

1 – SCHEME DETAILS

Project Name	T0006 South West Bus Corridors (Public Transport)	Type of funding	Grant
Grant Recipient	Sheffield City Council	Total Scheme Cost	£3,977,126
MCA Executive Board		MCA Funding	£3,298,175 (TCF Re-baselining) £678,951 (funding source TBC)
Programme name	TCF	% MCA Allocation	100%
Current Gateway Stage	FBC	MCA Development costs	£457,560
		% of total MCA allocation	12%

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 are interventions to improve public transport connectivity along the Abbeydale Road and Ecclesall Road corridors in southwest Sheffield both to and from the city centre.

The scheme will feature improvements to bus detection which will give buses priority at junctions to beat congestion, and the enhanced enforcement of illegal parking and loading in bus lanes with cameras, along with infrastructure improvements at or near junctions and bus stops. This will provide increased accessibility to the city centre as well as to local centres and other destinations along the corridors from large residential areas including Millhouses, Brincliffe and Parkhead.

The specific activities funded are:

- Construction of outputs, including cameras for parking enforcement
- Costs for any design over and above the stage 2 grant award
- Project management fees
- Traffic management fees
- Statutory undertakers costs
- Monitoring and evaluation

- Comms and engagement

The Objectives for the scheme remain as:

- Objective 1 – Retain bus service consistency and reliability across all time periods.
- Objective 2- Increased use of public transport in the corridors
- Objective 2 – Increase the catchment population within 30 minutes travel time by bus to the city centre.

At OBC, the objectives were to be achieved through the installation of red routes to enforce the restriction of parking during certain times. However, there were significant concerns from businesses and some local residents about their perception of the impact of red routes and so these are not proposed within this FBC. It is now proposed to effectively enforce significant illegal parking and loading in bus lanes with cameras at certain hotspots without red routes. Civil enforcement officers would enforce illegal parking and loading outside of bus lanes along the corridors.

The outputs have changed from OBC as what was in the OBC was the whole of the route on which there was to be intervention this has now reduced to the specific areas where bus lanes are to be installed with the remainder of the route being addressed through alternative enforcement measures. There will also be more traffic signals that will have bus prioritisation (through detection measures on the bus stops and IT within the buses.)

The funding request of the project at OBC was £3,813k. However, in the intervening period the funding has been re-profiled and the funding available within the current programme is £3,298,175 and therefore there is now a gap of £678,951. The promoter has proposed that the shortfall be vired from the CRSTS programme, however the recent baselining exercise submitted to DfT has the project funding capped at 3.29m.

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 viable options consist of different approaches to enforcement of bus prioritisation on one or both of the key roads within the scope of the project. There is a clear rationale for the selection of the Preferred Option which is a package of bus priority interventions on both corridors along with enhanced camera enforcement of existing bus lane hours of operation. This will significantly improve bus journey time consistency and reliability to transform access by public transport to economic opportunities, retail, leisure and other services in the city centre.</p>
<p><i>Statutory requirements and adverse consequences</i></p>	<p><i>Does the scheme have any Statutory Requirements?</i></p> <p>The works are entirely within the adopted public highway and do not require planning permission. There will be amendments to some localised Traffic Regulation Orders at particular junctions on the corridors. The TRO's will follow all statutory consultation processes but the TRO's have not yet been advertised so could be subject to objections.</p> <p><i>Are there any adverse consequences that are unresolved by the scheme promoter?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There may be some delays to general traffic as a result of the interventions but the interventions have been determined from modelling to be the optimum solution. These delays should be offset by mode shift to public transport because of more reliable/efficient but journey times. • During construction the impact of reduced access to and through the area is a potential negative impact.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is an adverse risk of potential for abstraction from cycling along the corridors due to a more attractive public transport option to access the city centre. • There is the potential for a perceived negative impact on businesses along the corridors as a result of the proposals. Though SCC have engaged with local residents and businesses to highlight the benefits of high quality public transport to access business and residential areas along the corridors.
<i>FBC stage only – Confirmation of alignment with agreed MCA outcomes (Stronger, Greener, Fairer).</i>	The project demonstrates a good fit with the SEP across all outcome areas with clear qualitative contributions set out. It particularly aligns with the Greener outcome with the key objectives of the project to make public transport more efficient/appealing and thus generate a mode shift from cars.

4. VALUE FOR MONEY

Monetised Benefits:

<i>VFM Indicator</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>R/A/G</i>
<i>Net Present Social Value (£)</i>	14,564,000	
<i>Benefit Cost Ratio / GVA per £1 of SYMCA Investment</i>	8.35	
<i>Cost per Job</i>		

Non-Monetised Benefits:

<i>Non-Quantified Benefits</i>	Slight positive impact on : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reliability impact on Business users • Reliability impact on Commuting and Other users • Journey quality
--------------------------------	--

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?

