	<p>The modelled BCR of 5.3 is good for a programme of this nature, with benefits expected to comprise a mixture of: health and physical improvements; decongestion; journey ambience; reductions in accidents, absenteeism and harmful emissions; as well as other wider benefits. A significant part of these benefits are therefore social, rather than economic, hence this differs to other projects seeking LGF funding.</p> <p>Further sensitivity tests of the core scenario to assess the impact of the BCR affirm that it will be greater than 2, representing good value for money as a sustainable transport scheme.</p>	Approval Requested	Full approval and award of funding.
Scheme Promoter	BMBC, DMBC, RMBC, SCC via LTP	Risk	General programme and project risks associated with delivery have been identified in the FBC.	Grant Award	£11.88m Capital LGF
SCR Funding	£11.88m		The funding agreement for STEP to ensure funds are transferred to the LA Partners and managed via the LTP team to be finalised.	Grant Recipient	BMBC, DMBC, RMBC, SCC via Local Transport Partnership

Total Scheme Cost	£19.296m	State Aid	The applicant believes that the funding would not be considered State Aid and considers the response to all four tests to be no. This assertion has been produced in collaboration with SYPTE's Principal Solicitor.	Payment Basis	Defray in arrears
% SCR allocation	61.6%	Delivery	The Management Case demonstrates that the STEP programme should deliverable, at least in a practical sense, although concerns remain that the outcomes associated with the programme have not been quantified, which will impede monitoring of the impact of STEP, both during and following delivery.	Claw Back Clauses	Not recommended

Description	Conditions of Award
<p>The Sustainable Transport Exemplar Programme (STEP) is a series of transport interventions developed to provide the enabling infrastructure to support Sheffield City Region's growth ambitions and to enhance the quality of life for existing residents, employees and employers whilst also adding to the attraction for potential movement and investment into the area. The interventions are delivered by the four South Yorkshire local authorities and South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive (SYPTTE).</p> <p>The primary focus of STEP is active travel, delivered by new or improved dedicated walking and cycling routes. Public transport elements are also delivered through SYPTTE's STEP submission.</p> <p>STEP builds on previous Local Sustainable Transport Fund (LSTF) and existing Integrated Transport Block (ITB) packages and delivers on commitments made in the SCR Transport Strategy by supporting enablement of a strong and successful economy through viable, sustainable choices.</p> <p>Different types of activities are being undertaken to deliver on these interventions which can be categorised into four areas; town centre cycling and walking, intra-urban cycling and walking, highways improvements (accessibility) and public transport enhancements.</p> <p>The schemes included are:</p> <p><u>Town Centre Cycling and Walking</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Canal Street to Woodstock Road Link (Barnsley) • Pontefract Road Cycleway (Barnsley) • Junction 38 To Town Centre Cycle Route (Barnsley) • Town Centre Cycle Enhancements (Doncaster) • Town Centre Cycle & Pedestrian Access (Rotherham) • City Centre Cycle Routes (Sheffield) <p><u>Intra-Urban Cycling and Walking</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Park Springs Road to Broomhill Cycle Route (Barnsley) • Great Houghton to Park Springs Road Cycle Route (Barnsley) • Doncaster Greenways Extension - Woodfield Greenway (Doncaster) • Trans Pennine Trail Enhancements (Doncaster) • Cycle Routes Lower Don Valley (Rotherham) • Lower Don Valley Cycle Route (Sheffield) • Upper Don Valley Cycle Route (Sheffield) • Blackburn Valley Cycle Route (Sheffield) <p><u>Highways Improvements</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Herten Way 2 Way Scheme (Doncaster) • Greenhill Main Rd / Greenhill Avenue (Sheffield) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clarification is provided regarding the correct funding profile for the programme, with associated appendices also amended accordingly. 2. Further work is undertaken to clearly quantify outcomes associated with the delivery of the programme which will be monitored following scheme completion. 3. The funding agreement for STEP to ensure funds are transferred to the LA Partners and managed via the LTP team to be finalised. 4. Further clarity is provided regarding post-programme delivery maintenance funding, to ensure adequate funding is in place. 5. Further consideration is given to the longer-term assessment of outcomes and benefits associated with delivery of the programme. 6. The LTP Team continue to liaise with SCR to ensure that SCR CA governance requirements are met in terms of reporting, change requests, claims etc. 7. The LTP Team continue to work closely with SYPTTE in the overall management of both elements of the STEP programme.

Record of Approvals					
STEP					
Appraisal Panel		Executive Board		CA	
Date of Meeting	13-12-2016	Date of Meeting		Date of Meeting	
SCR Officer Presenting Paper	Melanie Dei Rossi	SCR Officer Presenting Paper		SCR Officer Presenting Paper	
Signature		Signature		Signature	
Approving Officer	Gareth Sutton	Approving Officer		Approving Officer	
Signature		Signature		Signature	
Date	06/07/17	Date		Date	

Scheme Summary

The Sustainable Transport Exemplar Programme (STEP) is a series of transport interventions developed to provide the enabling infrastructure to support Sheffield City Region's growth ambitions and to enhance the quality of life for existing residents, employees and employers whilst also adding to the attraction for potential movement and investment into the area. The interventions are delivered by the four South Yorkshire local authorities and South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive (SYPTE).

The primary focus of STEP is active travel, delivered by new or improved dedicated walking and cycling routes. Public transport elements are also delivered through SYPTE's STEP submission.

STEP builds on previous Local Sustainable Transport Fund (LSTF) and existing Integrated Transport Block (ITB) packages and delivers on commitments made in the SCR Transport Strategy by supporting enablement of a strong and successful economy through viable, sustainable choices.

Different types of activities are being undertaken to deliver on these interventions which can be categorised into four areas; town centre cycling and walking, intra-urban cycling and walking, highways improvements (accessibility) and public transport enhancements.

Below is a summary of all the projects being undertaken by STEP, with the exception of the public transport elements which are outlined in a separate Business Case submitted by SYPTE.

Town Centre Cycling and Walking

Canal Street to Woodstock Road Link (Barnsley)

This scheme was completed in 2015/16 and delivers a combined footway linking Canal Street to Woodstock Road in Barnsley. The scheme tarmacked the surface of an existing unmade footway, increased the width to 3m and enhanced signing along the route to encourage users to cycle or walk, either to work college or leisure by providing a wide safe route.

The scheme is located in the Dearne Valley and Junction 36 growth area identified in the Sheffield City Region Strategic Economic Plan (SEP).

Pontefract Road Cycleway (Barnsley)

Barnsley Town Centre is not currently connected to a main highway, which restricts cycling access. To encourage visitors, especially tourists from the Trans Pennine Trail to places like the Cooper Gallery, a new cycleway is needed to connect Barnsley Town Centre with the main cycle network. This means cycling tourists can avoid busy intersections between the A628 and A61.

