## Appendix 5.1 Option sifting tool

## West Of England Transport Assessments Option Assessment and Sifting Template

Atkins
WP1 South East Bristol and Whitchurch
22/01/2018

| Revision | Contents/Changes | Originated | Date | Checked | Date | Reviewed | Date | Authorised | Date |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.1 | Template Created for distribution | P Gilg | 11/12/2017 | T Jarvis | 11/12/2017 | J Foster-Clark | 11/12/2017 | J Foster-Clark | 11/12/207 |
| 1 | Final Draft: Template altered to remove average scores; summary page now text based | P Gilg | 18/12/2017 | T Jarvis | 18/12/2017 | A Chaudhrey | 19/12/2017 | J Foster-Clark | 20/12/207 |
| 1.1 | First draft of populating template | M Hansen | 21/12/2017 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.2 | Updated version | M Hansen | 05/01/2018 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.3 | Version shared during client meeting | M Hansen | 11/01/2018 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Version issued to client | M Hansen | 19/01/2018 | P Salvin | 22/01/2018 |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Updated version with client comments | M Hansen | 13/02/2018 | P Salvin |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Small changes internally should be marked with a version increase of 0.1
When a document is issued externally, the version should increase by 1

## Guide to using this workbook

## Please read before using the workbook

Colour coding of cells in this workbook:

| Note | Information/Note |
| :--- | :--- |
| input | Input data |
| result | Do not amend - takes values using formulae |

## Guide to the contents of each sheet:

| Sheet | Description |
| :--- | :--- |
| Front cover and version | Includes version and QA information |
| Guidance | These are intended for the worksheet user and do not need to be printed (right click on them and select 'hide' before printing). |
| Assessment Guidance |  |
| \#REF! | Options are assessed against Strategic and Management Cases. |
| 2nd Phase Assessment | Progressed options only are assessed against Economic and Financial Cases. |
| \#REF! |  |
| \#REF! | A summary of all options' case's assessment. |
|  | This displays only shortlisted options (which have passed both phases of assessment) |

Instructions:

| Step | Action | Where | Further guidance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Fill in a long list of options | 1st Phase Assessment: Columns A and C | This should include all modes. <br> "Themes" refer to active travel/ metro bus / park and ride etc. |
|  | Fill in corridor objectives under the Strategic Case heading. | 1st Phase Assessment: D4 to H4 | Up to five permitted (can be less if appropriate). <br> The first objective must relate to enabling or supporting SDL growth in SDL, as this is used as part of the sifting criteria. |
|  | Using the drop down menus, rate each option against the Strategic and Management Cases. Add brief comments to justify as appropriate. | 1st Phase Assessment: Columns D to M | See Assessment Guidance tab. |
|  | Check you are satisfied with the pass/fail criteria (set at the top of the column) for the Strategic and Management Cases. | 1st Phase Assessment: N5 to Q5 | Criteria should be agreed with WECA Client Group. |
|  | Populate the last two columns to indicate whether each option will be taken forward and why. | 1st Phase Assessment: Columns S and $T$ | Column R presents the overall result of the Pass/Fail tests, but there is the opportunity to over-ride this (with justification). Only options with a 'Yes' input in Column S are taken through to the 2nd Phase Assessment. |
|  | Options which pass the 1st Phase are automatically populated on the 2nd Phase Assessment sheet. This will need to be manually updated, by pressing the 'Reapply' button on the Data ribbon (next to Filter button) or Ctrl + Alt + L. | 2nd Phase Assessment: Reapply button under Data / Sort \& Filter | The 2nd Phase Assessment sheet contains a hidden filter based on the output from 1st Phase (Column S). This needs to be manually updated following any change to the values on the 1st Phase tab. |
|  | Using the drop down menus, rate each option against the Economic and Financial Cases. Add brief comments to justify as appropriate. | 2nd Phase Assessment: Columns E to L | See Assessment Guidance tab. |
|  | Check you are satisfied with the pass/fail criteria (set at the top of the column) for the Economic and Financial Cases. | 2nd Phase Assessment: M5 to P5 | Criteria should be agreed with WECA Client Group. |
|  | Populate the last two columns to indicate whether each option will be taken forward and why. | 2nd Phase Assessment: Columns R and S | Column Q presents the overall result of the Pass/Fail tests, but there is the opportunity to over-ride this (with justification). |
| 10 | Review overall assessment in the Summary tab. | Summary | Do not change any values here - go back to 1st / 2nd Phase tabs if required to update assessment |
|  | Short-listed options appear in the Shortlist tab. Update the filter as in Step 6, by pressing the Reapply button on the Data tab or Ctrl + Alt + L. | Summary Shortlist | The Shortlist sheet contains a hidden filter based on the output from 2nd Phase (Column R). This needs to be manually updated following any change to the values on the 2nd Phase tab. |

