	Scheme name / summary description	Value £'000
Α	Economic growth	
	New additions	
	None	
	Variations and reasons for change	
	None	
В	Transport	
Page	New additions	
	None	
73	Variations and reasons for change	
	None	
С	Quality of life	
	New additions	
	None	
	Variations and reasons for change	
	None	
D	Green and open spaces	

New additions

Richmond Park Disabled Access Path - FEASIBILITY / DEVELOPMENT

Why do we need the project?

The Multi Use Games Area (MUGA) was upgraded in 2018. There are some drainage issues in the park due to the high water table, causing several springs to flow from the ground around the site during periods of prolonged and heavy rainfall. The slope above the tarmac of the old playground has caused problems resulting in flooding across the old playground, over the main footpath that dissects the Park, and down towards the MUGA.

At the end of 2019 improvements were carried out to the drains to help alleviate the flooding problems. However, it is now thought that not only surface water causes the corner of the MUGA to flood, but also groundwater escaping through the tarmac slope.

Access to the MUGA is achieved via a set of steps or a steep grassy hill. The aim of the project is to achieve disabled access to the new sports facility to make it accessible to all, and at the same time alleviate the flooding issues.

Why address it now?

The Friends of Richmond Park have identified this as a priority due to the fact there is no access to the MUGA for disabled users and people with limited mobility. The MUGA was upgraded in 2018 so it's important to resolve the drainage issues and not threaten the usefulness of the MUGA or cause long term damage. As Local CIL funding has been agreed to help pay for the works there is an opportunity to address the issue now.

Furthermore, the full health benefits anticipated by the Public Health funding which improved the MUGA will not be realised, as over time the drainage could undermine the functionality of the MUGA.

How are we going to achieve it?

- Review the two existing Sketch Options for a disabled accessible path produced by the Council's Urban Environmental Design (UED) team.
- Advise on the best option to proceed with, with consideration to budget available and following discussion with Access Officer
- Add appropriate drainage to the scheme to deal with the ponding at the corner of the MUGA, and amend/further develop any details to create construction drawings and bring up to date in accordance with any new DDA legislation

What are the benefits?

- Build a DDA compliant footpath and improve accessibility to the MUGA
- Increase the number of users to the MUGA
- Resolve the flooding issue in the corner of the MUGA that long term has the potential to undermine the success of the MUGA
- Improve the health and wellbeing of the local community

Once completed, the site quality will be improved with an increase in the Sheffield Standard score. We also hope to see Increased usage of the MUGA by local community and green space users, due to better access and improved drainage

When will the project be completed?

+6

Need confirmation of design capacity and contract length following feasibility.

Costs

Capital Delivery Service Fees: £2.2K

Funding Available

Public Health Funding unused for Richmond Park to be transferred from Ball Courts Project £6.0K

S106 Funding unused for Richmond Park to be transferred from Play Improvements Project £0.2K

Procuremen	t	i. Feasibilit	y undertaken in-hous	e by the Ca	apital Delivery Service		
-	S106/ Public Health	Amount	£6.2K	Status	Existing unused funds	Approved	

Ecclesfield Park Improvements - FEASIBILITY / DEVELOPMENT

Why do we need the project?

There has been little investment in this District Park in recent years. Apart from the playground, MUGA and small skate grind rail, there are no other leisure and recreation facilities in the park, which appeal and attract a diverse range of park users.

As one of the largest parks in the North East of Sheffield, investment is required to provide facilities which enable the site to become a destination for the local and wider community. The aim is to transform the park into an 'Active Park' which provides activities and opportunities for a wide range of ages and abilities.

Why address it now?

- To provide recreational and leisure facilities currently not available in Ecclesfield Park or surrounding areas.
- To raise the overall standard of the park, helping raise its standing as a destination site and helping its transition to becoming considered an 'Active Park'.
- Public Health funding is available now, which could be lost if progress isn't made this year

How are we going to achieve it?

Initial consultation with the wider community will allow improvements for the park to be identified and prioritised, enabling further design and development work to progress options. Internal services will be used for this feasibility:

- Project Management Parks & Countryside Service
- Cost management, procurement, contract admin, Construction (Design and Management) Regulations compliance Capital Delivery Service
- Design work Urban and Environmental Design (level of input to be determined through consultation and project improvement prioritisation)

+11

What are the benefits?

Ball Courts / Play Improvements

-6

Identify and tackle barriers to usage of the site through consultation and feasibility works, leading to an Outline Business Case to... Install new facilities and infrastructure which encourages more active use of Ecclesfield Park Create a welcoming and accessible site which surpasses the Sheffield Standard Plant new trees Contribute to the development of Ecclesfield as an 'Active Park' When will the project be completed? We hope this project will be completed by March 2022, although this will depend on the results of this feasibility. **Feasibility Costs** CDS/Design Fees £7K Surveys £3K Contingency £1K Page £11K Total **Total Funding** S106 Parks Programme £29.6K (some of which will be used to fund the feasibility) 76 S106 Sport Contribution £110.2K Public Health Funding £100.0K (Part of Year 3's allocation) Total Available £239.8K S106 Parks **Funding** Amount £11K Status **Approved** Programme Source Feasibility undertaken in-house; i. Design by UED **Procurement** ii. Project Management by the Parks & Countryside Service iii. Cost Management the Capital Delivery Service Variations and reasons for change

Scheme description

'Ball Courts' was a programme of works at various sites that needed ball court improvements, funded by S106 from the approved Parks Programme.

Play Improvements is still a programme of works at various sites that needed play improvements, funded by S106 from the approved Parks Programme and Public Health funding.

What has changed?

Richmond Park had both ball court and play improvements as a result of the above schemes, but not all the allocated funding was used and has left small balances. As further works are needed at Richmond Park it makes sense to move these small remaining amounts of funding to the new access scheme (above) to help cover the costs. The amount remaining on Play Improvements is S106 so can't be used anywhere else.

Variation type: Budget Decrease

Budget

Current 20/21 Budget Ball Courts £13.3K - £6.0K = £7.3K (S106 specific to Frecheville, scheme planned)

Current 20/21 Budget Play Improvements £59.4K - £0.2K = £59.2K

Funding

Page

Public Health £6.0K + S106 £0.2K = £6.2K

Procurement

N/A

Section 106 Parks Programme

Scheme description

Block allocation of certain S106 agreements to deliver a programme of improvements to Parks across the city.

What has changed?

There is an allocation of £29.6K across 3 agreements held for Ecclesfield Park. To enable a feasibility to take place £11K of this needs to be drawn down to the project budget, see entry above for Ecclesfield Park.

Variation type: Budget Decrease

Budget

<u>Current 20/21 Budget</u> £346.7K - £11K = £335.7K Total 20-22 Budget £687.7K - £11K = £676.7K -11

	Funding	S106 (agreement	1280)				
	Procureme	ent	N/A				
E	Housing	growth					
	New addit	ions					
	New Build	Council Housing	Phase 16 – Newstead Enabling Works (General Needs & Older Persons Independent Living)	+4,160			
	Why do we	e need the project?	?				
		part of the original S ed to provide afforda	Scowerdons, Weaklands, Arbourthorne & Newstead (SWAN) sites regeneration proposals and is HRA land that is still to able housing.				
ס	Housing Growth projects to provide General Needs and Older Person's Independent Living properties on this Newstead site is part of the New Homes Delivery Plan and the HRA Business Plan, and aims to deliver new homes in line with the identified need.						
age 7	procure the	bility has been completed on the site for both types of units, and general needs is ready to progress - see entry below. It has been decided to re the enabling contract separately to the main works in order to mitigate the risk of unknown ground conditions having an impact on the main acts. This will also progress now.					
∞	This enabli	ng works contract ne	eeds to be in place as soon as possible so ground works don't hold up the main contracts.				
	How are w	e going to achieve	it?				
	Scheme to	be tendered via YO	RCivil 2 Framework, Lot 3 under the NEC3 contract, Option B				
	What are t	he benefits?					
	To deliver to:	he enabling works fo	for the whole of the site in order to mitigate the risk of unknown ground conditions having an impact on the main contracts,				
	• Reme	diate the site					
	Create	e development plate	eaus for use by later contracts				
	• Under	take infrastructure v	works to site (service diversions and installations where practicable)				
	which are n	nore suitable for the	ertainty to both projects prior to embarking upon the main works contract. Two different forms of contract can be used a different types of construction work. The main contract will be let under a fixed price option, whereas the enabling works on, allowing for approximate quantities for undefined elements.				
	When will	the project be com	npleted?				
	November	2021					

	Costs								
	CDS Fees	£68.1K							
	External Fe	es £61.4K							
	Commercia	l Fees £1.0K							
	Constructio	n £3,669.8k	<						
	Contingenc	y £359.7K							
	Total	£14,160.0K							
	Budget								
	20/21 £	70K							
	21/22 £4,0	25K							
	22/23 £6	<u>55K</u>							
D	Total £4,16	60K							
Page	Funding	HRA/1-4-1s	Amount	£14,160K	Status	Funding available in Stock Increase	Approved		
79	Source	70/30 split	Amount	214,1001	Otatas	Block Allocation	Approved		
	_	,	i. Principal	Contractor by mini-co	ompetition	via the YORcivil2 framework.			
	Procureme	ent	In the ever	nt that insufficient leve	els of intere	est are received, compete by restricted pr	ocedure with PQ	Q.	
	Variations								
	New Build	Council Housing F	Phase 5 - N	ewstead General Ne	eds				+14,284
	Scheme de		114000	5110101a1 110	040				111,201
		part of the original S ed to provide afforda			norne & Ne	wstead (SWAN) sites regeneration propo	sals and is HRA	land that is still to	
		ed Housing Growth			s properties	s is part of the New Homes Delivery Plan	and the HRA Bu	siness Plan and	
	What has o	changed?							
						for the proposed site, and we are now in ocurement for delivery. The main contract			

Framework, Lot 7 under NEC3 contract Option A.

As a result of the feasibility, it is recommended that 81 mixed housing units are built, with a potential for additional 12 units achieved by adding an additional storey to the apartment blocks. Works to include external works, drainage and infrastructure but will exclude enabling works as this is now to be procured through a separate contract to cover both the General Needs and Older Person's Independent Living new builds (Phase 6) on the Newstead site.

This decision was taken in order to mitigate the risk of unknown ground conditions having an impact on the main contracts.

See entry for New Build Phase 16 - Newstead Enabling Works GN & OPIL.

Updated Objectives

- The project will deliver up to 93 new council housing units, as part of the Stock Increase Programme.
- To provide a housing mix that integrates with the whole programme of Housing delivery and is in line with the identified need
- To provide good quality and sustainable homes, using the fabric first approach to increase thermal comfort and reduce fuel bills

Updated Benefits

- Deliver approximately 93 new high quality affordable homes in the City
- Regenerate a vacant site in SCC ownership
- Provide types of social housing to meet current needs
- Provide approximately £14m of economic activity
- Reduce maintenance costs to SCC through well thought out design, and running costs to occupiers through the fabric first approach

Variation type: Budget Increase

Costs

CDS Fees	£173.8K
Surveys	£135.0K
External Fees	£711.7K
Client Costs	£40.0K
Commercial Fees	£1.0K
Construction	£12,724.9K
Contingency	£609.6K

	Total £14,396.0K	
	Budget	
	Actuals 19/20 £37.8K	
	Current 20/21 Budget £74.2K + £188.0K = £262.2K	
	Current 21/22 Budget £0.0K + £1,474.0K = £1,474.0K	
	Current 22/23 Budget £0.0K + £12,350.0K = £12,350.0K	
	Current 2023+ Budget £0.0K + £272.0K = £272.0K	
	Current 20-23 Budget £112.0K + £14,284.0K = £14,396.0K	
	Funding HRA £10,110.8K + 1-4-1s £4,285.2K from Stock Increase Block Allocation	
	i. Principal Contractor by mini-competition via the YORbuild2 framework	
	Procurement In the event that insufficient levels of interest are received, compete via a suitable alternative framework.	
Page	ii. Surveys by closed competitive tender, prioritising local companies wherever possible.	
	Council Housing Stock Increase Programme	-18,444
84	Scheme description	
	Block allocation of funding for the Stock Increase Programme.	
	What has changed?	
	Outline business cases have been brought forward for the general need new build and the enabling works contract at the Newstead site. Funding therefore needs drawing down from the block allocation to cover these schemes. See entries above	
	Variation type: Budget Decrease	
	Budget	
	Current 20/21 Budget £ 5,358.0K - £257.9K = £5,100.1K	
	Current 21/22 Budget £54,019.5K - £5,499.0K = £48,520.5K	
	Current 22/23 Budget £67,123.2K - £12,415.0K = £54,708.2K	
	Current 23/24 Budget £20,428.8K - £272.0K = £20,156.8K	
	<u>Current 24/25 Budget £13,348.0K - £0.0K = £13,348.0K</u>	

	Total 20-	-25 Budget £160,27	77.5K - £18,443.9K = £141,833.6K	
	Funding	HRA and 1-4-1s		
	Procureme	ent	N/A	
F	Housing	investment		
	New addit	ions		
	Older Pers	sons Independent L	Living (OPIL) Fire Suppression Systems - FEASIBILITY	+12
	Why do we	e need the project /	what is the strategic fit?	
D			ce (CDS) to carry out a review of the current arrangements of providing fire suppression systems in OPIL schemes and ghbourhood Service of the alternative options and potential procurement routes	
age			the basis for an OBC to secure specific funding from the investment programme for the next 2 years to install individual within OPIL accommodation where residents cannot self evacuate	
82			eview the current arrangements for providing fire suppression systems. This will include examination of the specification, procurement and delivery and value for money.	
	The c the be	urrent arrangements	help us move forward and formalise the design responsibilities and contract arrangements in any future contract is have been in place since 2016 and although the arrangements have worked well there is a need to review and consider blogy, whether improved suppression systems and service delivery are available, and can be delivered more effectively	
			uld mean expending more monies than needed for a product and service which can be bettered, and not making the best ailable in the UK fire suppression systems market place	
	What are t	he Objectives?		
			ble accommodation for elderly residents who are not able to self evacuate delivery of the installations is fully compliant and value for money is being achieved.	
	What are t	he Expected Benef	fits?	
	To enTo coOPIL	able residents to ren ntinue to meet the re management are ab	misting systems have put out the fire, protected the assets, and saved lives or prevented serious injury. main in their homes when they're unable to self evacuate, and be safe equirements of the Regulatory Reform Fire Safety Order 2005 as enforced by South Yorkshire Fire Service. sole to have confidence that funds are available to support their work when assessing individual residents and completing solution.	

-427

• Residents are confident that we are maintaining their safety despite their deteriorating ability to self evacuate.

When will the project be delivered?

To cover the period 20/21, 21/22 and into 22/23. Over this period approx. 65 flats expected to need misting systems installed.

Costs

CDS Fees £12K

Budget

20/21 £12K

Source Procureme	Allocation				apital Delivery Service.	7.66.000	ragacizo
Funding	HRA from Block	Amount	£12K	Status	Funding Available	Approved	August20

Page

83

Variations and reasons for change

Housing Demolitions Programme

Scheme description

There are vacant garages and outhouses throughout the city which are currently in a state of disrepair and it is not financially viable to invest in them further. This project addresses the associated issues of rent loss, ongoing maintenance obligations, anti-social behaviour and improving the physical appearance of neighbourhoods.

What has changed?

The tender process has been finalised, at a construction cost of £864.3K. The figure is lower than the budget awarded in the original business case (£1,401.2K), as the tender only includes blocks that have been confirmed for demolition.

OBC; 35 blocks of outhouses (279 individual) + 68 garage blocks (507 individual) + Up to 88 precast concrete garage blocks (638 individual) FBC; 35 blocks of outhouses (279 individual) + 70 garage blocks (518 individual)

Following the review of the 88 precast garages, 39 blocks were identified as not sustainable. The addresses were cross referenced with the proposed demolition list and showed 37of these identified for demolition, therefore only 2 blocks of 11 garages needed to be included.

The difference in budget required has then been reduced by some additional costs identified to allow for the demolition work to go ahead, including:

- Refurbishment and Demolition Surveys (R&D Surveys) for Asbestos containing materials.
- Legal costs and compensation for leaseholders of outhouses.

• A contingency of 8% has been allowed which is greater that the one identified previously because demolition is a high risk project and it can present many unknowns. Variation type: Budget Decrease Costs CDS Fess £108.0K Client Directs £95.8K Works £864.2K Contingency £84.4K Total £1,152.5K The budget approved at OBC was £1,579.3K therefore the balance of the budget not required will be transferred back to the block allocation for H&S Essential Work for allocation to future schemes. Page Budget 84 Actuals 19/20 £7.8K Current 20/21 Budget £548.1K - £142.4K = £405.7K Current 21/22 Budget £513.6K - £132.6K = £381.0K Current 2022+ Budget £509.9K - £151.9K = £358.0K Current 19-24 Budget £1,579.3K - £426.8K = £1,152.5K **Funding** HRA **Procurement** N/A **Block Allocation Health & Safety Essential Work** +415 Scheme description Block allocation of HRA funding for projects addressing health any safety issues with the Council Housing stock. What has changed? 1. A review of the procurement arrangements for installing fire oppression systems in OPIL accommodation is taking place. The funding for the review/feasibility will be drawn down from here. See entry above 'OPIL Fire Suppression Systems'; £-12.0K 2. The contract is ready to be awarded for the Housing Demolitions Programme. Following the review of the scope of garages to include and the