The scheme is located in the Dearne Valley and Junction 36 growth area.

Junction 38 To Town Centre Cycle Route (Barnsley)

Barnsley's North West corridor is an important, yet congested commuter route for employees travelling to and from Huddersfield and Wakefield, but it is poorly served by cycling paths, prohibiting cycling as a viable option for many commuters as well as people cycling for leisure.

By building this new cycleway there will be direct access to Barnsley Town Centre from J38. This additional cycling infrastructure will help to grow the rapidly growing cycling economy in Barnsley and boost GVA which will manifest itself in additional bike manufacturing capacity,

cycle and accessory retailing, cycling infrastructure and maintenance and additional tourist potential to tourist areas along the route and through the provision of live cycling events which Barnsley town centre has recently hosted.

The scheme is located in the Dearne Valley and Junction 36 growth area.

Town Centre Cycle Enhancements (Doncaster)

This project addresses gaps in the Doncaster cycling network, focussing primarily on connections with the town centre, Doncaster Greenways and the Trans Pennine Trail. Schemes include the Leger Way Toucan and Bennethorpe cycle lane, which will complete the route from the South to the Town Centre. Other schemes include routes from the West where some provision is in place but is incomplete. This scheme will also enhance to a number of employment sites along the route to the Town Centre.

This scheme supports growth in the Doncaster Sheffield Airport corridor, identified in the SEP.

Town Centre Cycle & Pedestrian Access (Rotherham)

The Rotherham West masterplan developed in 2005 identified poor links for pedestrians and cyclists between Masbrough/Ferham area and the town centre. This scheme seeks to improve those links and following the implementation of links between the east of the town centre (Eastwood area) and the town centre to create an obvious and commodious route for cyclists into and across the town centre for the purposes of commuting, leisure and general accessibility. East Rotherham ranks as an area of high deprivation, provision of alternative and cost effective travel options is essential for these areas to improve their connectivity and opportunities.

Project success can be determined by measuring the number of people cycling via continued data collection. The current trend is for cycling to increase by 10% year on year in Rotherham and such an increase in these locations will be deemed a success.

This supports growth in the Advanced Manufacturing Innovation District (Sheffield/Rotherham Don Valley Corridor), identified in the SEP.

City Centre Cycle Routes (Sheffield)

This project creates two cross city centre routes to benefit and encourage cycling and walking, building on the investment in cycle infrastructure from both Sheffield universities. Furthermore, it links into the proposed developments centred round the new Retail Quarter.

It's proposed because there is a lack of obvious links between university campuses, the city centre and transport interchanges. Staff surveys at Sheffield Hallam University over the last decade have highlighted the issue of poor cycle and walk connections between City Campus and Collegiate Campus. University of Sheffield are investing over £4million in public realm and improved cycle and walking infrastructure around their sites.

The intervention is located in the Sheffield City Centre growth area identified in the SEP.

Intra-Urban Cycling and Walking

Park Springs Road to Broomhill Cycle Route (Barnsley)

Footpath widening between Park Springs Road and Broomhill to incorporate cycle route infrastructure. This route serves the key employment zone in Grimethorpe and enhances cycling and walking as travel options to employers in the area, most notably ASOS who employ over 4000 people at their Grimethorpe warehouse.

The proposal improves active travel links in the local area which when combined with the proposed new link on Doncaster Road would provide a formal active travel link between the two employment sites. Residents in Wombwell would also have improved active travel links via Cathill Road to these future employment sites. Residents in Darfield would have a new active travel link to employment opportunities in Wombwell.

The project will encourage modal shift thereby increasing the free flow of traffic and reducing journey times for other car passengers and bus services along Barnsley Road.

By providing a new link those without access to a private motor vehicle will have an alternative method of accessing future employment opportunities at the site for those coming from Darfield and Wombwell. This will reduce social exclusion and further boost economic growth by reducing congestion in and around Cathill Roundabout.

The scheme is located in the Dearne Valley Junction 36 growth area.

Great Houghton to Park Springs Road Cycle Route (Barnsley)

Construction of a new cycle lane on Cat Hill Road to further encourage usage on the Park Springs Road cycleway (ASOS) to the Broomhill area and to attractions such as Old Moor Wetlands Centre. Works include resurfacing part of the carriageway which is in poor condition, sorting a longstanding drainage issue where the carriageway has sunk and associated signing and lining.

The project will help link employment sites to tourism areas whilst promoting health, improving air quality and reducing congestion. Once these sites are developed they will also require a potential workforce. This workforce will be hampered from getting to the site if congestion is severe.

The scheme is located in the Dearne Valley and Junction 36 growth area.

Doncaster Greenways Extension - Woodfield Greenway (Doncaster)

Woodfield Greenway links the Trans Pennine Trail (TPT) with the Lakeside area and therefore provides an employment link scheme linking the TPT through to White Rose Way and the Lakeside for a number of settlements including Edlington and Balby developments.

This scheme supports growth in the Doncaster Sheffield Airport corridor, identified in the SEP.

Trans Pennine Trail Enhancements (Doncaster)

Improved surfacing of the TPT between Doncaster and the Dearne will enhance access to the employment sites in the Dearne area.

This scheme supports growth in the Doncaster Sheffield Airport and Deane Valley and Junction 36 corridors, identified in the SEP.

Cycle Routes Lower Don Valley (Rotherham)

Significant improvements to the canal towpath cycle route around New York Stadium including the construction of a new cycle route at a higher level to reduce the risk of flooding and to allow the removal of a cantilevered section of the towpath which is narrow, slippery when wet and unsuitable for cyclists. The scheme also includes the full resurfacing of the towpath around New York Stadium to provide an all-weather surface. This route will complete the Rotherham to Sheffield off road cycle route and provide direct access into Rotherham town centre.

There is demonstrable demand from the community for this, which will improve accessibility to public transport and from a cycling perspective bridge gaps in the existing network.

This supports growth in the Advanced Manufacturing Innovation District (Sheffield/Rotherham Don Valley Corridor), identified in the SEP.

Lower Don Valley Cycle Route (Sheffield)

Also applicable to Rotherham, over 65,000 people work and over 41,000 live in the Lower Don Valley (census data 2011) and new cycling and walking links will provide short (in distance), cost-effective sustainable transport options from local areas.

They will also allow access to a wider field of employment by linking into existing and proposed strategic routes that serve Sheffield, Meadowhall and Rotherham.

Delivering this project reduces cycling requirements on fast, busy roads that often don't allow access to the existing network.

This supports growth in the Advanced Manufacturing Innovation District (Sheffield/Rotherham Don Valley Corridor).

