Early Assessment and Sifting Tool Forms

Contents

Acronyms

AONB	Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
AQMA	Air Quality Management Area
BB2SCS	Bristol to Bath South Coast Study
BCR	Benefit Cost Ratio
CIL	Community Infrastructure Levy
CPO	Compulsory Purchase Order
DfT	Department for Transport
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
GRIP	Guide to Railway Investment Projects
HGV	Heavy Goods Vehicle
HLOS	High Level Output Specification
HOV	High Occupancy Vehicle
JSA	Joint Strategic Assessment
KSI	Killed and Seriously Injured
LTP	Local Transport Plan
PRN	Primary Route Network
RFI	Regional Freight Interchange
RUS	Route Utilisation Strategy
SWARMMS	South West Area Multi Modal Study
SWLEP	Swindon & Wiltshire Local Enterprise Partnership
TOC	Train Operating Company
WHS	World Heritage Site

Introduction

This document provides copies of the Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) forms that have been completed for each of the 70 candidate major transport schemes included in the report to Cabinet on 21 May 2013.

EAST is a Department for Transport (DfT) decision support tool that forms the initial part of the DfT's Transport Business Case. It has been developed to quickly summarise and present available evidence on schemes in a clear and consistent manner, and provides relevant, high level information to help inform an early view of how schemes perform and compare.

The DfT's guidance sets out how users should complete EAST forms and what issues needs to be considered and addressed (available from https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/4475/east-guidance.pdf).

It should be noted that EAST has been designed so that it can be applied without necessarily having to obtain detailed evidence as is usually required to support funding applications. This means that users may not have answers to every question posed in EAST but where possible are encouraged to provide a best estimate or view drawing on wider knowledge, similar projects, professional judgement, etc.

The EAST form requires answers to a number of subjects including:

- Identified scheme problems and objectives
- Scale of scheme impact
- Fit with transport and other objectives
- Economic growth impact
- Carbon emissions impact
- Public acceptability
- Practical feasibility
- Key risks
- Capital and revenue costs.

In general, the EAST process requires responses to be determined based on the following scale:

- Score=1 Red (lowest rating or highest risk)
- Score=2 Red/Amber
- Score=3 Amber
- Score=4 Amber/Green
- Score=5 Green (highest rating or lowest risk).

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**A303 Furze Hedge Junction**
Date	
Description	Safety measures and junction improvements on A303/A350 at Furze Hedge junction. Preferred option is to extend the existing grade seperated 'quarter cloverleaf' junction layout to a 'half cloverleaf' layout.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	Recognition of safety concerns associated with right turns at the Furze head junction. Accident statistics over a five year period reinforce these concerns. Objective is to reduce personal accident injuries at junction through a number of proposed options.	
Scale of impact	4	In the Highways Agency 'A303/A350 Furze Hill Accident Investigation Report' (May 2007), it is estimated that there would be a 40%-90% reduction in accidents depending on which of the identified options was implemented.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	3	Reasonable fit with national transport goals. Benefits to safety particularly involving HGV's. Minimal impact anticipated on journey times and carbon emissions. Land take would be required to construct cloverleaf junction; existing infrastructure would complement this choice of junction.
Fit with other objectives	3	Reasonable fit with LTP objectives particularly SO8. May have some conflict with policies S06 and SO7.
Key uncertainties	Land take - possible requirement for CPO.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	2	Little consultation has taken place. Possibility of opposition to landscape impact of scheme.

Economic

Economic growth	**3. Amber**	Little impact expected on journey times although journey reliability may slightly increase due to decrease in incidents and wait time at current junction layout.
Carbon emissions	**3. Amber**	Improved efficiency of HGV movements. Embedded carbon in construction materials.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**3. Amber**	None or minimal impacts.
Local environment	**3. Amber**	Slight positive effect on air quality although no local AQMA. Limited negative landscape impact through landtake of fields (part of) and hedgerows.
Well being	**4. Amber/green**	Decrease in killed and seriously injuries estimated in Highways Agency report.
Expected VfM category		Not established. Average BCR for local road scheme = 4.23 (from RAC Foundation report 'Rates of Return on Public Spending on Transport' (June 2009).

Managerial

Implementation timetable	4. 1-2 years	
Public acceptability	3	Little consultation has been undertaken. Land take may raise environmental concerns.
Practical feasibility	4	Highways Agency report identified 'Barriers to Implementation' which were typical of scheme type.
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	3	Initial option assessment undertaken in Highways Agency 'A303/A350 Furze Hill Accident Investigation Report' (May 2007).
Key risks	Considered to be a low overall risk.	

Financial

Affordability	4	
Capital Cost (£m)	02. 0-5	Options in Highways Agency report range from £22,245 (Option 5) to £2,263,979 (Option 1).
Revenue Costs (£m)	01. None	Although there would be some ongoing maintenance costs.
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	4	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	2	
Where is funding coming from?	Envisaged that majority of funding would come from Highways Agency.	
Any income generated? (£m)	No	

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**A303 Stonehenge Improvement**
Date	
Description	2.1km Bored Tunnel on section of the A303 adjacent to Stonehenge to reduce visibility from sensitive zones of the site. This forms part of the 'Published Scheme'.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	Traffic delays at peak and holiday times, traffic congestion, negative impact of traffic on World Heritage Site (Stonehenge). Objectives are to eliminate the traffic impact on the Stonehenge site by the construction of a 2.1km bored tunnel to assist in the future developments outlined in the WHS management plan.	
Scale of impact	4	This would have a positive impact on the environment within the WHS, although traffic would not be totally eliminated from its environs.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	2	Low fit with national transport goals. Whilst a bored tunnel may improve the quality of the environment within the WHS and improve safety, it is unclear of the impact on other transport objectives.
Fit with other objectives	2	Low fit with LTP3 objectives. However, scheme meets the objectives and aims of the Stonehenge WHS Management Plan.
Key uncertainties	Scheme costs and deliverability.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	4	Public inquiry held during 2004, with Inspector in favour with minor improvements needing to be made. Due to increase in scheme costs, the government commissioned a review in 2006 to determine whether the scheme still represented value for money and to consider other options. Alternatives have been suggested by those opposed to the scheme and by the Highways Agency.

Economic

Economic growth	**4. Amber/green**	The overall A303 scheme improves the A303 at its western and eastern ends and should provide significant improvements in journey time reliability and reductions in journey times. Moreover, the government has indicated that it would not make economic sense for these improvements to progress without the tunnel. However, the proposal to close the junction of the A344 with the A303 may cause traffic to divert onto the A303 which may constrain the anticipated journey time improvements.
Carbon emissions	**2. Red/amber**	There will be significant embedded carbon due to the construction work. Carbon emissions and congestion are likely to reduce although the extent of this is unclear, especially with the closure of the A344/A303 junction.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**4. Amber/green**	The A303 is a strategic route and the scheme may help economic regeneration in the wider South West region.
Local environment	**4. Amber/green**	The scheme will have an impact on the natural environment, especially the junctions at either end, although putting the road in a tunnel will remove traffic from around Stonehenge. There will also be positive impacts on both air quality and noise pollution within the WHS.

Well being	**4. Amber/green**	Positive impacts on the reduction of KSI's at the A344 junction with the A303 Stonehenge Bottom. It is anticipated that journey times and journey time variability for non-work and non-commute trips will decrease especially at weekends and in holiday periods. Potential threat of crime/terrorism in the tunnel environment.
Expected VfM category	4. Low 1-1.5	Based on the BCR value included in the A303 Stonehenge Improvement Scheme Review Public Consultation (January 2006).

Managerial

Implementation timetable	6. 5-10 years	Originally hoped that scheme would be in place before the Olympics.
Public acceptability	4	A number of consultations have taken place in the past and there is general support for the scheme amongst the majority of stakeholders. Some objections have been received with alternatives suggested and assessed. All stakeholders involved have been consulted.
Practical feasibility	3	A bored tunnel, although expensive, is seen as being technically feasible and models have been run in order to confirm its effectiveness. Alternative options have been considered but these have also proven to be costly but provide less benefit than the bored tunnel option.
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	5. High	Various options/alternatives have been made by relevant stakeholders involved and evidence via modelling has proven that the most pragmatic option would be the bored tunnel rather than the cut and cover option.
Key risks	High costs involved with the construction.	

Financial

Affordability	1. Not affordable	Scheme needs to be related to wider aspirations for A303 corridor.
Capital Cost (£m)	09. 500-1000	Costs according to Parlimentary Report (www.publications.parliament.uk) states £540m in 2007.
Revenue Costs (£m)	01. None	Ongoing maintenance costs would be met by the Highways Agency who manage the A303.
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	1.High risk	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	2	Options assessment.
Where is funding coming from?	Highways Agency	
Any income generated? (£m)	No	

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**A303 Stonehenge Parker Plan**
Date	
Description	Alternative Stonehenge route (known as the Parker Route or AR4) - new 25km long dual carriageway road diverging south from the existing A303 west of Winterbourne Stoke to the north of Salisbury and then rejoining the existing A303 south-east of Bulford Camp. The scheme would also include an Eastern Link to provide a notional bypass of the A36 around Salisbury.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	Traffic delays at peak and holiday times, traffic congestion, negative impact on Stonehenge WHS. Objectives are to eliminate traffic near Stonehenge site and offer a northern Salisbury bypass.	
Scale of impact	2	Stonehenge inquiry Inspector outlined a number of advantages (e.g. benefits for Salisbury, Amesbury and archaeological sites within the WHS) and disadvantages (e.g. scheme would represent a long detour for A303 traffic; adversely affect many archaeological sites and have much greater environmental effect; result in loss of 150ha of good agricultural land). Inspector concluded that the disadvantages significantly outweighed the benefits.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	1. Low	Poor fit with national transport goals.
Fit with other objectives	1. Low	Poor fit with LTP3 objective and Wiltshire Core Strategy.
Key uncertainties		
Degree of consensus over outcomes	2	Included as 'Alternative Route AR4' at the 2004 Stonehenge Public Inquiry and included in public options review consultation (see Highways Agency 'A303 Stonehenge Improvement Scheme Review - Public Consultation Report' (July 2006)).

Economic

Economic growth	**3. Amber**	Scheme would increase journey times on the A303 thus increasing the cost of travel. Not well related to development growth proposals in Wiltshire Core Strategy.
Carbon emissions	**1. Red**	Increased journey length (with a resultant in CO2 emissions) and considerable embedded carbon in scheme construction.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**3. Amber**	Some positive impacts for vulnerable groups in Salisbury and Amesbury but potential adverse impact on competitiveness of South West region as a result of increased journey times.
Local environment	**1. Red**	Although the scheme significantly reduces negative traffic impacts on the Stonehenge WHS, it will have a significant impact on the wider local landscape, and other archaeological sites (approx. 56).
Well being	**3. Amber**	Some positive severance benefits in Salisbury, Amesbury and the Stonehenge WHS. Increased journey lengths, time and costs for non-work and non-commute A303 users (e.g. visitors).

Expected VfM category	5. Poor <1	Highways Agency economic review identified a low growth BCR of 0.05 (-2.96 without the Eastern Link) and a NPV of -£143m (-£478m without the Eastern Link).

Managerial

Implementation timetable	7. 10+ years	
Public acceptability	2	Included as 'Alternative Route AR4' at the 2004 Stonehenge Public Inquiry and included in public options review consultation (see Highways Agency 'A303 Stonehenge Improvement Scheme Review - Public Consultation Report' (July 2006)).
Practical feasibility	1. Low	Presented at 2004 Stonehenge Public Inquiry where Inspector conculded that scheme (AR4) did not warrant further investigation. Also, included in Highways Agency 'A303 Stonehenge Improveent Scheme Review - Stage 1 Report' (January 2006).
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	2	As above.
Key risks	High cost; environment and other archaeological/wildlife site impacts; value for money assessment.	

Financial

Affordability	1. Not affordable	
Capital Cost (£m)	09. 500-1000	Estimated at £518m at 2011 prices (see 'A303 Stonehenge Improvement Scehem Review - Stage 1 Report').
Revenue Costs (£m)	01. None	Assumed that the Highways Agency would meet any maintenance costs.
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	2	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	1. Static	
Where is funding coming from?		
Any income generated? (£m)	No	

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**A303 Winterbourne Stoke Bypass**
Date	
Description	Provision of new dual carriageway road to bypass Winterbourne Stoke village (this scheme was originally part of the published A303 Stonehenge Improvements scheme).

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	This section of the A303 has a poor safety record with high volumes of traffic going through Winterbourne Stoke village with associated congestion problems. The provision of a bypass would eliminate the majority of traffic from the village and provide a better and safer living environment, especially for those properties alongside the current A303. Such as scheme would also reduce congestion and improve the safety record on this section of the A303.	
Scale of impact	5. Significant impact	The bypass would significantly reduce the high volumes of traffic currently travelling through Winterboure Stoke with a resultant strong positive impact on accident levels.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	2	Low fit with national transport goals.
Fit with other objectives	2	Low fit with LTP3 objectives and emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy particularly in relation to development growth proposals.
Key uncertainties		
Degree of consensus over outcomes	4	As part of larger A303 improvement scheme, a public inquiry was held in 2004 and public consultation took place in early 2006. There is generally widespread support amongst local residents.

Economic

Economic growth	**3. Amber**	The provision of a bypass should improve journey time reliability and reduce the incidence of accident delays. However, the scheme is not well related to development growth in the emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy.
Carbon emissions	**1. Red**	There would be significant embedded carbon due to the construction of the bypass. There may also be some additional induced traffic.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**3. Amber**	The A303 is a strategic route and the scheme may assist economic regeneration in the South West region. The reduction of high volumes of traffic in Winterbourne Stoke will improve conditions for vulnerable groups.
Local environment	**2. Red/amber**	The scheme will have a significant detrimental impact on the natural environment and landscape. There would, however, be positive impacts in Winterbourne Stoke which is a conservation area.
Well being	**4. Amber/green**	Positive impact on residents in Winterbourne Stoke (i.e. reduced severance, encouragement of active travel modes and less accident incidents and risk). However, there will be some level of redistributed traffic depending on the scheme option.
Expected VfM category	4. Low 1-1.5	The Highways Agency report 'A303 Stonehenge Improvement Scheme Review - Stage 1 Report' (Jan 2006) identified a range of BCRs from 1.2 to 2.1 (low growth) depending on the scheme option. In the subsequent partial solutions options analysis report in February 2008, the Highways Agency identified a scheme BCR of 0.86 (low growth) to 1.15 (high growth).

Managerial

Implementation timetable	6. 5-10 years	
Public acceptability	3	A number of consultations have taken place in the past and there is general support from local residents for the scheme. Some objections have been received from other stakeholders.
Practical feasibility	4	Considered techically feasible.
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	5. High	High level of study work and feasibility undertaken and publicly scrutinised at consultation events associated with the A303 Stonehenge Improvements.
Key risks	High construction costs and timescale for delivery. Value for money assessment.	

Financial

Affordability	1. Not affordable	The Highways Agency 'A303 Stonehenge Improvement Scheme Review - Partial Solutions Options Analysis' (February 2008) concluded that BCRs of between 0.86 to 1.15 "...are not sufficient to provide a strong economic case for providing a dual carriageway bypass of Winterbourne Stoke as a stand-alone scheme".
Capital Cost (£m)	06. 50-100	The Highways Agency 'A303 Stonehenge Improvement Scheme Review - Stage 1 Report' (Jan 2006) estimated construction costs of between £56m and £70m depending on option choice.
Revenue Costs (£m)	01. None	Ongoing maintenance costs should be met by the Highways Agency.
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	2	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	2	Route options.
Where is funding coming from?	Highways Agency	
Any income generated? (£m)	No	

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**A338 Britford Diversion**
Date	
Description	2km new road plus junctions to bypass Britford Village.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	High traffic volumes and speeds through Britford Village, congestion on the A338 into Salisbury.	
Scale of impact	2	Some improvement to road safety in Britford Village, although there is an existing cycle path and there are no significant pedestrian crossing movements. Congestion impacts very uncertain as traffic would still reach Harnham Gyratory - the original scheme was intended link to join up with the formerly proposed Salisbury bypass.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	1. Low	Poor fit with national transport goals - improves road safety and urban realm in Britford but otherwise not well related to other goals.
Fit with other objectives	1. Low	Poor fit with LTP objectives and emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy. Some improvement to road safety and urban realm in Britford but not well related to other objectives including planned development growth.
Key uncertainties	Route alignment. Nature and degree of benefits and impacts. Consultation response. Accurate cost estimate.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	1. Little	No consultation undertaken for nearly 20 years.

Economic

Economic growth	**3. Amber**	Unlikely to reduce congestion into Salisbury and therefore improve journey times and variability. Not well related to proposed development growth in Core Strategy.
Carbon emissions	**2. Red/amber**	Anticipated adverse impact on carbon emissions through induced trips and embedded carbon in construction.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**3. Amber**	Improves urban realm in Britford and safety around Britford schools. Unclear impact on Rowbarrow development.
Local environment	**2. Red/amber**	Proposed route alternatives pass through between 1-3 significant archaeological sites. Significant land take and environmental/landscape impacts. Some benefits in Britford itself.
Well being	**4. Amber/green**	Improvements in reduced severance and improved safety for Britford schools/village. Unclear impacts on Rowbarrow.
Expected VfM category		Not established. Average BCR for local road scheme = 4.23 (from RAC Foundation report 'Rates of Return on Public Spending on Transport' (June 2009).

Managerial

Implementation timetable	6. 5-10 years	
Public acceptability	2	No consultation undertaken for 20 years - likely to be controversial given environmental/landscape impacts.
Practical feasibility	2	The original proposed alignments (2 alternatives) pass through a site which is now a housing development.
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	2	A bypass would remove traffic from this section of the A338 through Britford but the proposals require modelling to determine the impact on traffic flows and congestion.
Key risks	Scheme costs; route alignment; uncertain benefits and impacts.	

Financial

Affordability	2	
Capital Cost (£m)	03. 5-10	Estimated at £3.3 - £3.7m in 1993. Approx.at least £8.4m in today's prices but costs likely to be higher as now no connection provided by Salisbury bypass.
Revenue Costs (£m)	01. None	Although there would be ongoing maintenance costs.
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	1.High risk	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	2	Route options.
Where is funding coming from?		
Any income generated? (£m)	No	

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**A350 Beanacre Bypass**
Date	
Description	Provision of an A350 bypass for western Melksham and the village of Beanacre.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	The A350 through western Melksham suffers from congestion and poor journey time reliability. The communities of west Melksham and Beanacre experience high levels of traffic with associated severance and noise pollution.	
Scale of impact	4	Would remove the majority of traffic from west Melksham and Beanacre.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	3	Reasonable fit with national transport goals. The A350 is an important road corridor into west Wiltshire and a bypass could improve access, reduce journey times and promote the local economy. It would also improve the environment of the communities bypassed. However, it may lead to additional vehicular trips and will have a detrimental impact on the natural environment.
Fit with other objectives	3	Reasonable fit with LTP objectives and the emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy for reasons outlined above.
Key uncertainties	Requirement for significant housing allocation to justify and fund any scheme.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	2	Local community aspiration for scheme but no detailed analysis/consultation undertaken.

Economic

Economic growth	**4. Amber/green**	A bypass will improve journey time reliability and resilience, and may benefit the local economy. Would help support development growth both in Melksham and on A350 corridor generally.
Carbon emissions	**2. Red/amber**	Better flowing traffic may lead to slightly lower carbon emissions but the improved route may induce additional car trips. Significant construction so high levels of embedded carbon.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**4. Amber/green**	Reduction of traffic in communities will be of some limited benefit for vulnerable groups. Scheme should assist in wider regeneration aims for A350 corridor.
Local environment	**2. Red/amber**	Reduced noise and air pollution (no identified AQMA) in bypassed communities. However, scheme will give rise to significant environmental and landscape impacts.
Well being	**4. Amber/green**	Scheme will reduce severance and accidents in west Melksham and Beanacre. May encourage increased levels of cycling and walking in communities.
Expected VfM category		Not established. Average BCR for local road scheme = 4.23 (from RAC Foundation report 'Rates of Return on Public Spending on Transport' (June 2009).

Managerial

Implementation timetable	6. 5-10 years	Will require design, land acquistion, planning permisison, possible public inquiry and assembly of funding.
Public acceptability	2	Likely to be very controversial and little or no consultation undertaken to date
Practical feasibility	3	Likely to be feasible but little evaluation work undertaken to date.
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	1. Low	Concept scheme with little supporting evidence.
Key risks	Cost; value for money assessment; deliverability; environmental impacts and mitigation.	

Financial

Affordability	2	Not well related to currently proposed development growth plans.
Capital Cost (£m)	05. 25-50	No cost estimate produced. Average cost of single carriageway scheme was £10.6m per mile in 2006 (see http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200506/cmhansrd/vo061030/text/61030w0008.htm).
Revenue Costs (£m)	01. None	Although there would be ongoing maintenance costs.
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	3	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	2	Different alignment options could be tested
Where is funding coming from?		
Any income generated? (£m)	No	

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**A350 Chippenham Bypass Dualling**
Date	
Description	Dualling of the A350 Chippenham Bypass with a High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV)/HGV lane.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	There are traffic queues and delays in peak periods; modelled worsening conditions with development growth; and a generally compromised role. The objectives are to improve journey time reliability, encourage car sharers, improve connectivity, encourage inward investment and facilitate development growth.	
Scale of impact	3	By its nature, the HOV/HGV lane limits the scale of the potential improvement in relation to highway capacity, delays and journey time reliability. Generally, while improving conditions on the A350, problems will remain at some of the junctions and on some of the local links to/from the A350.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	4	Good fit with national transport goals. The scheme should complement the integrated transport package approach in Chippenham. The HOV/HGV lane encourages and provides for car sharing, buses, coaches and HGV movements. Makes full use of available land and capacity of bridges. Uncertainty regarding overall impact on carbon emissions.
Fit with other objectives	4	Good fit with a number of LTP3 objectives. Also a good fit with the emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy and the proposed City Deal.
Key uncertainties	Overall impact on journey times and carbon emissions; wider acceptance of HOV/HGV lane.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	2	Little directly related consultation and possibly some resistance to HOV/HGV only lanes.

Economic

Economic growth	**4. Amber/green**	Improving/facilitating connectivity between the western Wiltshire towns, and to the A36/M4; encouraging inward investment (and a consequent reduction in out-commuting); and facilitating development growth in the A350 Wiltshire corridor (e.g. proposed growth in Chippenham of 4,000 houses and 26.5ha of employment land to 2026).
Carbon emissions	**3. Amber**	Encouragement for car sharing and better provision for buses and coaches. Improved efficiency of HGV movements. Embedded carbon in construction materials.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**4. Amber/green**	Limited positive impacts for minority/vulnerable groups. Can assist with key outcome in the Core Strategy to delivery major regeneration projects in Chippenham and Trowbridge.
Local environment	**3. Amber**	Positive effect on air quality but no local AQMAs. Limited negative landscape impact.
Well being	**3. Amber**	Some positve impact on non-work and non-commute trips.
Expected VfM category	1. Very High >4	Estimated BCR of 'A350 North of Chippenham Dualling' scheme is 14.6.

Managerial

Implementation timetable	5. 2-5 years	Scheme has the potential to be towards the lower end of this timeframe.
Public acceptability	3	Little direct consultation on scheme although included in wider discussion around emerging Core Strategy. Possible objections to designation of additional lanes as HOV/HGV only.

Practical feasibility	4	Planning permission already in place although need to undertake EIA. No requirement to secure 3rd party consents.
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	3	Some related modelling undertaken as part of development of Chippenham Transport Strategy. Evidence from other HOV lane schemes elsewhere in UK.
Key risks	Low overall risk given that required planning permission and infrastructure (land and bridges) are in place. Some risk associated with EIA and public consultation on HOV/HGV only lanes.	

Financial

Affordability	3	Relatively high scheme costs. Opportunity to use developer contributions via CIL.
Capital Cost (£m)	05. 25-50	Based on £26.75m cost in Regional Funding Allocation application in Feb 09.
Revenue Costs (£m)	01. None	Although there would be ongoing maintenance costs.
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	4	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	2	Flexibility to convert additional lane to all traffic use.
Where is funding coming from?	Possible use of CIL funds associated with local significant development growth.	
Any income generated? (£m)	No	

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**A350 North Chippenham Dualling**
Date	
Description	The scheme involves four elements: 1) widening A350 between the Badger Roundabout and Malmesbury Road Roundabout to dual 2-lane; 2) minor adjustments to the entry/exit arms to the south of Badger Roundabout; 3) improving Malmesbury Road Roundabout; 4) widening A350 southbound between Jackson's Lane and Malmesbury Road Roundabout to 2- lane.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	The objective of the scheme is to reduce congestion and to help unlock the growth potential of two key development areas in Chippenham (North and South West Chippenham), by targeting investment on a major congestion pinch-point.	
Scale of impact	5. Significant impact	Expected to have a significant impact in reducing journey times and improving journey time reliability on the section of the A350 between the Jackson's Lane and the Badger Roundabout. Very high Benefit Cost ratio of 14.6.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	4	Good fit with national transport goals.
Fit with other objectives	4	Good fit with Wiltshire LTP3 objectives. Also has a good fit with the emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy and proposed City Deal.
Key uncertainties	Findings of detailed environmental assessment.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	3	Little or no direct consultation but scheme not anticipated to be controversial.

Economic

Economic growth	**5. Green**	Will help unlock potential development at north Chippenham (750 houses and 2.5ha of employment land) and south west Chippenham (800 houses and 18ha of employment land) strategic site allocations. Significant journey time (1½ minutes cut from average journey) and journey reliability benefits. Estimated £3.9m GVA added to local economy through creation of additional jobs.
Carbon emissions	**3. Amber**	Based on the output from TUBA, there would be a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions as average speeds are raised closer to optimum speeds. However, there would be some embedded carbon in construction materials.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**4. Amber/green**	Positive impacts on A350 corridor regeneration.
Local environment	**3. Amber**	An initial environmental impacts assessment has concluded that there would be no significant biodiversity, heritage or air quality impacts and only slight adverse landscape and noise impacts.
Well being	**4. Amber/green**	Positive impact on non-peak hour journey times and reliability.
Expected VfM category	1. Very High >4	Very high Benefit Cost ratio of 14.6 identified in Pinch Point application (Feb 13).

Managerial

Implementation timetable	4. 1-2 years	Timetable in Pinch Poinit application - on site early 2014; opening end of 2014.

Public acceptability	4	No extensive public consultation exercise undertaken but scheme not anticipated to be controversial and Pinch Point application supported by SWLEP and Wessex Association of Chambers of Commerce.
Practical feasibility	5. High	Included as Pinch Point application in Feb 13 with start date early 2014.
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	4	Pinch Point application submitted Feb 13.
Key risks	Findings of detailed environmental assessment. Nature and degree of service diversion work requried to be carried out by Statutory Authorities.	

Financial

Affordability	5. Affordable	
Capital Cost (£m)	02. 0-5	Estimted by Atkins study at £2.722m in outturn prices.
Revenue Costs (£m)	01. None	Although there would be ongoing maintenance costs.
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	5. Low risk	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	3	Possibility of designating HOV/HGV lane on dualled section.
Where is funding coming from?		
Any income generated? (£m)	No	

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**A350 Semington-Melksham Diversion Dualling**
Date	
Description	Dualling of the A350 between Semington and Melksham.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	Problems: Traffic queues and delays at peak times, potentially worsening with planned development growth. Objective: Increase highway capacity and lane occupancy on a busy stretch of this strategic route.	
Scale of impact	2	Expected to have only a limited benefit given current traffic conditions on this section of the A350.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	3	Reasonable fit with national transport goals in that it would improve journey times, relate well to economic development, and make good use of available land and infrastructure. However, the scheme would not assist with reducing carbon emissions, encouraging healthy alternatives and protecting the local environment.
Fit with other objectives	3	Reasonable fit with a some of the LTP3 objectives as it is a strategic route and is well related to significant development growth. However, this is partly offset by impact on carbon emissions and landscape.
Key uncertainties	Whether dualling of this section of A350 would deliver measureable benefits without any junction capacity treatments. The effect on overall journey times and carbon emissions.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	Don't know	Little or no consultation has been undertaken to date.