## Options scoring criteria

Strategic Case
Each option is scored on 6-point system with respect to potential contribution to scheme objectives. The comments column should be used to briefly record any key points relevant to the Strategic Case.

| Score | Summary | Impact |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 0 | Neutral / adverse | Not anticipated to have a beneficial impact / more likely to have an adverse impact |
| 1 | Very small impact | Would have a very small beneficial impact, possibly with undesirable consequences |
| 2 | Minor impact | Would have a modest overall impact |
| 3 | Moderate impact | Expected to have a reasonably significant impact with respect to the identified objective or outcome |
| 4 | Significant impact | Expected to have a very significant impact with respect to the identified objective or outcome |
| 5 | Fully addressed | Expected to fully address the identified objective or outcome, without any undesirable consequences |

## Management Case

The most likely timescales for implementation (5-year period) should be recorded, followed by an assessment of deliverability. The Key Risks / Issues column should be used to support the assessment - in particular any major risks or showstoppers leading to a score of 1 for deliverability should be identified. Equally, if the option is assessed as being unlikely to be delivered before 2036, brief explanation should be provided.

|  | Score | Summary |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Estimated timescales for implementation (opening year) | 1 | Unlikely to be before 2036 |
|  | 2 | Most likely to be between 2026 and 2036 |
|  | 3 | Most likely to be before 2026 |
|  |  |  |
| Deliverability | 1 | Unlikely to be deliverable - i.e. not practically feasible (for technical or possibly environmental reasons) |
|  | 2 | Deliverable but relatively high complexity and risk - i.e. some significant technical/environmental risks but potential for these to be mitigated |
|  | 3 | Deliverable with low complexity and risk - possibly some challenges but these can be overcome |

## Economic Case

For each of economic growth, environment and well being, each option is scored on a 5 -point scale. Where adverse impacts are likely, scoring should be based on the most adverse impact expected in each case post-mitigation (e.g. a minor adverse impact under air quality does not offset a major adverse impact under landscape). Where only beneficial impacts are likely, scoring should take into account the overall range of impacts rather than focusing on just one element. Any specific major adverse / beneficial impacts should be recorded in the comments column with brief justification provided.

| Score | Summary | Further information |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| -2 | Major adverse impact | This would indicate likelihood of a major adverse impact, which could not be satisfactorily mitigated. |
| -1 | Minor / Moderate adverse impact | Moderate / minor adverse impacts - which can probably be satisfactorily mitigated through the design process. |
| 0 | Neutral | Only use if there is reasonable evidence that no beneficial or adverse impacts would occur. |
| 1 | Minor / Moderate beneficial impact | Use these if there is reasonable evidence of minor / moderate beneficial impacts overall, and no risk of adverse impacts. Beware <br> of optimism bias in scoring! |
| 2 | Major beneficial impact | Would require strong evidence that the option would be genuinely transformative, and/or with regional-wide benefits, plus no <br> risk of adverse impacts to achieve this score. |

Where possible, an estimate of likely capital costs including appropriate risk allowance should be made. Requirements for on-going revenue costs are assessed qualitatively, but could be entered into the comments column along with more detailed capital costs estimates if available. Finally, a qualitative assessment of overall affordability is made - primarily with the purpose of identifying any options that at this stage would be considered unaffordable - justification would be required for such an assessment and set out in the comments column

|  | Score | Cost (current core costs including risk allowance) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capital cost | 1 | >£ 100m |
|  | 2 | £ 50-100m |
|  | 3 | £ $25-50 \mathrm{~m}$ |
|  | 4 | £ 10-25m |
|  | 5 | < f 10 m |
|  |  |  |
| Revenue costs | 1 | Likely requirement for ongoing revenue support for operation of transport services or facilities (e.g. over 5 years). |
|  | 2 | Likely requirement for short-term revenue support for operation of transport services or facilities (e.g. up to 5 years). |
|  | 3 | No requirement for revenue support / on-going costs limited to infrastructure maintenance only. |


| Affordability and <br> financial risk | 1 | Not likely to be affordable, due to very high capital and/or revenue costs or associated financial risks. |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
|  | 2 | Likely to be affordable, but with potentially high capital and/or revenue costs; manageable financial risks. |
|  |  | Affordable with relatively low capital and/or revenue costs, and low financial risk. |