Upper Don Valley Cycle Route (Sheffield)

Creation of new cycle route from Oughtibridge to Stocksbridge via Wharnccliffe Woods and Deepcar. Primarily a leisure route it will also benefit utility journeys through and between Stocksbridge and Deepcar, and Penistone. The Upper Don valley is a key employment growth area with over 40,000 working within the area (census data 2011).

Schemes in the Upper Don Valley form part of the strategic network for cycling and walking from residential, employment and education areas. This project extends the existing route northward from Hillsborough to connect North Sheffield into the City Centre. Approximately 40,000 people work in this area (census data 2011) and the new links and routes will provide short (in distance), cost effective sustainable transport options between local areas. As with other projects, it will link onto existing strategic routes in the area.

This supports growth in the Sheffield City Centre growth area.

Blackburn Valley Cycle Route (Sheffield)

The Blackburn Valley Cycle Route project forms part of the strategic network linking housing, employment, education, leisure and other trip generating sites and locations. Running parallel with the M1 and close to Junction 35A, Blackburn Valley serves nearby business parks. As it currently stands the route only runs as far as Ecclesfield and does not connect into Chapeltown or Smithywood Business Park. The proposal completes the route which will enable cyclists to cycle off road or on quiet roads, on a level surface between Sheffield City Centre, Meadowhall and north to Ecclesfield and Chapeltown.

The project aims to alleviate pressure on some of Sheffield's roads that are run at capacity during peak times. Over the past 20 years, despite multi-million pound investment building and upgrading new roads, improving traffic control, introducing park and ride, Sheffield still has the same number of vehicles and people travelling on its roads. In order to create capacity on roads so that development can take place (that will generate new trips) viable and cost effective options have to be available. An improved public transport system will help medium to long journeys (5 miles plus) but for short trips under 5 miles if the facilities are to an excellent standard - wide segregated or quiet routes cycling can be the better option. The route length between Chapeltown to Meadowhall is 4 miles, the route will be entirely off road.

This supports growth in the Sheffield City Centre growth area.

Highways Improvements

Herten Way 2 Way Scheme (Doncaster)

Conversion of Herten Way into a two way road which will help alleviate traffic congestion issues with ASDA in particular but also make an existing area of development land more attractive for investment as access will be greatly improved.

This scheme supports growth in the Doncaster Sheffield Airport and Deane Valley and Junction 36 corridors, identified in the SEP.

Greenhill Main Rd / Greenhill Avenue (Sheffield)

Improved pedestrian and cycle crossing facilities across the busy Greenhill Main Road route to reduce congestion and offer improved access and opportunity for cyclists. This investment complements the recent improvement works to cycle routes around (and more general traffic management at) the nearby Meadowhead Roundabout. This new facility will also improve cycle access to the new National Centre for Sports and Exercise Medicine (NCSEM) at Graves.

ASSESSMENT SUMMARY (TO BE COMPLETED BY THE ASSESSOR)

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

The STEP has a clear strategic rationale which focuses on supporting the SCR Growth Plan and the SEP through “enabling infrastructure”, centred primarily around enhancing the offer for active travel through new or improved dedicated walking and cycling routes. Within this it is acknowledged by the promoter that the strategic impact of STEP will be less direct than some other LGF supported schemes, due to its ‘supportive’ nature.

The programme closely aligns with the SCR Transport Executive Board remit, and the FBC also suggests some links to all the other theme boards (excluding Corporate), although some of this could be better substantiated.

The programme also has close strategic and delivery links to other local transport programmes, including the Integrated Transport Block (ITB) and the Local Sustainable Transport Fund (LSTF) / Sustainable Travel Transition Year (STTY) / Sustainable Travel Access Fund (STAF), all three of which are different iterations of sustainable transport funding.

It is also asserted within the FBC that the programme aligns effectively with the transport strategies of the four South Yorkshire local authorities, who will be delivering the various projects that constitute this element of STEP, as well as a raft of other national policies, although the explanatory detail regarding these national policies is somewhat limited.

The objectives associated with the scheme can draw a clear strategic lineage, although are broadly thematic, rather than directly quantified in terms of outcomes and benefits. Nevertheless, there is still a robust plan for delivery of key activities, which is supported by the LTP Team's existing programme management arrangements and the individual promoter's prior experience of delivering similar schemes previously. This provides confidence in terms of the potential deliverability of the programme, and also means, for the most part, that the SMART ethos should be adhered to, although this needs to be built up for post completion evaluation.

A limitation of this FBC, as with some of the previous drafts, remains that consideration of alternative options seems to have been fairly ‘light touch’ with an overall assertion that full funding is essential to realise the proposed benefits of the programme, rather than the promoter suggesting any potential scalability (which may be possible, given the modular nature of some of the projects in this programmes).

This also means that the narrative regarding the adverse consequences of the programme not going ahead are predominantly focused around the anticipated benefits of the programme not being realised, as well as a weakening of the transport offer and related infrastructure in South Yorkshire.

In terms of any disbenefits of the scheme proceeding, some are identified in terms of the potential for disruption associated with construction of the schemes, and a risk of increased cycling accidents due to more cyclists being on the South Yorkshire highways networks, but these are viewed as being significantly outstripped by the potential benefits that will be realised.

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

The assessment of the market potential for the programme is limited to the project partners experience of delivering similar schemes previously, combined with national Government set targets for cycling levels as justification for the proposed interventions and does not explore fully why the proposed interventions are the right interventions to achieve these strategic goals.

All the projects are feasible and deliverable, primarily due to drawing on previous experience of similar delivery from the promoters.

The procurement requirements for the programme are minimal, and there are no significant concerns to outline in this area, other than to note that any procurement that has been completed or is still required, will have to adhere to each individual local authority's tendering requirements.

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

The FBC for STEP includes quantified modelling to help demonstrate the potential positive economic / monetised benefits the programme is expected to deliver. The programme provides a strong Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) of 5.3, which significantly exceeds the anticipated threshold for transport projects of 2.

The monetised benefits calculations are based on greenhouse gases, other environmental benefits, accidents, physical activity, journey ambience, economic efficiency (commuting and business users), and wider public finances rather than Jobs and GVA along with links to the SCR transport strategy. Programme benefits include: increased/improved health, improved road safety, improved air quality, increased social interaction, reduced congestion, better access to employment, improved public realm, and improved public satisfaction.

Standardised growth figures have been used but in some cases where localised counts were not available baseline figures have been calculated using similes, there is therefore a risk that the benefits to be achieved could be over or under estimated. The reported BCR of 5.3 allows a significant allowance for Optimism Bias and this should be included as a sensitivity test.

Subsequent additional sensitivity tests in this regard have confirmed that a BCR of greater than 2 should be achieved, thus still representing good value for money as a sustainable transport scheme.

