



## Assurance Summary

### Scheme Details

<b>Project Name</b>	T0023 Nether Edge Wedge	<b>Type of funding</b>	Grant
<b>Grant Recipient</b>	SCC	<b>Total Scheme Cost</b>	£13,307,585
<b>MCA Executive Board</b>	TEB	<b>MCA Funding</b>	13,207,585
<b>Programme name</b>	TCF	<b>% MCA Allocation</b>	99%

### Appraisal Summary

Project Description	
<p><i>Is it clear what the MCA is being asked to fund?</i></p> <p><b>Yes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• improved cycle infrastructure: 2.5km</li> <li>• improved pedestrian infrastructure: 2.5km</li> <li>• junction improvements: 6</li> <li>• new bus lanes: 50m</li> <li>• Bus priority signals : 1</li> <li>• Signalised junction improvements (ITS): 4 Length of segregated cycle track: 1.84km</li> <li>• Traffic calming measures: 6</li> <li>• pedestrian crossing upgrades: 8</li> <li>• segregated cycle crossings: 7</li> <li>• school streets :1</li> <li>• Cycle parking: 100 spaces including an allocation for non-standard bikes (number determined by destination)</li> </ul>	
Strategic Case	
<i>Scheme Rationale</i>	<p><i>Does the scheme have a clearly stated rationale and provide a strong justification for public funding?</i></p> <p><b>Yes.</b> The applicant is seeking to enhance transport connectivity between Sharrow, Nether Edge and Broomhall linking into the city centre while at the same time improving journeys in the local area. The Nether Edge scheme proposal phase 1 is to construct an active travel route connecting the fringes of Nether Edge into the city centre via Sharrow, and on toward the university and hospital campus via Broomhall.</p>
<i>Strategic policy fit</i>	<p><i>How well does the scheme align with the strategic objectives of the SEP and RAP?</i></p> <p><b>Yes.</b> 3.1 and 3.2 set out strong strategic rationale as to why a scheme is needed, and what benefits the pursuance of a scheme could deliver. 3.3. outlines a number of ways in which the scheme has alignment with SCR and other regional policies. Section 3.3 refers not just to SCR policies, but also to recent national policies and policies adopted at the city council level</p>
<i>Contribution to Carbon Net Zero</i>	<p><i>Does this scheme align with the strategic objective to achieve Carbon Net Zero?</i></p> <p><b>Yes</b> - the applicant states in 3.1 that measures which encourage use of active modes for journeys to / from / within Sheffield will help to manage transport related emissions.</p>
<i>SMART scheme objectives</i>	<p><i>State the SMART scheme objective as presented in the business case.</i></p> <p>These are summarised from 6.1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Enable more travel by active modes</b></li> <li>• <b>To provide safe, direct and attractive active travel routes</b> from Nether Edge to the City Centre.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Improve the health of local residents</b></li><li>• <b>Increase the use of pedestrian and cycling facilities</b> in the city</li><li>• <b>Reduce severance between Nether Edge/Sharrow and the city centre</b></li><li>• <b>Improve the environment for residents along the route</b></li><li>• <b>Enhance road safety by all modes</b></li><li>• <b>Increase footfall in the city centre and HOTC2 area</b></li><li>• <b>Improve access to key city centre destination</b> for all modes including walking and cycling</li></ul> <p>Some of these are “outputs” others “outcomes”. More detail on how and when outcomes will be measured, is required for the FBC.</p> <p><i>Is there a ‘golden thread’ between the strategic objectives (see 3.2) and the scheme objectives (see 3.6)?</i></p> <p><b>Yes.</b> The scheme objectives derive clearly from SCR objectives, although there is no mention made of if and how local air quality impacts will be monitored.</p>												
Options assessment	<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>Alternative routes could have been considered but they would be less direct.</p>												
Statutory requirements and adverse consequences	<p><i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i></p> <p><b>No</b>, apart from TROs and associated public consultation required.</p> <p><i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i></p> <p>3.11 indicates that the principal negative implications relate to reduced operational performance at two junctions, plus reduction in car parking. Limited detail is presented. Modelling has been carried out and reports will be provided by the applicant.</p>												
Value for Money													
Core monetised Benefits	<p><i>[Core BCR – table 4.22]</i></p> <p><b>BCR = 2.21</b></p>	Non-monetised and wider economic benefits	<p><i>[Values/description – supplementary form]</i></p> <p><b>Enviro:</b></p> <p><b>Slight beneficial:</b></p> <p>LAQ, Townscape, biodiversity, water</p> <p><b>Distributional:</b></p> <p><b>Positive/slightly positive:</b></p> <p>Residents (Users, Noise, LAQ, Acc., Security, severance, accessibility)</p>										
<p><i>In your view do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?</i></p> <p><b>BCR</b></p> <table><tr><td>Low traffic growth (-60%)</td><td>1.88</td></tr><tr><td>High traffic growth (+100%)</td><td>2.69</td></tr><tr><td>No pandemic impact</td><td>2.43</td></tr><tr><td>No pandemic + low growth</td><td>2.06</td></tr><tr><td>No pandemic + high growth</td><td>2.99</td></tr></table>		Low traffic growth (-60%)	1.88	High traffic growth (+100%)	2.69	No pandemic impact	2.43	No pandemic + low growth	2.06	No pandemic + high growth	2.99	<p><i>Do the key assumptions and uncertainties present any significant risks to achieving the value for money?</i></p> <p><b>No</b></p>	
Low traffic growth (-60%)	1.88												
High traffic growth (+100%)	2.69												
No pandemic impact	2.43												
No pandemic + low growth	2.06												
No pandemic + high growth	2.99												
Value for Money Statement													
<p><i>Taking into consideration the monetised and non-monetised benefits and costs, does the scheme represent good value for money?</i></p> <p><b>Yes. High VfM.</b></p>													
Risk													
<p><i>What are the most significant risks and is there evidence that these risks are being mitigated?</i></p>													
Risk	Mitigation	Owner											

1.Increased build costs	<b>Elements of the scheme reduced or removed</b> , the route length would stay the same, to clarify this would be around planting, cycle stands, changes to surfacing colour etc -there would be no change to the scope and thus to the benefits	Sheffield City Council
2.Unexpected Utilities' costs.	<b>Early involvement with cost manager</b>	Project manager
3.Road Safety Audit issues	<b>RSA team appraised of developing design</b>	Project manager
4.Core Works Interface	<b>Forward planning with relevant parties</b>	Project manager
5.Traffic Regulation issues	<b>Early identification of TRO requirements</b>	Project manager

*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.** 99% SCR funding

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

**No** Design and Build contract with defined stages in 7.1

### **Delivery**

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

**Yes**, Milestones are provided at 7.3, but with a scheme of this size it is recommended that a programme is prepared, with construction and design broken into sections

*Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?*

**Yes**, Design and Build contract with defined stages in 7.1

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

**60%. Yes.** Risk provision of 15% of base costs included

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

**Yes** and has indicated that monetised benefits do not depend on some elements of the scheme which can therefore be cut without impact. Clarity is required at FBC regarding funding for works likely to occur beyond the end of the TCF programme.

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

**Yes, Yes.**

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

**Yes**

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

**Yes**, it has commenced. General support, with some concerns

*Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?*

**Yes**, but targets need to be refined for FBC.

### **Legal**

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

No evidence that the applicant has consulted a solicitor but it is reasonable to conclude that the scheme would not be deemed a subsidy.

## **Recommendation and Conditions**

<b>Recommendation</b>	Approval to proceed to FBC
-----------------------	----------------------------

<b>Payment Basis</b>	Defrayal
<b>Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)</b>	
<p>Prior to contract execution –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• SCC to provide MCA appendices A</li></ul> <p>The FBC should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• More detail on how objectives will be monitored/evaluated</li><li>• More detail on impacts on car traffic at two junctions (3.11)</li></ul>	