Economic

Economic growth	**3. Amber**	While the scheme is along the strategically important A350 and adjacent to the Principal Employment Areas of the Bowerhill Industrial Estate and Hampton Business Park (with 6ha of employment land allocated in the emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy), its benefits are considered to be limited given current traffic conditions.
Carbon emissions	**2. Red/amber**	Likely to encourage additional road trips, especially by car. There will also be embedded carbon emissions from construction.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**3. Amber**	Limited positive impacts for minority/vulnerable groups.
Local environment	**3. Amber**	Limited impact on air quality and natural environment as the scheme involves dualling the A350 on the existing road alignment.
Well being	**3. Amber**	Little or no anticipated change.
Expected VfM category		Not established. Average BCR for local road scheme = 4.23 (from RAC Foundation report 'Rates of Return on Public Spending on Transport' (June 2009).

Managerial

Implementation timetable	5. 2-5 years	
Public acceptability	3	Little or no consulation on the scheme.
Practical feasibility	4	The scheme involves dualling an existing single carriageway road on the current alignment and should present no significant technical problems. The scheme would need to be modelled and progressed through any statutory procedures.

What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	1. Low	Limited supporting evidence.
Key risks	That the capacity limitations of the junctions restrict the benefit accrued from the scheme.	

Financial

Affordability	2	
Capital Cost (£m)	03. 5-10	Estimate - no accurate scheme cost estimate produced.
Revenue Costs (£m)	01. None	Although there would be ongoing maintanence costs.
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	2	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	1. Static	
Where is funding coming from?		
Any income generated? (£m)	No	

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**A350 West Ashton Relief Road**
Date	
Description	An offline single carriageway improvement running north of the existing A350.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	Problems: current queues and delays during am and pm peaks; worsening with growth identified in the Wiltshire Core Strategy. Objectives: reduce delays and improve journey time reliability on the A350 corridor.	
Scale of impact	4	Expected to significantly alleviate the problem and deliver the objectives.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	3	Reasonable fit with national transport goals. Option fits well with other policies affecting the study area identified in the Core Strategy.
Fit with other objectives	3	Reasonable fit with LTP objectives. Complements and enhances proposals for the strategic housing and employment site in east Trowbridge - Ashton Park Urban Extension (2,600 houses and 15 of employment land).
Key uncertainties	Overall impact on A350 journey times. Deliverability issues.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	3	Consultation via Core Strategy process and Community Area Partnership. Local expectation that the scheme will go ahead as a prerequisite for the growth identified for Trowbridge.

Economic

Economic growth	**4. Amber/green**	Would improve journey time reliability along A350 (up to 5 minutes cut from peak hour journey time). Aids delivery of Ashton Park strategic site to the east of Trowbridge.
Carbon emissions	**2. Red/amber**	Increased highway network capacity is likely to induce car trips and therefore increase CO2 emissions. Embedded carbon in scheme construction.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**4. Amber/green**	Potential positive impact on regeneration of A350 corridor.
Local environment	**2. Red/amber**	New infrastructure is likely to lead to some landscape / natural environment imapcts.
Well being	**3. Amber**	Considered to have limited impacts.
Expected VfM category		Not established. Average BCR for local roads in RAC Foundation report = 4.23.

Managerial

Implementation timetable	5. 2-5 years	Tied in with development of east Trowbridge strategic site.
Public acceptability	4	Expecations are high, particularly from the local parish council(s), that the scheme will come forward to mitigate impacts of growth outlined in the Core Strategy.
Practical feasibility	5. High	Developers of the Ashton Park strategic site are confident that the scheme can be delivered. Independent work by consultants Mott MacDonald does not contradict this assessment.
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	5. High	Various reports related to Trowbridge Transport Strategy Development - reports to be used as evidence base in the Core Strategy examination in public.
Key risks	Affordability; core strategy process.	

Financial

Affordability	3	Potential addition costs on Ashton Park strategic site. However, A350 is likely to be a high priority for CIL funds.

Capital Cost (£m)	03. 5-10	Estimated cost of approximately £6m from 'Trowbridge Transport Strategy Development - Options Assessment Report'.
Revenue Costs (£m)	01. None	Although there would be ongoing maintenance.
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	3	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	2	An online improvement could be delivered for significantly less cost. Whilst not delivering the same benefits, the online proposal does alleviate some of the delays. However, this option is likely to have limited local support.
Where is funding coming from?		
Any income generated? (£m)	No	

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**A350 Westbury Bypass**
Date	
Description	Single carriageway bypass of Westbury.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	Problems: Traffic delays and queues at peak times, high traffic volumes on the A350, worsening conditions with development growth, poor air quality in the designated AQMA. Objectives: Improve air quality in town centre and journey time reliability, reduce through traffic and HGVs in town centre and help facilitate development growth.	
Scale of impact	3	Anticipated to have a moderate impact on addressing the problems and objectives outlined.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	3	Reasonable fit with national transport goals. A bypass would reduce journey times, improve journey time reliability and help support economic growth. However, a bypass may promote more car trips and increase carbon emissions. By removing traffic from the centre of Westbury it would reduce severance, promote a healthier envionment, and the reduction in traffic would also make the town more pedestrian and cycle friendly. The quality of life of people living in Westbury would be improved but the new road would have a significant negative impact on the natural environment.
Fit with other objectives	3	Reasonable fit with LTP objectives (for reasons outlined above) and a good fit with the emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy in that Westbury is identified as a potential key location for delivering economic development in Wiltshire.
Key uncertainties	Route alignment; consultation response; available funding; need to implement a transport improvement package in Westbury to secure urban realm improvements.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	2	Extensive consultation has occurred in the past in relation to several alternative routes. The proposed eastern route was taken forward to Public Inquiry in 2008 but was subsequently refused planning permission in 2009. In April 2012 there were renewed calls locally for the bypass project to be resurrected with all routes to be reconsidered. This will mean further, extensive consultation will be required.

Economic

Economic growth	**4. Amber/green**	Some journey time/reliability benefits (these issues are more related to Yarnbrook and West Ashton junctions north of Westbury). Helps support the development of the three Principal Employment Areas in Westbury, which could have wider positive economic impacts on Westbury and along the A350 corridor.
Carbon emissions	**1. Red**	Some increase in carbon emissions due to induced traffic. There will also be significant embedded carbon in the construction of the scheme.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**3. Amber**	Some limited potential positive impacts for vulnerable groups living in Westbury as a result of lower traffic volumes. Scheme would also seek to support the Core Strategy's regeneration aspirations for Westbury and the A350 corridor.
Local environment	**2. Red/amber**	Positive impacts on noise pollution and air quality particularly in the AQMA. However, there would be significant environmental and landscape impacts associated with any off-line improvement.
Well being	**4. Amber/green**	The scheme would reduce severance along the A350 in Westbury (although local traffic movements would remain) and help to encourage greater active travel (especially if implemented alongside a transport improvement package in the town).

Expected VfM category	2. High 2-4	As set out in the Inspector's report (February 2008) for the Eastern Bypass (BCR=4.362) and Far Western Route (BCR=2.556).

Managerial

Implementation timetable	6. 5-10 years	The objectives and options for a bypass scheme would need to be considered and subject to extensive consultion although some previous work could be used again.
Public acceptability	2	Previous public consultations have generally shown support for principle of reducing impacts of A350 traffic on Westbury but more divided opinion on scheme options (partly related to respondents' location).
Practical feasibility	4	Would need to seek planning permission and undertake feasibility, design and environmental assessment work for options. Existing evidence could be used as a base but further modelling would be required.
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	4	Much evidence was accumulated prior to the public inquiry on the eastern route in 2008.
Key risks	Difficulty in gaining a general consensus on a route option. Justifying that the problem in Westbury is significant enough to warrant a bypass solution.	

Financial

Affordability	1. Not affordable	
Capital Cost (£m)	05. 25-50	Cost estimate of eastern route was £34.719m (April 2009).
Revenue Costs (£m)	02. 0-5	Although there would be ongoing maintenance.
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	2	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	2	Route options.
Where is funding coming from?		
Any income generated? (£m)	No	

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**A350 Yarnbrook Relief Road**
Date	
Description	A new single carriageway link road between the A363 and A350.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	Problems: current queues and delays during the am and pm peaks particularly on the A350 approaches - worsening with development growth identified in the Core Strategy. Objective: to reduce delays on the A350 and provide access to the employment part of the Ashton Park strategic site identified in the Core Strategy.	
Scale of impact	4	Expected to significantly alleviate the identified problem.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	3	Reasonable fit with national transport goals.
Fit with other objectives	3	Reasonable fit with LTP objectives. Complements and enhances the Core Strategy strategic site allocation especially by providing access to the employment land allocation - Ashton Park Urban Extension (2,600 houses and 15 of employment land).
Key uncertainties	Land ownership / control.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	4	Consultation via Core Strategy process and Community Area Partnership. Good level of consensus that the road is required to deliver the strategic site and mitigate exisitng and future capacity problems.

Economic

Economic growth	**5. Green**	Improves function of the A350 (up to 5 minutes cut from peak hour journey time) and provides key access to employment land proposed in Core Strategy.
Carbon emissions	**2. Red/amber**	Increased network capacity may encourage induced car trips and increase CO2 emissions. Embedded carbon in scheme construction.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**4. Amber/green**	Positive impact on regeneration of A350 corridor.
Local environment	**2. Red/amber**	Positive benefits on urban environment and local community likely to be more than offset by impact of new infrastructure on landscape / natural environment.
Well being	**4. Amber/green**	Positive but limited impacts on community severance, road safety and off-peak journeys.
Expected VfM category		Not established. Average BCR for local roads in RAC Foundation report = 4.23.

Managerial

Implementation timetable	5. 2-5 years	Tied in with development of Ashton Park strategic site.
Public acceptability	4	High expectations, particularly from local parish and town councils, that the scheme will come forward to mitigate impacts of growth outlined in the Core Strategy.
Practical feasibility	5. High	Developers are confident that the scheme is practically feasible. Backed up by Wiltshire Council independent assessment.
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	5. High	Various reports as part of Trowbridge Transport Strategy Development - reports to be used as evidence at the Core Strategy examination in public.
Key risks	Land required being in the control of the developer.	

Financial

Affordability	4	Linked to development of Ashton Park strategic site. Scheme likely to come forward as a s106 access requirement for the strategic site.
Capital Cost (£m)	03. 5-10	Scheme estimated at £6m in 'Trowbridge Transport Strategy Development - Options Assessment Report'.
Revenue Costs (£m)	01. None	Although ongoing maintenance required.
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	3	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	1. Static	
Where is funding coming from?		
Any income generated? (£m)	No	

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**A36 Codford to Heytesbury Improvement**
Date	
Description	Approximately 4 kms of new single carriageway (with two rounabouts or signal controlled junctions serving the side roads) to replace esixsting sub-standard A36 route between Codford and Heytesbury.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	Poorly aligned narrow single carriageway; sub-standard junctions (B390 junction, Knook village junction and the Upton Lovell junction); poor accident record. Scheme aims to improve sub-standard junctions and improve safety and alignment of the route, reducing accident levels.	
Scale of impact	5. Significant impact	The provision of a new route with adequate road width, suitable junctions conforming to current design standards would be expected to significantly improve safety.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	2	Low fit with national transport goals - although strong links with road safety goals and targets.
Fit with other objectives	2	Low fit with LTP objectives - although particularly strong links with local road safety objectives and targets. Not well related to development growth in emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy.
Key uncertainties	Outcome of Envronmental Assessment - scheme is located almost entirely within the Cranbourne Chase and West Wiltshire AONB. Consultation with public and stakeholders. Revised cost and funding source.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	2	No recent consultation. Environmental Assessment not yet completed - scheme was rejected in 2004 by the government for understatement of the environmental impact of the scheme and what was considered a low value for money in the improvements it would provide.

Economic

Economic growth	**3. Amber**	Some positive impacts on journey times and reliability. However, scheme is primarily aimed at road safety issues not congestion/journey time improvements. Not well related to proposed development growth outlined in Core Strategy.
Carbon emissions	**2. Red/amber**	Embedded carbon in construction.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**3. Amber**	Some limited benefits for local communities.
Local environment	**1. Red**	The scheme will have negative impacts on the Cranbourne Chase and West Wiltshire AONB.
Well being	**4. Amber/green**	Strong positive benefits on road safety. More limited benefits on community severance and physical activity.
Expected VfM category	4. Low 1-1.5	BCR=1.5 and VfM='Poor' (from 'Published Eddington Evidence Base'). The scheme was rejected by the DfT in 2004 because "...the scheme's performance against the Department's appraisal criteria is not strong...".

Managerial

Implementation timetable	5. 2-5 years	Original proposed programme was: Feb 2002 (planing permission submitted) to May 2005 (open to traffic).
Public acceptability	3	The scheme is likely to draw a mixed reaction - supported for its road safety improvements but contentious because of its impacts on the AONB.
Practical feasibility	3	Previous preliminary design work undertaken in early 2000s. Need to update and undertake necessary planning and environmental processes. Other options would also need to be reconsidered.

What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	4	Preliminary design work undertaken in early 2000s.
Key risks	Value for money appraisal; Environmental Assessment; public consultation outcome.	

Financial

Affordability	1. Not affordable	Contributions from developers is unlikely as the scheme is not well related to planned development.
Capital Cost (£m)	04. 10-25	Estimated scheme cost in 2001 was £8.2m.
Revenue Costs (£m)	01. None	Although there would be ongoing maintenance costs.
Cost profile	Estimated cost related to preliminary design stage where it was judged that there were no major risks associated with the scheme costs.	
Overall cost risk	5. Low risk	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	3	Possibility to concentrate improvements at junctions only.
Where is funding coming from?		
Any income generated? (£m)	No	

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**A36 Southampton Rd Improvement**
Date	
Description	Dualling the current single carriageway section from Bourne Way Roundabout to College Roundabout; capacity improvements at Bourne Way Roundabout.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	1) Combination of narrow carriageway width and turning traffic generated from adjacent developments results in insufficient link capacity for through traffic. This causes traffic to travel slowly, with subsequent blocking back at times into College Roundabout and Bourne Way Roundabout. Congestion at College Roundabout blocks Churchill Way, which affects traffic throughout the Salisbury area. 2) Traffic generated by developments along Bourne Way has priority over A36 westbound traffic when it joins the A36 at the Bourne Way Roundabout. At times of high traffic generation along Bourne Way, the roundabout operates over capacity which can generate queues extending back along the A36.	
Scale of impact	4	The scale of impact is partly dependent on the operation of College Roundabout - the Salisbury Transport Strategy has identified that College Roundabout operates at over 70% of capacity on all arms of the junction in the morning and evening peak. However, an initial review of the junction revealed that little could be done to improve College Roundabout as it is required for u-turns.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	3	Reasonable fit with national transport goals: improves journey time reliability on key route and helps support Salisbury's role as a Principal Settlement; reduces carbon and air quality emissions from stop-start traffic but may induce additional traffic; some elements of scheme may need to be non-standard potentially causing safety issues; possible impact on cycle lane provision; improves the experience of end-to-end journeys for car, HGV and bus users.
Fit with other objectives	3	Reasonable fit with LTP objectives and emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy.
Key uncertainties	Cost estimate; required land take; need to implement sub-standard/innovative solutions; lack of realistic capacity enhancements for College Roundabout.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	3	Some general consultation on problems and options as part of development of Salisbury Transport Strategy.

Economic

Economic growth	**5. Green**	Positive impacts on journey times and reliability on congested section of key strategic route through Salisbury, a Principal Settlement where 6,060 houses and 29ha of employment land are proposed to 2026.
Carbon emissions	**3. Amber**	May be both positive (e.g. improved bus/P&R journey times and reduced stop-start traffic) and negative (e.g. induced traffic) impacts.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**3. Amber**	Potential removal/reduction of pedestrian/cycling lanes. Positive impact on sub-regional economic growth.
Local environment	**3. Amber**	Limited positive impact on air quality through better traffic flow. Potential to secure streetscape improvements.
Well being	**4. Amber/green**	Improved non-work/commute journey times and reliability. Better accessibility to local supermarkets and other retail outlets. Potential for reduced physical activity as a result of removal/reduction in pedestrian and cycling path provision.
Expected VfM category		

Managerial

Implementation timetable	5. 2-5 years	Timescale very much dependent on difficulty of land aquisition and need/opportunity to implement non-standard solution.
Public acceptability	3	No direct public consultation but some general consultation on problems and options as part of development of Salisbury Transport Strategy.
Practical feasibility	3	Considered to be largely practical but somewhat dependent on land acquisition issues and/or use of non-standard/innovative options (e.g. lane widths, tidal working).
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	3	Salisbury South Eastern Approaches Study (2002) considered a number of capacity problems and options on the A36 Southampton Road. The recent Salisbury Transport Strategy included consideration of the present and forecast problems on the A36 - a VISSIM model is available to undertake micro simulation.
Key risks	Cost estimate; land acquisition; need to use non-standard/innovative option solutions; lack of realistic capacity enhancements available for College Roundabout.	

Financial

Affordability	4	Potential for Highways Agency contribution (e.g. through 'Pinch Point' programme).
Capital Cost (£m)	03. 5-10	No cost estimate has been produced.
Revenue Costs (£m)	01. None	However, there would be ongoing maintenance costs.
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	Don't know	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	4	Potential to have '2+1' solution without any land-take; potential to have westbound bus lane between Kennel Farm and Bourne Way and/or improved cycle lane provision.
Where is funding coming from?	Potential funding from Highways Agency 'Pinch Point' programme.	
Any income generated? (£m)	No	

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**A36 Wylye Valley Relief Road**
Date	
Description	Relief road providing bypasses to the settlements of Stapleford, Stoford and South Newton on the A36.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	Levels of traffic on the A36 travelling through local communities including the villages of Stapleford, Stoford and South Newton. The level and type of traffic combined with narrow village streets cause intimdation and severence issues. The objective of the relief road is to reduce the negative impact of traffic on the local communities and provide a more suitable road for HGVs and high traffic volumes to travel along.	
Scale of impact	4	The relief road would significantly reduce the negative social and urban environmental impacts of the current traffic levels on this section of the A36. However, some traffic would still make use of the existing A36 route for access.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	2	Low fit with national transport goals and emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy. Limited fit with economic growth (e.g. in terms of supporting development growth and improving journey time reliability) and conflicts with climate change objectives. Positive impacts on road safety and community quality of life.
Fit with other objectives	2	Low fit with LTP objectives. While the scheme has some fit with freight management, road safety and community objectives it has a limited fit or conflicts with a number of other objectives.
Key uncertainties	Up-to-date costs. Funding availability. Overcoming statutory processes. Identifying a technically feasibile route.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	2	Some historic consultation has been undertaken with the community on route options.

Economic

Economic growth	**3. Amber**	Limited positive impact on journey times and limited relationship to development growth.
Carbon emissions	**1. Red**	Although a better aligned carriageway will improve fuel efficiency, overall carbon emissions will be increased through induced traffic and embedded carbon from the construction of the road itself.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**3. Amber**	The scheme provides some limited benefits for vulnerable groups in the identified communities.
Local environment	**1. Red**	While the scheme will have benefits for the communities along the existing A36, it will have a significant negative impact on the surrounding natural environment.
Well being	**4. Amber/green**	Positive impacts on community severance, road safety and non-work and non-commute journey times.
Expected VfM category	3. Medium 1.5-2	BCR=3 with a 'low' VfM - taken from 'Published Eddington Evidence Base'.

Managerial

Implementation timetable	6. 5-10 years	
Public acceptability	2	Some historic consultation on the provision of a relief road.
Practical feasibility	3	Feasible alignments have been identified in the last 10 years.
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	3	Bid submitted to the DfT as part of the Wiltshire LTP1.
Key risks	Costs; technical feasibility; statutory processes; environmental impacts and mitigation factors.	

Financial

Affordability	1. Not affordable	
Capital Cost (£m)	06. 50-100	Estimated £34m in 2003.
Revenue Costs (£m)	01. None	Although there would be ongoing maintenance costs.
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	3	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	2	There could be a number of route options.
Where is funding coming from?		
Any income generated? (£m)	No	

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**A360 Chocolate Poodle Bridge**
Date	
Description	Chocolate Poodle Bridge (a single span structure carrying the Berks & Hants rail line over the A360 north of Littleton Pannell) has a measured headroom of 14' and signed headroom of 13' 6". The scheme would lower the carriageway under the bridge by 750mm to provide a headroom of 16' 6" and a reduced speed limit of 40 mph.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	Over-height vehicles, particularly HGV's, are colliding with the bridge. HGV's exceeding the signed height are diverted via a network of adjacent minor roads through Great Cheverell causing impacts on the local community.	
Scale of impact	4	Increasing the headroom to 16' 6" allows all standard height HGV's to pass under the bridge, thus removing the requirement for a diversion route through Great Cheverell. Reallocation and potential additional increase of HGVs to A360 through Littleton Pannell (north of B3098). Local HGVs trips through Great Cheverall would remain.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	2	Low fit with national transport goals.
Fit with other objectives	2	Low fit with LTP3 objectives. Reduces impact of traffic in communities, improves road safety and encourages the efficient and sustainable distribution of freight. However, the A360 is not identified as a strategic freight route and the impacts of over-height HGVs are simply redistributed to the A360 albeit where they may have a lower scale of impact. Also, not well related to development growth in emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy.
Key uncertainties	Costs associated with diversion/lowering of statutory utilities. Impact on HGV movements along A360. Need for scheme given implementation of advisory over-height signing scheme in Devizes area.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	3	Public consultation undertaken in 2012 on alternative route options for over-height HGVs (see Cabinet Member report reference HT-009-12). Likely opposition from Littleton Panell residents on A360 (north of B3098) to implementation of carriageway lowering scheme.

Economic

Economic growth	**3. Amber**	Minor positive impact on overall journey times and a reduced level of incidents (e.g. bridge strikes).
Carbon emissions	**3. Amber**	Minor positive impact on carbon emissions through shortening of trip distances.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**3. Amber**	Benefits for vulnerable groups in Great Cheverell of reduced HGV trips and intimidation, will be partly offset by increased impacts through reallocation and potential increase of HGVs on A360.
Local environment	**3. Amber**	Uncertain balance of impacts between relevant communities.
Well being	**4. Amber/green**	Positive impacts on community severance through Great Cheverell will be partly offset by increased impacts through reallocation and potential increase of HGVs on A360.
Expected VfM category		Not established.

Managerial

Implementation timetable	4. 1-2 years	

Public acceptability	3	Public consultation undertaken in 2012 on alternative route options for over-height HGVs (see Cabinet Member report reference HT-009-12). Likely opposition from Littleton Panell residents on A360 (north of B3098) to implementation of carriageway lowering scheme.
Practical feasibility	2	A number of statutory utilties and other services would need to be diverted or lowered.
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	3	The Council's previous term consultant, Mouchel, produced a report 'Feasibility Study - Carriageway Lowering Options (Ref: 1029551/R/002) in 2011 which set out two options - one to lower the carriageway by 300mm (to 15'0") and the other by 750mm (to 16'6"). Mouchel concluded that if deemed financially viable, Option 2 should be taken forward for implementation.
Key risks	Costs associated with diversion/lowering of statutory utilities. Impact on HGV movements along A360. Need for scheme given implementation of advisory over-height signinf scheme in Devizes area.	

Financial

Affordability	3	
Capital Cost (£m)	02. 0-5	Mouchel estimated the following costs: Option 1 - £909,000; Option 2 - £989,000.
Revenue Costs (£m)	01. None	Although there would be some ongoing maintenance costs.
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	2	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	1. Static	
Where is funding coming from?		
Any income generated? (£m)	No	

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**Amesbury Transport Package**
Date	
Description	Walking/cycling network and facility improvements; public transport enhancements; traffic and demand management measures; interchange enhancements; selective road improvements; and smarter choice measures.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	Traffic growth in and around the town impacts on economic growth, road safety, and community severance, and inhibits the development of walking and cycling. The objectives of the package are to improve traffic flow around the town, develop public transport, develop walking and cycling routes, improve access to the A303 and linkages to Stonehenge to take advantage of tourism opportunities, and the creation of more parking with linkages to other modes of transport.	
Scale of impact	3	Anticipated to encourage greater sustainable local trips with resulting benefits to health, air quality, severance and public realm. However, likely that many car based local trips especially to surrounding settlements would remain.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	5. High	Generally an excellent fit with national transport goals
Fit with other objectives	5. High	Generally an excellent fit with LTP3 transport objectives and emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy. However, somewhat weaker relationship with economic objectives given relative scale of proposed growth to 2026 (2,100 houses (with 1,300 remaining to be identified) and 7ha of employment land). Some synergy with City Deal proposals given nearby military communities).
Key uncertainties	Accurate cost estimate and ongoing revenue costs. Local residents 'buy in' to behavioural change and traffic/demand management measures.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	2	No specific consultation undertaken although aspiration for smarter choices measures in community plan.

Economic

Economic growth	**4. Amber/green**	No significant congestion or journey time issues identified. Delivery of package would help facilitiate proposed development growth. Measures should also assist community aspiration to market the town and attract tourism overspill.
Carbon emissions	**4. Amber/green**	Carbon emissions would be expected to decrease, although the impact may be relatively limited dependant on the extent to which demand management measures and bus service improvements can be implemented.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**5. Green**	The promotion of sustainable transport options should benefit vulnerable groups e.g. children, the elderly, etc.
Local environment	**4. Amber/green**	Limited positive air quality (no identified AQMA) and noise impacts. Improvements to street scene and urban environment will aid community plan goals.
Well being	**4. Amber/green**	Positive impact on community severance, physical activity from increased walking and cycling, passive crime surveillance and access to key facilites. However, there is the possibility of a negative impact on road safety due to there being more cyclists on the roads.

Expected VfM category	1. Very High >4	The report on 'The Effects of Smarter Choices Programmes in the Sustainable Travel Towns' identifies that packages of smarter choices could give a congestion-only BCR of 4.5 and an overall BCR of around 9.

Managerial

Implementation timetable	5. 2-5 years	Implementation could be undertaken over a variable timeframe.
Public acceptability	3	No direct consultation although community plan consultation has identified general support for type of measures in package.
Practical feasibility	3	Generally employs tried and tested measures (e.g. in DfT smarter choices demonstration towns) although not extensively tested locally.
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	2	Aspirations for implementation of similar type of measures in community plan. Wider evidence available nationally (e.g. DfT's smarter choices demonstration towns). Some baseline data but no detailed analysis has been undertaken locally.
Key risks	Degree of local appetite for behavioural change and traffic/demand management measures. Ongoing revenue costs (e.g. commercial viability of bus services).	

Financial

Affordability	3	Ability to implement package options over time. However, issues regarding (ongoing) revenue costs.
Capital Cost (£m)	02. 0-5	No package cost estimate produced.
Revenue Costs (£m)	02. 0-5	Smarter choices measures and supported bus services.
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	3	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	5. Dynamic	Various package options.
Where is funding coming from?	Potentially from CIL and LTP; existing and future s106 agreements.	
Any income generated? (£m)	Don't know	

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**Avebury Bypass**
Date	
Description	Provision of an A4361 bypass for Avebury village in order to reduce traffic levels and congestion, and prevent the negative environmental and social impacts of traffic on the local community and the World Heritage Site (WHS).