The most significant limitation of the FBC is that outcomes associated with each project and the programme have not been identified and presented in the main business case documentation other than as monetised benefits. This is an essential requirement for the benefit realisation and scheme evaluation post completion. Evaluation of performance out schemes is necessary to develop project learning loops and to inform future scheme development and appraisal loops.

Therefore, it is recommended prior to entering into a funding agreement a set of measurable project metrics be completed and agreed. Following the modelling analysis undertaken outcomes such as walk / cycle user targets and other quantified benefits can be presented in a SMART way to inform a measure of programme success. This is essential as the programme is not directly delivering against the SEP objectives of GVA and jobs. The outputs of each element of the programme are well defined and very specific in the FBC.

The programme follows a well-established programme delivery route and includes the normal range of risks and uncertainties associated with the programme which are well understood.

There remains some uncertainty regarding the nominated scheme promoter for the South Yorkshire-wide programme. According to the FBC, Sheffield City Council have been identified as lead applicant however further work is required to determine and agree how the funding will flow to each of the LA Partners and managed via the LTP team.

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

The finances for the programme are well developed, although some recent reprofiling of projected delivery and spend, required as a result of slippage associated with the completion of the assurance process, means that the main figures in the FBC now appear to be out of date. There are also some discrepancies between the cost category breakdown in the main FBC and those found in the accompanying appendices.

These will both require a review by the promoter, and the correct figures will need to be presented in an updated FBC prior to entering into the funding agreement. A request for change will also need to be presented to reflect the profile change however it the overall funding ask across the whole STEP programme is not anticipated to change as part of these revisions.

Reassurance has been provided that no additional funding will be requested from SCR to cover either cost overruns or post-delivery revenue costs, with the former being dealt with through the LTP Team's existing 'flexible' programme management approach (which includes managing several different funding allocations). In terms of the latter, there are still some concerns about how maintenance costs for capital assets generated by STEP will be covered, particularly given that this has been a broader point of contention within South Yorkshire previously. However, this is not a significant enough concern to delay further progress of this funding application.

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

Overall there is a high level of confidence in the LTP Team to manage STEP, given their previous experience of coordinating similar funding, including the successful delivery of the 2015/16 element of the programme. The links to SCR governance processes and arrangements will need to be further developed to improve the alignment of programme reporting / grant claim procedures.

Detailed milestones are provided for the programme, which all seem deliverable and achievable. These are not provided on a per project basis, and reporting from the STEP programme management team will need to continue to monitor these, escalating where necessary variances to time, cost, quality, issues and risks via the SCR quarterly reporting processes.

Risks associated with the programme seem well understood, with a well-defined structure in place for escalation and management of these risks by the LTP Team.

Linking to this, the LTP Team also has robust structures in place to monitor the ongoing delivery of the programme, although post-completion evaluation needs to be strengthened to determine the benefit realisation of specific schemes and the SMART objectives of the programme.

Prior to entering into funding approval, a SMART outcome / benefit realisation plan is required for the programme.

Finally, in terms of State Aid, the promoter has sought support from SYPTE's Principal Solicitor in order to re-state that it is believed that it does not apply to this programme.

Please summarise your overall assessment of the Business Case and set out any recommendations for SCR.

The promoter remains clear about the anticipated strategic fit of this sustainable and active travel programme, with it providing “enabling infrastructure” to improve accessibility, especially for the working population without access to a car, as well as improving connectivity and journey reliability, and making the region more attractive to employees and employers, thus supporting growth. There are also anticipated health benefits, in terms of increased active travel and reduced air pollution (as a consequence of reduced congestion), as well as a reduction in road traffic accidents.

Consequently, STEP is designed to address policy objectives of the SCR Transport Strategy rather than directly delivering the SEP outcomes, such as a GVA uplift, although the causal link between improved connectivity and the objectives of the SEP is recognised.

There is a high level of confidence in the deliverability of STEP, given the experience of delivering similar projects by the four local authorities, who will be completing the interventions, and the LTP Team's track record of coordinating similar programmes. Detailed milestones are also presented in the FBC for the overall programme, although the management of these for individual projects sits with the LTP Team. The revised funding profile now presented to match the approvals will need to be reflected in a request for change.

In terms of potential disbenefits of the scheme proceeding, a small number are identified, but are seen as minor in comparison to the benefits that should be realised.

Consideration of alternative options, other than the full funding allocation requested, remain somewhat limited, meaning a lot of the narrative is focused on the negative impacts of a scaled back programme, rather than on how the modular nature of the different projects could potentially be utilised to deliver reduced delivery if the complete funding ask is not available.

The assessment of the market potential for the programme is limited to the project partners experience of delivering similar schemes previously, combined with national Government set targets for cycling levels as justification for the proposed interventions and does not explore fully why the proposed interventions are the right interventions to achieve these strategic goals.

Procurement requirements for the programme are minimal, and there are no significant concerns to outline in this area.

The modelling now completed for the programme has identified an overall Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) of 5.3, which presents good value for money for a transport based scheme. The methodology used to arrive at this figure follows a robust process.

Standardised growth figures have been used but in some cases where localised counts were not available baseline figures have been calculated using similes, there is therefore a risk that the benefits to be achieved could be over or under estimated. The reported BCR of 5.3 allows a significant allowance for Optimism Bias and this should be included as a sensitivity test.

Subsequent additional sensitivity tests in this regard have confirmed that a BCR of greater than 2 should be achieved, thus still representing good value for money as a sustainable transport scheme.

The most significant limitation of the FBC is that outcomes associated with each project and the programme have not been identified and presented in the main business case documentation other than as monetised benefits. Therefore, it is recommended prior to entering into a funding agreement a set of measurable project metrics be completed and agreed

There remains some uncertainty regarding the nominated scheme promoter for the South Yorkshire-wide programme. According to the FBC, Sheffield City Council have been identified as lead applicant however further work is required to determine and agree how the funding will flow to each of the LA Partners and managed via the LTP team.

Although the finances for the programme are well developed, there now appear to be some discrepancies in the spend profile presented in this FBC, compared to revised figures that have previously been submitted. The correct figures will need to be presented in an updated FBC prior to

entering into the funding agreement. A request for change will also need to be presented to reflect the profile change however it the overall funding ask across the whole STEP programme is not anticipated to change as part of these revisions.

Reassurance has been provided that no additional funding will be requested from SCR to cover either cost overruns or post-delivery revenue costs, although the latter has previously been a point of contention in South Yorkshire, and therefore may require further reassurance going forward.

Finally, in terms of State Aid, the promoter has sought support from SYPTE's Principal Solicitor in order to re-state that it is believed that State Aid does not apply to this programme. This may require clarification from SCR's own legal representative.

