

## 1 – SCHEME DETAILS

<b>Project Name</b>	T0008_2 - Magna-Tinsley Phase 1	<b>Type of funding</b>	Grant
<b>Grant Recipient</b>	Sheffield City Council	<b>Total Scheme Cost</b>	£1,596,477
<b>MCA Executive Board</b>	Transport & the Environment	<b>MCA Funding</b>	£1,596,477
<b>Programme name</b>	TCF	<b>% MCA Allocation</b>	100%
<b>Current Gateway Stage</b>	FBC	<b>MCA Development costs released to date</b>	£844,961

## 2 – PROJECT DESCRIPTION

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

Yes, it is clear what the MCA is being asked to fund which is the first phase of the wider Connecting Sheffield Magna-Tinsley active travel scheme. This Phase 1 is focussed on a new toucan crossing at the Sheffield Road/Raby Street junction to provide a safe crossing point from the Tinsley Village across Sheffield Road.

Phase 1 also includes the rationalisation and resurfacing of parking bays within Cooper & Turner's premises alongside Sheffield Road which is required to deliver the Phase 2 project. A new gated access for Cooper & Turner onto Sheffield Road will also be provided, removing a potential safety concern for active travel users and vehicles based on the poor visibility from the current access. This needs to be funded as part of the project as the removal of several of Cooper & Turner's parking bays is required to deliver LTN 1/20 compliant active travel infrastructure on Sheffield Road.

The SYMCA funds will be used to pay for:

- The development of the Scheme from the SOC programme submission to DfT to this FBC submission including professional fees such as project management, design, modelling and engagement

- The construction of one new toucan crossing on Sheffield Road by the junction with Raby Street and associated works either side of the crossing
- A new manually operated gated access on Sheffield Road west of Deadman's Hole Lane for Cooper & Turner and resurfacing of diagonal parking bays and relining to parallel bays ahead of the Phase 2 works

### 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>There are two Do Something options which reflect alternative locations for the Toucan crossing. The preferred location being based on modelling done to understand the impact on surrounding traffic flows at peak times. The preferred site has then included the additional works at Cooper &amp; Turner premises to become the Preferred Option. The preferred option will deliver an improved crossing in the most optimum location in terms of likely usage by people wanting to access/egress Tinsley Village and the Sheffield-Tinsley canal towpath. The delivery of enabling works on Sheffield Road by Cooper &amp; Turner will also remove a key risk for Phase 2 of the project as the existing parking arrangement at Cooper &amp; Turner present a challenge for delivering the desired active travel infrastructure on Sheffield Road and therefore require the reallocation of parking spaces</p>
<p><i>Statutory requirements and adverse consequences</i></p>	<p><i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i></p> <p>The new crossing is wholly within the existing highway and does not present a material impact on users of existing transport networks or systems. All works will be delivered under existing powers bequeathed to Sheffield City Council as Highway Authority. There will be Temporary Traffic Regulation Orders required for the extent of the works on the highway.</p> <p><i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i></p> <p>Traffic modelling of the Sheffield Road/Raby Street crossing has been undertaken which shows that the crossing will have a negligible impact on the operation of M1 J34S.</p> <p>The construction of the project may result in disruption to the operation of the highway network, and to</p>

	<p>the access to and operation of Cooper &amp; Turner’s business. Discussions have taken place with Cooper &amp; Turner about the phasing of the works to ensure at least one of their accesses always remains open during construction.</p> <p>There will be adverse environmental impacts associated with extraction and transportation of materials for the project and the construction. These are not considered to be atypical for schemes of this type or scale.</p>
<p><i>FBC stage only – Confirmation of alignment with agreed MCA</i> The project seeks to unlock barriers to growth and employment opportunities to Tinsley which is one of the most deprived areas in Sheffield and the UK. <i>outcomes (Stronger, Greener, Fairer).</i></p>	<p>The project aligns with the SEP in terms of improving Health and Greener outcomes. It seeks to unlock barriers to growth and employment opportunities to Tinsley which is one of the most deprived areas in Sheffield and the UK.</p> <p>The project will help reduce severance caused by the physical and build environment and will remove a potential safety barrier for people, helping encourage more trips to be undertaken on foot and by bicycle and therefore increasing levels of physical activity which has health benefits.</p> <p>The project will remove a barrier to travelling by active and net-zero transport modes, encouraging modal shift. This will reduce the number of vehicles that use the local road network helping to improve air quality.</p>

#### 4. VALUE FOR MONEY

##### Monetised Benefits:

<i>VFM Indicator</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>R/A/G</i>
<i>Net Present Social Value (£)</i>	-£1,596,477	
<i>Benefit Cost Ratio / GVA per £1 of SYMCA Investment</i>	n/a	
<i>Cost per Job</i>	n/a	

##### Non-Monetised Benefits:

<i>Non-Quantified Benefits</i>	The Options have been ranked on the basis of the following benefits with Preferred Option scoring as follows		
	Safety	+2	Will deliver a new controlled crossing, providing a safe location for crossing Sheffield Road.
	Severance	+2	Delivering a new controlled crossing will overcome the severance issues caused by Sheffield Road, helping people access the opportunities in the Lower Don Valley and at Meadowhall as well as those accessible from Meadowhall Interchange and Meadowhall South tram stop.
	Accessibility	+2	The crossing in this location provides direct access onto the shared use path on the northern side of Sheffield Road, from which the canal towpath can be accessed, and Phase 2 of the scheme will be accessible from.
	Impact on highway network	0	Modelling undertaken using the SAAM showed that the crossing in this location is likely to have a negligible impact on the operation of M1 J34S.