| 1st Phase Assesment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Themes | No. | Trasportopion |  |  |  |  |  |  | Managenent |  |  | Streegic case |  | Managenent case |  |  | Taken forwardto phase $2 ?$(Manual entry) |  |
|  |  |  |  | Providea arage of comenen |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Passit $=$ | passit $=$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | destinations such as Bristol city orbital movements, to and for | $\begin{aligned} & \text { existing network and minimise } \\ & \text { inappropriate movements on } \\ & \text { local roads } \end{aligned}$ | transport along the rridor and orbita movement | Oveala Assesment |  |  |  |  | aeati impat | Udeatei ipe | 2,2082036 |  |  |  |  |
| Oitite |  | MetroBus route from Emersons Green to Whitchurch and beyond, connecting to existing MetroBus infrastructure (via new transport link around South East Bristol) - Gold standard. | Signticar impar | nean im | 3. Modeata imma | mant | sgntant |  | 2020208 | $\underbrace{2}$ Dodiveable but high | Dependent on the building of new link road. Emersons Green to Whitchurch is a very long route; unlikely to be able to have an offline bus route for the entire route. Will likely take longer than the delivery of the new roads. Very high cost. May be difficult to deliver in terms of land acquisition / construction requirements. | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | ves |  |
| $\xrightarrow{\text { Ontial }}$ Metrous |  | MetroBus route from Emersons Green to Whitchurch and beyond, connecting to existing MetroBus infrastructure (via new transport link around South Ea | mate inpa | 4. Sgriteat impar | 3. Moseate impact | Sdeate impact | 3. Moseate impart |  | 20282036 |  |  | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | ves | Unlikely to be able to deliver offline bus route for the entire route, but there will likely be sections where an offline bus route is possible and preferable. Current A4174 Emersons Green to Hicks Gate is already dual carriageway - would require careful consideration of what is required above and beyond this. |
| $\xrightarrow{\text { Ontibl }}$ Merous | 3 | MetroBus route from Emersons Green to Whitchurch and beyond, connecting to existing MetroBus infrastructure (via new transport link around South East Bristol) - Bronze standard. | Modesatie mpaa | 3, Mosearat impat | 2. M M Mrimpact | M Mor impat | 2. M M \% i mpat |  | ${ }^{20262036}$ |  |  | Pass | ${ }_{\text {ral }}$ | Pass | Pass | Fail | No |  |
|  | 4 | MetroBus route from Emersons Green to Whitchurch and beyond, connecting to existing MetroBus infrastructure (on existing roads, e.g. Whitchurch Lane/Stockwood Ln). | 1, Ver smal impat | 0, Neutala amese | 0. Nutalal avesese | . Neutalal atesese | 0. Nutaral avesese | Existing infrastructure only, with no new link roads, would not provide a sufficient orbital route. | 2082036 |  | Undeliverable because constraints on the current roads (widths) are high - would not be able to build a MetroBus standard route. | Fal | Fal | Pass | Fal | Fail | No | Existing infrastructure only, with no new link roads, would not provide a sufficient orbital route, and would not be up to a MetroBus standard. |
| Ontitel | 5 |  | Veve smal impart | 1, Vey smal imat | O. Nutalal aveseso | p.Neutral atesese | 0. Neutala/ amesese | Undesirable to have to go into the city centre to interchange - may be useful to improve city interchange but not for an orbital route. | Stor 20 |  |  | Fal | ${ }_{\text {fal }}$ | Pass | Pass | Fal | No | Undesirable to have to go far out of the way into the city centre and change. This would not address the key issue of congestion on the route. |
| $\xrightarrow{\text { Ontabl }}$ Merous | 6 | bus seniceoon nem obtial taspoot | Vodatie ineat | Mnor mpact | 2. Mnorimpact | Mnorimpal | 2. M M Mror mpat |  | 220820236 |  |  | Pass | Fal | Pass | Pass | Fal | ves |  |
|  | 7 |  | Vey snal inpat | 1, Vee smal impad | O. Nental a avese | aral ade | Heal |  | 3. Betore 2026 |  |  | Fal | Fal | Pass | Fal | Fal | No |  |
|  | 8 | sast he capativo ote essing stio ony. | norimpat | 3, Modease impat | O. Neutala a auese | 3.Modeation | 2. Mnorimpat | Expanding existing site as Brinslington would results in more traffic on the A4, and would increase congestion along that section. | Estore206 |  |  | Fal | fal | Pass | Fal | Fal | No | Fail as this scheme is simply not deliverable due to this land being designated for housing. |
| AAAB7 Link | 9 | And | Venta/ aduese | 0. Nentalal adeseso | 1, Vers snal inpar | Very sal in mat | 0. Nutaral a atese | Unlikely to be sufficient to meet the demands on the corridor as congestion would remain poor. Many local roads would still be used and are generally unsuitable as strategic routes. | Estore 2026 |  | Dativalab but | Fal | Fal | Pass | Pass | Fal | No |  |
|  | 10 |  | Sontant imact | 3, Mosease impact | 3. Modeasal impact | Signtian impat | 3.Modeatei mpar | Woud bo astatagataly signican toute. | 1. Ater 2036 |  | Needs substantial work to take it to consideration, and is likely to take longer to complete than the A38 - Hicks Gate section. | Pass | Pass | Fal | Pass | Fal | No |  |
| ${ }^{\text {AAAB7 Link }}$ |  |  | Spinaat imat | ${ }^{3}$. Nodeatei impact | 4. Sgoticant impat | 4. Somitican menat | 4. Sgoricartimpat | Would be a strategically significant route. How it links with the new SDL, P\&Rs, and caters for the orbital MetroBus are essential <br> factors to consider. | 2.2082038 |  |  | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | ves |  |


| Thenes |  | vo. Trasport option | Obiective 1 |  |  |  |  | Comments (key points relevant toStrategic Case) | Mangement case |  |  | Straegic case |  | Mangegnent case |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Overall } \\ \text { assessment (as } \\ \text { calculated) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Taken forward } \\ \text { to phase } 2 ? \\ \text { (Manual entry) } \end{gathered}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Dostst supor sol |  | Timesales | Deineability |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Provide arneo of comenement |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (ex | osjectives Pastit ${ }^{\text {e }}$ | Passtit= | Pastits |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | ${ }_{\text {dem }}^{\text {demem }}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { destinations such as Bristol city } \\ \text { centre and Keynsham, and for } \\ \text { orbital movements, to enable } \\ \text { mode shift } \end{gathered}$ | existing network and minimise inappropriate movements on local roads |  |  |  |  |  |  | ate impat | atei mpat | 2026208 |  |  |  |  |
| AAA37 Link |  |  | Siltan impact | 3. Modeasat impat | 4. Sgonfeat impat | Storitant impar | 4. Sgoticartimat |  | Would be a strategically significant route. How it links with the new SDL, P\&Rs, and caters for the orbital MetroBus are essential actors | 2,2082096 |  |  | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | ves |  |
| ${ }^{\text {AAA37 Link }}$ |  |  | marat inpea | 3. Modeatei impact | 4. Sopricant inpat | Signicant inpact | 4.Sonficantimpat | Would be a strategically significant route. How tinks with the factors to consider. | 2.2082036 |  | Will likely have engineering constraints and environmental impacts, and impacts on <br> utilities requires further investigation. | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | ves |  |
|  |  |  | 4. Sonfleat impat | 2. M Morimpad | 4. Sogntian timad | Mnor impat | ${ }^{3}$ 3. Mosatati mpact |  | 2.2028236 |  | To consider how route will interact with the local roads is important. Sensitivities with alignment through the village. | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | ves | There is evidence of local roads being used instead of the main roads, and with the SDL and the new A4-A37 Link this is likely to only |
| ${ }_{\substack{\text { Westota37 } \\ \text { Luk }}}^{\text {Lat }}$ |  |  | Sontican impat | 2. M Morimpat | 4. Sgonicarimar | Mnorimeat | 3. Modeate impact |  | 2.2028208 |  |  | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | ves |  |
|  |  | Connect around the east of Whitchurch to connect back to the A37 near the boundary between Bristol and Bath \& North East Somerset. Traffic towards Whitchurch Lane would then route along the A37 into Bristol and turn west (then south west) into Ridgeway Lane, which then continues as Whitchurch Lane to the west. (Pink) | Veresmal inpar | norina | 2. Mnor mpact | Unor inpad | 2. Mnorimpat |  | 2.2028236 |  | Senter | Fal | Fal | Pass | Pass | Fail | No |  |
|  |  |  | Nodesale impat | Moderatei mpact | 3. Wotaratie impat | Unorimpat | 3. Moseate impact |  | Estore 2026 |  | 1 ssuss wil land ownestrip. | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | ves |  |
|  | 18 |  | IVotate impat | 2. M Mori impal | Mnor ineat | Iodeatal imat | 2. Mnorimpat |  | 2.2082036 |  | Issus | Pass | Fal | Pass | Pass | Fal | No | Option fails as the lack of a left turn filter lane would result in substaintial queueing on the A4174 by 2024, thus hindering orbital movements. |
|  | 19 | S sparation whin AAA Alyoer. | 3. Notaratie impat | 1, Vers snal il mpact | Mior inmat | Mnorimeat | 2. Mnor mpact |  | 2.2028296 |  |  | Pass | Fal | Pass | Pass | Fail | No |  |
|  | 20 |  | 1 1. Vers smal impat | 1, Ven smal ilimat | O. Nutalal a atese | 1, Vers smal inpad | 1. Vey smal impad |  | , Beatere206 |  |  | Fal | Fal | Pass | Pass | ${ }_{\text {Fail }}$ | No |  |
|  | 21 |  | 4, Sgonican impat | 3. Modease inpat | 2. Mnorimpact | 4. Sginican impat | ${ }^{3}$. Mocasate impact |  | ${ }^{2} 202028236$ |  |  | Pass | Pass | Pass | Fal | Fail | No |  |
|  | 22 |  | 4, Sgonican impat | 3. Moseatat impat | 2. Mnorimpat | Sionitanat inpat | 3, Modeateie impat |  | 2.20282036 |  |  | Pass | Pass | Pass | Fal | ${ }_{\text {Fail }}$ | No |  |
|  | 23 |  | 3 3. Odesale impact | 3. Moseatat impat | 2. M Mnorimpact | Modeatei impart | 3. Mdeatate impart |  | 2.2028208 |  | Uniky | Pass | Pass | Pass | Fal | Fal | No |  |
| ${ }_{\substack{\text { and } \\ \text { Transport }}}^{\text {Antic }}$ |  |  | .Modeatal impar | 3. Modeasei impat | 2. Mnorimpat | 2. Mnor maad | 3. Modeate impact | There is congestion along the corridor however it is not as poor as similar corridors such as the A4, and it is possible that an enhanced bus service could encourage mode shift. | 33.8atore 228 |  |  | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | ves |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Railway Path } \\ & \text { MetroBus and } \\ & \text { Cycle Route } \end{aligned}$ |  | Offline MetroBus route from Whitchurch to the city centre via the old Railway Path with strategic cycle route infrastructure. | 4 4, Somitiantitimaat | 3,100 | 1 1, ver | 4, Sgitican impar | 3, Mom |  | 1, Atere 2036 |  | Some sections of the old railway path have been built on, it is highly unlikely there will be space for a MetroBus route through these. | pass | Pass | fal | Fal | fail | No |  |