Following review of the full business case it is recommended that:

- 1. Clarification is provided regarding the correct funding profile for the programme, with associated appendices also amended accordingly.**
- 2. Further work is undertaken to establish quantified outcomes associated with the delivery of the programme which will be monitored following scheme completion.**
- 3. The funding agreement for STEP to ensure funds are transferred to the LA Partners and managed via the LTP team to be finalised.**
- 4. Further clarity is provided regarding post-programme delivery maintenance funding, to ensure adequate funding is in place.**
- 5. Further consideration is given to the longer-term assessment of outcomes and benefits associated with delivery of the programme.**
- 6. The LTP Team continue to liaise with SCR to ensure that governance requirements are met in terms of reporting, change requests, claims etc.**
- 7. The LTP Team continue to work closely with SYPTE in the overall management of both elements of the STEP programme.**

TRANSPORT EXECUTIVE BOARD

12th JANUARY 2017

UPDATE ON TRANSPORT FOR THE NORTH – STRATEGIC TRANSPORT PLAN

Purpose of Report

To provide Members with a progress update on the development of the pan-Northern Transport Strategy being developed by Transport for the North and its partners.

Thematic Priority

6. *External Connectivity: Secure investment in infrastructure where it will do most to support growth.*

Freedom of Information

This paper is not exempt under [Part II of the Freedom of Information Act 2000](#)

Recommendations

Give, in detail, the endorsement and recommendation that is being sought on the issue concerned. If the report is for discussion or to seek guidance, then this should be stated. Avoid recommending that 'the report be noted' instead invite members to identify any further issues arising from the report.

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Transport for the North (TfN) is working with partner organisations at multiple levels to develop a pan-Northern Strategic Transport Plan (STP) that seeks to support the economic growth identified in the Northern Powerhouse Independent Economic Review (NPIER) published in March 2015 and which will assist in unlocking funding for major schemes.

The Plan's development is being achieved through modal workstreams with representatives from the partners and relevant statutory bodies, and cover the following:

- Road
- Rail
- Freight
- International Connectivity
- SMART (Ticketing and Information)

SCR's presence at these working groups is to help TfN establish its priorities, influence discussions to ensure SCR objectives are met and ensure that all transport aspirations to deliver growth are captured. Additionally, SCR officers have been involved in the development of conditional outputs associated with the workstreams. Its representation is given at Appendix 1 to this document and TEB is requested to endorse this involvement, together with the description of the SCR position on these workstreams.

- 1.2** Whilst TfN is not yet a Statutory Transport Body, it is intended to establish this in early 2017 as shown in the key milestones below:

	Date
Draft Statutory Instrument	mid December 2016
Parliamentary Approval	10 th February 2017
Ministerial Approval	24 th March 2017

- 1.3** The modal development work will result in two reports (Integrated Road Report and Integrated Rail Report) that will establish priorities which will then feed into a separate STP. Freight is recognised as cross-cutting and covers road, rail and air connectivity. In accordance with DfT guidance on transport strategy development, the STP is also subject to high level environmental assessment which, together with the draft main document, is subject to public consultation. Key milestones are:

- **Spring 2017** – Publication of the Draft STP, Road Report, Rail Report and Initial Sustainability Appraisal / Statement
- **Summer 2017** - Public Engagement on STP and progress sequenced development programme
- **September 2017** - Final Draft STP and refined priorities
- **December 2017** – Consultation version finalised
- **February – May 2018** - Formal Public Consultation of STP
- **July 2018** - Adoption of Strategic Transport Plan

1.4 Work is also continuing on the development of the prioritisation framework to inform sequencing of schemes. Discussions began in November 2016 around the factors that will inform sequencing and the development of prioritisation criteria. Whilst all schemes will require business case development, appraisal and an acceptable Benefit-Cost Ratio, it is not proposed that this factor alone is used in the prioritisation process. As such, the following have been identified as requiring further consideration through a 'conversation' stage with partners to ensure the final strategy isn't just data led but is influenced by wider considerations:

- Corridors and networks;
- Pan-Northern connectivity as the main priority;
- Balance of schemes across the North;
- Trade-offs, substitutions and synergies; and
- Deliverability, affordability and acceptability.

Discussions will continue across TfN and its partners around criteria and scoring rules (to be completed by end of January 2017) and the overall approach (to be completed by March 2017). It is recognised that perhaps two strategic alternatives will need to be developed via STPDG advice; the Sustainability Appraisal; and TfN Leadership although no further information around these is currently available.

The approach is designed to facilitate the development of a coherent and coordinated pan-Northern perspective to support economic growth for the North as a whole (and that fit with the NPIER) rather than being piecemeal or based solely on discrete business case development.

2. Workstream Update

2.1 NORTHERN POWERHOUSE RAIL

This TfN workstream is specifically focussed on providing better connections across 6 Northern Cities and economic centres (Sheffield, Manchester, Leeds, Liverpool, Newcastle and Hull) and Manchester Airport with fast, frequent rail journeys (e.g. 6tph, 30 mins Sheffield-Manchester), creating a pan-Northern network. The network will promote transformational economic growth to help rebalance the national economy. Initial feasibility work has shown that for many routes this requires new lines or use of HS2 (e.g. the new M18 HS2 route can be part-utilised to deliver <30 minute journey times between Sheffield and Leeds).

A report to TfN Partnership Board was scheduled for December 2016 although further development work is continuing. It should be noted that Rail North work is separate to that of TfN who are an independent body and will be integrated into TfN when it becomes a Statutory Transport Body in 2017.

TfN presented a paper to the Executive Board meeting of 11th November 2016 around the commission of a second phase of NPR demand modelling work for the remainder of 2016/17. The TfN Commissioning Board approved the proposal to commission a second phase of NPR demand modelling from the Atkins-Motts-Systra contract for £420,000 in 2016/17 funded via the Transport Development Fund.

Key Issues for SCR:

- Maintaining representation at all relevant meetings
- Reviewing the modelling commission work

2.2 INTERNATIONAL CONNECTIVITY

A report to TfN's Executive and Partnership Boards was scheduled for December 2016 and it is expected that its recommendations and implementation plans will be published in

January 2017. A forward programme with associated supporting communications activities will be developed with the Executive Board and Partnership Board from January 2017 following the completion of the final report.

Key Issues for SCR:

- Ability to review the work and identification of people with appropriate knowledge (the issue of international connectivity is generally outside the remit and competences of a Transport Authority).

2.3 FREIGHT AND LOGISTICS

This workstream addresses the road and rail movement of goods, including looking at distribution centres and how to maximise efficiencies. In November 2016, TfN commissioned additional strategic analyses to enhance understanding of the specifics of the rail freight market in the north of England; this technical work will be delivered in March 2017 and include ongoing strategic engagement work with the private sector and also identify the implications of the interventions that TfN need to deliver within the road and rail workstreams. As the engagement with the private sector progresses there will be an enhanced understanding of the opportunities around how freight can play a key role in moving cargoes and resources. This will include ports, airports and logistics hubs.

