VERSION 1 24.11.2021



1 – SCHEME DETAILS			
Project Name	A61 Chesterfield Road	Type of funding	Grant
Grant Recipient	Sheffield City Council	Total Scheme Cost	£10,000,000
MCA Executive Board	TEB	MCA Funding	£10,000,000
Programme name	CRSTS	% MCA Allocation	100%
Current Gateway Stage	SBC	MCA Development costs	£250,000
		% of total MCA	2.5%
		allocation	

2 – PROJECT DESCRIPTION

£10m of CRSTS funding is requested for:

- £250k development costs
- Interventions to improve bus journeys along the A61 corridor from Meadowhead roundabout in the South to Sheffield city centre in the north.
- The scheme also aims to promote mode shift from cars to buses, walking and cycling.
- The details of the chosen interventions are not fully decided, but may include:
 - Upgrades to key links between A61 corridor
 - o Bus stops
 - Bus stop enhancements (real time information boards etc)
 - Traffic management to reduce rat running
 - Traffic signals
 - o Car Park improvements to move car parking off the A61 corridor thereby increasing space for pedestrians / cyclists and improved bus facilities.
 - Disabled car parking spaces
 - o Rationalise the number of access / egress points along the corridor and review the crossing infrastructure

3. STRATEGIC CASE

Project rationale	Areas of On-stree A lack of Inconsist Safety is:	 The rationale for the scheme has been split into five themes, which includes reasons such as: Areas of the A61 which suffer from high levels of congestion which cause delays to public transport. On-street parking causing congestion for all transport modes and safety issues for cyclists. A lack of green space along the A61 Chesterfield Road Corridor as well as poor public transport infrastructure. Inconsistent provision of walking and cycling infrastructure. Safety issues along the A61 Chesterfield Road Corridor which has resulted in 94 accidents in the past 5 years. 				
Strategic fit	Please see annex 1 b	Please see annex 1 below.				
Proposed outcomes	The proposed outcom	The proposed outcomes are yet to be fully defined. However, the identified elements of the preferred option are:				
	Location Challenge Intervention					
	Woodseats	Bus stops	Review bus stop location - linked to key desire lines and available crossing facilities			
	Dyche Lane	Rat runs	Narrow road, 20 zone, traffic management and improved cycle/pedestrian facilities			
	Woodseats	Promote cycling	Upgrade key links between A61 corridor and access to SVCR			
	Greenhill Avenue	Greenhill Avenue	Traffic Management / Route Closures to influence route choice and demand through local road network			
	Greenhill Avenue	Greenhill Avenue	Traffic Signals to reduce queuing between Greenhill Avenue and Meadowhead Roundabout (prevent queuing onto roundabout)			
	St James Retail Park	Retail Park queuing	Internal car park improvements - add early left turn / mini-roundabout			
	Woodseats	Lack of disabled parking	Implement additional disabled parking bays			
	Woodseats	Parking	Move parking off corridor to car park – increase space for pedestrians/cyclists, use space for improved bus facilities and enhance public realm (more greenery)			
	Whole corridor	Bus stops	Implement consistent bus stops and information provision (real time information and digital advertising)			
	Whole corridor	Opportunity to improve overall corridor	Opportunity to address maintenance issues on corridor - introduce improved public realm and reduce street clutter			
	Subway Meadowhead	Crossing issues	Infill underpass, replace with controlled at-grade cycle/pedestrian crossing			
	Woodseats	Congestion / crossing issues	Rationalise the number of access/egress points on corridor and review crossing infrastructure – 3 sections (Cobnar Road/ Woodseats house Road) (Chanterey Road, Oliviet, Helmton, Haughton) (Brocholme, Aisthorpe, Nettleham)			

This requires further development and detail at OBC stage with clearly outlined outcomes and outputs.

4. VALUE FOR MONEY

Unknown at present. This will need to be established at OBC when further detail on the proposed outcomes is known.

5. RISK

Have the key risks and mitigation of these been identified?

Yes. The top key highlighted risks are:

Risk	Post Mitigation Likelihood (1-5)	Post Mitigation Impact (1-5)	Mitigation	Owner
Further cuts to bus services reduce the benefits of the scheme compared to those presented within the economic case	4	4	Not possible as all external	David Whitley
Failure to ensure all local access requirements are met including, changes to parking, rights of way, diversions and private access	3	4	Early consultation with local businesses/community and ensure all local access requirements are met	David Whitley
Works lead to increased congestion, especially in Woodseats, leading to a negative public perception of the scheme	3	4	Use of microsimulation and strategic model to stress test the transport impacts	David Whitley
Failure to secure private land acquisition	4	3	Early engagement with private land owner and ensure scheme can deliver intended benefits if private land cannot be acquired	David Whitley
Stakeholder management strategy is ineffective. Local businesses/community may object to the scheme	3	4	Identify the businesses/communities affected by the proposals and consult with them early on. Gain an understanding of their concerns and plan ahead with the project accordingly	David Whitley

It is noted within the SBC that the preferred option may be revised in response to the first risk relating to reduced bus patronage if necessary.

Further information on bus patronage / demand will be required at OBC and will need to be taken into account when considering the economic benefits of the preferred option.

6. DELIVERY

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

Yes - Based on the information given the timetable looks reasonable – the FBC is expected in Mar25, works expected to commence in Jun25 and works complete in Sep26. Given that the details of the chosen interventions are still be developed further clarification on the estimated timetable for delivery will be required at OBC.

Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?

Sufficient for SBC.

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

30% - sufficient at this stage.

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

No, although the SBC has not specifically asked this question. To be clarified at OBC.

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

No - To be clarified at OBC.

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

No – to be signed prior to submission of SBC.

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

Some public consultation has been undertaken, although this is still ongoing. Early engagement with bus operators has taken place which identified a need to improve reliability of bus services. The SBC includes information on further planned public consultation including:

- Business groups
- Local area committee representatives
- Councillors

Detail on the outcome of public consultation should be shared at OBC.

Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?

No - to be clarified at OBC.

Annex 1 – Strategic Policy Fit

To what extent does the project meet the MCA's strategic objectives as set out in the of the MCA Corporate Plan 2021-22?

Outcome	Strategic Objective	R/A/G Rating	Comments
Stronger	Leading an economic transformation by:		No information provided
Achieve sustained good growth, underpinned by productivity gains that exceed the UK average	 creating not just a bigger economy but a better one: higher- tech, higher skill, and higher-value - backing wealth and job creators 		
	 enabling businesses to survive, adapt and thrive and be more innovative and resilient as we come out of the pandemic and resulting economic downturn 		No information provided
	 stimulating local economies by investing in the infrastructure, transport and digital capabilities to create jobs and transform places 		No information provided
Greener	Leading a green transformation by:		Interventions that encourage people to travel by public
Drive forward environmental sustainability to achieve our net- zero carbon target by 2040	 decarbonising our economy, regenerating the natural environment and accelerating Net Zero Carbon transition 		transport instead of car can play a vital role in decarbonising our transport sector.
	 capitalising on technological and scientific capabilities to improve the resilience and quantum of clean energy supply, storage, distribution and usage 		The scheme will aim to provide improvements to EV charging infrastructure where possible.
	 revolutionising transport, getting South Yorkshire moving by foot, bike, bus, tram and train 		Influence a mode shift away from car usage towards bus and active travel in line with the SYMCA target.
Fairer	Leading a wellbeing and inclusion transformation by:		The scheme will aim to deliver bus priority along the
Unlock prosperity by eliminating the wage gap and health inequalities between South	raising quality of life, reducing inequality, and widening opportunity for South Yorkshire people		corridor, this will contribute towards improving inclusivity and access to opportunities for all as well as proving more sustainable travel choices.
	 equipping people to contribute to and benefit from economic prosperity 		Improvements to public transport infrastructure and bus priority measures along the corridor will help connect residents and businesses to economic opportunities.

Yorkshire and the	9. supporting people to improve their skills, get back to work,	The sche	eme will aim to deliver bus priority along the
national average	remain in or progress in work, or set up in business and	corridor	which will improve equal access to opportunities
	thereby accelerate social mobility		education and training.

8. RECOMMENDATION AND CONDITIONS

RecommendationRecommended to progress to OBCPayment BasisConditions of Award (including clawback clauses)

In advance of formal approval, the SBC should:

• Identify the SRO and the SRO should sign the SBC.

As part of the OBC submission, the following should be included (along with other standard information):

- Clarified objectives which are written as SMART objectives.
- Clearer information on how the preferred option and interventions align to relevant policies included within the OBC, rather than limited to what is included as part of the separate options assessment report (as was the case for the SBC).
- Modelling / economic assessment to be completed as outlined in the SBC.
- Further information on bus patronage / demand will be important for OBC stage and will need to be taken into account when considering the economic benefits of the preferred option.
- Further detail to be provided on the chosen interventions and associated outputs and outcomes.
- It is also expected that the above should inform the forecast delivery timescales.
- Outcomes of the proposed public consultation outlined in the SBC should be included in the OBC.
- Updated subsidy control compliance statement.
- Information to be provided on the governance structure.
- Information on the proposed monitoring and evaluation procedures.
- Confirmation of how potential cost overruns will be handled.