

Appendix C1 - Assurance Summary

VERSION 1 24.11.2021

1 – SCHEME DETAILS

Project Name	O0050 Sheaf Valley Cycling Route	Type of funding	Grant
Grant Recipient	SCC	Total Scheme Cost	£2.386m
MCA Executive Board	TEB/MCA	MCA Funding	£2.3m (capped)
Programme name	ATF	% MCA Allocation	100%
Current Gateway Stage	FBC	MCA Development costs	£303k
		% of total MCA allocation	12.8%

2 – PROJECT DESCRIPTION

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

Yes

Intervention	No. /Length	Location
segregation	400m	various
New controlled crossing	1	Bramall Lane
Improved controlled crossing	4	Harmer lane, Shoreham st/ring road, Matilda/Shoreham
Improved uncontrolled crossing	1	Broadfield Road
Point closure - new	2	Cherry Street and Little London Road
Point closure - relocated	1	Rydal Road
Point closure - upgraded	1	Little London Road
Track widening	200m	Various locations
Parking restriction	1780m	Various locations
Junction improvement/Remodelling	1	Conversion of 5 arm R'about into T junction includes 2 closures
20mph area	1	Highfield
Total length of treatment	4.0k	

3. STRATEGIC CASE	
<i>Scheme Rationale</i>	<i>Does the scheme have a clearly stated rationale and provide a strong justification for public funding?</i> Yes. As reported for the OBC, the rationale is clear and in line with SYMCA strategies.
<i>Strategic policy fit</i>	<i>How well does the scheme align with the strategic objectives of the SEP and RAP?</i> The FBC very clearly links the scheme outputs to the SEP and Transport Strategy objectives.
<i>Contribution to Carbon Net Zero</i>	<i>Does this scheme align with the strategic objective to achieve Carbon Net Zero?</i> Yes , clearly,
<i>SMART scheme objectives</i>	<i>State the SMART scheme objective as presented in the business case.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the use of existing and planned pedestrian and cycling facilities in the city centre • Improve the cycling environment that is safer for both walking and cycling to replace journeys made by car; • Improve access to key city centre destination for all modes including walking and cycling • To create a cultural shift towards making cycling and walking the natural choice for shorter journeys • That this route will form part of a local area network linking into the Nether Edge TCF and ATF proposals, and creating a longer much improved active travel route when combined with City Centre, HZN and AMID proposals. Ultimately forming a key piece of the citywide network so that all destinations within the city are accessible and safer by bike or foot. <i>Is there a 'golden thread' between the strategic objectives (see 3.2) and the scheme objectives (see 3.8)?</i> Yes , the scheme objectives are consistent with the vision of the SEP.
<i>Options assessment</i>	<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> Yes. The promoter has clarified that an appropriate filtering process to identify the best alignment in strategic terms regardless of costs and then the preferred route was considered in detail. Whilst this would appear to be not best practice, it is a proportionate approach in this case.
<i>Statutory requirements and adverse consequences</i>	<i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i> Yes – ETROs and TROs <i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i> The FBC (7.12) lists a number of potential implications for traffic re-distribution and abstraction from public transport some of which could be beneficial. The M&E plan is being designed to measure these impacts.
<i>FBC stage only – Confirmation of alignment with agreed MCA outcomes (Stronger, Greener, Fairer).</i>	<i>Does the scheme still align with strategic objectives?</i> Yes <i>Have the conditions of approval granted at OBC been complied with?</i> Yes. An updated QRA and a legible organogram are provided with the FBC.

4. VALUE FOR MONEY		
Monetised Benefits:		
<i>VFM Indicator</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>R/A/G</i>
<i>Net Present Social Value (£)</i>	£8.077m	G

<i>Benefit Cost Ratio / GVA per £1 of SYMCA Investment</i>	5.58	G
<i>Cost per Job</i>	n/a	
Non-Monetised Benefits:		
<i>Non-Quantified Benefits</i>	Not identified	
Value for Money Statement		
<i>Taking into consideration the monetised and non-monetised benefits and costs, does the scheme represent good value for money?</i>		
Yes. The benefits are sensitive to the assumed cycling uplifts (17%;64%;64% A;B;C) which whilst based on experience elsewhere in Sheffield (Penistone Rd) are still uncertain. However, if they prove to be optimistic (eg by 100%) the BCR would be >2 and the scheme worthwhile/good VFM.		
5. RISK		
<i>What are the most significant risks</i>		
The Risk Log (Appendix A.3) lists and assesses the expected impact on costs of:		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Insufficient access to materials and resources. 2. TRO consultation for Shoreham Street receives objections 3. Costs exceed budget. 4. Covid restrictions introduced / Contractors workforce need to self-isolate 5. Events (sporting / other) planned throughout summer impact on construction timescales 		
The first of these is rated as high impact, high likelihood (EV=£65K).		
<i>....and is there evidence that these risks are being mitigated?</i>		
Yes. The promoter states that these possible events are being and will be mitigated as much as possible by early discussions with stakeholders and good communication with contractor and wider supply chain with regard to using alternative products if the desired ones are unavailable.		
<i>Do the significant risks require any contract conditions? (e.g. clawback on outcomes)</i>		
No.		
<i>Are there any significant risks associated with securing the full funding of the scheme?</i>		
No.		
<i>Are there any key risks that need to be highlighted in relation to the procurement strategy?</i>		
No. The work will be undertaken by SCCs Highway PFI contractor Amey.		
6. DELIVERY		
<i>Is the timetable for delivery reasonable and has the promoter identified opportunities for acceleration?</i>		
Yes – milestones have been updated and they plan to advertise TROs as required by end April/beg May. Any objections to be reported to Committee for decision. No external procurement is required. Construction will commence at risk in May to minimise work post September 2022		
<i>Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?</i>		
Yes. AMEY already onboard.		
<i>What is the level of cost certainty and is this sufficient at this stage of the assurance process?</i>		
95%		

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

Sort of – more likely the scope will be reduced slightly unless they can find “another funding opportunity”.

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

Yes. TFS is the SCC Project Sponsor (=SRO)

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

Yes

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

Yes. Yes (see 7.11)

Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?

Yes. (see 7.12)

7. LEGAL

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

Yes, although has not sought a legal opinion. No (the scheme is clearly transport infrastructure as usually funded by the public sector).

8. RECOMMENDATION AND CONDITIONS

Recommendation	Proceed to contract
Payment Basis	Defrayal
Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)	
<p>The following conditions must be satisfied before contract execution.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Confirmation of costs• Confirmation that ATF funded works be completed by September 2022 <p><i>The conditions above should be fully satisfied by 30.06.22. Failure to do so could lead to the withdrawal of approval.</i></p> <p>The following conditions must be included in the grant agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Clawback on Outputs and Outcomes	