

1 – SCHEME DETAILS			
Project Name	T0008_2 - Magna-Tinsley Phase 2 Works	Type of funding	Grant
Grant Recipient	Sheffield City Council	Total Scheme Cost	£6,077,300 (Phase1 & 2) Phase 2 works EFC - £4,480,823
MCA Executive Board	Transport & the Environment	MCA Funding	£4,595,300 (TCF Re-baselining approved) Phase 1 - £1,596,477 approved Phase 2 - £2,998,823 approved available budget Balance £1,482,000 (funding source TBC - subject to award conditionality)
Programme name	TCF	% MCA Allocation	100%
Current Gateway Stage	FBC	MCA Development costs	-

		% of total MCA allocation	-
--	--	----------------------------------	---

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 a package of measures to facilitate walking, cycling and wheeling within the Magna, Tinsley and Meadowhall area. This includes:

Sheffield Road cycle tracks

- New separated cycle tracks on Sheffield Road between the Sheffield/Rotherham district boundary and Blackburn Meadows Way
- Improvements to footways on Sheffield Road

Blackburn Meadows Way

- Upgrade of the existing shared use footway/cycleway to provide traffic free, separated and safe infrastructure for both pedestrians and cyclists along this road

New toucan crossings

- Provision of seven new toucan crossings to provide safe crossing points and reduce levels of severance resulting from the physical and built environment.

Tinsley right turns

- Introduce the ability to turn right into Tinsley Village from Sheffield Road. This will improve access into Tinsley and help to remove a safety concern of vehicles u-turning on Sheffield Road

The specific interventions have been refined from those submitted at OBC following consultation and design review.

£1,596,477 of TCF funding has already been approved for the Phase 1 of the Magna-Tinsley scheme as part of a separate FBC submission.

The business case represents the full package of improvements along the corridor but it is actually split into two phases the first of which was approved by the MCA in Sep 23 and work is underway.

The agreed TCF funding allocation for this project is £4,595,300. The applicant will need to identify the additional £1,482,000 of funding from alternative sources in order to fully deliver the ambition of this project.

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 is a clear rationale for the selection of the shortlisted options which are focussed on the core objectives for improving walking and cycling connectivity. They represent different options for coverage along the route with the Preferred Option being the one that delivers the most improvement to the active travel provision along with toucan crossing and introduction of right turn facilities into Tinsley from Sheffield Road. This option will help overcome severance and safety issues resulting from the built and natural environment.</p>
<p><i>Statutory requirements and adverse consequences</i></p>	<p><i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i></p> <p>The project is almost wholly within the existing highway and does not present a material impact on users of existing transport networks or systems. The project will be subject to TRO's. These are not scheduled to be advertised until Jun '24. Through clarification the applicant has pointed out that they have engaged with the local community, local members and the decision-making Transport, Regeneration and Climate change committee over the last two years. The benefits of the scheme – as well as the detail, have been shared, with no issues identified. However, despite this there is still a risk that there could be further delays to the advertising of the TRO's or objections to the scheme which could impact implementation.</p> <p><i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i></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>The project is dependent on access to land required on Meadowhall Road by Alsing Road to overcome a pinch point for pedestrians and cyclists. This is in the ownership of British Land and included in a CPO by National Grid on the land parcel as part of their works delivering a new power cable. If access cannot be secured that extent of pathway widening will not go ahead. The applicant is engaging with both parties to seek to agree a resolution and is expecting to reach a decision before the cut-off date of Sept 24. This therefore leaves the project with a significant dependency that could leave the scheme compromised.</p>
<p><i>FBC stage only – Confirmation of alignment</i></p>	<p>There is a very clear alignment with the SEP in terms of improving people's productivity and social mobility by unlocking access to employment, improve sustainable access to employment in a key</p>

<i>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>	employment area, encourage mode shift from private vehicles and the resultant health and environmental benefits.
---	--

4. VALUE FOR MONEY

Monetised Benefits:

<i>VFM Indicator</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>R/A/G</i>
<i>Net Present Social Value (£)</i>	£2,006,452	
<i>Benefit Cost Ratio / GVA per £1 of SYMCA Investment</i>	1.74	
<i>Cost per Job</i>	n/a	

Non-Monetised Benefits:

<i>Non-Quantified Benefits</i>	n/a
--------------------------------	-----

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?