tender exercise the required budget has reduced. The budget now not required will therefore be transferred back into this block allocation See entry above 'Housing Demolitions Programme'; £+426.8K	
Variation type: Budget Increase	
Budget Current 20/21 Budget £6,685.0K - £12.0K + £426.8K = £7,099.8K Total 20-25 Budget £55,424.0K - £12.0K + £426.8K = £55,838.8K	
Funding HRA	
Procurement N/A	
People – capital and growth	
New additions	
Heritage Park & Holgate Meadows – Complex Learners - Feasibility	+16
Why do we need the project?	
There are 4 complex learners who have been identified for Heritage and Holgate; however they require a separate space from the main site.	
A space such as the caretaker's house could be utilised for these learners.	
There is a caretaker house on site at Heritage Park which could be suitable. However, its status is unclear and requires further examination.	
If this is not progressed now, 4 learners are likely to be placed within an ISP (Individual Support Plan).	
How are we going to achieve it?	
Feasibility and concept design (alterations to or extension of the caretaker's house at the Heritage site) to gateway 2 to allow a cost plan to be developed to determine budget and viability of the scheme. Key outputs will be:	
 Development of concept designs An options report Cost Estimate 	
What are the benefits?	
To propose a solution following initial feasibility an options appraisal.	
	Variation type: Budget Increase Budget E6.885.0K - £12.0K + £426.8K E7.099.8K

	When will	the project be com	pleted? TB	C - dependent on o	utcome of th	ne Feasibility.		
	Funding Source	Special Provision Capital - SEND	Amount	£16.3k	Status	Feasibility Stage	Approved	
	Procureme	ent				er the Capital Delivery Service Delivery Pa existing Asbestos Survey Framework.	artner framework.	
	Variations	and reasons for c	hange					
	None							
Н	Essential	compliance and	maintenar	nce				<u>'</u>
Page	New addit	ions						
	None							
80	Variations	and reasons for c	hange (ple	ase specify all tha	t apply: bu	dget increase / budget reduction / rep	rofiling / scope change / procureme	ent)
	None							
1	Heart of t	he City II						
	New addit	ions						
	None							
	Variations	and reasons for c	hange (ple	ase specify all tha	t apply: bu	dget increase / budget reduction / rep	rofiling / scope change / procureme	ent)
	Heart of th	e City 2 – Project F	Re-profiles					2020-21
	Scheme de	escription						-6,934k
		e City 2 seeks to trar or a phased delivery		field city centre with	an improve	d retail, working, leisure and living enviro	nment. Cabinet Approval in March	2021-22

V	What has c	hanged?						+6,934k
							orrespond to the profile of the contractual spend agreed shown in the table below:-	
			Approved	Budget Move	ements	Revised		
			Budget (000)	2020-21 (000)	2021-22 (000)	Budget (000)		
	94058	B Laycock House C Pepper Pot	17,036	-617	4,021	20,441		
	94060	Building	18,118	-3,161	5,700	20,658		
	94067	HOCII Infr & PR	7,460	-3,157	-2,787	1,516		
—			42,615	-6,934	6,934	42,615		
Page	Total net	variance				0		
87		profile]						-
ľ	unding	Prudential Borrowing)					
F	Procureme	ent						
F	leart of the	e City 2 [H1 Leah's Y	ard]					2020-21
5	Scheme de	escription						-1,548
H	Heart of the	City 2 seeks to trans	form Sheffield	city centre with	an improved ref	tail, working, leisu	re and living environment.	2021-22
		a Grade II* listed buil k into use. Works are					of disrepair and needs to be stabilised prior to being id further decay.	+1,548
V	What has c	changed?						
							been realigned with the programme of works. As a he project is £4,453k funded by Prudential Borrowing.	

Capital Team | Commercial Business Development

Variation t • [rep • [sliph	ype: - profile] ppage]					
Funding	ing Prudential Borrowing					
Procureme	ent					