TfN have identified transport constraints for freight growth on a pan Northern Strategic basis within the NPIER context in line with the STP and Integrated Road and Rail Reports. Concern exists around lack of information from Network Rail on freight movements (due to perceived commercial sensitivity) and TfN are now seeking data on overall tonnage movements rather than supply chain detail.

Commissioning: The second commission was discussed at the Freight Steering Group on 8th November 2016 and the request for services revised and agreed by the Executive Board on 14th November to better focus the study around priorities and to explore the cost-benefit analyses and GVA on key interventions. The Steering Group agreed that greater emphasis needed to be placed also on carbon and pollutant reduction. The commission includes scheduled meetings with the successful bidder to ensure the correct focus.

Key Issues for SCR:

- Continued input into the workstream
- Participation in overseeing the stage 2 study – TfN has requested delegated authority around the consultancy appointment and SCR representatives need to ensure its views are included during the study itself – this is achievable within the terms of the commission via the interim review meetings.

2.4 Strategic Roads

This workstream reflects the Strategic Road and Key Road networks that link the major towns and growth areas, now known as the Major Route Network (MRN). Conditional Outputs have been developed and strategic routes identified across the North (together with interfaces in neighbouring counties). These are being included within a draft Integrated Roads Strategy report and SCR will have further opportunity to review and comment in advance of its publication as a draft in March 2017.

TransPennine Tunnel Study: this was reviewed by the Wider Connectivity Assessment Project Board in November 2016 and the Stage 3 report published on 24th November 2016. The Stage 3 report is very high level and provides a preliminary assessment of options. The TransPennine Project Board comprises Highways England, TfN and consultants (WSP, PB and SDG). SCR officers have approached TfN to discuss the Stage 3 report and its implications and interfaces (the date has yet to be confirmed at the time of writing).

Key Issues for SCR:

- Ensuring that SCR understands how any proposal could impact on its current and future road networks

3. Implications

3.1 Financial

There are no financial implications of this paper as it is providing a progress update only. However, financial implications arising from this pan-Northern strategic work may have financial implications that will be the subject of future reports.

3.2 Legal

There are no legal implications of this paper currently.

3.3 Risk Management

If the SCR does not continue its active role in the development of the TfN Strategies and Programme, there is a risk that benefits to the City Region may not be delivered.

3.4 Equality, Diversity and Social Inclusion (Equality Act - Public Sector Equality Duty)

There are no specific equality, diversity or social inclusion implications arising from this report.

4. Communications

- 4.1** TfN is currently leading on communications for all partners and SCR will ensure accuracy of information and data and provide advice on stakeholder engagement around consultation in Spring 2017.

5. Appendices/Annexes

- 5.1** Appendix 1: Table showing SCR attendance at TfN workstreams

Appendix 2: Table showing update detail of TfN Workstreams

REPORT AUTHOR Gillian Heyworth
POST Senior Policy Advisor (Temporary)
Officer responsible Mark Lynam
Organisation **Sheffield City Region**
Email **Mark.lynam@sheffieldcityregion@org.uk**
Telephone **0114 220 3445**

Background papers used in the preparation of this report are available for inspection at:

Other sources and references:

APPENDIX 1

Transport for the North Governance Structure

Governance Stream	Workstreams	SCR Attendance	Purpose
Partnership Board	N/A	Cllr Julie Dore Martin McKervey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategic Direction Monitoring progress Advice at milestones on future direction to meet TfN's objectives. Engagement with Government.
Executive Board	All TfN workstreams	Diana Terris	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall management of TfN workstreams.
Strategic Transport Plan Development Group (STPDG)	Rail Road International Connectivity Freight and Logistics	Mark Lynam	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of the TfN STP. Management of the rail and road workstreams.
Strategic Integrated Roads Report Group (SIRR)	As below	Gill Heyworth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administer the production of the road reports which feed into STP.
	Northern Trans Pennine Group	No current SCR representative. Proposed review post meeting with TfN on TPT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addressing connectivity in general between Leeds/Sheffield and Manchester/Liverpool.
	Trans Pennine Tunnel (TPT) Group	Gill Heyworth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Working group looking specifically at the TPT.
	Manchester NW Quadrant Group	No attendance required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Group looking specifically at road connectivity in NW Manchester.
	TPT Wider Transport Connectivity Assessment	Gill Heyworth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Study group specifically looking at wider road connectivity linked to the TPT routes.

Integrated Rail Report Group (IRRG)	As below	Suzannah Rockett	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administer the production of the rail reports which feed into STP.
Northern Powerhouse Rail	Working Group	Suzannah Rockett	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Group specifically looking at solutions to achieve the conditional outputs between core cities.
	ITSS Sub-Group	Suzannah Rockett	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sub-group of NPR developing train service specifications to meet COs and provide options to model.
	Sheffield Station Study	Suzannah Rockett	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developing options for Sheffield Station in relation to HS2, NPR and local connectivity
Freight and Logistics Working Group	N/A	Alex Forrest	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developing the freight input into the STP and Integrated Road and Rail Report
International Connectivity Commission	N/A	?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No further meetings as report to be considered by Executive Board before further work undertaken.
Smart	N/A	Suzanne Hutchinson (SYLTE)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support the program of activity Feed in City Region views & requirements / streamline activity Input into OBC and other relevant documents

<p>Strategic Transport Strategy: this identifies the strategic transport priorities for the Northern region up to 2050 predicated on the NPIER and covers:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The strategic case for change set in the economic context of the NPIER; an economic plan about transport and clearly defined Objectives and Conditional Outputs; • The options and prioritisation framework that TfN is defining to achieve the objectives as part of its portfolio; • The approach TfN intends to take to deliver the strategic transport priorities, including funding, Governance, the evolving Strategic Transport Board and next steps. Current work is around the Strategic Case and objectives with multi-modal Conditional Outputs • Prioritisation Framework - Approach and Criteria (5 cases: Strategic; Economic; Commercial; Financial; and Management); and • Programming and Sequencing – working towards a final approach for affordability, acceptability and deliverability.
<p>Economic Growth and Transport Demand Analysis - Evolving from the NPIER, this covers development of travel demand forecasts to inform TfN STP and input in to the prioritisation of investment programmes, providing a robust and credible analytical framework to underpin the strategic and economic case for investing in transport infrastructure and inform the prioritisation of the required investments, including futures work around technology and skills</p>	<p>1st draft completion date: March 2017 to be followed by the first stage of public engagement. The document will include options for investment and be supported by the Roads and Rail Reports, and the criteria and programme for prioritization.</p> <p>Supported by Road Report, Rail Report, Sustainability Statement and Public Engagement workstreams</p>
<p>Sustainability</p> <p>The Transport Plan requires a Sustainability Appraisal and a Sustainability Statement will be published alongside the draft Transport Plan in March 2017</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An opportunistic consideration of social, environmental and economic factors for an integrated sustainability appraisal; • The aim is to apply the appraisal in a proportionate and meaningful way as an integral part of developing and consulting on the STP; • This will encompass legislative requirements and consider the wider economic and social impacts of the STP, including undertaking an Strategic Environmental Assessment; • Publication of a scoping report in Autumn 2016 is integral to completing the sustainability appraisal process and a legislative requirement for completion of a Strategic Environmental Assessment; and • Designated consultation bodies (defined by the SEA regulations) must be consulted on the scoping report and on publication of the sustainability appraisal.

