

ii. Reduce congestion and delays to all vehicles, improving air quality

2. Public Realm

- i. Reduce severance between Kelham Island, Burngreave and Neepsend and the city centre
- ii. Improve the environment for all road users around West Bar junction and along Tenter Street
- iii. Increase community use for events and engagement using streets in Kelham where traffic is removed

3. Active Mode Accessibility

- iv. To provide safe, direct and attractive active travel (or walking and cycling routes) resulting in mode shift by residents of Burngreave / Pitsmoor and Neepsend/ Kelham Island towards active travel for trips to and from the City Centre.
- v. Improve the health of local residents as a result of increased activity resulting from increased active travel
- vi. Increase the use of pedestrian and cycling facilities in the city through mode shift from the private car for short journeys

Impacts are quantifiable and qualitative and will be monitored. It is likely that O2. will be the most significant of these.

Outputs are:

- Bus Lane on Mowbray Street – 110m
- Bus Gates on Burton Road – 2
- New bus stop - 6 (4 Burton Road, 2 Neepsend Lane)
- Fully accessible cycle route – 2 km
- New cycle crossing – 11 (4 at Rutland Road, 1 at Russell St/IRR, 4 at West Bar, 1 at Tenter Street, 1 at Townhead Street)
- New pedestrian crossing – 6 (4 at Rutland Road, 1 at West Bar, 1 at Townhead Street)
- Improved pedestrian crossing – 5 (3 at West Bar, 1 at Tenter Street, 1 Broad Lane.)
- Segregated cycle track - 750m
- Cycle gate at traffic signals - 1
- Road humps – 13 (2 on Penistone Road, 5 on Green Lane, 2 on Russell Street, 1 on Alma Street and 3 on Rock Street)
- Signalisation of the Rutland Road / Burton Road junction including provision for pedestrian and cycle crossings
- Removal of general traffic from Burton Road between Neepsend Lane and its junction with Boyland Street, to Burton Road as far as the junction with Rowland Street
- Diversion of general traffic away from the B6074 via Boyland Street and Hicks Street/Platt Street/Harvest Lane

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New cycle track between Rutland Road and Boyland Street on Neepsend Lane • Improved pedestrian and cyclist facilities to cross the inner ring road at Russell Street / Gibraltar Street • Reconfiguration of West Bar junction from its current roundabout into a Dutch style roundabout, with priority given to cyclists over general traffic on each arm of the junction approaches • Landscaping and improved pedestrian environment through the delivery of Blue-Green infrastructure at West Bar junction and along Tenter Street and Gibraltar Street • Continuous footways across side roads to provide pedestrian priority along Rock Street and Burngreave Road • A number of side streets made one way (e.g. Wilson Street, Rowland Street, Percy Street) become one way • Current temporary point closures of Ball Street and Alma Street to general traffic (delivered through EATF) are to be reviewed subject to the approval of appropriate TRO's to enhance the priority of active travel within the area. Both to remain accessible for pedestrians and cyclists • Improvements to bus stops <p>Outcomes (measurable)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. More walking and cycling (and associated health benefits). 2. More bus users (within and outside the Kelham area) and fewer cars (than otherwise) through reduced journey times and improved reliability. 3. Less through traffic. 4. Fewer accidents <p>Distributional Impact screening proforma completed - further analysis will need to be undertaken for FBC.</p>
<i>Options assessment</i>	<p><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></p> <p>The applicant has used the Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) and MCD analysis to identify the best combination of routes, measures and facilities to maximise net benefits to transport users and providers. All but the preferred option were discarded as failing to meet all objectives</p>
<i>Statutory requirements and adverse consequences</i>	<p><i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i></p> <p>Yes – TROs. No timescale provided but list of requirements given in Appendix MC11. Cabinet approval required before contracts can be let Public consultation programme is comprehensive.</p> <p><i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i></p>

There are several adverse impacts that are being managed and avoided or mitigated via public consultation including reduced access during construction and negative impacts on local business. Impacts that can't be mitigated by this project alone are: abstraction of AT from PT (worsening the viability of PT) and infilling of some car trips by new car trips travelling slightly longer distances.

Value for Money

Core monetised Benefits

£18.21m PVB
Of which:

	£m	%
Highway	(1.49)	(8)
PT	1.71	9
AT	13.46	74
Urban realm	0.79	4
B-G infra	3.7	20
Indirect tax change	0.06	0

Non-monetised and wider economic benefits

[Values/description – supplementary form]
Per Appraisal Summary Table:

Slight negative – Business users journey costs
Neutral – Noise, LAQ, GHG, Biodiversity, Water enviro, reliability, security, wider impacts, regeneration, access, affordability, severance, option values,
Mod. positive – Townscape, Commuting times, Journey quality, accidents
Large positive: Physical activity

In your view do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?

The core BCR (1.88) has been tested for a range of uncertainties, but it appears that it has been based on the assumption that the planned residential and business developments would not generate any walking and cycling without the scheme. This is unlikely given the restricted capacity for car as a mode of travel in the city centre. Work is in progress to confirm the appropriate uplift due to the scheme alone, which will may have a significant (downward) impact on the BCR

Value for Money Statement

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

This will be confirmed following resolution of the issue above, but based on the available information at this time, the project is estimated to generate reasonable value for money for society. This is based on the current BCR estimate and other non-monetised benefits presented.

Risk

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

The key risks from a delivery perspective pertain to delays due to need for traffic management during construction and unusual design features raising safety concerns and/or adoption under the PFI. Unexpected utilities' costs and tender submissions exceeding budget leading to delay and cost overrun are also highlighted.

The Applicant has put forward suitable mitigating responses to these.

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 of the scheme?

No – 100% TCF funded

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

Competition for resources across the TCF programme could add delay and cost.

Delivery

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

Yes, via early and ongoing engagement with major contractors

Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?

Yes

What is the level of cost certainty and is this sufficient at this stage of the assurance process? Has the promoter confirmed they will cover any cost overruns without reducing the benefits of the scheme?

60%. This is as expected for an OBC. Financial case says if unforeseen risk occurs they will ask for use of any headroom in the TCF programme.

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

Yes.

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

No

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

Yes. A wide range of stakeholders is in scope and have already been consulted

Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?

Yes, a clear and comprehensive approach has been outlined.

Legal

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

Legal opinion to be included within the OBC document as requested.

Recommendation and Conditions

Recommendation	Proceed to FBC, but on condition that the issues below are resolved to the satisfaction of the MCA, prior to FBC submission. Failure to do so will result in FBC not being considered further or a delay to the assurance process.
Payment Basis	Defrayal
Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)	
<p><i>The following recommendations must be satisfied by 1. the updated OBC and 2. as part of FBC.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Prior FBC submission:<ol style="list-style-type: none">i. Updated PVB and BCR after accounting for DM AT demand upliftii. Updated sensitivity tests and switching values2. Prior to FBC, Applicant to:<ol style="list-style-type: none">iii. distinguish between short and long-term objectives. For example, the footfall increase is an outcome which will likely arise and build over time and beyond the initial project timescales. It would also be helpful to see how the scheme will measure and monitor benefits such as modal shift, carbon saving etc. (as per SCR spreadsheet appendices)iv. provide a full DIAv. update the commercial case section required for consistency with the management case milestones.vi. assess and cost project risks to ensure SCR has the clearest view on the specific funding/programme risks.vii. confirm the scale of the commuted sum and what this will support/timelines for maintenance.	

- viii. clarify the key assumptions and other activities which underpin the scheme's current milestones.
- ix. include Legal response to state aid into FBC
- x. provide further information on the proposed M&E plan.