The economic modelling for the FBC has not be recalculated, it is based on the analysis produced for the OBC with the following incremental adjustments to the Preferred Option only:

- A 20% reduction of bus user benefits has been applied to account for the fact that camera enforcement of parking in bus lanes is likely to be lower than camera enforcement of parking along the full length of a red route.
- Increased scheme costs reflecting latest design and cost estimates.
- Increased level of sunk costs excluded from the Present Value Costs.

Although the overall cost of the scheme has increased, because a significant proportion of the costs are now sunk (reflecting later stage in project lifecycle and feasibility stage costs expended) and therefore excluded from the VFM calculation this has had the effect of increasing the BCR from 6.25 at OBC to 8.35. With sunk costs considered this would be 5.35

The project has been modelled on a reasonable basis following DfT TAG guidelines and produces a BCR which represents very high VfM.

The costs and benefits have been subject to sensitivity testing and switching values which demonstrates that even with significant reductions in benefits and /or increases in costs from those assumed, then it would still produce a positive BCR and be VfM.

The justification of the Preferred Option is reasonable but is based on a qualitative assessment of the merits over the alternative because only the PO has been updated and analysed from an economic modelling perspective. However, the alternative scenarios were modelled at OBC stage.

5. RISK

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

The risks below are the top 5 risks extracted from a comprehensive risk register in which retained risks have been priced and fed into the risk provision included in the project costs. One of the other key risks which has not been included in this table is the risks in relation to stakeholder engagement which if there are objections to the TRO's this could delay implementation.

No.	Risk	Likelihood (High, Med, Low)	Impact (High, Med, Low)	Mitigation	Owner
1	Budget – Finished project costs more than the funding allowance.	Med	High	Progress and cost to be closely monitored, contingency budget allowed for.	SCC
2	Unexpected utilities diversions required.	Med	High	C2 to C4 checks and GPR surveys carried out, contingency budget allowed for.	SCC
3	War in Ukraine / elsewhere causes shortages in supply chain.	Low	Med	Potential for shortages to be identified and contingency plan identified in advance.	SCC
4	Adverse weather conditions.	Low	Med	Contingency in construction programme to cover winter working and unforeseen conditions.	SCC
5	Developments in the area affect progress and traffic management.	Low	Med	Monitor prospective developments, early liaison with SCC Highway Co-ordination, early engagement with developers.	SCC

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

Clawback on achievement of outputs.

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

n/a

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

There are no risks to the procurement strategy. Amey have been appointed under the Non-core element of the PFI contract and works commissioned under a NEC contract. The contractor (Amey) will 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 providing the start of the project is not held up by TRO objections.

Is the procurement strategy clear with defined milestones?

The procurement strategy is clear with Amey already having been appointed and engaged in the feasibility and design works.

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 95% which is appropriate for the stage of the project and reflects the contractual basis where most price risk rests with Amey. A small provision for risk has been retained.

The promoter has confirmed they will cover any costs overruns that cannot be mitigated.

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

Yes, there a clear governance structure showing how the project aligns with the wider programme governance. The SRO is identified as Tom Finnegan-smith. The FBC has not yet been signed.

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

Public consultation has taken place with regard to the original proposal to install Red routes. There were concerns from businesses and some local residents to red routes was due to the belief that red routes would prevent all parking and loading during the day along both corridors. Although there was mis-conception as to the effect of Red routes, these have now been removed from the project with the proposed enhanced enforcement of parking and loading in bus lanes with cameras in some areas of the route and by Civil Enforcement Officers on the reminder.

The installation of the bus lane enforcement cameras does not require public consultation as this measure is enhancing the enforcement of existing parking and loading restrictions. The installation of bus lane enforcement cameras has been approved by the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee. Whilst this is within the statutory rules for SCC, given the exposure this project has previously had, there is a risk that there is public dissent when the revised plans are known.

Are monitoring and evaluation procedures in place?

Yes, a detailed Monitoring and Evaluation plan is in place. The M&E plan includes a number of outcome themes which do align with the strategic objectives of the project and TCF programme. Quantified outcomes have not yet been provided but SCC have provided a note setting out their approach to setting and measuring the outcomes to be developed prior to the MCA board.

7. LEGAL

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

Yes, Subsidy Control has been considered and determined that the project complies with SC regulations because the works are general interest public works within the existing highway boundary and benefits will be available to all existing and future users of the highways and buses operating on it.

8. RECOMMENDATION AND CONDITIONS

Recommendation	Full award subject ot conditions
Payment Basis	Defrayal
Conditions of Award (including clawback clauses)	
The following conditions must be satisfied before contract execution. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Quantified Outcomes in terms of increased bus patronage, reduced journey times, improved reliability/punctuality and increased catchment population of the City centre to be agreed. To be measured against baseline data from an agreed date in 2023.• Confirmation of successful TRO consultation process.• DfT approval of rebaseline exercise• Confirmation and agreement of source for funding shortfall	