**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?*

There are no monetary or non-monetary benefits provided. The preferred option is the one with the highest cost.

Because there aren't any quantified benefits it is not possible to say that project is VfM in the traditional way. However, there is a logic to the selection of the options and their relative ranking based on their ability to address the key issues for this phase in terms of Safety, Severance, Accessibility and congestion. The rationale for the inclusion of the Cooper & Turner works as part of this phase 1 works does not have any incremental economic benefit but is included to facilitate and de-risk the wider scheme delivery with the resultant Active Travel benefits.

## 5. RISK

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

The top 5 risks are set out below. The most significant of the risks are in relation to the relocation/installation of power cables which could impact the 7-month construction programme.

Whilst not acknowledged in the project risk register, there is also a risk that phase 2 does not go ahead in a timely manner as there are still a number of issues to resolve including co-ordination with more extensive utility diversions to be agreed with National Grid and land access agreements to be settled with Meadowhall owner British Land.

No.	Risk	Likelihood (High, Med, Low)	Impact (High, Med, Low)	Mitigation	Owner
1	Relocation of the 275kV cable on Sheffield Road	Low	High	Further trial holes to locate cable with appropriate safety measures in place	Amey/SCC
2	Installation of a new 275kV cable by National Grid – potential clash of works impacting on programme	Low	High	Ongoing discussions taking place between SCC and National Grid about programmes	SCC
3	Public objection to the project	Medium	Medium	Additional comms to be undertaken in August 2023 on the full project. Initial 2021 engagement showed strong support	SCC

				for the new crossing on Sheffield Road	
4	Unexpected commuted sums	Low	Medium	Need to factor into design and seek advice from HMD in relation to design changes to minimise sums	SCC
5	Unexpected contamination found as a result of the historical use of the site	Low	Medium	Historical knowledge to be used to inform contingency and design. Test cores to be undertaken in appropriate places	SCC

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

No

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

There is no other source of funding for the project.

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

The procurement process is complete and work is to be carried out by the in-house Highways PFI contractor, Amey under the Non-core framework contract.

The 'non-core' contract, is based on standard clauses under NEC3 Option A contract. The activity schedule will relate to a programme where each activity is allocated a price and interim payments are made against the completion of the activities. The contractor (Amey) will therefore largely bear the risk of carrying out the work at the agreed prices.

## 6. DELIVERY

*Is the timetable for delivery reasonable?*

The timetable for delivery with a 7-month construction period could be challenging given that works will be required on, and adjacent to, a very busy road. There are also utility diversion requirements for this phase of works.

*Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?*

The procurement process is complete

*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?*

The level of cost certainty is 90% which reflects the FBC stage of the project but with some risk remaining with regard to the non-core works and the cooper and turner works which are still to be finalised.

A risk allowance of approximately £176k is included in the costs requested from SYMCA, providing an allowance for foreseeable additional costs. In the event of costs increasing beyond those forecasts, Sheffield City Council have stated they may seek additional TCF funding as part of the funding request for Phase 2 of the project. Any further and/or unforeseeable overspend will be underwritten by the Council.

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

There is a sound governance structure set out from project team up to Project Sponsor and linking to officers and Cabinet members. There are also links into Rotherham MBC and SYMCA with regard to liaison on their complementary schemes.

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

Comprehensive stakeholder engagement has taken place with a wide range of interest groups. Public Consultation was carried out over a 4-week period and resulted in 84% of respondents being supportive.

*Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?*

Monitoring procedures are in place to ensure the agreed delivery plan is achieved.

The outcomes of the project are to be monitored post implementation, to provide a comparison against baseline data collected and collated by Sheffield City Council. This will include a range of data collection and analysis conducted by the Council to include:

- Manual / Automatic counts by location/mode
- Air quality monitoring
- Analysis of collision data
- Perception surveys of users and non-users

Evaluation will be undertaken and reported one-year and five-years after implementation of the overall Connecting Magna-Tinsley project.

## 7. LEGAL

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

Subsidy control has been considered and the view that it does not constitute Subsidy on the basis that, as this project involves improvements to the public environment, this improvement cannot have state implications as it will be protected for public use by virtue of being public highway.

--

<b>8. RECOMMENDATION AND CONDITIONS</b>
---

<b>Recommendation</b>	Proceed to contract
-----------------------	---------------------

<b>Payment Basis</b>	Deferral
----------------------	----------

<b>Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)</b>
---

Clawback on achievement of outputs.
-------------------------------------