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	The dominance of vehicle traffic through the village of Avebury, which causes intimidation to the local community and visitors to the WHS. The level of HGVs travelling on the route is also identified as a particular issue as it causes damage to the value of the WHS. The objective is to remove traffic from the community of Avebury and the WHS.	
Scale of impact	4	The provision of a bypass around Avebury would remove the majority of traffic that travels through Avebury but the route would still be used for access and local traffic including some freight and agricultural vehicles.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	2	Low fit with national transport goals. A bypass promotes road safety in that it reduces traffic travelling through the village which attracts 250,000 visitors per annum. However, the scheme is not in line with national objectives on the promotion of sustainable transport, carbon emission reduction or protection of the local environment. The A4361 is not a strategic route and a bypass is unlikely to have significant economic growth benefits. It may however increase visitor levels to the WHS and there is a need to balance conservation of the monumnent and the economic benefits of visitors to the site.
Fit with other objectives	2	Low fit with LTP objectives. The scheme does not promote economic growth, sustainable transport or encourage reduced use of the private car, and would have a significant landscape and environmental impact. However it would improve pedestrian accessibility and reduce traffic intimidation within Avebury. Localised benefits are likely be achieved in relation to road safety, air quality, pedestrian and cycle access, and an increase in the movements of cycle and pedestrians around the site. However, the overall scheme increases carbon emissions and encourages use of unsustainable modes.
Key uncertainties	Route costs, alignment and feasibility. Likely environmental impact of the scheme. Availability of funding.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	1. Little	Little or no consultation has been undertaken and the scheme is likely to be very controversial.

Economic

Economic growth	**3. Amber**	While the scheme may improve journey times and variability, the economic benefits are limited as the A4361 is not a strategic route and is not well related to local economic development, although it may improve links to Swindon. Reduced traffic and congestion may encourage more visitors and tourists to Avebury.
Carbon emissions	**1. Red**	The scheme may encourage additional car journeys. There will also be significant contruction requirements with embedded carbon.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**3. Amber**	Limited beneficial impacts for vulnerable groups - they may be encouraged to access the village centre and the WHS as a result of reduced traffic on the A3461.
Local environment	**1. Red**	The construction of a bypass will give rise to significant negative impacts on the landscape and natural environment - the scale of impact will depend on the alignment chosen. Environmental benefits are likley to be restricted to Avebury village and the WHS.

Well being	**4. Amber/green**	Likely to be a positive impact on Avebury village for the local residents and visitors to WHS in terms of reduced severance, less threat and intimidation from heavy traffic, and improved pedestrian and cycle access around the village and WHS.
Expected VfM category		Not established. Average BCR for local road scheme = 4.23 (from RAC Foundation report 'Rates of Return on Public Spending on Transport' (June 2009).

Managerial

Implementation timetable	6. 5-10 years	
Public acceptability	2	No formal consultation undertaken - scheme may be acceptable to the local community of Avebury but controversial amongst wider stakeholders.
Practical feasibility	2	No detailed feasibility or alignment investigation.
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	1. Low	No detailed evidence base.
Key risks	Public and stakeholder opposition to a road scheme in the vicinity of the WHS. Lack of funding to implement the scheme. Feasible and acceptable route alignments. Scale, nature and extent of environmental impact.	

Financial

Affordability	1. Not affordable	High scheme costs and no developer funding available.
Capital Cost (£m)	05. 25-50	Cost estimate based on average cost of a single carriageway bypass of £10.6m per mile in 2006 - see http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200506/cmhansrd/vo061030/text/61030w0008.htm.
Revenue Costs (£m)	01. None	Although there would be ongoing maintenance costs
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	2	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	2	Potential for alternative options for improvements to traffic management and mitigation as an alternative to a bypass scheme. Avebury Visitor and Traffic Management Group is investigating opportunities for parking management, pedestrian and cycle access Improvements, and a sustainable transport package to reduce the impact of traffic within Avebury.
Where is funding coming from?		
Any income generated? (£m)	No	

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**Bradford North Curve**
Date	
Description	Reinstating the single-track chord between Bradford West and North junctions. Anticipated to involve four switch ends and associated signalling plus a short section of plain line.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	To provide a strategic alternative rail route between Bath and Chippenham (and Bristol-London) when the route via Box is closed.	
Scale of impact	5. Significant impact	Achieves identified objective.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	3	Reasonable fit with national transport goals - e.g. reducing delays; some reduction of carbon dioxide emissions; fits with 'seven day railway' initiative.
Fit with other objectives	3	Reasonable fit with LTP objectives. Local impact limited to resilience of Chippenham-Bristol services unless further rail service options are introduced.
Key uncertainties	Technical assessment; accurate cost estimate.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	4	Included as a stakeholder aspiration in the Great Western RUS. Wide public and stakeholder consultation is not considered vital given nature of the proposal.

Economic

Economic growth	**3. Amber**	Benefit accrues only during diversions (order of magnitude 150 days through electrification plus around 20 days per year thereafter). A greater impact would come if scheme utilised by new rail services.
Carbon emissions	**3. Amber**	Limited impacts - more reliable journeys may encourage modal shift; some embedded carbon in construction works.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**6. No Impact**	
Local environment	**3. Amber**	Some limited air quality and noise benefits through the reduced need for subsitute bus services.
Well being	**3. Amber**	Journey time/reliability benefits for passengers on diversion/engineering days.
Expected VfM category	3. Medium 1.5-2	Based on average BCR of 2.83 for a heavy rail scheme from RAC Foundation report adjusted to reflect scheme circumstances.

Managerial

Implementation timetable	6. 5-10 years	No current assessment studies (e.g. GRIP process). However, ideally, should be implemented to fit in with Great Western main line electrification programme.
Public acceptability	4	Included as a stakeholder aspiration in the Great Western RUS. Largely a non-controversial scheme.
Practical feasibility	3	Need to establish detailed technical feasibility e.g. at interface between old/new signalling.
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	1. Low	No assessment undertaken by Network Rail.
Key risks	Not meeting the Great Western main line electrification works programme; technical implementation at interface between old/new signalling; cost estimate.	

Financial

Affordability	3	Expectation that a significant part of the funding would come from the rail industry.

Capital Cost (£m)	03. 5-10	Anticipated to be made up of one crossover, two single switches and short connecting line, with associated signalling.
Revenue Costs (£m)	01. None	
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	2	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	2	
Where is funding coming from?	Scheme may attract funding from Network Rail / High Level Output Statement / Train Operating Company.	
Any income generated? (£m)	No	

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**Bradford on Avon Bypass**
Date	
Description	A single carriageway bypass of Bradford on Avon with a river and railway crossing.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	Traffic delays and queues at peak times; high traffic volumes through the historic centre of Bradford on Avon; air quality in the AQMA; community severance; intimidation for vulnerable road users.	
Scale of impact	3	While the bypass would remove the majority of through traffic from Bradford on Avon, significant existing local traffic (approx. 60% of total traffic) would remain and the additional highway capacity may induce other local car trips especially at peak times.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	2	Low fit with national transport goals. While improving journey times and reducing the impact of traffic in Bradford on Avon, the option would not be well related to the Government's national transport goals on economic growth, reducing carbon emissions, encouraging healthy alternatives and protecting the local environment. Moreover, the option does not make better use of existing infrastructure and there may be some adverse impact on existing rail and bus services.
Fit with other objectives	2	Low fit with LTP3 objectives and emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy - option is not on a key route and not well related to significant development growth (510 houses and 2-3ha of employment land to 2026); positive impacts (e.g. reduced traffic delays and an improved public realm) are offset by a number of negative impacts (e.g. on carbon emissions and landscape).
Key uncertainties	Degree of positive impact on delays and journey times; level of abstraction from bus and rail services; accurate cost estimate; landscape impacts.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	1. Little	Little or no consultation has been undertaken and the option is likely to be very controversial.

Economic

Economic growth	**3. Amber**	While the option should improve journey times and variability, it does not improve accessibility options nor is it well related to development growth (relative to growth levels in other Wiltshire towns).
Carbon emissions	**1. Red**	The option is likely to encourage additional road trips especially by car and possibly abstract from parallel bus and rail services. There are also significant construction requirements with embedded carbon.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**3. Amber**	The potential positive impacts for vulnerable groups in Bradford on Avon as a result of lower traffic volumes and therefore less intimidation may be partly offset by the potential negative impact on parallel bus and rail services.
Local environment	**2. Red/amber**	The negative impact on the local natural environment is only partially offest by the benefits in Bradford on Avon because a significant amount of local traffic will remain.
Well being	**3. Amber**	Positive impact on severance and use of active modes in Bradford on Avon is lessened by the remaining significant local traffic and the potential impact on existing bus and train services as a result of abstraction.
Expected VfM category		Not established. Average BCR for local road scheme = 4.23 (from RAC Foundation report 'Rates of Return on Public Spending on Transport' (June 2009).

Managerial

Implementation timetable	6. 5-10 years	
Public acceptability	2	No recent consultation on scheme. Necessary consultation process would likely be long and difficult.
Practical feasibility	2	Need to model scheme and take through statutory requirements - EIA could be significant.
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	2	No modelling undertaken. Some relevant information derived from Historic Core Zone and AQMA work.
Key risks	Public opposition; costs associated with the river and railway line crossings; environmental impacts; planning and orders processes.	

Financial

Affordability	1. Not affordable	Relatively high scheme cost and limited local developer contributions available. Not well related to national and local objectives.
Capital Cost (£m)	05. 25-50	Cost estimate based on average cost of single carriageway scheme of £10.6m per mile (see http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200506/cmhansrd/vo061030/text/61030w0008.htm).
Revenue Costs (£m)	01. None	Although there would be ongoing maintenance costs.
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	2	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	2	Route options.
Where is funding coming from?		
Any income generated? (£m)	No	

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**Bradford on Avon Transport Package**
Date	
Description	A package of: walking/cycling network and facility improvements; public transport service and facility enhancements; traffic and demand management measures; selective road improvements; interchange enhancements; and smarter choice measures.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	High traffic flows; peak time congestion; air pollution; community severance and road user intimidation from traffic; impact on historic fabric; high level of out-commuting; community desire to be carbon neutral by 2050.	
Scale of impact	3	Anticipated to encourage more sustainable local trips. However, many car based local and through trips would remain.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	5. High	Generally an excellent fit with the national transport goals - weaker fit with economic goal given status of local road network, employment numbers in town and level of future development growth.
Fit with other objectives	5. High	Generally an excellent fit with LTP3 objectives and emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy. However, as with the national transport goals, the fit is somewhat weaker in relation to the economic objectives given Bradford on Avon's local circumstances (e.g. relatively limited proposed future development growth of 510 houses and 2 to 3ha of employment land to 2026 in Core Strategy).
Key uncertainties	Degree of local appetite for behavioural change and traffic/demand management measures. Accurate cost estimate and ongoing revenue costs.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	3	Consultation has taken place on the Historic Core Zone (HCZ) project and there seems to be support for the promotion of sustainable transport options. Ties in with the community's aspiration to be carbon neutral by 2050.

Economic

Economic growth	**4. Amber/green**	Measures to encourage and support sustainable modes (e.g.increased walking and cycling) may lead to an increase in some journey times. However, this is likely to be offset by reduced peak time congestion and the support for sustainable development growth albeit at a relatively low level.
Carbon emissions	**4. Amber/green**	While carbon emissions would be expected to decrease, the impact may be relatively limited given the topography of the town and the extent to which demand management measures and bus services can be implemented.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**5. Green**	The promotion of sustainable transport options and a corresponding reduction in traffic and congestion should benefit children, the elderly, people on low income etc. However, overall, Bradford on Avon is a relatively affluent town.
Local environment	**5. Green**	Beneficial impacts on air quality, noise and the setting of the historic core of the town.
Well being	**4. Amber/green**	Positive impacts on community severance, physical activity and passive crime surveillance. Some possible negative impacts on road accidents (as a result of more people cycling) and journey times (as a result of the prioritisation of the town's highways for pedestrians and cyclists).
Expected VfM category	1. Very High >4	The report on 'The Effects of Smarter Choices Programmes in the Sustainable Travel Towns' identifies that packages of smarter choices could give a congestion-only BCR of 4.5 and an overall BCR of around 9.

Managerial

Implementation timetable	5. 2-5 years	Implementation could be undertaken over a variable timeframe.
Public acceptability	3	While other consultations have demonstrated support for some of the measures, the actual implementation of the package and the behavioural change it requires may raise a significant number of objections.
Practical feasibility	4	Generally employs tried and tested measures (e.g. in DfT smarter choices demonstration towns).
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	3	Evidence from development of the HCZ and DfT's smarter choices demonstration towns.
Key risks	Degree of local appetite for behavioural change and traffic/demand management measures. Ongoing revenue costs.	

Financial

Affordability	3	Ability to implement package options over time. However, issues regarding (on-going) revenue costs (e.g. for personalised travel planning and bus services).
Capital Cost (£m)	02. 0-5	No package cost estimate produced.
Revenue Costs (£m)	02. 0-5	Personalised travel planning, publicity, supporting bus services and maintenance of capital elements.
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	3	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	5. Dynamic	Several different packages of measures could be implemented.
Where is funding coming from?	Potentially from CIL and LTP; existing and future s106 agreements.	
Any income generated? (£m)	Don't know	

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**Bumpers Farm Ind. Est. A350 Link**
Date	
Description	A new link road from the Bumpers Farm Industrial Estate to West Cepen Way on the A350 Chippenham Bypass comprising 50m of new carriageway, approximately 200m of upgraded existing highway, and a junction with the A350

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	The single indirect access to/from the A350 from Bumpers Farm Industrial Estate and congestion on the A350 Bristol Road roundabout are believed to deter businesses/developers from expanding/locating on the estate. The aim of the scheme is to improve access to Bumpers Farm Ind Est and make it more attractive for businesses to expand/locate there which will help to improve the occupancy of the units.	
Scale of impact	2	While the scheme would improve access to Bumpers Farm, it would mainly benefit car commuters at peak periods. However, the scheme may cause additional congestion on the A350 which may offset any benefits.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	2	Low fit with national transport goals. While the scheme will improve access to the industrial estate, it may lead to increased delays on the A350 strategic route. The scheme may also further encourage car commuting to the site.
Fit with other objectives	2	Low fit with LTP3 objectives. LInks in with the emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy which identifies the Bumpers Farm Ind Est as a Principal Employment Area. However, the scheme would contravene a Core Strategy policy of not having direct accesses onto the PRN. The addition of a new junction may also increase the number of incidents on this stretch of the A350.
Key uncertainties	That a new link road would attract new businesses to the Bumpers Farm Ind Est and reduce the number of vacant premises. The impact of the junction on the A350 has not been modelled and evaluated.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	1. Little	It is understood that the SWLEP supports the scheme but no recent public consultation has taken place.

Economic

Economic growth	**3. Amber**	The new link may improve connectivity and journey time reliability to the Bumpers Farm Ind Est but may increase congestion and journey time reliability for travellers on the strategic A350 route
Carbon emissions	**3. Amber**	Possible slight reduction in CO2 emissions due to shorter trip lengths for businesses and commuters on Bumpers Farm. However, the road may encourage more car trips and the construction of the road will result in embedded carbon.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**3. Amber**	Limited impact in this area with a minimal benefit to the regeneration of Bumpers Farm
Local environment	**3. Amber**	Possible slight reduction in air pollution offset by degradation of natural/public realm due to construction of short length of new road
Well being	**3. Amber**	End-to-end travel time and cost of journeys may decrease but the risk of accidents may increase slightly
Expected VfM category		Not established. Average BCR for local road scheme = 4.23 (from RAC Foundation report 'Rates of Return on Public Spending on Transport' (June 2009).

Managerial

Implementation timetable	4. 1-2 years	

Public acceptability	2	No consultation has been undertaken.
Practical feasibility	4	Unlikely to be any technical barriers
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	1. Low	Little or no supporting evidence
Key risks	Scheme may not improve the economic fortunes of Bumpers Farm but may increase congestion on the A350 strategic route.	

Financial

Affordability	4	
Capital Cost (£m)	02. 0-5	No scheme cost estimate produced.
Revenue Costs (£m)	02. 0-5	Ongoing maintenance costs
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	4	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	1. Static	
Where is funding coming from?	Possibly CIL funds.	
Any income generated? (£m)	No	

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**Calne Eastern Bypass**
Date	
Description	Bypass on the eastern edge of Calne.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	To reduce town centre traffic and congestion levels, and improve local air quality.	
Scale of impact	3	While the scheme would help reduce town centre traffic levels and congestion, local traffic flows would remain.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	2	Low fit with national transport goals. While improving journey times and reducing the impact of traffic in Calne town centre, the option would not be well related to goals related to economic growth, reducing carbon emissions, encouraging healthy alternatives and protecting the local environment. Moreover, the option does not make better use of existing infrastructure.
Fit with other objectives	2	Low fit with LTP3 objectives - positive impacts (e.g. reduced congestion and an improved public realm) are offset by a number of negative impacts (e.g. on carbon emissions and landscape).
Key uncertainties	Accurate scheme cost; funding source (the scale of housing allocation for Calne is not of an appropriate scale to fund the scheme), environmental impacts.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	2	In a Calne Town Council consultation, 48% of respondents were in favour of an eastern bypass.

Economic

Economic growth	**3. Amber**	Scheme will improve journey times and variability. However, the removal of non-local traffic could have an effect on commerce in the town centre.
Carbon emissions	**1. Red**	The scheme is likely to encourage additional car trips. There are also significant construction requirements with embedded carbon.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**3. Amber**	Some potential positive impacts for vulnerable groups in Calne town centre as a result of lower through traffic volumes.
Local environment	**2. Red/amber**	While there are positive air quality (identifed AQMA) and noise benefits, these are offset by significant landscape impacts.
Well being	**3. Amber**	Severence within the town should be reduced which may increase physical activity suach as cycling and walking.
Expected VfM category		Not established. Average BCR for local road scheme = 4.23 (from RAC Foundation report 'Rates of Return on Public Spending on Transport' (June 2009).

Managerial

Implementation timetable	6. 5-10 years	
Public acceptability	2	Calne Town Council recorded 48% in favour of an eastern bypass through a local consultation.
Practical feasibility	3	Standard bypass scheme. However, full modelling and environmental assessment would be required.
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	2	Some background and baseline information but no detailed feasibility or preparatory work has been undertaken.
Key risks	Cost, funding source, environmental impact.	

Financial

Affordability	1. Not affordable	Current planned housing allocation is insufficient to fund delivery of scheme.
Capital Cost (£m)	05. 25-50	No scheme cost estimate produced. Average cost of a single carriageway scheme in 2006 was of £10.6m per mile (see http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200506/cmhansrd/vo061030/text/61030w0008.htm).
Revenue Costs (£m)	01. None	Although there would be a requirement for ongoing maintenance.
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	2	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	2	Alignment options.
Where is funding coming from?		
Any income generated? (£m)	No	

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**Calne Transport Package**
Date	
Description	A package of: walking/cycling network and facility improvements; public transport service and facility enhancements; traffic and demand management measures; selective road improvements; interchange enhancements; and smarter choice measures.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	Traffic growth and delays in the town centre impacting on economic growth and journey time reliability; air quality in the town centre (there is an AQMA); concerns about road safety and community severance due to traffic levels; walking and cycling access to schools and shops; need to improve local bus services; need to encourage use of the Northern Distributor Road (NDR) to relieve congestion in Curzon Street and the rest of the town centre.	
Scale of impact	3	Package would encourage more sustainable local trips and appropriate traffic management measures would encourage use of the NDR, easing congestion in the town centre. However, given local circumstances, it is likely that a large number of trips would still be made by car.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	5. High	Generally excellent fit with national transport goals.
Fit with other objectives	5. High	Generally excellent fit with LTP3 objectives and emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy. However, there is a somewhat weaker relationship with economic objectives given proposed development growth levels to 2026 (1,240 houses (although only 370 remain to be identified)).
Key uncertainties	Public's appetite for behavioural change measures and necessary traffic/demand management measures. Ongoing revenue costs.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	2	Limited public engagement on certain measures but no consultation on package as a whole.

Economic

Economic growth	**4. Amber/green**	Improving accessibility and travel options should reduce delays in peak periods. However, increases in prioritisation for pedestrians, cyclists and buses may affect other journey times. Package would help support proposed development growth.
Carbon emissions	**4. Amber/green**	The promotion of public transport, smarter choices, cycling and walking should all have a positive impact on reducing CO2 emissions, especially if complementary demand management measures promote a change in behaviour. This will also depend on the extent to which sustainable transport infrastructure and bus services can be delivered.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**5. Green**	The promotion of alternative modes of transport with the resultant reduction in traffic and congestion should benefit those without access to a car such as young people, the elderly and people on low incomes.
Local environment	**5. Green**	The package should help improve air quality (identified AQMA), reduce noise and and improve the public realm environment.
Well being	**4. Amber/green**	Package gives rise to less severance, more physical activity, although less traffic may lead to higher speeds and increased conflict between vehicles and pedestrians /cyclists.
Expected VfM category	1. Very High >4	The report on 'The Effects of Smarter Choices Programmes in the Sustainable Travel Towns' identifies that packages of smarter choices could give a congestion-only BCR of 4.5 and an overall BCR of around 9.

Managerial

Implementation timetable	5. 2-5 years	Implementation could be undertaken over a variable timeframe.
Public acceptability	3	While other consultations have demonstrated support for some measures, no consultation has taken place on the package as a whole - some of the elements, such as demand management and behaviour change measures, may not be universally supported.
Practical feasibility	4	All measures should be feasible as they are tried and tested nationally if not locally.
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	2	Evidence from similar projects elsewhere in the UK demonstrates significant modal shift along with associated positive impacts on transport emissions. However, little or no detailed analysis has been undertaken locally. Evidence from similar projects elsewhere in the UK demonstrates significant modal shift along with associated positive impacts on transport emissions. However, little or no detailed analysis has been undertaken locally.
Key risks	Degree of local appetite for behavioural change and traffic/demand management measures. Ongoing revenue costs.	

Financial

Affordability	3	Ability to implement package options over time. However, issues regarding (ongoing) revenue costs.
Capital Cost (£m)	02. 0-5	No package cost estimate produced.
Revenue Costs (£m)	02. 0-5	Individualised travel planning and public transport set-up and ongoing costs.
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	3	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	5. Dynamic	Various package options would be available.
Where is funding coming from?	Potentially CIL, LTP, etc.	
Any income generated? (£m)	Don't know	02. 0-5

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**Chippenham Station Third Platform**	
Date		
Description	Reinstating 3rd platform at Chippenham station with signalling to allow trains to reverse direction.	

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	Provides a strategic alternative rail route between Trowbridge and Bath when the route via Limpley Stoke is closed. Facilitates a backup rail freight route for 9'6" containers between Southampton and Bristol or Wentloog (South Wales). Can help facilitate new passenger routes - Westbury-Chippenham-Corsham-Bath, etc.	
Scale of impact	2	
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	3	Reasonable fit with national transport goals.
Fit with other objectives	3	Reasonable fit with LTP3 objectives.
Key uncertainties	Cost and ability to schedule work with other line upgrades.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	3	No direct consultation or stakeholder engagement but unlikely to be publicy controversial.

Economic

Economic growth	**3. Amber**	Positive but limited impacts on connectivity, reliability and resilience issues.
Carbon emissions	**3. Amber**	Limited impacts - more reliable journeys may encourage modal shift; some embedded carbon in construction works.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**3. Amber**	Additional platform facility may benefit vulnerable users.
Local environment	**3. Amber**	Potential but limited positive impacts on air quality, noise and the urban realm if measure encourages modal shift from car to rail.
Well being	**3. Amber**	Possible positive but limited impacts on non-work related journeys and accessibility to key locations.
Expected VfM category	3. Medium 1.5-2	Based on Great Western RUS appraisal.

Managerial

Implementation timetable	6. 5-10 years	
Public acceptability	3	No direct consultation or stakeholder engagement but unlikely to be publicy controversial.
Practical feasibility	3	Initial high level assessment in Great Western RUS.
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	2	Initial high level assessment Great Western RUS.
Key risks	Constructing a business case requires co-ordination of several potential beneficiaries from the scheme.	

Financial

Affordability	2	
Capital Cost (£m)	04. 10-25	Estimted costs of £13m including optimism adjustment from Great Western RUS.
Revenue Costs (£m)	01. None	
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	2	

Other costs	

Commercial

Flexibility of option	2	There is scope for adjusting the scale / flexibility of the track layout and signalling.
Where is funding coming from?		
Any income generated? (£m)	Yes	02. 0-5 Potential additional passenger services.

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**Chippenham Transport Package**
Date	
Description	A package of infrastructure and promotional measures to encourage the uptake of sustainable transport modes, including improvements to the walking and cycling network and measures to increase the use of public transport services. Also to include measures to relieve congestion such as traffic and demand management schemes and selected road improvements.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	Peak time congestion on key routes in and around Chippenham. Poor connectivity of public transport, walking and cycling links between the town centre and key destinations. Significant planned development growth is likely to lead to increased congestion.	
Scale of impact	4	Anticipated that the package of measures would encourage more sustainable trips and other measures would help to relieve congestion and the related disbenefits of poor air quality and journey time delays.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	5. High	Excellent fit with national transport goals. The package relates well to many of the Government's transport goals on economic growth, reducing carbon emissions, encouraging healthy alternatives and protecting the local enviornment.
Fit with other objectives	5. High	Excellent fit with LTP3 objectives and emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy given significant proposed growth to 2026 (4,000 houses and 26.5ha of employment land).
Key uncertainties	The degree of public uptake for sustainable modes of transport and traffic/demand management measures. Accurate cost estimates for infrastructure requirements.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	3	Some initial work has been undertaken on developing a package of measures for the town - key stakeholders have been involved with some initial consultation.

Economic

Economic growth	**5. Green**	Improved journey times and reliability. The package will also assist with facilitating significant development growth.
Carbon emissions	**4. Amber/green**	Sustainable transport and traffic congestion measures should help to reduce carbon emissions.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**5. Green**	The promotion of sustainable transport measures should help to improve accessibility for vulnerable groups. The package should also have a positive impact on regeneration in the area and along the A350 corridor.
Local environment	**4. Amber/green**	Likely beneficial impacts on air quality (although no identified AQMA), noise and the urban environment through reduced traffic levels.
Well being	**4. Amber/green**	The uptake of more sustainable modes of transport such as walking and cycling should help to improve health and well being. Non-work and non-commute trips should be easier and quicker. Severance may be reduced by improving pedestrian accessibility.
Expected VfM category	1. Very High >4	The report on 'The Effects of Smarter Choices Programmes in the Sustainable Travel Towns' identifies that packages of smarter choices could give a congestion-only BCR of 4.5 and an overall BCR of around 9.

Managerial

Implementation timetable	6. 5-10 years	Whilst some of the sustainable transport measures could be introduced within a shorter time frame, improvements to road junctions and larger infrastructure schemes are likely to take longer. Programme would also need to be related to implementation of future development growth.

Public acceptability	4	Initial consultation has shown some degree of support for the measures proposed.
Practical feasibility	3	The promotion of sustainable modes is considered to be fairly straightforward. However, the design of new infrastructure measures may be more difficult, depending on the nature of the scheme proposed.
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	3	Some intial high level transport modelling has been undertaken. There is also evidence available from the DfT's Sustainable Travel Demonstration Towns programme.
Key risks	Public opposition to the implementation of measures which may reprioritise road space and/or seek changes in travel behaviour.	

Financial

Affordability	4	CIL associated with proposed significant local development growth.
Capital Cost (£m)	05. 25-50	Currently estimated at some £30m.
Revenue Costs (£m)	02. 0-5	Ongoing revenue funding for smarter choices and possible subsidy support for bus services.
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	3	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	5. Dynamic	Several different packages of measures could be implemented.
Where is funding coming from?	Potentially from CIL and LTP; existing and future s106 agreements.	
Any income generated? (£m)	Don't know	

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**Churchfields Ind Est A36 Link**
Date	
Description	To provide a new road link from Churchfields Industrial Estate to the A36 Wilton Road by widening Ashfield Road and improving the existing railway tunnel.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	Poor access for HGVs and other vehicles to the Churchfields Industrial Estate which impacts on the economic viability of local businesses and causes extraneous journeys and congestion on other sections of the highway network.	
Scale of impact	4	Would address the problem of access to the industrial estate but with significant undesireable impacts.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	2	Low fit with national transport goals.
Fit with other objectives	2	Low fit with LTP objectives and emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy - Churchfields Ind. Est. is identified for redevelopment into a mixed-use residential led scheme.
Key uncertainties	Community and environmental impacts; redevelopment proposal for Ind. Est.; cost estimate.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	1. Little	No consultation has taken place and scheme is likely to be highly contentious

Economic

Economic growth	**4. Amber/green**	Will improve access to the existing industrial estate.
Carbon emissions	**3. Amber**	Mixed impacts - reduced journey lengths; potentially induced traffic; and embedded carbon in scheme construction.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**3. Amber**	Potential benefits for vulnerable groups on existing access routes but adverse impact for community in vicinity of scheme.
Local environment	**2. Red/amber**	Will bring about noise and air quality benefits on current access routes, some of which are in an AQMA. However, the scheme will have a significant negative impact on the local environment in the vicinity of the scheme.
Well being	**2. Red/amber**	Severance and accident rates may improve on the current access routes but severance and loss of amenity will occur on the new/improved link road which is in a residential area
Expected VfM category		Not established. Average BCR for local road scheme = 4.23 (from RAC Foundation report 'Rates of Return on Public Spending on Transport' (June 2009).

Managerial

Implementation timetable	6. 5-10 years	Would involve the construction of an improved rail crossing (tunnel), planning permission and possibly compulsory purchase and demolition of land and property.
Public acceptability	1. Low	No recent consultation has taken place on the scheme. Likely to be supported by business but opposed by affected local residents
Practical feasibility	2	Technical problem of enhanced rail crossing (expanded tunnel) and demolition of property.
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	1. Low	Little evidence available.
Key risks	Redevelopment proposals for Churchfields Industrial Estate in Core Strategy. Likely to be problems enlarging the rail crossing and many statutory hurdles involved with obtaining planning permssion, CPOs, and demolition of property.	

Financial

Affordability	2	
Capital Cost (£m)	04. 10-25	Estimate based on professional judgement.
Revenue Costs (£m)	01. None	Although there would be ongoing maintenance costs.
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	1.High risk	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	1. Static	Road widening on restricted alignment.
Where is funding coming from?		
Any income generated? (£m)	No	

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**Corsham Station**
Date	
Description	Construction of a new railway station with two 125 metre platforms, a footbridge, kiosk, car park and cycle storage.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	Lack of easily available rail option; increased road-based trips and journey times particularly into Bath and Chippenham leading to congestion and air quality issues; local development growth including at MoD site.	
Scale of impact	3	Improved journey times, particularly at peak hours, for users. Improved sustainable transport option for residents, visitors and MoD staff. Limited overall impact on traffic volumes and journey times given typical rural rail mode share. Relatively low level of development growth in local area.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	4	Good fit with national transport goals. Likely negative impact on existing parallel bus services.
Fit with other objectives	4	Good fit with LTP3 objectives. Also a good fit with City Deal proposal given location of MOD Corsham site. Included as an element in the Bristol Metro proposals.
Key uncertainties	Lack of a stopping train service; current accurate cost estimate.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	4	Little recent direct consultation on scheme details. However, strong historic local support for proposal which is also included in emerging Core Strategy. Included as stakeholder aspiration in Great Western RUS.

Economic

Economic growth	**4. Amber/green**	Positive impact on users' journey times; limited positive impact on journey times overall. Provides increased resiliance through greater transport choice. Can help facilitate local sustainable development growth although this is relatively low (1,050 houses and 6ha of employment land). Improves connectivity and accessibility to key urban centres.
Carbon emissions	**4. Amber/green**	Possible use of electric trains; encouragement for modal shift to a more sustainable option; limited construction works.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**4. Amber/green**	Provides a sustainable transport option for people without access to a car.
Local environment	**4. Amber/green**	Positive but limited impacts on air quality (e.g. in Bath AQMA) and the urban and rural environment.
Well being	**4. Amber/green**	Increased connectivity and accessibility for non-work/commute trips. Limited positive impact on physical activity (e.g. through increased walking and cycling to station) and safety.
Expected VfM category	2. High 2-4	Based on BCR of 2.58 from RPP bid document

Managerial

Implementation timetable	5. 2-5 years	Largely dependent on available stopping train service and funding.
Public acceptability	4	Little recent consultation on scheme details. However, strong historic local support for proposal which is also included in emerging Core Strategy. Included as stakeholder aspiration in Great Western RUS.
Practical feasibility	2	Lack of a current or proposed stopping train service. Land is safeguarded in Local Plan. Previous RPP bid proposal considered a number of practical issues.

What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	3	Little robust analysis undertaken since RPP bid work in 2000.
Key risks	Failure to secure a suitable stopping train service. Accurate cost estimate and necessary funding.	

Financial

Affordability	3	Limited local developer contributions - possible use of wider CIL funds and major scheme funding.
Capital Cost (£m)	03. 5-10	£4m estimate produced by Railtrack towards the end of 2002.
Revenue Costs (£m)	02. 0-5	Estimated £1.5m operating costs in RPP bid document (2000).
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	4	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	2	Station location/design.
Where is funding coming from?		
Any income generated? (£m)	Yes	02. 0-5

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**Corsham Transport Package**
Date	
Description	A package of: walking/cycling network and facility improvements; public transport enhancements; traffic and demand management measures; selective road improvements; and smarter choice measures.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	High traffic flows on the A4, peak time congestion, poor public transport information, lack of a train station. Need to improve pedestrian and cycle links (implement town cycle network), improve footways and crossings, better integrate transport and improve availability, accessibility, frequency and affordability of buses and information on times.	
Scale of impact	3	Anticipated to encourage more trips using sustainable modes. However, likely that many car based journeys would remain.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	5. High	Generally an excellent fit with national transport goals
Fit with other objectives	5. High	Generally an excellent fit with LTP3 objectives and the emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy. However, somewhat weaker relationship with economic objectives given modest proposed growth levels to 2026 (1,050 houses and 6ha of employment land). Synergy with City Deal given local military presence.
Key uncertainties	Degree of local appetite for behavioural change and traffic/demand management measures. Ongoing revenue costs.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	3	Limited consultation on some measures but no consultation on package as a whole - the promotion of sustainable transport was identified, however, as an issue during the 2012 JSA community event.

Economic

Economic growth	**4. Amber/green**	The increased prioritisation of pedestrian, cyclists and buses may increase journey times for other traffic although this should be (partly) offset by the easing of peak time congestion. However, many car based journeys would remain. The package would also help support the delivery of the planned development growth to 2026 and the City Deal proposal.
Carbon emissions	**4. Amber/green**	The package of measures should have a positive impact on carbon emissions. However, the size and nature of the town, and the degree to which traffic/demand management measures and behavioural change measures can be successfully implemented will tend to limit this beneficial impact.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**5. Green**	The promotion of a package of measures should benefit children, the elderly, low income families, disabled people, etc.
Local environment	**4. Amber/green**	Beneficial impacts on air quality (although no AQMA identified), noise and the setting of the market town.
Well being	**4. Amber/green**	Positive impacts on community severance, passive crime surveillance and physical activity. Public realm improvements will help reinforce a sense of community. Possible negative impact on road safety with more people walking and cycling.
Expected VfM category	1. Very High >4	The report on 'The Effects of Smarter Choices Programmes in the Sustainable Travel Towns' identifies that packages of smarter choices could give a congestion-only BCR of 4.5 and an overall BCR of around 9.

Managerial

Implementation timetable	5. 2-5 years	Implementation could be undertaken over a variable timeframe.

Public acceptability	3	Limited consultation responses (e.g. from community plan update and JSA event in 2012) but package as a whole considered unlikely to be controversial. However, some objections may be forthcoming as a result of necessary traffic/demand and behavioural change measures.
Practical feasibility	4	Generally considered to be feasible in that no major component is required and measures are tried and tested nationally if not locally.
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	2	Evidence from similar projects elsewhere in the UK (e.g. DfT demonstration towns). Some local background and baseline information available but little detailed evidence.
Key risks	Degree of local appetite for behaviour change and traffic/demand management measures. Ongoing revenue costs.	

Financial

Affordability	3	Package could be implemented over a period of time. However, issues over (ongoing) revenue costs.
Capital Cost (£m)	02. 0-5	No package cost estimate produced.
Revenue Costs (£m)	02. 0-5	Smarter choices measures and supported local bus services.
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	3	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	5. Dynamic	Ability to vary package options.
Where is funding coming from?	Potentially CIL, LTP, etc.	
Any income generated? (£m)	Don't know	02. 0-5

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**Cricklade Southern Relief Road**
Date	
Description	A 3km single carriageway road between the A419 Primary Route and Chelworth Industrial Estate.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	High volume of HGVs travelling through Cricklade with resultant adverse impacts on noise, air quality, vulnerable road users, community severance and the historic urban environment.	
Scale of impact	4	The scheme would be expected to significantly alleviate the identified problem.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	2	Low fit with national transport goals. While there is some degree of fit with the objectives related to noise, air quality and streetscapes, there is some conflict with the objectives related to carbon emisisons and the natural environment.
Fit with other objectives	2	Low fit with LTP3 objectives and emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy given low levels of proposed development growth.
Key uncertainties	Scheme cost; impact on local natural environment; effect on existing and induced traffic levels.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	2	Mouchel study in 2004 found that "This option was strongly supoprted by some participants...However it has to be noted that not all participants were in favour of a new bypass".

Economic

Economic growth	**3. Amber**	The option should improve journey times and reliability by reducing delays and vehicle conflicts through Cricklade. Not well related to proposed development growth in emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy.
Carbon emissions	**2. Red/amber**	Embedded carbon in construction and likelihood of scheme inducing additional traffic.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**3. Amber**	While the scheme would improve the streetscene environment in Cricklade for vulnerable groups, this is considered to be of relatively limited value overall.
Local environment	**2. Red/amber**	It is considered that the positive benefits in Cricklade will be offset by the negative impacts of the scheme on the local natural environment.
Well being	**4. Amber/green**	The option would help reduce community severance in Cricklade and in doing so may encourage more people to walk and cycle as the level of HGV intimidation would be greatly reduced.
Expected VfM category		Not established. Average BCR for local road scheme = 4.23 (from RAC Foundation report 'Rates of Return on Public Spending on Transport' (June 2009).

Managerial

Implementation timetable	6. 5-10 years	
Public acceptability	2	While the principle of a southern relief road had been discussed at various times by the community, there has been little or no recent widespread or detailed consultation.
Practical feasibility	3	Uncertainties concerning ground conditions.
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	2	While there is some data on the nature of HGV movements, there is no detailed modelling/data relating to the impact of the relief road itself.
Key risks	Scheme cost, environmental impacts and effect on existing and induced traffic flows.	

Financial

Affordability	1. Not affordable	Relatively high scheme cost and limited local developer contributions available.
Capital Cost (£m)	04. 10-25	Cost estimate based on average cost of single carriageway scheme of £10.6m per mile (see http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200506/cmhansrd/vo061030/text/61030w0008.htm).
Revenue Costs (£m)	01. None	Although there would be ongoing maintenance costs.
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	2	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	2	Route options.
Where is funding coming from?		
Any income generated? (£m)	No	

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**Devizes Bypass**
Date	
Description	A single carriageway bypass linking the A361 south west to to north of Devizes.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	Problem: Devizes is a busy and vibrant market town which exhibits traffic delays and congestion during both the am and pm peak hours. The amount and characteristics of the traffic contribute to poor air quality. An AQMA has been declared on the A361 at Shanes Castle. Objective: to reduce traffic through the town centre, reducing delays and congestion in order to improve air quality.	
Scale of impact	1. Small impact	Traffic surveys show that the amount of traffic travelling through Devizes in the am peak hour which could use the bypass is small; only 224 vehicles could make use of the bypass between 7am and 10am, which equates to 2% of the total trips on the network in Devizes and around 5% of trips at Shanes Castle. Consequently, the objectives are unlikely to be delivered.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	1. Low	Poor fit with national tranpsort goals. The option would not relate well to the Government's national transport goals on economic development, reducing carbon emissions, encouraging healthy alternatives and protecting the local environment.
Fit with other objectives	1. Low	Poor fit with LTP3 objectives. The option is not on a strategic route and is not related to significant growth options or access to growth areas identified in the emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy.
Key uncertainties	No alignment identified and therefore difficult to estimate cost.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	2	Consultation to date is at the community plan level.

Economic

Economic growth	**3. Amber**	Does not relate to improving access to empoyment areas. The option is likely to have limited impact in the town and insignificant benefits to the local economy.
Carbon emissions	**1. Red**	The new road capacity is likely to induce trips and diverted trips are likely to be longer. The spare capacity in the town centre could result in more local car trips undermining sustainable alternatives. There will also significant embedded carbon from the construction of the bypass. Therefore overall, it is expected that this option would increase carbon emissions.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**3. Amber**	There will be some positive impacts for vulnerable groups due to lower traffic volumes, less severance and improved air quality in the town centre. However, traffic will be diverted elsewhere which may give rise to similar problems in another part of the community.
Local environment	**1. Red**	The estimated route length is 4 miles through open countryside and the negative impact on landscape and environment will be significant.
Well being	**3. Amber**	The potential positive impact on severance and take up of active modes in Devizes is offset by the significant amount of remaining local traffic.
Expected VfM category		Not established. Average BCR for local road scheme = 4.23 (from RAC Foundation report 'Rates of Return on Public Spending on Transport' (June 2009).

Managerial

Implementation timetable	6. 5-10 years	
Public acceptability	2	No meaningful consultation has taken place in recent years.

Practical feasibility	2	No alignment has been identified.
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	4	A new traffic model has been developed for Devizes. The data collected provides excellent evidence and if necessary the bypass option can be tested in the model.
Key risks	Beign able to demonstrate a transport case for the option.	

Financial

Affordability	1. Not affordable	High scheme cost and as it is not a growth area there are limited developer contributions available.
Capital Cost (£m)	06. 50-100	No scheme cost estimate. Average cost of a single carriageway bypass of £10.6m per mile in 2006 - see http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200506/cmhansrd/vo061030/text/61030w0008.htm.
Revenue Costs (£m)	02. 0-5	Although there would be ongoing maintenance costs.
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	2	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	1. Static	Alignment options.
Where is funding coming from?		
Any income generated? (£m)	No	

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**Devizes Inner Relief Road**
Date	
Description	A single carriageway relief road linking the A361 south west to north east Devizes.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	Problem: Devizes is a busy and vibrant market town which exhibits traffic delays and congestion during both the am and pm peak hours. The traffic contributes to poor air quality. An AQMA has been declared on the A361 at Shanes Castle. Objective: to reduce congestion and improve air quality.	
Scale of impact	1. Small impact	Traffic surveys have shown that only 224 vehicles enter and leave Devizes during the am peak period between 7 and 10 am, which equates to 2% of all traffic in Devizes. The IRR would also allow trips originating in Devizes and leaving Devizes along the A361 to ustilise this route. However, it is likely that all the traffic using IRR would still have to pass through the AQMA.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	1. Low	Poor fit with national tranpsort goals. The option does not relate well to the Government's national transport goals on economic development, reducing carbon emissions, encouraging healthy alternatives and protecting the local environment.
Fit with other objectives	1. Low	Poor fit with LTP3 objectives. This option is not on a strategic route and is not well related to significant growth options identified in the Wiltshire Core Strategy.
Key uncertainties	No alignment identified. The extent to which the scheme would relieve congestion and improve air quality.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	2	Little consultation to date except for that undertaken as part of the community plan - some local stakeholders believe this option could provide benefits if not within this plan period but the next.

Economic

Economic growth	**3. Amber**	Whilst the option may improve journey times it is not well related to providing access to new employment or housing areas.
Carbon emissions	**2. Red/amber**	The IRR is likely to induce car trips and make existing trips longer. It is likely to undermine sustainable transport options and more support may be required to retain public transport services. There will be significant embedded carbon associated with its construction.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**3. Amber**	The option may provide some positive benefits to vulnerable groups but the it may also undermine passenger transport services by making it easier to drive.
Local environment	**2. Red/amber**	Likely to have a negative impact on landscape of the local environment.
Well being	**3. Amber**	Positive impact on severance and the use of healthy travel modes is lessened by the amount of remaining local traffic and the potential negative impact on the existing bus services caused by abstraction.
Expected VfM category		Not established. Average BCR for local road scheme = 4.23 (from RAC Foundation report 'Rates of Return on Public Spending on Transport' (June 2009).

Managerial

Implementation timetable	6. 5-10 years	
Public acceptability	2	Consultation at community plan level.
Practical feasibility	2	Alignment unknown and therefore impossible to tell if a practical feasible scheme is possible.

What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	4	A new traffic model for Devizes has been built which has provided the details used in this assessment. A transport study is currently underway which will consider this scheme in more detail. If necessary, this option could be run through the traffic model in order to assess its impact.
Key risks	Scheme objectives and development; funding sources.	

Financial

Affordability	1. Not affordable	Not well related to significant development growth.
Capital Cost (£m)	05. 25-50	No scheme cost estimate. Average cost of a single carriageway bypass of £10.6m per mile in 2006 - see http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200506/cmhansrd/vo061030/text/61030w0008.htm.
Revenue Costs (£m)	02. 0-5	Although there would be ongoing maintenance costs.
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	2	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	2	Detailed scheme options.
Where is funding coming from?		
Any income generated? (£m)	No	

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**Devizes Parkway Station**
Date	
Description	New parkway station with associated facilities in the vicinity of Devizes. Potential sites identified are Lydeway and Market Lavington (Chocolate Poodle).

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	Improve accessibility to rail services in local area. Reduce journey distances, particularly by car, to rail stations (currently Pewsey and Chippenham). Support economic and development growth in Devizes.	
Scale of impact	2	While journey lengths are likely to be reduced, the parkway nature of the option means that the accessibuility of rail services is likely to be little different for the majority of Devizes residents.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	3	Reasonable fit with national transport goals. Limited development growth in Devizes area and parkway location significantly restricts sustainable transport access and reinforces need and use of motorised vehicles which may reduce access opportunities for those people without a car.
Fit with other objectives	3	Reasonable fit with LTP objectives. The emerging Core Strategy suggests that this option should be considered in the plan period.
Key uncertainties	Business case for parkway station; lack of identified suitable stopping service; accurate cost estimte.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	3	Concept of parkway station included in emerging Core Strategy but little direct public consultaton on scheme particulars - community belief that station will deliver significant economic benefits to Devizes.

Economic

Economic growth	**3. Amber**	Reduced journey times for some users (and in doing so will abstract some existing users from other stations/services). Only limited development growth in Devizes (1,730 houses and 9.9ha of employment land from 2006-2026) and parkway location could reduce direct economic impacts in town.
Carbon emissions	**3. Amber**	Possible reduction in carbon emissions from shorter car journeys to new station and if existing medium/long distance car journeys shift to rail - however, the option may abstract existing users from bus services and other railway stations. Embedded carbon in station construction.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**3. Amber**	Parkway nature does not positively improve access to rail for those without a car.
Local environment	**2. Red/amber**	Negative impact of building(s), car park and car trips on immediate area around station location.
Well being	**3. Amber**	Limited positive impact on non-work related trips.
Expected VfM category	4. Low 1-1.5	Eddington evidence suggests BCR range of 1.1 to 3 for urban rail schemes. It is considered that a parkway option is likely to be at the lower end of this scale.

Managerial

Implementation timetable	6. 5-10 years	
Public acceptability	3	Limited or no consultation on scheme details although the principle of the option is understood to be strongly supported by the local community.
Practical feasibility	2	No site location assessment. Lack of identified suitable stopping train service.

What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	1. Low	Little or no robust evidence available.
Key risks	Business case for parkway station; lack of identified suitable stopping service; accurate cost estimate.	

Financial

Affordability	2	Limited eveloper funding available given future proposed development levels in Devizes to 2026.
Capital Cost (£m)	03. 5-10	Based on previous costs identified for Wilton Station (estimated at £3.8m in 2000).
Revenue Costs (£m)	02. 0-5	Based on previous costs identified for Wilton Station (£108k annual subsidy estimed in 2003).
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	2	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	1. Static	
Where is funding coming from?		
Any income generated? (£m)	Yes	02. 0-5

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**Devizes Transport Package**
Date	
Description	An integrated transport package for Devizes comprising; walking/cycling network and facility improvements; public transport service and facility enhancements; traffic and demand management measures; interchange enhancements; smarter choices measures; and selected junction and road improvements.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	Problems: high traffic flows and peak time congestion resulting in delays and air quality problems culminating in an AQMA being declared on the A361 at Shanes Castle. The traffic levels also cause community severance, poor journey time reliability and impact on the historic fabric of the town centre.	
Scale of impact	4	Surveys have shown that 27% of trips in Devizes have both an origin and destination in Devizes during peak hours. As such, a package of measures could have a significant impact at reducing local traffic levels and alleviating identified problems.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	5. High	Generally an excellent fit with national transport goals.
Fit with other objectives	5. High	Generally an excellent fit with LTP3 objectives and emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy. However, somewhat of a weaker fit with economic objectives given relative proposed development growth levels to 2026 (1,730 houses (although only 405 remain to be identified) and 9.9ha of employment land).
Key uncertainties	Ability to secure sufficient funds to implement package from relatively limited (remaining) development growth to 2026. Degree of public appetite for behavioural change measures. Ongoing revenue costs.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	4	A transport strategy has been developed with local stakeholders including the Area Board and was subject to public consultation in late 2012.

Economic

Economic growth	**4. Amber/green**	Improving accessibility and reducing congestion and delays, particularly at peak times, is likely to support economic growth. However, increased cycling and walking prioritisation may increase some vehicle journey times. Package woulod help support remaining proposed development growth to 2026.
Carbon emissions	**4. Amber/green**	Carbon emissions expected to decrease compared to a do nothing scenario. However, the scale of the CO2 reductions will depend on the extent to which traffic/demand management measures and behavioural change can be implemented.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**5. Green**	Improves sustainable transport access to new and existing sites by providing walking, cycling and passenger transport improvements. This should benefit young people, the elderly and people on low incomes, etc.
Local environment	**5. Green**	Expected to improve air quality (there is an identified AQMA) and reduce noise pollution, as well as improve the setting of the market town.
Well being	**4. Amber/green**	Positive impact on health and physical activity by promoting walking and cycling. Reduction of traffic should lead to reduced community severance and improved access to key facilities.
Expected VfM category	1. Very High >4	The report on 'The Effects of Smarter Choices Programmes in the Sustainable Travel Towns' identifies that packages of smarter choices could give a congestion-only BCR of 4.5 and an overall BCR of around 9.

Managerial

Implementation timetable	6. 5-10 years	Implementation could be over a variable timescale, although the developing transport strategy is planned to be in line with the Core Strategy timeframe.
Public acceptability	4	A transport strategy has developed with stakeholders and public consultation was carried out over the winter of 2012/13. Work undertaken so far suggests that there is general support for sustainable transport and a package of measures.
Practical feasibility	5. High	Transport strategy process has ensured that only options that are deliverable and affordable are taken forward.
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	4	Transport strategy work has been conducted using a newly developed traffic model. The outputs will be used as evidence for the Core Strategy.
Key risks	Ability to secure sufficient funds to implement package from relatively limited (remaining) development growth to 2026. Degree of public appetite for behavioural change measures. Ongoing revenue costs.	

Financial

Affordability	4	The transport strategy has been developed in such a way that it is deliverable and affordable to ensure that the Core Strategy will be considered sound by the inspector at the examination in public.
Capital Cost (£m)	02. 0-5	The Core Strategy identifies around 400 new homes to be built in the plan period in Devizes. Available funding is likely to be limited. It is not a growth town so funds via CIL are not likely to be a priority.
Revenue Costs (£m)	02. 0-5	Support for passenger transport services and smarter choices.
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	4	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	5. Dynamic	Ability to adapt strategy/package to changing circumstances.
Where is funding coming from?	Potentially from CIL and LTP; existing and future s106 agreements.	
Any income generated? (£m)	Yes	02. 0-5

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**Harnham Relief Road and Brunel Link**
Date	
Description	A 4.3km single carriageway bypass from A3094 Netherhampton Rd to A338 Downton Rd, and a 0.95km link from Netherhampton Rd to Churchfields Ind Est across the River Nadder and its floodplain on a 400m viaduct.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	Improved access to Churchfields Ind Est; closure of current city centre route to HGVs; traffic relief on Harnham Rd and increased capacity at Harnham Gyratory; safe and reliable route between Netherhampton and Downton Rd; improved access to hospital.	
Scale of impact	4	The scheme would be expected to have a significant impact on the identified problems and objectives.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	3	Reasonable fit with national transport goals. While the option fits well with some national transport goals (e.g. increased journey time reliability; better connectivity to jobs and markets; reduced air pollution and community severance/road user intimidation), there is some significant conflict with others (e.g. impact on carbon emissions and the local natural environment).
Fit with other objectives	3	Reasonable fit with LTP3 objectives. Planned redevelopment of Churchfields Ind. Est. in Wiltshire Core Strategy reduces need for scheme.
Key uncertainties	Impacts on local natural environment and mitigation costs. Need for scheme given future role of Churchfields Industrial Estate.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	2	Planning application submitted in early 2000's. No recent consultation. Scheme likely to be very controversial.

Economic

Economic growth	**4. Amber/green**	Improves journey time reliability through the Harnham Gyratory and connectivity to an existing key employment site. However, Churchfields Industrial Estate allocated for mixed-use residential led scheme in Core Strategy.
Carbon emissions	**2. Red/amber**	While reduced stop-start driving should reduce carbon emissions, it is considered that the possibility of induced traffic and significant construction would outweigh this.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**3. Amber**	Limited positive impacts for vulnerable groups as a result of less through traffic in Harnham and less HGV traffic in city centre (subject to future role of Churchfields Ind. Est.).
Local environment	**2. Red/amber**	Positive impacts on city centre (heritage and AQMA) and identified noise problem areas on A338 and A36. However, significant negative natural environmental impacts (ecological, flooding, landscape, archaelogical, etc).
Well being	**3. Amber**	Reduction in severance in Harnham and reduced HGV intimidation in city centre (subject to future role of Churchfields Ind. Est.). Limited positive changes in physical activity, KSIs, crime or access/connectivity for leisure trips.
Expected VfM category		Not established. Average BCR for local road scheme = 4.23 (from RAC Foundation report 'Rates of Return on Public Spending on Transport' (June 2009).

Managerial

Implementation timetable	6. 5-10 years	
Public acceptability	3	Scheme is likely to divide public opinion between those who see benefits for city centre and Harnham, and those who will focus on the natural environmental impacts.
Practical feasibility	4	Generally considered to be practical - some uncertainties over natural environmental factors (e.g. archaeological and flooding).

What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	4	Extensive evidence submitted as part of previous planning applications - would need to be updated.
Key risks	Natural environmental uncertainties (e.g. archaeological and flooding factors). Scheme costs. Likely divided public opinion. Planned redevelopment of Churchfields Ind Est.	

Financial

Affordability	2	High scheme costs with mixed outcomes. Would require substantial proportion of available CIL transport funds over period to 2026.
Capital Cost (£m)	05. 25-50	Estimated cost of £18m in 2005.
Revenue Costs (£m)	01. None	Although there would be ongoing maintenance costs.
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	2	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	1. Static	
Where is funding coming from?		
Any income generated? (£m)	No	

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**Lafarge Rail Freight Facility**
Date	
Description	Rail freight facility (and waste consolidation centre) at the former Lafarge cement works, Westbury utlising the existing rail head.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	Bulk transportation of goods including waste by rail to relevant markets and processing plants - reduced length and number of HGV trips; lower carbon and air pollution emissions.	
Scale of impact	2	Likely to only affect a limited number of overall HGV trips on the network. Potential for wider area benefits to be at least partly offset by more local impacts on Westbury.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	3	Reasonable fit with national transport goals - reduced number of HGV trips on strategic highway network; lower carbon and air pollution emisisons; and reduced risk of transport accidents. Makes use of existing rail infrastructure.
Fit with other objectives	3	Reasonable fit with LTP3 objectives - e.g. sustainable freight distribution; reduced air pollution and carbon emissions; making best use of existing infrastructure. Synergies with emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy e.g. aspiration for Westbury to be a key employment location; location on A350 corridor; and desire to ensure the future of the former Lafarge cement works.
Key uncertainties	Demand for and use of facility - scale of benefits and operational costs/practicality. Local impacts. Access considerations.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	2	Previous use as concrete works with existing railhead. No or little recent consultation on scheme concept.

Economic

Economic growth	**3. Amber**	Uncertain impact on users' journey times, reliability and costs - depends on interchange penalty, journey distance and load frequencies. Limited positive impacts on overall journey times, reliability and safety. Should have a positive impact on the number of incidents. Fits in with Core Strategy aspiration for Westbury to be key employment location.
Carbon emissions	**4. Amber/green**	Some positive impacts on carbon emisisons - scale depends on number and nature of transferred HGV trips.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**3. Amber**	Minor positive impact on regeneration of A350 corridor.
Local environment	**3. Amber**	Air quality and noise benefits derived from the reduction in medium/long-distance HGV trips needs to be weighed against air quality, noise and urban environmental impacts in local area, particularly through Westbury. Overall, the impact is considered to be neutral given location of site.
Well being	**3. Amber**	Need to balance benefits derived from reduced number of medium/long-distance HGV movements against likely increased movements on local highway network through local Westbury communities. Some minor positive road safety benefits.
Expected VfM category	4. Low 1-1.5	As suggested by BCRs from Faber Maunsell report 'North Wales Rail Strategy Study'.

Managerial

Implementation timetable	5. 2-5 years	Railhead already in place.
Public acceptability	3	Historic use as concrete works. No or little consultation on use as rail facility and waste consolidation centre. Generation of HGV trips likely to raise objections from Westbury residents.

Practical feasibility	4	National evidence (from Spalding RFI Study) suggests that basic rail freight interchanges are practical.
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	3	Some national evidence (e.g. Spalding RFI Study).
Key risks	Demand for and use of site. Willing operator. Ongoing revenue costs. Access arrangements. Local feelings.	

Financial

Affordability	3	Funding of ongoing revenue costs will be an issue particularly in view of likely usage levels.
Capital Cost (£m)	02. 0-5	The Spalding RFI Study estimates a cost of £15m (£10m for main line connections and £5m for construction of the interchange and highways access) for a basic rail freight interchange and highway acess on a green field site with no existing main line or highway connections.
Revenue Costs (£m)	02. 0-5	Typical operating costs would be £20-£25 per container lift (based on Spalding RFI Study).
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	4	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	4	Some flexibility to scale scheme up and down.
Where is funding coming from?		
Any income generated? (£m)	Yes	02. 0-5

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**Ludgershall & Tidworth Transport Package**
Date	
Description	An integrated transport package for Tidworth and Ludgershall to include: walking/cycling network and facility improvements; public transport service and facility enhancements; traffic and demand management measures; selective road improvements; interchange enhancements; and smarter choices measures.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	Problems: Peak time congestion, high traffic flows and poor accessibility to schools. Objective: improve mode choice and access.	
Scale of impact	3	Package should encourage more sustainable trips but low car ownership and young profile of residents means there is reduced scope (compared to other Wiltshire towns) to shift mode split to sustainable modes.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	5. High	Generally an excellent fit with national transport goals.
Fit with other objectives	5. High	Generally an excellent fit with LTP objectives and emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy. However, somewhat weaker relationship with economic objectives given modest proposed proposed growth to 2026 (1,750 houses and 12ha of employment land). Synergy with City Deal given local military presence.
Key uncertainties	The ability to obtain sufficient development related funds to implement the proposed strategy is uncertain. Ongoing revenue costs. Degree of appetite for behavioural change measures.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	4	A transport plan is in existence which highlights walking and cycling in particular. Strong local support from residents.

Economic

Economic growth	**4. Amber/green**	Improving accessibility and travel options should reduce delays in peak periods. However, increases in prioritisation for pedestrians and cyclists may affect vehicle journey times. Package would help support proposed development growth.
Carbon emissions	**4. Amber/green**	Proposed development growth is likely to cause CO2 increases. However, the package approach will mitigate against this and any increase in CO2 emissions should be less than business as usual.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**5. Green**	Provides access to regeneration sites and improved access by provision of bus services from new housing locations. The promotion of sustainable transport options should benefit children, the elderly, low income groups, etc.
Local environment	**4. Amber/green**	Expected improvements in air quality (although no identified AQMA) compared to do nothing scenarios due to more sustainable modes of travel being used. In addition, there would be beneficial impacts on noise and the setting of the town.
Well being	**4. Amber/green**	Positive impact on health by promoting walking and cycling. Positive impacts also on community severance, passive crime surveillance and access to key facilities. Some possible negative impacts on road accidents as a result of more people cycling.
Expected VfM category	1. Very High >4	The report on 'The Effects of Smarter Choices Programmes in the Sustainable Travel Towns' identifies that packages of smarter choices could give a congestion-only BCR of 4.5 and an overall BCR of around 9.

Managerial

Implementation timetable	5. 2-5 years	Implementation could be undertaken over a variable timeframe. However, the plan would be for measures to be fully implemented within the Core Strategy period (i.e. 2026).
Public acceptability	4	Transport plan developed and supported by local communities.
Practical feasibility	4	Schemes are practical and generally tested but the MoD own some land required to implement certain schemes.
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	3	Transport studies carried out 5 years ago.
Key risks	Ensuring that sufficient funding is available to fully implement the transport package. That MoD land is available for the implementation of some cycling links. Ongoing revenue costs.	

Financial

Affordability	3	Ability to implement package measures over time. The geography of the area means that long distance cycle routes are required which increases package costs significantly. Issues regarding (ongoing) revenue costs.
Capital Cost (£m)	02. 0-5	Estimated from existing transport plan.
Revenue Costs (£m)	02. 0-5	Personalised travel planning, publicity, supporting bus services and maintenance of capital elements of the package.
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	4	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	5. Dynamic	Flexibility in delivery although plan is to implement in line with Core Strategy timescale (i.e. to 2026).
Where is funding coming from?	Potentially from CIL and LTP; existing and future s106 agreements.	
Any income generated? (£m)	No	02. 0-5

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**Ludgershall to Andover Railline**
Date	
Description	Implementation of passenger services (utilising existing rail line) between Ludgershall and Andover. Construction of new railway station at Ludgershall with two platforms and asscoated facilities.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	Problems: Ludgershall has no direct passenger rail access. The nearest station is Andover. Objective: to provide passenger services between Andover and Ludgershall reducing car trips and improving access options and connectivity.	
Scale of impact	4	Would improve access to rail services to/from Ludgershall and to/from Castledown Business Park a Principal Employment Area identified in the emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	4	Good fit with national transport goals.
Fit with other objectives	4	Good fit with LTP3 objectives. The emerging Core trategy suggests that the scheme be looked into during the plan period. However, it is not identified as a Core Strategy or LTP3 rail priority.
Key uncertainties	Business case - e.g. availability of suitable rolling stock; funding requirement; likelihood of DfT including in franchise beyond initial three year funding period.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	2	Little or no consultation has taken place.

Economic

Economic growth	**3. Amber**	Limited journey time and connectivity benefits given likely service levels (however, the option is likely to abstract exisitng bus users). Would improve access to/from the Castledown Business Park, a Principal Employment Area identified in the emerging Core Strategy.
Carbon emissions	**4. Amber/green**	Potential modest decrease in carbon emissions especially if long distance car trips change mode to rail.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**4. Amber/green**	Provides access to rail services which may be particularly beneficial to those people without access to a car. Can assist in regeneration aspirations for Ludgershall.
Local environment	**3. Amber**	Limited positive impacts on air quality, noise and the urban environment.
Well being	**4. Amber/green**	Improve accessibility to key destinations.
Expected VfM category		Needs to be established.

Managerial

Implementation timetable	6. 5-10 years	
Public acceptability	3	Local consultation events demonstrate general support for the concept. But there is the realisation that costs may be prohibitive in the short to medium term.
Practical feasibility	3	No detailed assessments but it is considered that the exisitng rail line could be utilised after upgrading.
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	3	Parrys People Movers have expressed an interest in the line but this did not lead to any significant committment.
Key risks	Insufficient passenger patronage to warrant investment. Real danger that transfer from existing successful 15 minute bus service from Activ8 may mean that service needs financial subsidy in the future.	

Financial

Affordability	2	Start-up and ongoing costs are likely to be prohibitive given anticipated business case and patronage.
Capital Cost (£m)	03. 5-10	Based on previous costs identified for Wilton Station proposal - estimated at £3.8m in 2000.
Revenue Costs (£m)	02. 0-5	Based on revenue costs identified for Wilton Station proposal - £108k annual subsidy estimated in 2003 Halcrow report.
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	1.High risk	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	5. Dynamic	Has the flexibility to adapt and change to circumstances and funding opportunities or constraints.
Where is funding coming from?		
Any income generated? (£m)	Yes	02. 0-5

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**M4 Junction 16**
Date	
Description	Junction improvement - new dedicated lanes to allow vehicles travelling from Royal Wootton Bassett to access Hay Lane without having to go around the roundabout. Extra lanes on the M4 eastbound and westbound slip roads to avoid queuing back onto the main carriageway of the motorway.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	Junction 16 exhibits peak hour capacity problems. Growth in Swindon (and north Wiltshire) will add further pressure - acknowledged need to mitigate impacts.	
Scale of impact	5. Significant impact	Well developed and tested solution which is agreed by Highways Agency and local authorities to have beneficial outcome.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	4	Good fit with national transport goals. Scheme will allow growth to occur where it would otherwise be significantly constrained
Fit with other objectives	4	Good fit with LTP objectives and has Swindon & Wiltshire Local Enterprise Partnership support. Also has a good with with emerging Wiltshire and Swindon core strategies and has synergies with proposed City Deal.
Key uncertainties	Funding, unresolved environmental/planning issues and rate of development unpredictable.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	2	Scheme remains controversial and subject to challenge.

Economic

Economic growth	**5. Green**	Scheme is the key to unlocking housing and employment growth in the area including 4,500 houses and associated employment land at Southern Development Area.
Carbon emissions	**3. Amber**	Embedded carbon in construction works but overall scheme is considered not to have any significant carbon impacts.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**4. Amber/green**	Positive regeneration case.
Local environment	**2. Red/amber**	Unresolved environmental concerns - likely need for a screening opinion, potentially leading to a full Environmental Assessment.
Well being	**4. Amber/green**	Should be beneficial in terms of accessibility and journey times.
Expected VfM category	2. High 2-4	No detailed assessment carried out - VfM based on typical value for this type of scheme.

Managerial

Implementation timetable	4. 1-2 years	Current planning agreement for Wichelstowe has obligation to construct improvement prior to occupation of 1100 houses - current total stands at 500.
Public acceptability	2	Despite several (failed) legal challenges, the scheme continues to attract strong opposition.
Practical feasibility	5. High	Design is well developed and tested to prove defined outcomes.
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	4	Substantial body of evidence, however, final details are to be resolved (and are subject to any changes due to Environmental Assessment implications).
Key risks	Environmental concerns - need for Environmental Assessment; pace of development; lack of final agreed solution; funding.	

Financial

Affordability	5. Affordable	Assumed to be affordable in that it is expected to be funded in its entirety from development (secured through agreement). Remains to be seen whether concerns over viability change that assumption.
Capital Cost (£m)	03. 5-10	Estimate - final cost to be determined.
Revenue Costs (£m)	02. 0-5	Solution heavily dependant on complex signal arrangement - likely to result in (relatively) significant maintainence/replacement costs.
Cost profile	No additional cost burden.	
Overall cost risk	3	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	1. Static	Other options have been considered and dismissed - preferred single solution.
Where is funding coming from?	Developer/landowner of Wichelstowe site.	
Any income generated? (£m)	No	

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**M4 Junction 16a**
Date	
Description	New intermediary junction onto M4.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	An option for the redevelopment of RAF Lyneham (involving increased traffic activity) is potentially constrained by capacity on the local road network (including M4 J16).	
Scale of impact	5. Significant impact	Dedicated solution providing a direct link to the Strategic Route Network (M4).
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	2	Low fit with national transport goals. While the scheme could provide some benefits at J16, it would be contrary to the general policy of resisting new motorway junctions.
Fit with other objectives	2	Low fit with LTP objectives - the scheme could lead to/facilitate car dominated development. Synergy with City Deal proposals in view of RAF Lyneham redevelopment.
Key uncertainties	Cost; deliverability (land control); Highways Agency approval; extent of MoD use at RAF Lyneham.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	1. Little	Scheme and outcome largely untested/unproven.

Economi

Economic growth	**4. Amber/green**	Supports redevelopment of RAF Lyneham.
Carbon emissions	**2. Red/amber**	Scheme likely to induce traffic. Also construction would include significant embedded carbon.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**4. Amber/green**	Regneration benefits as scheme fits in with City Deal proposal given its military focus.
Local environment	**2. Red/amber**	Adverse landscape impact.
Well being	**3. Amber**	No significant benefits or impacts.
Expected VfM category		Not established. Average BCR for local road scheme = 4.23 (from RAC Foundation report 'Rates of Return on Public Spending on Transport' (June 2009).

Managerial

Implementation timetable	5. 2-5 years	Minimum time required if mandate for scheme progression was given immediately. Likelihood is that the timescale would be much longer.
Public acceptability	2	May have some support locally - however, would anticipate signifcant objection from environmental groups and others.
Practical feasibility	2	Largely unproven - statutory powers and legal feasibility likely to be significant barriers.
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	2	Only basic informal analysis undertaken to date.
Key risks	Highways Agency consent and compliance. Environmental concerns unknown/untested. No modelling undertaken to assess unintended consequences.	

Financial

Affordability	1. Not affordable	
Capital Cost (£m)	05. 25-50	Based on professional judgement - no detailed assessment undertaken.
Revenue Costs (£m)	01. None	Although there would be ongoing maintenance costs.
Cost profile	Likely to remove some passing trade for existing businesses in Royal Wootton Bassett.	
Overall cost risk	1.High risk	

Other costs	

Commercial

Flexibility of option	2	Route options.
Where is funding coming from?		
Any income generated? (£m)	No	

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**Malmesbury Transport Package**
Date	
Description	A package of sustainable transport measures to include walking, cycling, public transport enhancements, traffic demand management initiatives, selective road improvements and smarter choices measures.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	Proximity to the M4 and a narrow employment base has led to considerable out-commuting resulting in some additional peak time traffic and congestion around the town. This coupled with on-street parking has created a certain amount of severance within the valued historic town centre. There are poor public transport links into the town from some of the surrounding villages and areas.	
Scale of impact	3	Likely to encourage more sustainable local travel into Malmesbury from both town residents and those from surrounding settlements. However, much car-based travel is likely to remain.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	5. High	Generally an excellent fit with the national transport goals.
Fit with other objectives	5. High	Generally an excellent fit with the LTP3 objectives and emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy. However, somewhat weaker relationship with economic objectives given relatively limited proposed development growth to 2026 (760 houses and 5ha of employment land).
Key uncertainties	Accuarate cost estimate and ongoing revenue costs. Degree of local appetite for behavioural change and traffic/demand management measures.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	3	Some limited consultation and engagement on certain measures, which generally receive favourable responses. No consultation on a package as a whole. Traffic demand measures may raise some local objections.

Economic

Economic growth	**4. Amber/green**	Prioritisation of pedestrians and cyclists on the highway may result in increased vehicle journey times. However, this likely to be partly offset by reduced peak time congestion as people shift to sustainable modes. Package would help suport proposed development growth albeit that this is at a relatively low level.
Carbon emissions	**4. Amber/green**	While carbon emissions would be expected to decrease, the impact may be relatively limited dependant on the extent to which demand management measures and sustainable transport modes can be implemented.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**5. Green**	The promotion of sustainable transport options and a reduction in traffic and congestion would benefit vulnerable groups such as children, the elderly, etc by providing greater accessibility to essential services.
Local environment	**4. Amber/green**	Limited improvement in air quality (no identified AQMA) and a reduction in road traffic noise, as well as improvements to severance.
Well being	**4. Amber/green**	Positive impact on levels of physical acitvity and community severance.

Expected VfM category	1. Very High >4	The report on 'The Effects of Smarter Choices Programmes in the Sustainable Travel Towns' identifies that packages of smarter choices could give a congestion-only BCR of 4.5 and an overall BCR of around 9.

Managerial

Implementation timetable	5. 2-5 years	Implementation could be undertaken over a variable timeframe.
Public acceptability	2	Little direct consultation but package considered to be broadly uncontroversial although will require some traffic/demand management and behavioural change measures which may raise some objections.
Practical feasibility	3	Generally employs tried and tested measures (e.g. in DfT smarter choices demonstration towns) although not tested extensively locally.
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	2	Aspirations in the community plan but little or no detailed assessment and analysis has been undertaken.
Key risks	Degree of local acceptance of the need for behavioural change and traffic/demand management measures. Lack of (ongoing) revenue funding (e.g. commercial viability of bus services).	

Financial

Affordability	3	Ability to implement package options over time. Issues regarding ongoing revenue costs.
Capital Cost (£m)	02. 0-5	No package cost estimate produced.
Revenue Costs (£m)	02. 0-5	Smarter choices measures and supported bus services.
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	3	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	5. Dynamic	Various package options.
Where is funding coming from?	Potentially from CIL and LTP; existing and future s106 agreements.	
Any income generated? (£m)	Don't know	

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**Marlborough Station**
Date	
Description	Provision of a new railway station and associated facilities for Marlborough and a new branch line to connect to the existing Berks and Hants line.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	Marlborough has no rail station; the nearest station is Great Bedwyn. Public transport options in Marlborough are limited and the provision of a railway station would enable journeys currently undertaken in a car to be made by rail. This could help relieve local congestion, reduce traffic levels and help address the town's AQMA.	
Scale of impact	2	The provision of a station and rail line will improve transport options but is unlikely to have a significant effect on local travel patterns and reduce car journeys.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	4	Good fit with national transport goals in that it improves public transport access to Marlborough and may reduce traffic and journey times on local roads. Supports growth and economic development, reduces carbon emissions, may encourage sustainable/healthy transport options. May have small adverse impact on existing bus services.
Fit with other objectives	4	Good fit with LTP3 objectives; supports economic growth, improves accessibility and encourages travel by alternatives to the private car. Lesser fit with emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy given proposed role for Marlborough and planned modest development growth levels.
Key uncertainties	Agreement from Network Rail and TOCs to connect a new rail line to the Berks and Hants line and for rail services to run to a new Marlborough station. Evaluation of option feasibility and cost.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	1. Little	Likelihood that many local residents and businesses would think option is a good idea. However, there has been no consultation with rail organisations and other relevant bodies, and the full implications of the option are not curretly known.

Economic

Economic growth	**4. Amber/green**	User journey times and variability should improve and a station would help support local economic growth/development albeit that this is modest in nature (as set out in emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy - 610 houses and 3ha of employment land to 2026).
Carbon emissions	**4. Amber/green**	Encourages modal shift to rail especially for medium to long distance trips and encourages walking/cycling to station. However, embedded carbon in construction works.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**4. Amber/green**	Provides a sustainable transport option for people without access to a car.
Local environment	**2. Red/amber**	Limited improvements in air quality but re-instatement of rail line may have significant impact on AONB landscape and natural environment.
Well being	**4. Amber/green**	May reduce traffic from local roads and encourage walking/cycling to station. Improves accessibility to key locations.
Expected VfM category	2. High 2-4	Based on average BCR from Eddington and RAC Foundation reports.

Managerial

Implementation timetable	7. 10+ years	Long term project involving many statutory procedures and land assembly.
Public acceptability	2	No consultation undertaken - public opinion is likely to be mixed.

Practical feasibility	2	Need to identify and assess station location and more particularly link to main line. Also, no identification of suitable stopping service.
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	1. Low	Low level of analysis, evaluation and supporting evidence.
Key risks	Feasibiity, deliverability, cost, and lack of public, industry and stakeholder support.	

Financial

Affordability	2	
Capital Cost (£m)	04. 10-25	To include station, approximately 4 miles of track, signalling and new junction to main line.
Revenue Costs (£m)	02. 0-5	Based on revenue costs identified for other railway station proposals in Wiltshire.
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	1.High risk	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	2	
Where is funding coming from?		
Any income generated? (£m)	Yes	02. 0-5

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**Marlborough Transport Package**
Date	
Description	A package of walking/cycling network and facility improvements; public transport service and facility enhancements; traffic demand management measures, selective road improvements; interchange enchancements and smarter choices measures.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	Identified problems; traffic and congestion on the High Street and in the town centre; a lack of cycle and cycle parking facilities; the need for pedestrian crossing improvements; poor quality public transport interchanges; air quality issues on the A346 linked to HGV flows; congestion caused by vehicles queuing for parking spaces in the High Street. There is a need for better management of parking in central locations (e.g High Street, George Lane) and improvements to bus services and links to nearest rail stations and economic centres, along with the promotion of these services.	
Scale of impact	3	Package would encourage more sustainable local trips and in doing so would improve road safety, public health, air quality and journey time reliability, and reduce congestion and severance. However, many car-based local and through trips would remain.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	5. High	Generally an excellent fit with the national transport goals.
Fit with other objectives	5. High	Generally excellent fit with LTP3 objectives and emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy. However, somewhat weaker relationship with economic objectives given modest proposed growth to 2026 (610 houses and 3ha of employment land).
Key uncertainties	The extent to which measures will promote behavioural change within the community. Local appetite for package measures especially traffic/demand management measures. Accurate cost estimate and ongoing revenue costs.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	3	Issues have been raised by community through the Marlborough Community Area Transport Strategy (MCATS) in 2005 and the Transition Wiltshire Report on required public transport integration and improvements (2012). However, the appetite for traffic management and demand management measures are untested.

Economic

Economic growth	**4. Amber/green**	A sustainable transport package may promote improved journey times through the centre of town by reducing congestion, especially with improved parking and traffic management. However, increased prioritisation of pedestrians and cyclists may actually increase some journey times. Package would help support modest development growth proposals of emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy.
Carbon emissions	**4. Amber/green**	Measures look to reduce levels of carbon emissions - level of improvement partly dependent on the community's willingness to embrace behavioural change.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**5. Green**	Reduced traffic and congestion and improvements in sustainable modes will benefit vulnerable groups by increasing levels of interaction and community cohesion, reducing threat and initmidation, and improving road safety. The provision of bus services will help people on low income and those without a car access further education and employment in nearby urban centres, and improve links to train stations.
Local environment	**5. Green**	Potential for improvements in air quality (identified AQMA), noise pollution and the setting of the historic core of the town.

Well being	**4. Amber/green**	Better provision of sustainable transport provides positive impacts in terms of accessibility to key facilities, reduced community severance, and increased physical activity. Some possible negative impacts on road accidents as a result of more people walking and cycling.
Expected VfM category	1. Very High >4	The report on 'The Effects of Smarter Choices Programmes in the Sustainable Travel Towns' identifies that packages of smarter choices could give a congestion-only BCR of 4.5 and an overall BCR of around 9.

Managerial

Implementation timetable	5. 2-5 years	Implementation could be undertaken over a variable timeframe.
Public acceptability	3	Previous public consultation and the Marlborough Community Area Transport Study (2005) has demonstrated some support for some package measures. The Transition Wiltshire Report in 2012 also showed support for a package of sustainable transport measures/improvements for Marlborough. However, the actual implementation of the package and the behavioural change it requires may raise a significant number of objections.
Practical feasibility	3	Generally employs tried and tested measures although not extensively tested locally.
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	3	The Marlborough Community Area Transport Strategy (2005) and the Transition Marlborough Report (2012) indicate the feasibility of aspects of the package and demonstrate some support for the measures. Similar schemes implemented elsewhere show evidence of behavioural change through the implementation of sustainable transport packages and the Eddington Study shows their benefits. However, there is little detailed analysis of the situation in Marlborough.
Key risks	Level of uptake of behavioural change and traffic/demand management measures undertaken by the community. Accurate cost estimate and (ongoing) revenue costs.	

Financial

Affordability	3	Ability to implement package options over time. Issues regarding ongoing revenue costs.
Capital Cost (£m)	02. 0-5	No package cost estimate produced.
Revenue Costs (£m)	02. 0-5	Personalised travel planning, publicity, supporting bus services and maintenance of capital elements.
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	3	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	5. Dynamic	Different package aspects could be implemented depending on funding available.
Where is funding coming from?	Potentially from CIL and LTP; existing and future s106 agreements.	
Any income generated? (£m)	Don't know	

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**Melksham Signal Improvements**
Date	
Description	Installation of intermediate signals on the single track rail line through Melksham.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	Line capacity constraints - current restriction of any passenger service enhancments to two-hourly service; achieving a train service commensurate with Melksham's size; lack of a realistic rail alternative to A350 between west Wiltshire and Swindon.	
Scale of impact	4	Would have a significant impact on addressing capacity constraints on the single track line through Melksham.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	3	Reasonable fit with national transport goals: improves connectivity to markets and businesses; makes better use of existing infrastructure; helps reduce carbon and air pollution emissions; provides a sustainable transport alternative for non-car users; improves end-to-end rail journey times.
Fit with other objectives	3	Reasonable fit with LTP3 objectives. Supports the strategic role of the A350 corridor set out in the emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy.
Key uncertainties	Lack of a current and proposed hourly train service; accurate cost estimate.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	3	No detailed engagement with Network Rail. However, it is considered that, subject to practical factors, the option would be generally supported.

Economic

Economic growth	**4. Amber/green**	In association with a suitably enhanced Trans Wilts train service, the scheme would have positive impacts on connectivity, reliability and resilience which would help support economic and development growth along the A350 corridor and particularly in Melksham (1,930 houses to 2026). The scheme would also provide rail industry operational benefits.
Carbon emissions	**4. Amber/green**	Encourages and facilitates a more frequent train service which would help reduce carbon emisisons.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**4. Amber/green**	Encourages and facilitates a more frequent train service which would provide a non-car travel alternative and improve the connectivity of western Wiltshire towns particularly Melksham.
Local environment	**3. Amber**	While an enhanced train service should result in positive local environmental benefits, these are considered to be rather limited in nature.
Well being	**3. Amber**	While an enhanced train service could reduce road safety casualties and risk, encourage walking and cycling trips to/from stations, and improve non-peak hour journey times, these are considered to be relatively limited in nature.
Expected VfM category	3. Medium 1.5-2	Based on average BCR of 2.83 for a heavy rail scheme in RAC Foundation report adjusted to reflect scheme circumstances.

Managerial

Implementation timetable	5. 2-5 years	Estimated timescale - there are no current or detailed proposals.
Public acceptability	4	While there are not considered to be any public consultation issues surrounding the scheme, there has only been very limited engagement with Network Rail.
Practical feasibility	3	While Network Rail has only undertaken a high level assessment, the scheme is not considered to present significant practical difficulties.

What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	1. Low	Network Rail have only undertaken a high level assessment of the scheme.
Key risks	Lack of a current or proposed hourly train service; accurate cost estimate.	

Financial

Affordability	3	It is anticipated that a proportion of the necessary funding would come from the rail industry - although the scheme is not currently programmed by Network Rail.
Capital Cost (£m)	02. 0-5	No available cost estimate.
Revenue Costs (£m)	01. None	
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	Don't know	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	1. Static	
Where is funding coming from?		
Any income generated? (£m)	No	

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**Melksham Transport Package**
Date	
Description	A package of: walking/cycling network and facility improvements; public transport service and facility enhancements; traffic and demand management measures; selective road improvements; interchange enhancements; and smarter choice measures.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	Traffic growth and delays on the A350 - impacts on employment and economic growth, road safety, journey time reliability and community severance; walking and cycling access to Melksham Oak School and the new Asda store; need to improve public transport services - local bus services, access to the railway station and improved rail services; town centre improvements.	
Scale of impact	4	Package would encourage more sustainable local trips (with resulting health, air quality, severance, public realm, etc benefits) and the transfer of some medium-distance trips to public transport, especially when the proposed TransWilts enhancements are delivered. Selective road improvements to the A350 would improve journey time reliability.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	5. High	Generally an excellent fit with national transport goals.
Fit with other objectives	5. High	Generally an excellent fit with LTP3 objectives and emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy. However, somewhat weaker relationship with economic objectives given scale of proposed development growth identified to 2026 (1,930 houses (with only 605 to be identified) and 6ha of employment land).
Key uncertainties	Degree of local appetite for behavioural change and traffic/demand management measures. Accuare cost estimate and ongoing revenue costs.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	2	Some limited engagement on some measures but no consultation on package as a whole. However, only traffic and demand management measures would be anticipated to raise significant local objections.

Economic

Economic growth	**4. Amber/green**	The prioritisation of pedestrians and cyclists, and complementary traffic management measures, may increase journey times in the town. However, this could be offset by reduced peak time delays and more reliable journey times particularly on the A350 as mode shift occurs. These factors, together with the general promotion of sustainable transport modes, will help facilitate local development growth.
Carbon emissions	**4. Amber/green**	The package of measures should have a positive impact on carbon emissions. However, the size and nature of the town, and the degree to which traffic/demand management measures and behavioural change can be successfully implemented will tend to limit this impact.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**5. Green**	The promotion of sustainable transport options should benefit vulnerable groups such as children, the elderly, etc. Regeneration benefits for the A350 corridor which is a key objective of the emerging Core Strategy.
Local environment	**4. Amber/green**	Beneficial impacts on air quality (although no identified AQMA), noise and to the setting of the market town.
Well being	**4. Amber/green**	Positive impacts on community severance, physical activity, passive crime surveillance and access to key facilities . Some possible negative impacts on road accidents as a result of more people cycling.

Expected VfM category	1. Very High >4	The report on 'The Effects of Smarter Choices Programmes in the Sustainable Travel Towns' identifies that packages of smarter choices could give a congestion-only BCR of 4.5 and an overall BCR of around 9.

Managerial

Implementation timetable	5. 2-5 years	Implementation could be undertaken over a variable timeframe.
Public acceptability	3	Some limited engagement on some measures but no consultation on package as a whole. However, only traffic and demand management measures would be anticipated to raise significant local objections.
Practical feasibility	3	Generally tried and tested measures (e.g. in DfT smarter choices demonstration towns).
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	2	Some baseline data (e.g. A350 traffic flows, bus patronage, cycle and pedestrian surveys) but little or no other detailed analysis.
Key risks	Degree of local appetite for behavioural change and traffic/demand management measures. Ongoing revenue costs.	

Financial

Affordability	3	Ability to implement package options over time. Issues regarding (ongoing) revenue costs (e.g. for personalised travel planning and bus services).
Capital Cost (£m)	02. 0-5	No package cost estimate produced.
Revenue Costs (£m)	02. 0-5	Personalised travel planning, publicity, supporting bus services and maintenance of capital elements.
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	3	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	5. Dynamic	Several different packages of measures could be implemented.
Where is funding coming from?	Potentially from CIL and LTP; existing and future s106 agreements.	
Any income generated? (£m)	Don't know	

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**MOD Corsham A4 Link**	
Date		
Description	A new single carriagewaynew link road (approx. 1km) from the MOD Corsham site (Westwells Road) to a new junction on the A4.	

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	To improve access and connections to/from the MOD Corsham site; encourage and support the growth of key development sites.	
Scale of impact	3	Expected to have a moderate impact on the identified problems and objectives.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	2	Low fit with national transport goals.
Fit with other objectives	2	Low fit with LTP objectives. Relatively modest development growth proposed in emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy (1,050 houses and 6ha of employment land). Synergy with City Deal proposal given significant military presence locally.
Key uncertainties	Objectives; scheme details; costs.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	1. Little	Little or no direct consultation on scheme - potentially contentious locally.

Economic

Economic growth	**4. Amber/green**	Positive impacts on access to/from MOD Corsham site - synergy with City Deal proposal.
Carbon emissions	**2. Red/amber**	Embedded carbon in construction, and link may encourge a greater number and percentage of vehicle trips to MOD Corsham site.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**3. Amber**	Scheme may assist in regeneration terms - link with City Deal proposal.
Local environment	**2. Red/amber**	Local landscape impacts.
Well being	**3. Amber**	No significant well being impacts.
Expected VfM category		Not established. Average BCR of 4.23 for local road schemes from RAC Foundation Report 'Rates of Return on Public Spending on Transport' (June 2009).

Managerial

Implementation timetable	6. 5-10 years	
Public acceptability	2	No direct consultation undertaken. Likely to be significant objections from some stakeholders and local residents.
Practical feasibility	3	While the scheme should not present any significant engineering issues there is no outline or detailed scheme plan.
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	2	No detailed analysis undertaken - some background data available.
Key risks	Scheme details; costs; consultation responses.	

Financial

Affordability	4	
Capital Cost (£m)	02. 0-5	No scheme cost estimate produced. As reported in Hansard, the average cost of a single carriageway scheme was £10.6m per mile in 2006.
Revenue Costs (£m)	01. None	Although there would be some ongoing maintenance costs.

Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	3	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	2	Scheme alignment options.
Where is funding coming from?	Possible use of CIL, LTP and any funding associated with City Deal.	
Any income generated? (£m)	No	

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**New Burbage Wharf Bridge**
Date	
Description	New infrastructure to replace current staggered bridge that spans high speed rail and canal routes at wharf location.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	Safety concerns as bridge crossing is in a tight 'S' bend formation that crosses a main line railway - previous accidents have included a car that left the carriageway and fell onto the track and was subsequently hit by a freight train.	
Scale of impact	4	Reduction in journey times to all traffic. Improved safety to all users.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	2	Low fit with national transport goals.
Fit with other objectives	2	Low fit with LTP objectives. Not well related to emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy. Aspirations of A338/346 Working Group to de-prime road raises value for money argument for such a scheme.
Key uncertainties	Funding and consensus from other stakeholders (e.g. Network Rail and British Waterways). Land take through CPO may be required. Recent accident record (no reported accidents since 2007).	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	2	Design work undertaken in 1960's and repeated when Burbage Bypass was completed in 1990's. Raised as issue in LTP2 area consultations. Little or no recent consultation.

Economic

Economic growth	**3. Amber**	Limited positive journey time and reliability improvement. Scheme not well related to development growth as set out in emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy.
Carbon emissions	**3. Amber**	Likely small reduction in carbon emissions through the more efficient passage of traffic, although an improved bridge alignement may induce additional HGV trips. Significant construction requirement with associated embedded carbon.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**6. No Impact**	
Local environment	**3. Amber**	Limited impact expected due to predominantly rural location although Burbage Wharf will benefit from reduced traffic impact.
Well being	**4. Amber/green**	Reduction in accidents particularly rear shunt type. However, accident statistics show no reported accidents on bridge in last 5 years (2007-2012). Some journey time benefits for non-work and non-commute trips.
Expected VfM category		Not established.

Managerial

Implementation timetable	6. 5-10 years	
Public acceptability	3	No recent consultation on scheme. Aspirations in previous community LTP consultations.
Practical feasibility	4	Previous design work undertaken. Significant co-ordination with Network Rail would be required.
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	2	Little available evidence other than design drawings.
Key risks	Costs associated with the canal and railway line crossings; environmental impacts; planning and orders processes.	

Financial

Affordability	2	Not well related to planned development growth.
Capital Cost (£m)	02. 0-5	No available accurate cost estimate.
Revenue Costs (£m)	01. None	Although there would be ongoing maintenance costs.
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	2	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	1. Static	
Where is funding coming from?		
Any income generated? (£m)	No	

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**New Staverton Bridge**
Date	
Description	An improvement of the B3105 New Terrace, Staverton in order to provide a second bridge crossing of the River Avon in the vicinity of the B3106 junction, as the existing bridge has a very poor alignment and is restricted to single track working.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	The grade II listed bridge over the River Avon at Staverton is single track, has very poor alignment, and it, and the junction of the B3105 with the B3106, are controlled by traffic signals. The restrictions give rise to congestion at peak times and it is believed that this causes HGV drivers to use the A363 Town Bridge in Bradford on Avon (which has an 18t weight limit) to access Trowbridge and the Canal Road Industrial Estate. On the other hand local people in Staverton and Hilperton believe a weight restriction should be imposed on the B3105.	
Scale of impact	2	A second river crossing parallel to the original bridge would still require junctions, possibly signalised, at either end for CPUK access and at the junction of the B3106.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	2	Low fit with national transport goals. There is the potential to reduce congestion and improve journey times for local businesses. There may also be a small reduction in journey times and carbon emissions. In terms of safety, health, quality of life and equality of opportunity, the project may improve matters in Bradford on Avon but to the detriment of the environment and people of Staverton and Hilperton.
Fit with other objectives	2	Low fit with LTP objectives. The scheme aims to minimise traffic delays, improve journey time reliability and encourage the more efficient distribution of freight. It may also reduce carbon emissions and air pollutants in Bradford on Avon which has an AQMA. The scheme would also complement the proposed Hilperton Gap Road and form an improved route to the Canal Road Industrial Estate and strategic site in Trowbridge. However, the scheme does nothing to promote healthier travel or alternatives modes of transport, and the communities of Staverton and Hilperton will be adversely affected by the increased number of HGVs and general traffic that would use the improved route.
Key uncertainties	There are considerable technical difficulties to be overcome in locating a second crossing in this location.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	1. Little	No consultation undertaken. There is likley to be considerable opposition from Staverton and Hilperton residents.

Economic

Economic growth	**4. Amber/green**	The scheme should improve connectivity, journey time reliability and resilience. However, the effect is likely to be limited due to degree with which the scheme will improve the whole route. The scheme will complement the proposed Hilperton Gap Road and together these two roads could form an improved access route to the Canal Road Industrial Estate and strategic growth area in Trowbridge. If the improved route proves particularly attractive it may promote out-commuting to Bath which would be undesireable.
Carbon emissions	**3. Amber**	Some limited reduction in carbon emissions if congestion and journey times are reduced. However, this may be negated if more traffic use the route and it gives rise to increased use and/or out-commuting. Also embedded carbon in construction.

Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**3. Amber**	The proposal may reduce traffic and its effects in Bradford on Avon but equally traffic will probably increase on the B3105 through Staverton and Hilperton, which will give rise to increased severance, noise and air pollution, which will disproportionately affect the young and the elderly.
Local environment	**2. Red/amber**	The scheme will potentially improve air quality and reduce traffic in Bradford on Avon but air and noise pollution will rise on the B3105 in Staverton and Hilperton, especially if drivers are attracted to use the improved route. In addition, construction of the new bridge will have an impact on the River Avon and its environs. It will also have a detrimental visual impact on the setting of the existing grade II listed bridge.
Well being	**3. Amber**	Severance is likely to be increased in communities along the B3105 but potentially reduced in Bradford on Avon.
Expected VfM category		Not established.

Managerial

Implementation timetable	6. 5-10 years	May require planning permission, CPOs of adjacent land, and consents from the Environment Agency.
Public acceptability	2	May be supported by some local businesses but likely to be unpopular with local residents in Staverton and Hilperton.
Practical feasibility	2	Technically feasible but very difficult to engineer a solution that improves junction capacity while maintaining all current accesses and vehicle movements.
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	1. Low	No evidence or evaluation has been undertaken to illustrate that a scheme can be delivered that confers the stated scheme objectives.
Key risks	That statutory processes cannot be overcome. That the considerable technical difficulties can be resolved to provide a second bridge that relieves congestion by increasing junction capacity whilst retaining the existing access needs and vehicular movements. That traffic, particularly HGVs, thorugh Bradford on Avon will reduce when the scheme is implemented.	

Financial

Affordability	3	
Capital Cost (£m)	02. 0-5	No accurate cost estimate available.
Revenue Costs (£m)	01. None	Although there would be ongoing maintenance
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	1.High risk	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	2	Exact location and design options would be available.
Where is funding coming from?		
Any income generated? (£m)	No	

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**Porton Down A338-A30 Link**
Date	
Description	New single carriageway road (approx. 5 miles) linking the A303 to the A30 via Porton Down.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	Improve access and connections to Porton Down to encourage and support employment growth; reduce impact of traffic on villages located along A338.	
Scale of impact	3	Expected to have a moderate impact on the identified problems and objectives.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	2	Low fit with national transport goals.
Fit with other objectives	2	Low fit with LTP objectives. Emerging Wiltshire Core strategy identifies a 10ha employment land allocation to 2026 but little housing growth. Some synergy with City Deal proposal given location of Defence Science & Technology Laboratory (DSTL).
Key uncertainties	Carriageway alignment and details; cost.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	2	Little or no direct consultation has been undertaken.

Economic

Economic growth	**4. Amber/green**	The scheme would have a positive impact on access to Porton Down and improve journey times and reliability. The scheme would also help to retain and encourage employment. Some synergy with City Deal proposal.
Carbon emissions	**1. Red**	Significant embedded carbon in construction and may encourage an increased number of vehicle trips to Porton Down sites.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**3. Amber**	No significant impacts.
Local environment	**1. Red**	Limited positive impacts on air quality (no identified AQMA) and noise particularly along A338. However, the impact of the scheme on the local landscape would be significant.
Well being	**4. Amber/green**	Reduced severance impacts for communities along A338.
Expected VfM category		Not established. Average BCR of 4.23 for local road schemes in RAC Foundation report 'Rates of Return on Public Spending on Transport' (June 2009).

Managerial

Implementation timetable	6. 5-10 years	
Public acceptability	1. Low	No direct consultation has been undertaken - likely to be significant objections.
Practical feasibility	2	No outline or detailed scheme plan.
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	2	No detailed analysis undertaken - some background data available.
Key risks	Link alignment and details; cost; consultation response; environmental impact.	

Financial

Affordability	1. Not affordable	

Capital Cost (£m)	06. 50-100	No scheme cost estimate produced. As reported in Hansard (http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200506/cmhansrd/vo061030/text/61030w0008.htm) the average cost of a single carriageway scheme was £10.6m in 2006.
Revenue Costs (£m)	01. None	Although there would be ongoing maintenance costs.
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	3	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	2	Route options.
Where is funding coming from?		
Any income generated? (£m)	No	

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**Porton Station**
Date	
Description	Construction of a new station at Porton, with 2 platforms, parking and associated facilities.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	Lack of accessibility for Porton Down businesses. Volume of traffic in Idmiston and Porton villages, and on the A338 (through Salisbury and the Winterbournes).	
Scale of impact	3	Significant benefit to business accessibility at Porton Down. Decrease in traffic in Porton/Idmiston but some additional traffic may be attracted to station. Minor improvement to congestion on the A338 London Road.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	4	Good fit with national transport goals. Improves journey times for some business travel to Porton Down and reduces the impact of traffic in Porton/Idmiston; supports economic growth by enabling new development; reduces carbon emissions; to some extent encourages healthy alternatives and protects the local environment. Maybe leads to a small adverse impact on existing bus services.
Fit with other objectives	4	Good fits with LTP3 objectives. Option is related to significant development growth at key employment site. Supports improved accessibility and encourages travel by alternatives to the private car. Supports Core Strategy policy to assist with the implementation of new stations.
Key uncertainties	Agreement with Train Operating Companies for suitable train services to stop at station. Accurate cost estimate. Level of abstraction from bus services (likely to be low).	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	3	No recent consultation. Previously expressed local support.

Economic

Economic growth	**4. Amber/green**	The option should improve journey times and journey reliability for new users. It would support a key employment development site. Is likely to be particularly helpful for MOD staff retention (e.g.staff relocating from Portsmouth).
Carbon emissions	**4. Amber/green**	Encourages modal shift to trains and may also help to encourage walking/cycling (e.g. to/from origin and destination stations).
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**4. Amber/green**	Provides rail access for people in Porton/Idmiston. Improves options for travel (and thus employment opportunities) to Porton Down particularly for those without access to a car. Impact on local bus service likely to be minimal as small existing usage (though most abstraction likely to come from the Porton Down work bus which it would replace).
Local environment	**3. Amber**	Some impacts of station construction but these are likely to be relatively minor. Site for parking needs to be identified. Minor improvements in local air quality and noise.
Well being	**4. Amber/green**	Positive impact on severance, road safety and use of active modes.
Expected VfM category	2. High 2-4	Based on average BCR for a heavy rail scheme from RAC Foundation report (based on Eddington study).

Managerial

Implementation timetable	6. 5-10 years	
Public acceptability	3	No recent consultation on scheme. Parking may lead to some objections from local residents, but these may be off-set by potential improvements to accessibility and overall traffic reduction.

Practical feasibility	2	Need Train Operating Companies to agree to stop suitable services. Needs detailed station design and costings. Current land constraints.
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	3	Halcrow study in 2001 looked at patronage and overview of feasibility. Needs to be updated in light of expansion of Porton Down site.
Key risks	Agreement with Train Operating Company. Identify suitable location for car park.	

Financial

Affordability	3	
Capital Cost (£m)	03. 5-10	Cost estimated at £1.75m in 2001 (Halcrow).
Revenue Costs (£m)	02. 0-5	Estimated at £51,000 per year in 2001 (Halcrow). Assumes existing employer-funded shuttle bus to Salisbury station is replaced with shuttle bus to Porton Station. Expected expansion of Porton Down site may reduce this subsidy.
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	2	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	2	Station localtion/details.
Where is funding coming from?	Potential funding support from Porton Down developments.	
Any income generated? (£m)	Yes	02. 0-5

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**Royal Wootton Bassett Bypass**
Date	
Description	A bypass to divert the A3102, which presently runs through Royal Wootton Bassett (RWB) town centre, to the south of the town.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	The major transport routes of the M4 and the A419, along with the expanision of Swindon is generating additional traffic and congestion in RWB. The A3102 routes traffic through RWB High Street. High volumes of HGV traffic and the levels of air pollution are also a concern.	
Scale of impact	2	A bypass could potentially remove a significant amount of through traffic from the centre of RWB but a great deal of locally generated traffic would remain, especially around the High Street area.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	2	Low fit with national transport goals. Should help to improve journey times and reduce the impact of traffic in RWB. However, it may not necessarily meet objectives on reducing carbon emissions and encouraging healthy alternatives.
Fit with other objectives	2	Low fit with LTP objectives. Whilst the scheme could help minimise traffic delays and improve journey time reliability it would not make best use of existing infrastructure or improve sustainable access. Limited development growth proposed for RWB as part of emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy.
Key uncertainties	Impact on delays and journey times. Accurate cost estimate of scheme.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	2	Safeguarded alignment for bypass was shown in the North Wiltshire Local Plan 2001 but no recent consultation undertaken.

Economic

Economic growth	**3. Amber**	The option could help improve journey times but it does not improve accessibility and is not closely related to any significant development growth.
Carbon emissions	**1. Red**	Option may result in longer trips and also encourage addtional trips, especially by car. Signficant construction requirements with embedded carbon.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**3. Amber**	Some positive impact for vulnerable groups in the centre of RWB as a result of lower traffic levels.
Local environment	**2. Red/amber**	Whilst there may be benefits in the centre of RWB due to improved air quality (although no identified AQMA) and less noise pollution, there will be a negative impact on the local natural environment.
Well being	**4. Amber/green**	Positive impact for those within RWB town centre especially by reducing severance and intimidation from traffic.
Expected VfM category		Not established. Average BCR for local road scheme = 4.23 (from RAC Foundation report 'Rates of Return on Public Spending on Transport' (June 2009).

Managerial

Implementation timetable	6. 5-10 years	
Public acceptability	2	No recent consultation on scheme although it was included in North Wilts 2001 Local Plan.
Practical feasibility	2	Technical appraisal of the scheme was undertaken by Halcrow in 1995; however traffic modelling and feasibility would need to be re-visited.
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	2	As above.
Key risks	Public opposition. Environmental impacts. Planning and order processes.	

Financial

Affordability	2	Relatively high scheme cost and limited local developer contributions available.
Capital Cost (£m)	05. 25-50	No cost estimate produced. Average cost of single carriageway scheme was £10.6m per mile in 2006 (see http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200506/cmhansrd/vo061030/text/61030w0008.htm).
Revenue Costs (£m)	01. None	Although there would be ongoing maintenance costs.
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	2	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	2	Other route alignments could be considered.
Where is funding coming from?		
Any income generated? (£m)	No	

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**Royal Wootton Bassett Station**
Date	
Description	Construction of a railway station with two platforms and associated station facilities.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	Congestion and air quality issues associated with road-based trips in the RWB area. Congestion around J16 of the M4. Local development growth in local Wiltshire area and also in and around Swindon.	
Scale of impact	3	Improved sustainable transport options for RWB residents and nearby settlements, pariticularly commuters. However, development growth in RWB is relatively small scale compared to other towns in Wiltshire.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	4	Good fit with national transport goals on economic growth, reducing transport emissions and improving quality of life.
Fit with other objectives	4	Good fit with LTP3 objectives. Also a good fit with City Deal given proposal to create a new defence training college at former RAF Lyneham.
Key uncertainties	Accurate cost estimate. Availability of and capacity for new train services on this line and resulting effect on journey times elsewhere on the network. Possible need for platform loop.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	3	Little direct consultation on scheme details but historically has been part of the North Wilts Local Plan for a number of years and is included in emerging Core Strategy. Included as stakeholder aspiration in Great Western RUS.

Economic

Economic growth	**4. Amber/green**	Provides increased resilience through greater transport choice. Helps to support planned development growth in the area - 920 houses and 3.7ha of employment land. Postive impact on journey times and helps to reduce congestion in and around RWB.
Carbon emissions	**4. Amber/green**	Great Western mainline due to be electrified. Encourages modal shift to rail.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**4. Amber/green**	Providing great levels of accessibility for all; improves available travel options. Helps support local economic regeneration.
Local environment	**4. Amber/green**	Positive but probably limited impact on air quality. Some impact on urban/rural environment.
Well being	**4. Amber/green**	Improves levels of accessibility to services, places of employment etc.
Expected VfM category	2. High 2-4	Based on typical BCR for heavy rail scheme.

Managerial

Implementation timetable	5. 2-5 years	Potential implicatons of other works on GWML.

Public acceptability	3	No recent direct consultation although historically part of North Wiltshire Local Plan and LTP. Included as stakeholder aspiration in Great Western RUS.
Practical feasibility	3	Land safeguarded in Local Plan. However, the rail lines at RWB pose a problem in introducing a new local stopping service because of the high speed trains using the lines. The two Inter City routes (i.e. the Bath Spa and Parkway routes) join immediately to the west of the former RWB station site - possibility that new track and infrastructure (possibly in the form of 'platform loops', additional running lines and new signalling) could be required along the route to provide the necessary capacity for both high speed and local service trains.
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	3	Further detailed work is required but similar schemes have been successfully implemented elsewhere in UK.
Key risks	Availability of and capacity for accommodating new train stopping services - would need to be resolved between respective local authorities, Network Rail and the relevant Train Operating Companies. Accurate cost estimate.	

Financial

Affordability	3	
Capital Cost (£m)	04. 10-25	Based on Corsham Station estimate (£4m at 2002 prices) plus consideration of need for a 'loop'.
Revenue Costs (£m)	02. 0-5	To be determined but Corsham RPP bid estimated £1.5m operating cost at 2000 prices.
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	2	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	2	Other station locations considered in the past.
Where is funding coming from?		
Any income generated? (£m)	Yes	02. 0-5

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**Royal Wootton Bassett Transport Package**
Date	
Description	Package of measures to include a new walk/cycle route between Royal Wootton Bassett (RWB) and Swindon, and a personalisied travel planning project for residential developments. Also includes improvements to the walking and cycling network, public transport improvements, traffic and demand management measures, interchange enhancements, smarter choices, and selective roads improvements.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	The expansion of Swindon along with high level of out-commuting towards the M4 is generating additional traffic and congestion in RWB resulting in community severance and poor journey time reliability. High levels of HGV traffic along with concerns about air pollution are also local issues.	
Scale of impact	3	Likely to encourage more local trips by sustainable modes although many vehicular through trips are likely to remain.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	5. High	Generally an excellent fit with the Government's national transport goals.
Fit with other objectives	5. High	Generally an excellent fit with LTP3 objectives and emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy. However, somewhat weaker relationship with economic objectives given relatively limited proposed development growth to 2026 (920 houses and 5ha of employment land). Some synergy with City Deal proposals given redevelopment at RAF Lyneham.
Key uncertainties	Ongoing revenue costs. The degree of public uptake of more sustainable modes of transport and traffic/demand management measures. Accurate cost estimates for key infrastructure required.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	2	No specific consultation undertaken.

Economic

Economic growth	**4. Amber/green**	Likely positive impact on journey times due to reduced peak time congestion. Package would support proposed development growth albeit that this is at a relatively low level.
Carbon emissions	**4. Amber/green**	Encourages the use of more sustainable modes, which is likely to have a positive impact on behaviour change and carbon emissions. The scale of reduction is dependent on the extent by which demand management measures and sustainable transport improvements can be implemented.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**5. Green**	The promotion of sustainable modes and the reduction of traffic and congestion should help improve accessibility for vulnerable groups such as the eldery and disabled.
Local environment	**4. Amber/green**	Postive impacts on air quality (but no identified AQMA) and noise although high levels of traffic and congestion are likely to remain. Improvements to streetscape in RWB.
Well being	**4. Amber/green**	Positive impacts on community severance, levels of physical activity and access to key locations and services.
Expected VfM category	1. Very High >4	The report on 'The Effects of Smarter Choices Programmes in the Sustainable Travel Towns' identifies that packages of smarter choices could give a congestion-only BCR of 4.5 and an overall BCR of around 9.

Managerial

Implementation timetable	5. 2-5 years	Variable time frame - some improvements could be implemented in a relatively short time frame whilst others would take longer to design and implement.
Public acceptability	2	Little direct consultation but package considered to be broadly uncontroversial although will require some traffic/demand management and behavioural change measures which may raise some objections.
Practical feasibility	3	Generally employs tried and tested measures (e.g. in DfT smarter choices demonstration towns) although not tested extensively locally.
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	3	Evidence from similar projects elsewhere in the UK demonstrates significant modal shift along with associated positive impacts on transport emissions. However, there is little baseline data and little or no detailed analysis has been undertaken locally.
Key risks	Degree of local appetite for behavioural change. Land ownership requirements (cycle route to Swindon). Public opposition. Lack of (ongoing) revenue funding.	

Financial

Affordability	3	Ability to implement package options over time. However, issues regarding ongoing revenue costs (e.g. personalised travel planning and bus services).
Capital Cost (£m)	02. 0-5	No package cost estimate produced.
Revenue Costs (£m)	02. 0-5	Smarter choices measures such as personalised travel plans and supported bus services.
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	3	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	5. Dynamic	Various options for cycle route and flexible approach to other measures proposed.
Where is funding coming from?	Potentially from CIL and LTP; existing and future s106 agreements.	
Any income generated? (£m)	Don't know	

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**Salisbury bypass**
Date	
Description	A single carriageway bypass of Salisbury. Preferred option from A36 Southampton Road to A36 Wilton Road/A360 (including Harnham Relief Road). Alternative 'Eastern bypass' from A36 Southampton Road to A338 London Road/A345/A36.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	Traffic delays and queues at peak times; high traffic volumes on the A36 and Netherhampton Road; air quality in the AQMA; community severance; intimidation for vulnerable road users.	
Scale of impact	3	While the bypass would remove the majority of through traffic i.e. 40-50% of traffic from the A36 (or 15-22% from A30/A338 for an eastern bypass route), significant existing local traffic would remain and the additional highway capacity may encourage other local car trips.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	3	Reasonable fit with national transport goals. Improves journey times and reduces the impact of traffic in Salisbury; would help support economic and development growth, but would not meet objectives of reducing carbon emissions, encouraging healthy alternatives and protecting the local environment. Moreover, the option does not make better use of existing infrastructure and there may be some adverse impact on existing rail and bus services.
Fit with other objectives	3	Reasonable fit with LTP3 objectives - option is on a key strategic route and related to significant development growth in Salisbury. However, positive impacts (e.g. reduced traffic delays and an improved public realm) are offset by a number of negative impacts (e.g. carbon emissions, landscape, ecology). Does not reduce the need to travel by private car. Salisbury Transport Strategy sets out package of measures to address identified problems using alternative measures (Park & Ride, parking management, junction remodelling and smarter choices).
Key uncertainties	Degree of positive impact on delays and journey times; level of abstraction from bus and rail services; accurate cost estimate; environmental and landscape impacts.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	1. Little	Little or no consultation has been undertaken in the last decade or so and the option is likely to be very controversial.

Economic

Economic growth	**4. Amber/green**	The option should improve journey times and variability - although much local traffic would remain. The A36 is a key route and the scheme would help support economic and significant development growth in Salisbury.
Carbon emissions	**1. Red**	The option is likely to encourage additional road trips especially by car and abstract from parallel bus and rail services. There are also significant construction requirements with embedded carbon.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**3. Amber**	Some potential positive impacts for vulnerable groups on Wilton Road/ Harnham Road as a result of lower traffic volumes and therefore less intimidation, but this may be offset by the potential negative impact on parallel bus and rail services.
Local environment	**1. Red**	The negative impact on the local natural environment (sensitive and protected areas) is only partially offest by the benefits in Salisbury because a significant amount of local traffic will remain or may be generated. The ring road has already removed most traffic from the city centre, and significant additional changes would be needed to improve the urban realm/reduce traffic speeds on the ring road. Most benefit would be on Wilton Road/Harnham Road.

Well being	**3. Amber**	Positive impact on severance and use of active modes particularly on Wilton Road/Harnham Road is partly offset by the remaining/generated significant local traffic and the potential impact on existing bus and train services as a result of abstraction.
Expected VfM category		Not established. Average BCR for local road scheme = 4.23 (from RAC Foundation report 'Rates of Return on Public Spending on Transport' (June 2009).

Managerial

Implementation timetable	6. 5-10 years	
Public acceptability	2	No recent consultation on scheme. Necessary consultation process would likely be long and difficult. Likely strong opposition to any northern/eastern route, and substantial controversy over southern route options.
Practical feasibility	2	Need to identify new route (as new developments have been built/planned on preferred alignments (at Rowbarrow, Fugglestone and Bishopsdown)) and model scheme and take through statutory requirements. The environmental impacts of any scheme would be significant.
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	3	Modelling undertaken to suport development of Salisbury Transport Package but any bypass scheme would requrie more and specific modelling. Substantial environmental assessments carried out on previously proposed alignments.
Key risks	1997 report stated that no alignment could be found that would not raise significant ecological concerns and necessitate extensive ameliorative work. Local opposition. Accurate cost estimates - risk of cost overruns. Unknown impact on bus and rail services.	

Financial

Affordability	1. Not affordable	
Capital Cost (£m)	07. 100-250	£75million in 1995 prices - approx. £180m in 2011 prices.
Revenue Costs (£m)	01. None	Although there would be ongoing maintenence costs.
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	1.High risk	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	2	Several possible alignments.
Where is funding coming from?		
Any income generated? (£m)	No	

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**Salisbury Freight Consolidation Facility**
Date	
Description	A freight consolidation centre at the former Imerys site (junction of Wilton Road/Penning Road) in Salisbury. Facility would enable large loads to be broken up and delivered into Salisbury using smaller vehicles.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	HGV deliveries into the centre of Salisbury can be difficult due to historic streets, congestion and traffic delays. The presence of HGVs in the central area cause issues of threat and intimidation, particularly to vulnerable road users. Also, the HGV movements contribute to local air quality/noise issues.	
Scale of impact	3	Expected to have a reasonable impact on the problem identified in terms of reducing the impact on HGVs on the local community and environment within Salisbury. However, may be additonal costs and time (double handling) for users.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	3	Reasonable fit with national transport goals - particularly in relation to reducing transport emissions, better health and improving quality of life.
Fit with other objectives	3	Reasoanble fit with LTP objectives e.g. helping to achieve the more efficient and sustainable delivery of freight around Wiltshire; improve air quality; reduce the impact of traffic severance, noise and vibration on local communities; and help reduce traffic delays in Salisbury.
Key uncertainties	Site suitability and highway access into site. Likely level of use by businesses and hauliers. Operational costs and practicalities.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	2	Included as option in consultation on LTP3 and Imerys Quarry allocated as strategic employment site in emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy. However, no local or direct consultaton on freight consultation scheme undertaken.

Economic

Economic growth	**3. Amber**	Whilst journey times may increase for hauliers as loads have to be split, there may be some traffic management benefits in Salisbury as a result of the reduced number of HGVs in the central area.
Carbon emissions	**3. Amber**	Potential to use smaller, more fuel efficient vehicles to make deliveries; realised benefit depends on the number of deliveries that are transferred via the consolidation centre. Reduction in number of large HGVs in the town centre but possibility of extended journeys for some HGVs to actually reach site.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**3. Amber**	Limited impacts.
Local environment	**3. Amber**	Likely positive impact on air quality, noise pollution and the quality of the urban environment in central Salisbury. However, some adverse impacts in local area around site and on routes to site.

Well being	**4. Amber/green**	Reduced intimidation from large HGVs should reduce community severance in Salisbury centre and may encourage additional walking and cycling trips.
Expected VfM category	4. Low 1-1.5	BCR between 0.82 and 1.05 based on Freight Consolidation Study Report by Scott Wilson 2010.

Managerial

Implementation timetable	5. 2-5 years	Site allocated for employment in emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy and has an existing rail head.
Public acceptability	2	Little direct consultation undertaken - likely to be generally supported but risk of objections from residents near to site. Views from businesses/retailers need to be established.
Practical feasibility	2	Other freight consolidation examples elsewhere in the UK such as Bristol; however, doubts on applicability of option for city such as Salisbury. View from businesses/retailers important for operational feasibility.
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	2	Freight consolidation facilities are operating elsewhere in the UK but some issues identified in terms of on-going revenue costs.
Key risks	Demand for use from local businesses/retailers. Ongoing revenue costs. Access arrangements into Imerys Quarry site.	

Financial

Affordability	3	Funding of ongoing operating costs is likely to present an issue.
Capital Cost (£m)	02. 0-5	Estimated in the range of £1m to £2m.
Revenue Costs (£m)	02. 0-5	Estimated at £200k to £500k per annum.
Cost profile	Often requires operating subsidies (as seen from other examples in UK).	
Overall cost risk	3	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	3	
Where is funding coming from?		
Any income generated? (£m)	Yes	02. 0-5

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**Salisbury Rail Freight Facility**
Date	
Description	Rail freight facility (and waste consolidation/waste to energy centre) at Quidhampton, Salisbury utilising the existing rail head.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	Bulk transportation of goods including waste by rail to relevant markets and processing plants - reduced length and number of HGV trips; lower carbon and air pollution emisisons.	
Scale of impact	2	Likely to only affect a limited number of overall HGV trips on the network. Any benefits for wider South Wiltshire area offset by adverse impacts on immediate local area.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	3	Reasonable fit with national transport goals - reduced number of HGV trips on strategic highway network; lower carbon and air pollution emisisons; and reduced risk of transport accidents. Makes use of existing rail infrastructure.
Fit with other objectives	3	Reasonable fit with LTP3 objectives - e.g. sustainable freight distribution; reduced air pollution and carbon emissions; making best use of existing infrastructure. Synergy with emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy given Salisbury's role as a Principal Settlement and allocation of site (Former Imerys Quarry) as employment land (4ha).
Key uncertainties	Demand for and use of facility - scale of benefits and operational costs. Local impacts. Access difficulties.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	2	Site has previous use as quarry with existing railhead. However, no or little recent consultation on scheme concept.

Economic

Economic growth	**3. Amber**	Uncertain impact on users' journey times, reliability and costs - depends on journey distance and load frequencies. Limited positive impacts on overall journey times, realibility and safety. Possible impact on strategic employment site allocation in Core Strategy.
Carbon emissions	**4. Amber/green**	Some positive impacts on carbon emisions - scale depends on number and nature of transferred HGV trips.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**6. No Impact**	No obvious impacts except for providing a few job opportunities.
Local environment	**2. Red/amber**	Air quality and noise benefits derived from the reduction in medium/long-distance HGV trips needs to be weighed against air quality, noise and urban environmental impacts in local area around the site.
Well being	**2. Red/amber**	Local community severance impacts from increased HGV movements. Transfer of some HGV trips to rail should lower road safety risks.
Expected VfM category	4. Low 1-1.5	As suggested by BCRs from Faber Maunsell repot 'North Wales Rail Strategy Study'.

Managerial

Implementation timetable	5. 2-5 years	Railhead already in place. Site allocation for employment in Core Strategy.
Public acceptability	3	Historic use of site as quarry and some consultation on future use of site as employment land in Core Strategy. However, no recent consultation on use as rail freight facility and waste consolidation centre. Wider support is likely to be outweighed by local objections.

Practical feasibility	4	National evidence (from Spalding RFI Study) suggests that basic rail freight interchanges are practical. Expressed concerns by Highways Agency over access arrangements to/from A36. Need to improve land conditions from previous minerals use.
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	3	Some national evidence (e.g. Spalding RFI Study). Local evidence from Wiltshire and Swindon Rail Aggregate Study in 2003 and transport assessments commissioned by site owner Imerys.
Key risks	Demand for and use of site. Willing operator. Ongoing revenue costs. Access arrangments. Local opposition.	

Financial

Affordability	3	Funding of ongoing revenue costs will be an issue particularly in view of likely usage levels.
Capital Cost (£m)	02. 0-5	The Spalding RFI Study estimated a cost of £15m (£10m for main line connections and £5m for construction of the interchange and highway access) for a basic rail freight interchange and highway access on a green field site with no existing main line or highway connections.
Revenue Costs (£m)	02. 0-5	Typical operating costs would be £20-25 per container lift (based on Spalding RFI Study).
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	3	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	3	Some flexibility to scale scheme up and down.
Where is funding coming from?		
Any income generated? (£m)	Yes	02. 0-5

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**Salisbury Transport Package**
Date	
Description	Integrated transport strategy for the Salisbury and Wilton area.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	The Salisbury Transport Strategy identifies a number of problems and objectives including: highway network constraints and reliability; poor air quality; congestion; limited focus on sustainable means of travel; expensive and limited public transport services.	
Scale of impact	3	As part of the Wiltshire Core Strategy process, significant work on transport has been undertaken. However, the reduction in housing numbers has meant that the transport strategy has been scaled back accordingly.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	5. High	Excellent fit with national transport goals.
Fit with other objectives	5. High	Excellent fit with LTP objectives and Wiltshire Core Strategy (6,060 houses and 29ha of employment land to 2026).
Key uncertainties	The South Wiltshire Core Strategy is front loaded and development is therefore likely to come forward prior to the adoption of the Council's CIL. The ability to obtain sufficient funds via s106 to implement the proposed strategy is uncertain.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	4	The examination in public demonstrated that the approach adopted by the Council was acceptable.

Economic

Economic growth	**4. Amber/green**	The 'Salisbury Transport Strategy - Option Assessment Report' concludes that the measures would have a slight positive impact.
Carbon emissions	**4. Amber/green**	The Options Assessment Report concludes that whilst the package increases CO2 emissions, it increases CO2 emissions by less than business as usual.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**5. Green**	Provides access to regeneration sites and improved access by provision of public transport services from new housing locations.
Local environment	**4. Amber/green**	Expected improvements in air quality (AQMAs identified) compared to do nothing scenarios due to more sustainable modes of travel being used.
Well being	**4. Amber/green**	Positive impact on health by promoting walking and cycling.
Expected VfM category	1. Very High >4	The report on 'The Effects of Smarter Choices Programmes in the Sustainable Travel Towns' identifies that packages of smarter choices could give a congestion-only BCR of 4.5 and an overall BCR of around 9.

Managerial

Implementation timetable	6. 5-10 years	While there may be some flexibility in delivery timescales, the Strategy is planned to be delivered within the Core Strategy period (i.e. to 2026).
Public acceptability	4	Consultation on the Salisbury Transport Strategy has been undertaken via the South Wiltshire Core Strategy and examination in public process.
Practical feasibility	5. High	The process of developing the Salisbury Transport Strategy meant that only affordable and deliverable schemes were included in the adopted plan.
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	5. High	Based on South Wiltshire Core Strategy evidence base using modelling tools.

Key risks	Ensuring that the funding level meets that required to implement the Strategy. Lack of public appetite for demand mangement measures and necessary behavioural change.

Financial

Affordability	5. Affordable	Only measures that were considered affordable were included in the final Salisbury Transport Strategy otherwise the South Wiltshire Core Strategy could have been deemed unsound.
Capital Cost (£m)	04. 10-25	The 'Salisbury Transport Plan - Options Assessment Report' (para. 6.59) outlines that the 'radical' approach would cost approximately £15m.
Revenue Costs (£m)	02. 0-5	The 'Salisbury Transport Plan - Options Assessment Report' (Table 6.7) shows approximate annual costs of £4.25m.
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	4	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	5. Dynamic	Flexibility in Strategy delivery although plan is to implement in line with Core Strategy timescale (i.e. to 2026).
Where is funding coming from?	Potentially from CIL and LTP; existing and future s106 agreements.	
Any income generated? (£m)	Yes	02. 0-5

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**Sparcells Station**
Date	
Description	Construction of a new railway station with associated facilities at Sparcells / Moredon Bridge on the Kemble to Swindon line.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	Reduce road-based trips and journey times leading to congestion and air quality issues particularly within Swindon; relieve burden on local road network; support planned development growth and local economy within the area.	
Scale of impact	2	Improved sustainable transport option particularly for west side of Swindon. However, overall impact on objectives is considered to be fairly limited given typical expected mode share.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	4	Good fit with national transport goals.
Fit with other objectives	4	Good fit with LTP3 objectives. Better related to emerging Swindon Borough Council Local Plan than emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy.
Key uncertainties	Agreement with Train Operating Companies for services to stop at this site. Accurate cost estimate. Level of abstraction from bus services. Public consensus and evidence of requirement and modelling of use / location benefits to be considered.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	1. Little	No significant consultation undertaken.

Economic

Economic growth	**3. Amber**	Station would improve local connectivity options and provide improved journey times for users. Provides some limited support for economic and development growth in west of Swindon.
Carbon emissions	**4. Amber/green**	Encourages modal shift to sustainable transport mode (especially for medium to long journeys) and may also help encourage walking/cycling to the station from local area.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**4. Amber/green**	Provides rail access for Sparcells, Purton and west Swindon areas. Improves options for travel (and thus employment opportunities) for those without access to a car. Some potential impact on local bus services.
Local environment	**3. Amber**	Limited positive impacts on air quality and noise. Some local environmental impacts from station construction and use.
Well being	**3. Amber**	Potential positive but limited impacts on physical activity and leisure trips.
Expected VfM category	2. High 2-4	Based on average BCR for a heavy rail scheme from RAC Foundation report (based on Eddington study).

Managerial

Implementation timetable	6. 5-10 years	Network Rail have confirmed that there are no firm proposals for a station in this vicinity and that full optioneering and development work would need to be undertaken. However, Network Rail has confirmed that the Swindon to Kemble redoubling would not prejudice any future station proposal.
Public acceptability	3	No direct consultation on scheme but option is considered to be generally uncontroversial.
Practical feasibility	2	Need Train Operating Companies to agree to stop suitable services. Needs detailed station design and costings.

What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	1. Low	Little available robust evidence available.
Key risks	Agreement with Train Operating Companies for suitable services to stop at station. Accurate cost estimate. Public consensus and evidence of requirement and modelling of use / location benefits to be considered.	

Financial

Affordability	3	
Capital Cost (£m)	03. 5-10	Based on £4m estimate for Corsham Station produced by Railtrack in 2002.
Revenue Costs (£m)	02. 0-5	Based on £1.5m operating costs in Corsham Station RPP document.
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	2	
Other costs	Highway access/junctions.	

Commercial

Flexibility of option	2	
Where is funding coming from?		
Any income generated? (£m)	Yes	02. 0-5

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**Station Bridge, Westbury**
Date	
Description	Strengthening of bridge from its current 7.5t load bearing weight up to 40t using a composite deck solution.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	The current 7.5t weight limit leads to increased journey times for +7.5t vehicles to access the West Wilts Trading Estate especially those travelling to/from the south (Network Rail carried out strengthening of the bridge main girders to 40t capacity in 2011 and as a result the bridge was taken off Network Rail's list of Sensitive Structures - any improvements/repairs associated with a 40t capacity are Wiltshire Council's responsibility.	
Scale of impact	4	Would provide a southern access for +7.5t vehicles to access the West Wilts Trading Estate. However, this would reintroduce these vehicles to the local route with resultant impacts on the local community.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	3	Reasonable fit with national transport goals: improves journey times and network connectivity; lower carbon emissions. However, potential for adverse air quality and local community impacts.
Fit with other objectives	3	Reasonable fit with LTP3 objectives: minimises traffic delays; more efficient freight distribution; lower carbon emisisons. However, there may be adverse air quality and local community impacts. Complements desire in emerging Core Strategy for Westbury to be a key employment location.
Key uncertainties	Views of local residents to reinstatement of 40t rating. Cost of strengthening works e.g. cost of managing existing utility services.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	2	No direct consultation on scheme option. Objection to current 7.5 tonne limit received from local businesses and chamber of commerce.

Economic

Economic growth	**3. Amber**	Positive but limited impact on journey times, journey reliabilty and network connectivity. Provides improved access to existing Principal Employment Areas (West Wilts Trading Estate and Brook Lane & Northacre Trading Estate) and a proposed strategic employment land allocation at Mill Lane, Hawkridge (14.7ha).
Carbon emissions	**3. Amber**	Limited positive impact on carbon emissions as a result of slightly reduced journey distances for some HGV movements.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**3. Amber**	Some potential but limited regeneration benefits for the local Westbury economy and the A350 corridor.
Local environment	**3. Amber**	Will result in some redistribution of environmental impacts as a result of changed HGV trip patterns.
Well being	**3. Amber**	Will result in some redistribution of community impacts as a result of changed HGV trip patterns. Local bus journeys should benefit from full access along Station Road.
Expected VfM category		Not established.

Managerial

Implementation timetable	4. 1-2 years	Dependent on Network Rail permissions.
Public acceptability	2	The proposal to reintroduce +7.5t vehicles along Station Road may lead to objections from local residents.
Practical feasibility	4	An assessment of the bridge and the required works has been undertaken which recommended that "...the composite deck solution is adopted as it provides the 40t capacity with minimum delay or impact to the railway line".
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	3	The Council's term consultant, Mouchel, produced the following report in April 2012: 'Westbury Station Bridge - Strengthening Feasibility Report'.
Key risks	Local community opposition; accurate scheme cost (e.g. due to track access requriements, utility services management, etc).	

Financial

Affordability	4	
Capital Cost (£m)	02. 0-5	Mouchel estimated range: £446,000 to £1,031,000 (a budgetary construction cost estimate assuming major works for management of utility services is in the order of £800,000 to £1m).
Revenue Costs (£m)	01. None	Although there would be ongoing maintenance costs.
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	2	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	2	
Where is funding coming from?		
Any income generated? (£m)	No	

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**Staverton Station**
Date	
Description	New station constructed at Staverton, served by the proposed Trans Wilts service, consisting of a single platform with basic facilities.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	Hilperton and Staverton are beyond easy walking access to a railway station. The bus services from Staverton (in particular) do not provide a regular pattern service likely to attract car owners. The objective is to provide good inter-urban rail access.	
Scale of impact	3	It is considered that the option would have a moderate impact on the identified problem/objectives.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	4	Good fit with national transport goals.
Fit with other objectives	4	Good fit with LTP3 objectives. Lesser fit with emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy given development growth proposals.
Key uncertainties	Train operating company stopping a suitable train service - envisaged to be improved Trans Wilts service. Detailed station location assessment and feasibility.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	3	No detailed consultation undertaken, but option identified as a stakeholder aspiration in Great Western RUS.

Economic

Economic growth	**3. Amber**	Offers improved connectivity and accessibility but area is not identified as a significant economic or development growth priority in emerging Core Strategy.
Carbon emissions	**3. Amber**	Limited expected modal shift. Emissions from stopping trains and embedded carbon in construction.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**3. Amber**	Improves access to a sustainable transport option especially for those people without access to a car. Some limited positive impacts on the regeneration of the A350 corridor.
Local environment	**3. Amber**	Limited impacts on air quality, noise and the urban and natural environment.
Well being	**4. Amber/green**	Some improvements in accessibility to key locations. May encourage increased physical activity to/from station from local area.
Expected VfM category	3. Medium 1.5-2	Based on BCR of 2.83 from RAC Foundation report and 2.58 from Corsham Station RPP document - adjusted to reflect Staverton circumstances.

Managerial

Implementation timetable	6. 5-10 years	
Public acceptability	3	No detailed consultation undertaken, but option identified as a stakeholder aspiration in Great Western RUS.
Practical feasibility	2	No station assessment or feasibility study undertaken. No identified stopping service - however, LSTF Trans Wilts service enhancement would be relevant here.
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	1. Low	Little supporting evidence. Passenger demand would be difficult to forecast - easier if/when Trans Wilts service is improved and demand at Melksham Station can be monitored.
Key risks	Accurate cost estimate; business case inadequate to persuade train operating company to serve the station; possibility of additional line capacity works being required; passenger use being lower than forecast.	

Financial

Affordability	3	

Capital Cost (£m)	03. 5-10	Based on £4m estimate for Corsham Station produced by Railtrack in 2002.
Revenue Costs (£m)	02. 0-5	Based on £1.5m operating costs in Corsham Station RPP bid document (2000).
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	2	
Other costs	Scheme may affect / depend upon capacity enhancements to the Westbury-Swindon line.	

Commercial

Flexibility of option	1. Static	
Where is funding coming from?		
Any income generated? (£m)	Yes	02. 0-5

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**Strategic Bus Network Package**
Date	
Description	Package of measures including: 'kickstart' funding for 4 routes; bus stop and shelter improvements on routes not improved by the Key Bus Route Network project; measures to improve punctuality at 'pinch points'; marketing initiatives; limited extensions to existing real time passenger information system.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	The scheme supports the LTP Public Transport Strategy objective of improving the attractiveness and commercial viability of the main inter-urban bus routes - helps to provide a more attractive alternative to the private car; through increased passenger use, enables services to operate with less need for Council subsidy funding.	
Scale of impact	3	Similar measures have been effective at increasing patronage levels on other routes e.g. service 55.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	4	Good fit with national transport goals. Scheme would contribute to quality of life, equality of opportunity, economic growth and reduced carbon emissions goals.
Fit with other objectives	4	Good fit with LTP objectives. Scheme supports access to jobs, education, training, retail, health, social and other opportunities. Good fit with Wiltshire Community Plan for major shift to sustainable travel modes on key corridors.
Key uncertainties	The 'kickstart' programme relies on being able to identify routes where there is the potential to achieve sufficient growth to allow the improved service levels to be sustained without ongoing funding.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	2	Scheme measures not yet developed in detail and have not been discussed with stakeholders.

Economic

Economic growth	**4. Amber/green**	Improves non-car access between main towns and service centres.
Carbon emissions	**4. Amber/green**	Scheme aims to achieve modal shift to more sustainable and efficient bus use.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**4. Amber/green**	Improves accessibilty for those without access to a car.
Local environment	**3. Amber**	Some possible positive air quality and noise benefits but infrastructure may have localised visual impacts.
Well being	**4. Amber/green**	A generally positive impact on community severance, physical activity, road safety and access to services and facilities.
Expected VfM category	2. High 2-4	A report by Jacobs Consultancy 'Value for Money and Appraisal of Small Scale Public Transport Schemes' (e.g. bus priority measures, interchange enhancements, RTPI, P&R, etc) found that these type of schemes delivered a median BCR of 3.5.

Managerial

Implementation timetable	5. 2-5 years	
Public acceptability	4	Consultation on LTP Public Transport Strategy suggests that the scheme measures would be popular with many stakeholder groups.
Practical feasibility	4	Need to identify potential routes suitable for 'kickstart' programme.
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	2	No detailed work undertaken to develop project.

Key risks	That improved services might prove not to be financially sustainable at the end of the 'kickstart' funding period. That, in the absence of Council funding to maintain new bus shelters, parish and town councils do not agree to take over maintenance and cleaning responsibilities.

Financial

Affordability	2	Low score related to scheme revenue costs.
Capital Cost (£m)	02. 0-5	Estimated £0.5m-£1m for bus stop improvements, measures to improve punctuality, and improvements to RTPI (all scaleable).
Revenue Costs (£m)	01. None	Estimated £1.8m for 'kickstart' and marketing measures (scaleable).
Cost profile	Kickstart' funding would be highest in year 1 and decline over years 3-5. Capital funding spread over 3-5 years.	
Overall cost risk	4	
Other costs	Maintenance of shelters (Council would seek relevant parish / town council to take on this responsibility before agreeing to proceed at a site).	

Commercial

Flexibility of option	4	Scale of activity could be adjusted to match funding.
Where is funding coming from?	Likely combination of: LTP integrated block funding; CIL; and investment by commercial operators in vehicles and marketing.	
Any income generated? (£m)	Yes	02. 0-5

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**Swindon-Cricklade Heritage Line**
Date	
Description	Rejoining the Swindon and Cricklade Heritage Line with the Golden Valley mainline which runs between Cheltenham Spa and Swindon.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	Improve sustainable transport options in Cricklade. Congestion and air quality issues in and around Swindon, particulary associated with commuter traffic in North Swindon.	
Scale of impact	2	Anticipated to have a modest overall impact through improved journey times for users and providing sustainable access into Swindon and elsewhere on the rail system.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	3	Reasonable fit with national transport goals such as reducing transport emissions and improving quality of life.
Fit with other objectives	3	Reasonable fit with LTP objectives. Lesser fit with emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy given proposed level of development growth in Cricklade.
Key uncertainties	Level of passenger demand; technical feasibility; agreement with Network Rail and TOCs; accurate cost estimate.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	2	Little or no consultation undertaken although some local aspirations for re-opening of the line.

Economic

Economic growth	**3. Amber**	Option may help improve journey time reliability for users and help support economic growth in local area. However, Cricklade is not identified for significant planned growth in emerging Core Strategy.
Carbon emissions	**4. Amber/green**	Should encourage use of more sustainable transport modes although scale of impact is likely to be limited.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**3. Amber**	Provides rail access for those living in the Cricklade area and improves accessibility options for those without access to a car.
Local environment	**3. Amber**	Limited impacts on air quality and noise.
Well being	**4. Amber/green**	Increased levels of accessibility for local people and leisure users. Potential positive impact on physical activity and safety.
Expected VfM category	3. Medium 1.5-2	Based on average BCR of 2.83 for a heavy rail scheme from RAC Foundation report adjusted to reflect local circumstances.

Managerial

Implementation timetable	6. 5-10 years	
Public acceptability	2	No formal consultation undertaken on scheme although some local aspirations for re-opening of the line.

Practical feasibility	2	No detailed assessment or feasability study undertaken. Need agreement from Netowrk Rail and TOCs. Station options and designs required.
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	1. Low	Little evidence readily available.
Key risks	Agreement with Network Rail/TOCs; cost estimate; technical feasibility.	

Financial

Affordability	2	
Capital Cost (£m)	02. 0-5	No scheme estimate produced.
Revenue Costs (£m)	02. 0-5	
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	1.High risk	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	2	
Where is funding coming from?		
Any income generated? (£m)	Yes	02. 0-5

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**Thingley West Curve**
Date	
Description	Reinstating the single-track chord between Thingley West and South junctions. Anticipated this would involve four switch ends and associated signalling plus a short section of plain line.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	Provides a strategic alternative rail route between Trowbridge and Bath when the route via Limpley Stoke is closed. Facilitates a strategic rail freight route for 9'6" containers between Southampton and Bristol or Wentloog (South Wales). Possible new passenger route Westbury-Corsham-Bath etc.	
Scale of impact	4	Scheme reduces variability of journeys on the Portsmouth-Cardiff route by offering an alternative to the route via Bradford-on-Avon during disruption or engineering.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	3	Reasonable fit with national transport goals. Provides an opportunity for a gauge-enhanced route from Southampton to Bristol and South Wales (building upon existing/committed enhancement of Southampton-Salisbury).
Fit with other objectives	3	Reasonable fit with LTP3 objectives. Improves resilience of Westbury-Bath rail services (although missing Bradford on Avon). Potentially allows for future new passenger services.
Key uncertainties	Outcome of option and technical assessment (e.g. will gauge enhancement of Box Tunnel and remainder of route to Bristol be possible; will the rail industry choose the Badminton route). Level of freight trafffic available to make use of the route. Cost estimate.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	3	Wide public and stakeholder consultation is not considered vital given nature of proposal.

Economic

Economic growth	**4. Amber/green**	Would provide time/cost savings for container traffic between South Coast and Bristol / Wales. Scheme could also facilitate additional passenger services such as Westbury-Melksham-Corsham-Bristol.
Carbon emissions	**3. Amber**	Limited positive impacts through more direct route than via Reading and encouraging modal shift.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**4. Amber/green**	Improves competitiveness and regeneration of western Wiltshire (including A350 corridor), West of England and South Wales areas.
Local environment	**3. Amber**	Reduction of HGV miles is mainly on trunk routes, for which the assigned benefit is fairly low.
Well being	**3. Amber**	Limited positive impacts on community severance and safety through modal shift. Improved journey time/reliability for passengers on diversion/engineering days.
Expected VfM category	3. Medium 1.5-2	Based on average BCR of 2.83 for a heavy rail scheme from RAC Foundation report adjusted to reflect scheme circumstances.

Managerial

Implementation timetable	6. 5-10 years	Need for business case and associated studies (e.g. GRIP process) to be undertaken.
Public acceptability	4	Largely a non-controversial scheme.
Practical feasibility	3	The previous alignment of approx 300m radius is currently farmland. Two overhead National Grid routes cross the route.
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	1. Low	No assessment undertaken by Network Rail.

Key risks	Level of traffic to justify scheme; planning the work to coincide with route electrification and resignalling to minimise cost; cost estimate.	

Financial

Affordability	3	
Capital Cost (£m)	03. 5-10	Anticipated to be made up of crossover, two switches, single line and signalling.
Revenue Costs (£m)	01. None	
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	2	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	1. Static	
Where is funding coming from?	It is anticipated that Network Rail would be the key funding body.	
Any income generated? (£m)	Yes	02. 0-5 Track access charge from additional freight movements.

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**Trowbridge Transport Package**
Date	
Description	A package of measures including: a comprehensive walking strategy and pedestrian improvements thoughout the town; a cycle strategy that includes segregated routes on some key corridors and cycle parking at all main town centre destinations; significant investment in bus services, bus priority measures at key links/junctions and improvements to Trowbridge rail station; a 'Sustainable Travel Town Plan'; demand management and traffic calming measures; and selective road improvements measures (Option 1 in the 'Trowbridge Transport Stategy Development - Options Assessment Report', Dec 2011).

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	A number of transport issues and opportunities are outlined in the 'Trowbridge Transport Strategy Development - Options Assessment Report' including: very limited rail services to Melksham, Chippenham and Swindon; limited capacity and peak hour delays on the A350 at Yanbrook and West Ashton; A361 County Way acting as a barrier; limited capacity at several junctions; new developments forming barriers to movement and little incentive of sustainable modes; a number of distributor roads have limited or no pedestrian facilities; poor quality of footpaths and signing; lack of a co-ordinated network of cycle routes; and the demand does not justify peak hour town services.	
Scale of impact	4	Findings from DfT's 'Smarter Choices Demonstration Towns' shows potential positive impact of sustainable transport measures when combined with adequate promotion. Locally, Salisbury provides an insight into potential bus service patronage growth - a threefold increase in bus use for commuting, a 6% share over all journey purposes and a 50% increase in passengers per bus.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	5. High	Excellent fit with national transport goals.
Fit with other objectives	5. High	Excellent fit with LTP objectives and emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy (including delivery of 5,800 houses and 25ha of employment land to 2026).
Key uncertainties	Public and political support for a comprehensive package of sustainable transport measures; ongoing revenue costs.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	3	Consensus being established through development of Trowbridge Transport Strategy which has included stakeholder and public consultation.

Economic

Economic growth	**5. Green**	Measures will benefit journey times/reliability and help facilitate sustainable development growth. Will also Contribute to an attractive town environment encouraging inward investment and improving access options to jobs.
Carbon emissions	**4. Amber/green**	Due to the nature of car trips typically being replaced (i.e. lots of short journeys) by sustainable modes, the carbon saving are likely to be positive but modest.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**5. Green**	The scheme measures would be particularly beneficial for vulnerable groups. Also benefits the regeneration of Trowbridge and the A350 corridor.
Local environment	**4. Amber/green**	Positive air quality (altough no identified AQMA), noise and streetscene benefits.
Well being	**4. Amber/green**	Positive community, health, and accessibility benefits.
Expected VfM category	1. Very High >4	The report on 'The Effects of Smarter Choices Programmes in the Sustainable Travel Towns' identifies that packages of smarter choices could give a congestion-only BCR of 4.5 and an overall BCR of around 9.

Managerial

Implementation timetable	6. 5-10 years	While implementation of the measures is flexible, the package should ideally be related to Trowbridge's growth to 2026.
Public acceptability	3	While generally supported in outcome terms, there is likely to be some local opposition to measures such as cycle routes and bus priority measures where parking or road capacity affected.
Practical feasibility	4	Generally no untried techniques or technology required.
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	4	Measures form part of 'Trowbridge Transport Strategy Development - Emerging Strategy Report' (October 2012).
Key risks	The evidence for the take-up of the proposed measures in a market town context is relatively limited and so the scale of outcomes remains uncertain. Some parts of the package may face implementation difficulties due to local opposition. Although the 'carrot' measures are uncontroversial, the success of the package requires the public to significantly embrace a 'green travel' ethos.	

Financial

Affordability	4	CIL funding associated with proposed significant local development growth.
Capital Cost (£m)	04. 10-25	Infrastructure cost of £14.94m identified in 'Trowbridge Transport Strategy Development - Report on Emerging Strategy' (Oct 2012).
Revenue Costs (£m)	02. 0-5	Ten year revenue cost of £1.4m identified in 'Trowbridge Transport Strategy Development - Report on Emerging Strategy' (Oct 2012).
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	4	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	5. Dynamic	Flexibility in Strategy delivery although plan is to implement in line with Core Strategy timescale (i.e. to 2026).
Where is funding coming from?	Potentially from CIL and LTP; existing and future s106 agreements.	
Any income generated? (£m)	Yes	Don't know

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**Warminster Transport Package**
Date	
Description	A package of: walking/cycling network and facility improvements; public transport enhancements; traffic and demand management measures; interchange enhancements; selective road improvements; and smarter choice measures.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	Poor integration of public transport services and lack of walking and cycling routes in the town centre. Peak time congestion in town centre, community severance, continuing growth in out-commuting.	
Scale of impact	3	Likely to encourage more local sustainable travel into and around the town centre, although many car-based trips would remain.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	5. High	Generally an excellent fit with national transport goals.
Fit with other objectives	5. High	Generally excellent fit with LTP3 objectives and emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy. However, somewhat weaker relationship with economic objectives given relative development growth levels to 2026 (1,650 houses and 6ha of employment land).
Key uncertainties	Degree of local appetite for behavioural change and traffic/demand management measures. Accurate cost estimate and ongoing revenue costs.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	2	Some limited consultation and engagment on certain measures which generally receive favourable responses. No consultation on package as a whole.

Economic

Economic growth	**4. Amber/green**	Increasing prioritisation for pedestrians and cyclists is likely to increase vehicle journeys times. However peak time congestion should be reduced as people shift to sustainable modes. Helps support local development growth.
Carbon emissions	**4. Amber/green**	While carbon emissions would be expected to decrease, the impact may be relatively limited and dependant on the extent to which demand management measures and sustainable transport measures can be implemented.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**5. Green**	The promotion of sustainable transport options will benefit vulnerable groups such as children, elderly, those on low incomes, etc by providing greater accessibiliy to essential services, facilities and employment opportunities.
Local environment	**4. Amber/green**	Some benefits in terms of air quality (although no identified AQMA) and a reduction in road traffic noise with resultant urban environment benefits.
Well being	**4. Amber/green**	Should deliver a positive impact on community severance, physical activitiy levels, etc.
Expected VfM category	1. Very High >4	The report on 'The Effects of Smarter Choices Programmes in the Sustainable Travel Towns' identifies that packages of smarter choices could give a congestion-only BCR of 4.5 and an overall BCR of around 9.

Managerial

Implementation timetable	5. 2-5 years	Implementation could be undertaken over a variable timeframe.

Public acceptability	3	Little direct consultation but package considered to be broadly uncontroversial although will require some traffic/demand management and behavioural change measures which may raise some objections.
Practical feasibility	3	Generally employs tried and tested measures (e.g. in DfT smarter choices demonstration towns) although not tested extensively locally.
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	2	Evidence from similar projects elsewhere in the UK demonstrates significant modal shift along with associated positive impacts on transport emissions. However, little or no detailed analysis has been undertaken locally.
Key risks	Degree of local acceptance of the need for behavioural change and traffic/demand management measures. Lack of (ongoing) revenue funding (e.g. commercial viability of bus services).	

Financial

Affordability	3	Ability to implement package options over time. However, issues regarding (ongoing) revenue costs.
Capital Cost (£m)	02. 0-5	No package cost estimate produced.
Revenue Costs (£m)	02. 0-5	Smarter choices measures and supported bus services.
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	3	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	5. Dynamic	Various package options available.
Where is funding coming from?	Potentially from CIL and LTP; existing and future s106 agreements.	
Any income generated? (£m)	Don't know	

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**Westbury Additional Platform**
Date	
Description	Reinstate a platform on the down reception line with a new face provided to accommodate short formation services.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	To contribute to improved station performance as well as offering an increase in the level of operational flexibility which will also have the potential to reduce overall delay and provide future capacity for any growth in service levels.	
Scale of impact	4	Additional capacity created by the additional platform will benefit both passenger and freight services.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	4	Good fit with national transport goals.
Fit with other objectives	4	Good fit with LTP3 objectives. Would help support the strategic role of the A350 corridor set out in the emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy. Included in Great Western Route Utilisation Strategy.
Key uncertainties	Updated scheme costs.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	4	Included in Great Western RUS.

Economic

Economic growth	**4. Amber/green**	The business case (as reported in the Great Western RUS) found an estimated recovery of 70% of reactionary delay minutes equating to 27 minutes per day. Helps support economic and development growth in Westbury (1,290 houses and 18.5ha of employment land) and along the A350 corridor. The scheme would also provide rail industry operational benefits.
Carbon emissions	**4. Amber/green**	Potential to encourage modal shift through quicker and more reliable train journeys.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**3. Amber**	Some possible positive impacts on the regeneration of the A350 corridor.
Local environment	**3. Amber**	Some limited potential positive impacts on air quality and noise as a result of modal shift.
Well being	**4. Amber/green**	Improved journey times and reliability. Potential limited positive impacts on severance, physical activity and safety if modal shift encouraged.
Expected VfM category	2. High 2-4	BCR of 2.2 identified in business case (as included in Great Western RUS).

Managerial

Implementation timetable	5. 2-5 years	Network Rail has not produced a procurement route at this stage although the GRIP 2 work identified an outline programme: GRIP 3 - 8 months; GRIP 4 - 5 months; GRIP 5/6 - 27 months.
Public acceptability	4	Included in Great Western RUS - stakeholder and public acceptability is expected to be high.
Practical feasibility	4	Considered to be practically feasible. The scheme would require both Network and Station Change processes to be undertaken. Network Rail consider that as the proposed works are within the railway boundary, it is highly likely that the scheme would be delivered using Permitted Development Rights.

What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	3	Business case undertaken and option included in Great Western RUS. Network Rail has subsequently undertaken a GRIP 2 feasibility study. Further progression of the scheme would require an operational assessment and modelling work to demonstrate how the scheme will work. While an EIA has not been undertaken, an initial appraisal has not raised any significant issues.
Key risks	Further scheme requirements and costs identified through further GRIP stages. Scheme not identified for progression by Network Rail.	

Financial

Affordability	4	However, the scheme was not included in the HLOS (July 2012) and Network Rail has not programmed any funding.
Capital Cost (£m)	03. 5-10	Estimated cost £5.05m (2011 prices) at Network Rail GRIP 2 stage (includes optimism bias of 50%).
Revenue Costs (£m)	01. None	
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	4	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	1. Static	
Where is funding coming from?	Network Rail - although no funding has been identified.	
Any income generated? (£m)	Yes	Don't know

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**Westbury Rail Freight Facility**
Date	
Description	Rail freight facility at Westbury station using existing sidings.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	Encourage mode shift from road freight to rail freight with resultant positive impacts e.g. reduced medium/long distance HGV trips, lower carbon and air quality emissions.	
Scale of impact	2	Likely to only affect a limited number of overall HGV trips on the network. Also, scheme would potentially have some adverse impacts on immediate local area around facility.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	3	Reasoanble fit with national transport goals - reduced number of HGV trips on strategic highway network; lower carbon and air pollution emisisons; and reduced community severance. Also makes use of existing rail infrastructure.
Fit with other objectives	3	Reasonable fit with LTP3 objectives - e.g. sustainable freight distribution; reduced air pollution and carbon emissions; making best use of existing infrastructure. Synergies with emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy e.g. aspiration for Westbury to be a key employment location.
Key uncertainties	Demand for and use of such a facility - scale of benefits and operational costs. Degree and nature of local impacts. Access difficulties.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	1. Little	No or little recent consultation on scheme. Site is currently under contract and is being used by Network Rail as a reclamation centre.

Economic

Economic growth	**3. Amber**	Uncertain impact on users' journey times, reliability and costs - depends on journey distance and load frequencies. Limited positive impacts on overall freight journey times and reliability. Proximity to existing and planned Principal Employment Areas.
Carbon emissions	**4. Amber/green**	Positive impact upon wider CO2 reductions - however scale dependent on number of medium-to-long distance transferred HGV trips.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**3. Amber**	Minor positive employment and A350 corridor regeneration impact.
Local environment	**2. Red/amber**	Air quality and noise benefits derived from the reduction in medium/long-distance HGV trips needs to be weighed against air quality, noise and urban environmental impacts in local area, particularly through Westbury. Overall, the impact is considered to be negative given local circumstances.

Well being	**2. Red/amber**	Further community severence through increased HGV traffic/intimidation in the immediate local area. Only partly offset by wider but limited community severance and road safety benefits as a result of reduced medium/long distance trips.
Expected VfM category	4. Low 1-1.5	As suggested by BCRs from Faber Maunsell report 'North Wales Rail Strategy Study'.

Managerial

Implementation timetable	6. 5-10 years	Network Rail currently operate a rail recyling plant on the proposed site.
Public acceptability	2	Potential increase in HGV trips to facility is likely to raise strong local objections.
Practical feasibility	2	Site currently being used by Network Rail. Study conducted by Wiltshire County Council in 2009 concluded that there was insufficient relevant local industry to support a freight terminal in Westbury. The 2002 SWARMMS study stated that the Westbury site had "No potential as an inter-modal site".
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	3	SWARMMS (2002); BB2SCS (2004) and Wiltshire County Council study (2009).
Key risks	Demand and use of site facility - nature and extent of relevant local industry. Ongoing revenue costs. Local access and traffic issues, air quality and noise. Local objections.	

Financial

Affordability	3	Funding of ongoing revenue costs will be an issue particularly given likely usage levels.
Capital Cost (£m)	03. 5-10	The Spalding RFI Study estimates a cost of £15m (£10m for main line connections and £5m for construction of the interchange and highways access) for a basic rail freight interchange and highway acess on a green field site with no existing main line or highway connections. Associated highway development requirements could require this level of investment regardless of existing infrastructure. est £10m
Revenue Costs (£m)	02. 0-5	Typical operating costs would be £20-£25 per container lift (based on Spalding RFI Study).
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	2	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	4	Scale/scope of scheme could be adjusted to reflect circumstances.
Where is funding coming from?		
Any income generated? (£m)	Yes	02. 0-5

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**Westbury Transport Package**
Date	
Description	A package of: walking/cycling network and facility improvements; public transport enhancements; traffic and demand management measures; interchange enhancements; selective road improvements; and smarter choice measures.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	Town centre is fragmented and railway station is about 1 mile away from main shopping area. A350 runs through the town causing congestion, severance, and poor journey time reliability. Pedestrian and cycle navigation is not easy given high volumes of traffic and HGVs. Bus services are of relatively low frequency. Need to improve local bus services and access to the railway station as well as the general pedestrian environment around the town centre.	
Scale of impact	3	Package would encourage more sustainable local trips. Improved crossing points along the A350 and at junctions would help improve connectivity throughout the town for pedestrians and cyclists. Improving routes to the railway station would help link it to the town centre and residential areas. However, it is likely that high traffic volumes would remain on the A350 and other key routes.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	5. High	Generally excellent fit with the national transport goals.
Fit with other objectives	5. High	Generally excellent fit with LTP3 objectives and emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy. While there is only relatively modest housing growth proposed (1,290 houses to 2026) there is a desire to make Westbury a key location for employment growth in Wiltshire (18.5ha of employment land to 2026).
Key uncertainties	Degree of local support for behavioural change and traffic/demand management measures (although the Westbury vision and scoping study of July 2011 highlighted people's concerns about safety issues relating to crossing junctions and pedestrian movements). Ongoing revenue costs.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	3	Some related consultation as part of the Westbury vision and scoping study of July 2011.

Economic

Economic growth	**4. Amber/green**	Increased prioritisation of pedestrians, cyclists and buses is likely to increase journey times for other vehicles. However, improving links between the railway station, trading estates and the town centre will help support economic development growth.
Carbon emissions	**4. Amber/green**	The package of measures should have a positive impact on carbon emissions. However, the size and nature of the town, and the degree to which traffic/demand management measures and behavioural change measures can be successfully implemented will tend to limit this beneficial impact.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**5. Green**	The promotion of a package of measures should benefit children, the elderly, low income families, the disabled, etc. Making the railways station more accessible will increase options for Westbury residents in terms of access to key services.
Local environment	**4. Amber/green**	Beneficial impacts on air quality (there is an identified AQMA), noise and the setting of a market town.
Well being	**4. Amber/green**	Positive impacts on community severance, passive crime surveillance and physical activity. Public realm improvements will help re-enforce sense of community and pride in town as highlighted as part of the Westbury vision and scoping study. Possible negative impact on road accidents with more people crossing the A350 and more cyclists on the road.

Expected VfM category	1. Very High >4	The report on 'The Effects of Smarter Choices Programmes in the Sustainable Travel Towns' identifies that packages of smarter choices could give a congestion-only BCR of 4.5 and an overall BCR of around 9.

Managerial

Implementation timetable	5. 2-5 years	Implementation could be undertaken over a variable timeframe.
Public acceptability	3	Previous related consultation (as part of the Westbury vision and scoping study) suggests that residents would be open to improvements to the town centre and it has been recognised that the railway station is disconnected. However, many people still want a bypass and may see such a package as a poor substitute.
Practical feasibility	3	Generally tried and tested measures at national level if not locally.
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	2	Evidence nationally (e.g. DfT demonstration towns), and some local background and baseline information (e.g. Westbury vision and scoping study - July 2011).
Key risks	Local appetite for behavioural change and traffic/demand management measures (many local people still want a bypass and may view such a package as a poor substitute). Ongoing revenue costs.	

Financial

Affordability	3	Package could be implemented over time. Issues over (ongoing) revenue costs especially relating to supporting bus services.
Capital Cost (£m)	02. 0-5	No package cost estimate produced.
Revenue Costs (£m)	02. 0-5	Smarter choices measures and subsidised local bus services.
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	3	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	5. Dynamic	Ability to delivery different package options.
Where is funding coming from?	Potentially CIL and LTP.	
Any income generated? (£m)	Don't know	

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**White Horse Business Park Station**
Date	
Description	Construction of a new railway station/platform at White Horse Business Park, Trowbridge with associated facilities.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	Improve accessibility to rail services and connectivity to other economic and employment centres; help reduce car-borne trips and traffic congestion; support economic and development growth in local area.	
Scale of impact	2	Anticipated to have a modest impact on the identified objectives.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	4	Good fit with national transport goals.
Fit with other objectives	4	Good fit with LTP3 objectives. Scheme also fits well with the emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy.
Key uncertainties	Lack of an identified suitable stopping train service; accurate cost estimate; station location assessment.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	3	Included as stakeholder aspiration in Great Western RUS. No or little direct consultation undertaken but option considered to be low risk for significant objections.

Economic

Economic growth	**4. Amber/green**	Beneficial impact on new users' journey times. Helps support identified strategic development site allocation in emerging Core Strategy - Ashton Park Urban Extension (2,600 houses and 15 of employment land).
Carbon emissions	**4. Amber/green**	Option improves access to rail services in local area and facilitates/encourages reduced car use. Some embedded carbon in station construction.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**4. Amber/green**	Improves sustainable access for some vulnerable groups. Helps support the regeneration of the A350 corridor.
Local environment	**4. Amber/green**	Positive but limited impacts on air quality and noise. Mixed potential impacts on the urban and natural environment - dependent on exact station location and degree of modal shift.
Well being	**4. Amber/green**	Improves accessibility to key existing and planned employment locations.
Expected VfM category	2. High 2-4	Based on average BCR for a heavy rail scheme (2.83) from RAC Foundation report (based on Eddington study).

Managerial

Implementation timetable	6. 5-10 years	
Public acceptability	3	Included as an stakeholder aspiration in RUS. Little or no direct consultation undertaken but not considered to be of high risk of significant objections.
Practical feasibility	2	Lack of identified suitable stopping service. Not identified in development plan and need to undertake detailed site assessment.
What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	1. Low	Limited supporting evidence beyond a desktop exercise undertaken in the late 1990s.
Key risks	Business case could be inadequate to persuade train operators to provide a service. Possible impact on existing services heading to-from Westbury.	

Financial

Affordability	3	
Capital Cost (£m)	03. 5-10	Based on £4m estimate for Corsham Station produced by Railtrack towards the end of 2002.
Revenue Costs (£m)	02. 0-5	Based on £1.5m operating costs in Corsham Station RPP bid document (2000).
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	2	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	2	Station location/details.
Where is funding coming from?		
Any income generated? (£m)	Yes	02. 0-5

Early Assessment and Sifting Tool (EAST) - *Expanded Print View*

Option Name/No.	**Wilton Station**
Date	
Description	New railway station at Wilton adjacent to Park & Ride site with two platforms and associated station facilities.

Strategic

Identified problems and objectives	Congestion on the A36 (and A350). Supporting new planned development in Wilton.	
Scale of impact	3	Improved journey times; some reduction in congestion; support for modal shift; supports key employment and development sites.
Fit with wider transport and government objectives	4	Good fit with national transport goals. Improves journey times for travel to/from Wilton/Fugglestone; enables economic growth by supporting new development; reduces carbon emissions; to some extent encourages healthy alternatives and protects the local environment. Possible small adverse impact on existing bus services.
Fit with other objectives	4	Good fit with LTP objectives. Option is related to significant development growth at key employment/housing sites. Supports improved accessibility and encourages travel by alternatives to the private car. Supports Core Strategy policy to assist with the implementation of new stations. Would integrate with existing Park & Ride site.
Key uncertainties	Agreement with Train Operating Companies for suitable train services to stop at Wilton.	
Degree of consensus over outcomes	3	No recent consultation although there is expressed local support.

Economic

Economic growth	**4. Amber/green**	Will reduce local congestion by removing car trips between Wilton/Fugglestone and Salisbury station, and trips on A36/A350 corridor, although overall impact uncertain. Supports key employment and housing development sites Well related to two strategic site allocations - Fugglestone Red (1,250 houses and 8ha of employment land) and UK Land Forces Headquarters (450 houses and 3ha of employment land)) in emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy.
Carbon emissions	**4. Amber/green**	Encourages modal shift to rail, and may also encourage cycling/walking to/from station and by reducing traffic levels between Salisbury and Wilton.
Socio-distributional impacts and the regions	**4. Amber/green**	Improves accessibility and non-car travel options in Wilton and Fugglestone. Possible impact on local bus services (although limited due to lower bus fares and higher bus frequency). Conversely, the scheme may also increase bus patronage out to Wilton P&R.
Local environment	**4. Amber/green**	Minor improvements to air quality likely.
Well being	**4. Amber/green**	Positive impacts on road safety, severance and active travel modes.
Expected VfM category	2. High 2-4	Based on average BCR for a heavy rail scheme (from RAC Foundation report based on Eddington study).

Managerial

Implementation timetable	5. 2-5 years	
Public acceptability	4	Locally expressed support although no recent consultation.
Practical feasibility	2	Requires suitable stopping rail service.

What is the quality of the supporting evidence?	3	Railtrack costing report (2000); 2003 Halcrow report modelled demand, impacts on bus services and feasibility overview.
Key risks	Agreement with Train Operating Companies for suitable rail services to stop at Wilton.	

Financial

Affordability	3	
Capital Cost (£m)	03. 5-10	Estimated at £3.8m in 2000 (approx. £7.3m in 2011 prices).
Revenue Costs (£m)	02. 0-5	£108k annual subsidy estimated in 2003 Halcrow report.
Cost profile		
Overall cost risk	3	
Other costs		

Commercial

Flexibility of option	2	Station design.
Where is funding coming from?		
Any income generated? (£m)	Yes	02. 0-5