<p>Northern Powerhouse Rail: TfN's key outputs: coherent sequential investment programme, encompassing evidence from NPR Option Prioritisation, Rail North Long Term Rail Strategy, Freight and Logistics, Strategic Local Connectivity Report, International Connectivity Commission recommendations, HS2 and Network Rail Studies and gaps arising from outputs of TfN's Economic Growth and Demand Analysis, working in partnership with Rail North and Network Rail.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expanding on the existing Rail North Long Term Rail Strategy (LTRS) • Report to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rail North's existing Long Term Rail Strategy (managing the existing rail network); • NPR development (combination of new infrastructure, upgrades of existing, and utilising HS2); <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rest of the North's rail network (such as schemes identified through the SLC process, CP5 and CP6) • Identification of core conditional outputs to support TfN's and the Northern Powerhouse's economic growth aspirations; • Clear positioning on franchises and freight; • Consideration of what modal shift could be achieved; • Understanding strategic connectivity gaps and assessment of options for improving connectivity, including integration with the strategic road network and other modes of transport
<p>INTEGRATED AND SMART TRAVEL</p> <p>This workstream addresses integrated information, fares and ticketing to facilitate informed choice about mode of travel and is subject to a third party agreement being managed by TfN direct.</p>	<p>Staff continue to be recruited and TfN is working with development partners (PwC) to progress the workstream. An Outline Business Case is complete and was submitted to the Partnership Board (October 2016) and the Gateway Review completed October 2016. A review by the OGC expected which will provide assurance on the Programme.</p> <p>An OGC review was undertaken in October 2016 that included 32 interviews with representatives of a range of organisations and identified that further work on the commercial and management cases was required as a matter of urgency. Significant risks have been recognised and DfT is heavily involved.</p> <p>The review recognised that these issues were being addressed but considered that there were significant risks to successful delivery at programme level. A series of business cases have been developed to submit to DfT/HMT for approval, the first of these being the initial 'ask' will be finalised and submitted in 2016 (to be advised).</p> <p>Stakeholder Management: stakeholder engagement with the Transport Card Forum and suppliers plus consultation with city regions, LTAs, bus operators, TOCs and Ticketing companies has occurred. The Stakeholder Board papers will provide further information - has been held which whilst challenging further strengthens the bonds with delivery partners</p> <p>Information: this looks at how best to provide timetable and ticketing information across the North. Workstreams include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improving data accuracy and availability • Open Data and Open Data Services • Branding, Marketing and Communications

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Web Presence • A Tool Kit and Customer Information Guidelines for Stakeholders <p>Key Issues for SCR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Input into workstream and ensuring SCR's views are captured • Clarification of who is undertaking this work for SCR is required for strategic and technical elements.
<p>INTERNATIONAL CONNECTIVITY</p> <p>This workstream includes air links and how best to exploit opportunities for all airports in the North, with York Aviation being commissioned and establishing a baseline. The workstream is exploring the fit with the Freight and Logistics programme interfaces and surface access developments via the Road and Rail reports.</p>	<p>There is potential to attract 12million additional air passengers by 2050 over and above natural growth; business travel likely to increase; difficulties around airfreight to avail of cheaper air freight rates so, whilst the ability to carry air freight is important to the viability of long haul air services but issues exist around connections between the surface origin of goods and where they are flown from, at least in terms of the use of bellyhold freight capacity on passenger aircraft.</p>
<p>STRATEGIC ROADS NETWORK</p> <p>Key outputs: network plans identifying current and proposed schemes and interface with rail investment plans. A growth focussed, gap analysis of the strategic highway network (Highways England managed and key local strategic routes) is in progress to identify strategic road connectivity improvements, and will be informed by Highways England's Route Strategy evidence base.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A long-term, multi-year investment plan covering: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 TfN strategic studies; • Associated wider impact studies; • Evidence from the TfN programmes on Freight, Strategic Local Connectivity and International Connectivity • An analysis of strategic connectivity gaps and additional evidence, including integration with rail and other modes • Includes approach identifying priorities to inform the RIS 2 process, as well as long term investment • Strategic Road Network in the North and strategic cross boundary routes • Identification of core conditional outputs to support Northern Powerhouse economic growth aspirations • Potential for smarter management of data on the transport network, communicating real time travel information to drivers / passengers • Consideration in the long term of factors such as autonomous vehicles and road pricing • Plan to produce draft strategy and early priorities by January 2017, with final strategy agreed in advance of SRN Route Strategy report

This page is intentionally left blank

TRANSPORT EXECUTIVE BOARD

12th January 2017

LOCAL LARGE MAJORS APPLICATIONS

Purpose of Report

In November 2016, it was announced that the Sheffield City Region (SCR) has been successful in securing funding for two out of three applications made to the Department for Transport (DfT). These applications were to the Local Large Majors (LLM) fund, which was established to support the business case development costs faced by Local Authorities associated with 'exceptionally' large transport projects. This process was highly competitive with the DfT receiving over 50 applications and selecting only 12 to receive funding. This report summarises all three of the SRC bids and outlines the implications of the recent announcement, including next steps and project timelines.

Thematic Priority

The action proposed in this paper will deliver SEP Thematic Priority for the Sheffield City Region.

6. Secure investment in infrastructure where it will do most to support growth.

Freedom of Information

N/A

Recommendations

It is recommended that the board consider the contents of this report, noting the requirement to undertake further work on the development of business cases for the successfully funded schemes.

1. Introduction

- 1.1** In 2016, the DfT released details of a fund to support the development of Local Large Major (LLM) projects. Applicants were encouraged to submit a single submission to the fund, outlining the business case for their projects delivery, focussing upon the benefits the funding could unlock.
- 1.2** In June 2017, SCR Leaders approved the submission of three bids to the DfT LLM fund in partnership with Sheffield City Council (SCC), Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council (RMBC) and South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive (SYPTTE). These bids were SCR Mass Transit, AMID Innovation Corridor and Pan Northern Connectivity. Although only invited to submit a single application, it was felt that given the strength of our schemes and the benefits this funding could bring to our region we should submit multiple schemes.