A comprehensive analysis has been carried out using standard AMAT methodologies for the walking and cycling uplift benefits along the different sections of the route and with the addition of casualty prevention benefit using a sound approach. Although the costs have increased significantly from those considered at the OBC stage a significant proportion of those are now sunk costs and in accordance with Green Book guidance are not included in the VfM calculation. The economic appraisal produces a BCR of 1.74 which is in the Medium VfM category under DfT classification. This is an improvement on the BCR of 1.07 at the OBC Stage.

The key assumptions and uncertainties have been explored using sensitivity analysis across a number of scenarios. These demonstrate that across a 40 year appraisal period the BCR remains above 1 and has the potential to significantly improve. Only the 20 year appraisal test produces a BCR below 1. The sensitivity scenarios do not include a higher cost scenario as would be expected but this materiality is illustrated with the switching values analysis which shows that Present Value Cost would need to increase by £0.44m for the VfM to be Low.

5. RISK

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

These are the top 5 risk taken from a more comprehensive risk register. Whilst they are appropriate for the project, it does not include the risk with regard to access to land in the control of British Land.

No.	Risk	Likelihood (High, Med, Low)	Impact (High, Med, Low)	Mitigation	Owner
1	Utilities diversion times longer than forecast	High	High	Extent of diversions confirmed by C2, C3 and C4 checks. Ongoing discussions with National Grid regarding the Pitsmoor to Templeborough cable which is set to only interact with the Magna-Tinsley scheme in two locations now which will be factored into the programme	SCC and Amey
2	Public objection to the project, specifically changes that	High	Medium	Additional comms has been undertaken with stakeholders and public during FBC development with no objections raised.	SCC

	generate a TRO				
3	Unexpected utilities costs	Medium	Medium	C2s and C3s have been shared with cost manager to ensure known costs are included in the overall scheme costs. Final costs to be confirmed by C4 checks.	SCC and Amey
4	Adverse weather conditions	Medium	Medium	Monitor weather reports. Consider additional float in delivery programme for works scheduled over winter. Ensure all understand adverse weather clause in NEC contracts	SCC and Amey
5	Political change	Medium	Medium	Cross-party engagement has taken place on TCF at a programme level.	SCC

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

- Drawdown subject to demonstration of successful TRO process
- Drawdown subject to demonstration of successful resolution to land access issue.
- Claw back on outputs.

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?

Yes, the timetable for delivery is reasonable with the phase one works already having commenced. The milestones assume that TRO process is complete in July but this remains a risk.

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 cost certainty is 90%. We would normally expect the scheme to be at 95% at FBC submission but the applicant has explained that there are still some outstanding issues with regard to the drainage design that are leaving some uncertainty on price but that the scheme has been costed overall on a prudent basis at this stage. The applicant has confirmed that they will cover any cost overruns through additional SCC funding if possible or reducing the scope of the scheme if not.

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

A comprehensive consultation exercise has taken place which resulted in significant positive response. This was carried out to inform the OBC submission but since there have been some changes to the scheme then the revised proposals have been subject to further public consultation and endorsement.

Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?

A comprehensive M&E plan has been provided. The MEP sets out an approach that will be adopted for measuring the effectiveness of the project, encompassing input, output, outcome and impacts levels.

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. This seems reasonable.

8. RECOMMENDATION AND CONDITIONS

Recommendation	Full award subject to conditions
Payment Basis	Defrayal
Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)	

The following conditions must be satisfied before contract execution:

- Confirmation of successful TRO consultation process
- Completion of change control for funding shortfall (£1,482,000)