

APPENDIX B - Assurance Summary

VERSION 1 24.11.2021

1 – SCHEME DETAILS

Project Name	T0019 Kelham (Active Travel and Public Transport) –	Type of funding	Grant
Grant Recipient	Sheffield City Council	Total Scheme Cost	£16,055,333
MCA Executive Board	TEB	MCA Funding	£11,011,515 (Existing TCF baseline) £5,043,818 (TBC via SCC TCF programme Flexibility) -
Programme name	TCF	% MCA Allocation	100%
Current Gateway Stage	FBC	MCA Development costs claimed to date	£1,306,626
		% of total MCA allocation	

2 – PROJECT DESCRIPTION

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

The scheme's strategic case is good

The Kelham Active Travel and Public Transport (KATPT) scheme is part of Connecting Sheffield. Sheffield City Council (SCC) are seeking to enhance transport connectivity between the areas of Kelham and Neepsend with enhancements to active travel infrastructure (including the creation of a Dutch style Roundabout) and from those areas to the city centre by active travel modes and public transport. Priority for public transport will enhance bus journey times and reliability to and from the city centre and along the corridor in the direction of Hillsborough and beyond. This will deliver:

- Safer, direct and more attractive walking and cycling journeys connecting Sheffield City Centre to Kelham and Neepsend.
- Enhanced attractiveness of bus use through journey time consistency and improved reliability by prioritising buses over general traffic. This corridor forms an important route for buses serving a high passenger demand, both current and potential.

The scheme also plays an important role in supporting the proposals presented in the Housing Zone North development zone which aims to deliver 8,000 new homes over the next 20 years.

Specific Outputs:

- 0.80km New Cycleway
- 0.80km Active Travel Route
- 14220 sqm Improved Public Realm
- 5 New Crossings
- 9 Improved crossings
- 4 New Cycle Parking
- 2 New Bus Gates
- 0.11km Length of New/Improved Bus Lane

3. STRATEGIC CASE

<p><i>Options assessment</i></p>	<p><i>Is there a clear rationale for the selection of short-listed options and the choice of the Preferred Way Forward?</i></p> <p>The FBC considers 4 scheme Options as compared to the Do Nothing scenario. The AIMSUN model was used to determine the most effective scheme design to deliver the combination of high quality active travel infrastructure, traffic management and bus priority infrastructure which best achieves the project and programme objectives. Only the preferred option (4) was appraised on a Value for Money basis.</p>
<p><i>Statutory requirements and adverse consequences</i></p>	<p><i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i></p> <p>TRO's only - some already in place</p> <p><i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i></p> <p>Yes, re-routing effects have been modelled and appraised using the regional transport model and TUBA.</p>
<p><i>FBC stage only – Confirmation of alignment with agreed MCA outcomes (Stronger, Greener, Fairer).</i></p>	<p>The FBC clearly sets out the alignment of contributions from this project to the MCA Strategic Outcomes:</p> <p><u>Stronger</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved productivity through Making the public transport system faster, more reliable and resilient; • Reducing absenteeism due to physical activity substantially lowering the risk of ill-health; • Improving people's productivity and social mobility by unlocking access to employment. • Helping unlock new developments by making road space more efficient and improving access. • Infrastructure will make areas better connected and more liveable. <p><u>Greener</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inclusion of SUDS to reduce flooding risk • Will encourage an increase in low carbon journeys <p><u>Fairer</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved social mobility to unlock access to education and employment prospects • Improved wellbeing through physical activity.

4. VALUE FOR MONEY

Monetised Benefits:

VFM Indicator	Value	R/A/G
---------------	-------	-------

Net Present Social Value (£)	£12.19m	
Benefit Cost Ratio / GVA per £1 of SYMCA Investment	1.41	
Cost per Job		

Non-Monetised Benefits:

Non-Quantified Benefits	Moderate beneficial benefits with regard to Townscape and Slight beneficial benefits on Noise, Local Air Quality and Water Environment.
-------------------------	---

Value for Money Statement

Taking consideration of the monetised and non-monetised benefits and costs, and the uncertainties, does the scheme represent value for money?

Yes the scheme does represent Value for Money although at the low end in accordance with the DfT guidance.

5. RISK

What are the most significant risks and is there evidence that these risks are being mitigated?

Risk	Mitigation	Owner
1. Unexpected Utilities' costs. Medium probability High risk	Review of statutory providers records, Surveys and trial holes to confirm instance and depth of stats.	SCC Project manager
2. Risk of increased lead in times for materials as a result of volatility of the market and supply chain disruption. Medium probability High risk	The contractor has proposed advance ordering of materials. This depends upon budget availability.	SCC Project Manager
3. Increased cost as a result of inflation Medium probability High risk	An inflation process has been agreed with the contractor including agreeing inflation indices which are to apply. Established what elements of work are subject to inflation and what can be fixed by the Contractor.	SCC project manager / T&T cost manager
4. Failure to secure necessary Traffic Regulation Orders. Critical TRO's are point closures, and movement restrictions. Low probability High risk	Strong evidence and justification for the requirement of the TRO's for the project.	SCC client
5. Unexpected ground conditions (i.e. area of hard dig, tram tracks etc). High probability High risk	Contingency allocated.	SCC Project Manager

Do the significant risks require any contract conditions? (e.g. clawback on outcomes)

1. All required statutory consents must be satisfied before drawdown of funding.

Are there any significant risks associated with securing the full funding for the scheme?

Yes. The funding request is £5m overs the baseline TCF allocation for the scheme. Additional costs will need to be met within the TCF programme envelope.

Are there any key risks that need to be highlighted in relation to the procurement strategy?

No

6. DELIVERY

Is the timetable for delivery reasonable?

Yes. 18-month construction period from approvals and procurement completion, although a risk remains of ground conditions being harder than expected despite surveys carried out.

Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?

Yes. The procurement included a social value evaluation element and these outputs needs to be captured as commitments to the MCA.

What is the level of cost certainty and is this sufficient at this stage of the assurance process? Has the promotor confirmed they will cover any cost overruns?

95% Yes. If possible yes, but if not, some elements may be phased pending further funding.

Has the promoter demonstrated clear project governance and identified the SRO? Has the SRO or other appropriate Officer signed of this business case?

Yes. Signature pending and will be a condition of approval by AP.

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

Yes. 57% of respondents supported it

Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?

Yes – The scheme is covered by the TCF MEP

7. LEGAL

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

Yes, the scheme fully complies with Subsidy Control Regulations.

8. RECOMMENDATION AND CONDITIONS

Recommendation	Proceed to contract, with conditions
Payment Basis	Defrayal
Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)	
Conditions of Approval	
1. Appropriate signature of Business Case	
2. Submission from SCC of remaining TCF schemes revised baselines to reflect the additional funding request for this scheme.	
3. Appendix B completed with Social Value outputs to be included in the funding agreement.	
Conditions of Funding Drawdown	
4. All required statutory consents must be satisfied before drawdown of funding	