1.3 On 24 November 2016, DfT announced they would fund two of our schemes; the Mass Transit and the Innovation Corridor application. The total funding requested is £734,931 and £1.380m respectively. This funding will be used to support the development of Outline Business Cases (OBC's).

1.4 The Schemes

Although the DfT requested the submission of a single scheme to the LLM fund, the SCR and partners felt that we had multiple schemes of sufficient strength that should be considered. This decision proved successful as two of our three submissions have been approved for funding. This is a big achievement for the region, as the DfT received over 50 applications with ministers selecting only 12 winners.

1.5 At the time of writing, there are many details that need to be resolved including the total funding available, capital/revenue split and the grant acceptance conditions. This information will be established with the DfT through meetings, which are diarised for Dec 2016 and Jan 2017. The Board will be kept informed as the projects progress and for information, our applications that will receive LLM funding are briefly summarised below.

1.6 Mass Transit

In July 2016, SCR requested £734,931 towards the £2.706m costs (total over three years) of producing the OBC, to help secure the future of the existing Supertram network. The OBC for this scheme will assess three options, which have been developed with the recent public consultation responses in mind. To undertake this work, the DfT require the SCR to update the strategic transport model for our region, as the data it relies upon is no longer up to date.

1.7 Leaders agreed in October 2016 to fund the £1.6m towards the transport modelling work required for all LLM and other schemes. Of the £734,931 bid for from the DfT, £200,000 will be used to support the transport model update work. Once complete, the updated model will be available for other schemes to use to develop their economic case and test their preferred options, including the AMID scheme. SYPTE secured endorsement from their Executive Board to accept the £0.7m funding from DfT and to progress work on the OBC for the Mass Transit scheme.

1.8 SCR Innovation Corridor (AMID)

The SCR requested £1.38m from DfT towards the £1.855m required to develop the OBC for improved connectivity within the SCR Innovation Corridor. This project will provide new infrastructure in the form of a strategic transport corridor to improve growth by relieving traffic congestion. The geographical focus of this work will be between the Advanced Manufacturing Park, Waverly New Community, Sheffield Business Park and the Olympic Legacy Park. The modelling cost for this scheme is covered by the modelling work for Mass Transit, with no additional funding required from SCR.

1.9 Interdependencies

As with the Mass Transit Scheme, the Innovation Corridor work will also require an up to date transport model in order to test options. Given the interdependencies between the SCR transport modelling update and the two LLM projects, it is proposed that the DfT funding is received by the SCR with funding agreements put in place between the SCR and relevant project partners. The interdependencies and project milestones are shown in Table 1 (overleaf).

Scheme	Task	2016/17						2017/18						2018/19														
		q3			q4			q1		q2		q3		q4		q1		q2		q3								
		Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov
All schemes	Data collection																											
	Model Developpt																											
Mass Transit	Option development																											
	Option appraisal																											
	Feasibility/consultation/design																											
	Reporting/approval																											
AMID	Option development																											
	Option appraisal																											
	Feasibility/consultation/design																											
	Reporting/approval																											

2. Proposal and justification

- 2.1** The award of this funding to the SCR and partners means that further business case work can be undertaken to determine the future of Supertram and identify how we improve connectivity along the Innovation corridor. This funding is therefore beneficial in supporting the future growth the SCR, as this work would otherwise fall on (as yet) unidentified resource.
- 2.2** The funding of these LLM projects strategically aligns with the ambitions outlined in the SCR IIP. The Mass Transit project will seek to address the issues of ageing infrastructure and enable the SCR to capitalise on the opportunity presented by Tram Train. By improving links along the Innovation Corridor, the SCR will be taking steps towards establishing the area as Europe’s largest research led advanced manufacturing cluster.
- 2.3** By accepting this funding both the SCR and wider partners are agreeing to undertake work on developing the OBC for these schemes, within the time constraints set by the DfT. In order to accept this funding work needs to be done on the development of the business cases for these two projects, within the time-constraints imposed by the DfT submission deadline.
- 2.4** Meetings are being scheduled with the DfT to ascertain the exact amounts of funding available, establish the capital/revenue funding split, agree the metrics by which the projects will be monitored and firm up the timescales for delivery. There are also regular project board meetings within which the progress and development of these projects will be managed and discussed.

2.5 Next Steps

Meetings are being arranged with the DfT in December and January to clarify the exact amount of funding available, to discuss the capital/revenue split, establish the exact terms associated with the funding and to discuss the metrics against which project delivery will be monitored.

3. Consideration of alternative approaches

- 3.1** Consideration of alternative approaches would’ve been made at the point of application. If we did not accept this funding, we would need to seek to recover resources from alternative sources, which may negatively impact upon delivery in other areas.
- 3.2** Our unsuccessful application ‘Pan Northern Connectivity’ for £3.28m will continue to be developed and the SCR will seek feedback on why this application was unsuccessful.

Alternative funding sources will be investigated to progress the development of the OBC for this project.

4. Implications

4.1 Financial

The DfT announcement means that the development of the OBCs will not have to rely on (as yet) unidentified resource. Until the terms of the grant acceptance are known, we cannot expand on the full financial impact for the SCR. It is proposed that the grant is accepted by the SCR and a legal agreement put in place between the SCR and the project promoters, due to the interdependencies outlined in section 1.3. Discussions around the grant acceptance details will continue to be discussed with the SCR Finance and Legal Teams as further details emerge.

4.2 Legal

At present we do not know the terms attached to the acceptance of this funding. In accepting the funding the SCR will be obliged to meet whatever terms are outlined by the DfT. Acceptance of the grant will include consultation with SCR's legal and Finance Teams. As outlined above, part of the grant acceptance process will include the establishment of legal agreements between the SCR, SYPTTE and SCC.

4.3 Risk Management

Risk Logs for the projects will continue to be maintained by the Project Team. Project Board meetings are diarised and offer a forum for project issues to be escalated and dealt with accordingly.

4.4 Equality, Diversity and Social Inclusion ([Equality Act - Public Sector Equality Duty](#))

The Mass Transit OBC will take into account public consultation responses in the development of the cases. Both the Mass Transit and Innovation Corridor projects seek to improve connectivity and access to opportunities, which will facilitate inclusive growth across the region.

5. Communications

5.1 n/a

6. Appendices/Annexes

6.1 n/a

REPORT AUTHOR	Chloe Shepherd
POST	Strategy & Policy Officer
Officer responsible	Mark Lynam
Organisation	Sheffield City Region
Email	Mark.lynam@sheffieldcityregion.org.uk
Telephone	0114 2203445

Background papers used in the preparation of this report are available for inspection at:
Other sources and references: