

Scheme Sift - Step Two Criteria

Criteria	Issues	Overall Score	Weighting (Total Max 100)
Scale of scheme impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent does the scheme address the identified problems? What would happen if the scheme wasn't funded? What would be the scale of any undesirable consequences? Could these be mitigated? What is the (estimated) VfM or BCR of the scheme and what is this based on? 	Very High (5) High (4) Moderate (3) Low (2) Minimal (1)	10
Fit with strategic objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the scheme fit with national and local objectives? How does the scheme fit with other proposals in the area (e.g. Highway Agency, Network Rail or City Deal plans)? 	Excellent (5) Good (4) Reasonable (3) Low (2) Poor (1)	20
Contribution to economic and development growth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will the scheme contribute to the creation of new jobs and the retention of existing jobs in the SWLEP area (e.g. improved access to allocated employment site, employment growth evidence from local plan process, etc)? Will the scheme provide access solutions to help deliver economic and development growth in key centres, corridors and sectors (e.g. improved access to allocated housing site, housing growth evidence from local plan process, etc)? Will the scheme maintain or improve journey time reliability on key routes to and within the SWLEP area (e.g. evidence from surveys, models, etc)? 	Very High (5) High (4) Moderate (3) Low (2) Minimal (1)	30

Criteria	Issues	Overall Score	Weighting (Total Max 100)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of jobs created (as shown in the Local Plan evidence)? Number of houses delivered (as shown in Local Plan evidence)? Ease congestion journey time savings (from WebTAG compliant modelling)? 		
Environmental and community impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will the scheme contribute to an overall reduction in carbon emissions (tonnes of carbon)? What is likely to be the scheme's overall impact on the local built and natural environment? Will the scheme deliver improved accessibility to key services, facilities and employment sites? Will the scheme provide opportunities to improve health and road safety in the local area? 	Significant Positive (5) Positive (4) Neutral (3) Adverse (2) Significant Adverse (1)	20
Broad deliverability assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the key risks to cost? Are there other significant funding streams available? What are the key risks to programme? Is the scheme practically feasible? What is the quality of the supporting evidence? What are the key risks to acceptability? Does the scheme have public/stakeholder support? 	Very Low Risk (5) Low Risk (4) Medium Risk (3) High Risk (2) Very High Risk (1)	20

Scoring example: an overall score of 3 (moderate) against the 'Contribution to economic and development growth' criterion would result in a weighted score of 18 (i.e. 3x6).