

### 1 – SCHEME DETAILS

<b>Project Name</b>	South-West Bus Corridors (Public Transport)	<b>Type of funding</b>	Grant
<b>Grant Recipient</b>	SCC	<b>Total Scheme Cost</b>	£3.813m
<b>MCA Executive Board</b>	Transport	<b>MCA Funding</b>	£3.813m
<b>Programme name</b>	TCF	<b>% MCA Allocation</b>	100%
<b>Current Gateway Stage</b>	OBC	<b>MCA Development costs</b>	£0.38m (capped at 10% of total MCA allocation)
		<b>% of total MCA allocation</b>	10%

### 2 – PROJECT DESCRIPTION

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

The corridor improvements will benefit bus users and operators through the delivery of a range of interventions including:

- Changes to the length of bus lanes along Abbeydale Road and Ecclesall Road, parking restrictions and crossings.
- Traffic signal upgrades with buses given priority at junctions.
- Infrastructure improvements at junctions and bus stops.

### 3. STRATEGIC CASE

*Scheme Rationale*

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

**Yes.** The key outcomes of the scheme include:

- More consistent and reliable bus journey times.
- A better quality environment for waiting passengers and pedestrians

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improved perception of bus reliability, punctuality, and satisfaction.</li> <li>Enhanced access to employment and other services.</li> </ul>
<i>Strategic policy fit</i>	<p><i>How well does the scheme align with the strategic objectives of the SEP and RAP?</i></p> <p>The SEP aims to ensure 'residents and businesses are connected to economic opportunity'. However, public transport operating in the corridors is limiting the opportunities and access to employment in the city centre and beyond, through delayed and unreliable journey times.</p>
<i>Contribution to Carbon Net Zero</i>	<p><i>Does this scheme align with the strategic objective to achieve Carbon Net Zero?</i></p> <p><b>Yes</b></p>
<i>SMART scheme objectives</i>	<p><i>State the SMART scheme objective as presented in the business case.</i></p> <p><b>The scheme is designed to achieve better connectivity which will be achieved via improved:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>consistency and reliability across all time periods.</li> </ul> <p>And manifest in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased use of public transport in the corridors</li> <li>Increased population within 30 mins travel time by bus to the city centre</li> </ul> <p><i>Is there a 'golden thread' between the strategic objectives (see 3.2) and the scheme objectives (see 3.8)?</i></p> <p><b>Yes.</b></p>
<i>Options assessment</i>	<p><i>Is there a genuine Options assessment and is there a clear rationale for the selection of short-listed options and the choice of the Preferred Way Forward?</i></p> <p><b>Yes</b></p>
<i>Statutory requirements and adverse consequences</i>	<p><i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i></p> <p><b>Yes – TRO's. No land required.</b></p> <p><i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i></p> <p><b>Yes, displaced parking on side streets. Whilst there is general support for the proposals, further engagement with residents is planned to optimise design and acceptability.</b></p>
<i>FBC stage only – Confirmation of alignment with agreed MCA outcomes (Stronger, Greener, Fairer).</i>	<p><i>Does the scheme still align with strategic objectives?</i></p> <p><i>Have the conditions of approval granted at OBC been complied with?</i></p>

4. VALUE FOR MONEY		
<b>Monetised Benefits:</b>		
<i>VFM Indicator</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>R/A/G</i>
<i>Net Present Social Value (£)</i>	£16.96m	G
<i>Benefit Cost Ratio / GVA per £1 of SYMCA Investment</i>	6.25	G
<i>Cost per Job</i>	N/A	
<b>Non-Monetised Benefits:</b>		
<i>Non-Quantified Benefits</i>		
	Slight Positive impacts – Noise, LAQ	
<b>Value for Money Statement</b>		
<i>Taking into consideration the monetised and non-monetised benefits and costs, does the scheme represent good value for money?</i>		
<b>Very good VFM</b>		
5. RISK		
<i>What are the most significant risks ?</i>		
<b>Costs and delays - £40k included in budget.</b>		
<i>.....and is there evidence that these risks are being mitigated?</i>		
<b>Yes. By commissioning of contractors at an early stage likely issues can be identified.</b>		
<i>Do the significant risks require any contract conditions? (e.g. clawback on outcomes)</i>		
<b>No</b>		
<i>Are there any significant risks associated with securing the full funding of the scheme?</i>		
<b>No</b>		
<i>Are there any key risks that need to be highlighted in relation to the procurement strategy?</i>		
<b>No. The design and construction will be undertaken by Amey Hallam Highways Ltd through a direct award via Schedule 7 (Non-Core Design Services and Non-Core Scheme Construction Services) of the Streets Ahead PFI.</b>		

## 6. DELIVERY

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

**Yes – FBC by Jan 2023 – Completion Dec 2023.**

*Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?*

**Yes**

*What is the level of cost certainty and is this sufficient at this stage of the assurance process?*

**60%**

*Has the promoter confirmed they will cover any cost overruns without reducing the benefits of the scheme?*

**No**

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

**Yes**

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

**No**

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

**Yes, Yes – with some reservations** re parking on residential side streets.

*Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?*

**Yes.**

## 7. LEGAL

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

**Yes, No.**

## 8. RECOMMENDATION AND CONDITIONS

<b>Recommendation</b>	Proceed to FBC
<b>Payment Basis</b>	Defrayal
<b>Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)</b>	
1. Completion of FBC to requisite standard 2. FBC Development cost funding capped at £381,300 (10% of scheme value). Total OBC and FBC development costs are £1.026m (including £0.2m prepayment for stats). Development costs in excess of MCA funding awarded to be covered by alternative funding sources.	