|  |  |  |  |  | state | leic case |  |  |  | eme |  | Strateg | sicase |  | ement case |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Themes | No. | Trasport option |  |  |  | Objective 4 Improve journey time reliability for public transport along the corridor and orbital movements | oveanal asessment | Comments (key points relevant to Strategic Case) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Estimated timescales for } \\ \text { implementation (opening } \\ \text { year) } \end{gathered}$ | Deliveabluy | Key Risks / Issues affecting deliverability and timescales | Does it support SDL <br> objective (Column D)? <br> Pass if >= <br>  <br> 3, Moderate impact | Does it support overal objectives? Pass if >= <br> 3, Moderate impact | Timescales <br> Pass if $>=$ <br> $2,2026-2036$ | Deliverability <br> Pass if >= <br> 2, Deliverable but high <br> complexity/risk | $\begin{gathered} \text { Overall } \\ \text { assessment (as } \\ \text { calculated) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Taken forward } \\ \text { to phase } 2 ? \\ \text { (Manual entry) } \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | 4 |  | M Mor impat | Iodeate imat | 3, Modeate impact | diasat imad | 3. Modeasat impat |  | Batore 2026 |  |  | fal | Pass | Pass | pass | Fal | No |  |
|  | 45 | Sast A37, notho INoron lan | Inoteatimad | Nodeasal impat | 3. Notatat impact | Nodeseatimpad | \%.Modeati impat |  | Beaver 2026 |  |  | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Yes |  |
|  | 46 |  | amat in | 3, Mosease impat | 3, Modeate impat | Nodeatal | 3, Modea |  | Esater 2026 | $\underbrace{2}$ Dodiveabli bu high |  | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | ves |  |
| AAAB3L Lnk |  | South Alignment 1 - Single carriageway orbital corridor between Hicks Gate Roundabout and A37 - takes a direct alignment through the potential SDL. 40mph link providing access to the SDL and significant measures to provide connectivity across the link. Connecting to the A37 south of Staunton Lane. Not compatible with future dualling. (Purple) | Sigiticar ineat | 3. Modeate impat | 4. Sginfeat impat | 4, Sspritiant | 4.Sspritant | Would be a strategically significant route. How it links with the new SDL, P\&Rs, and caters for the orbital MetroBus are essential factors to consider. | 20282036 |  |  | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | yes |  |
| AAAB3 L Lnk |  | South Alignment 2 - Single carriageway orbital corridor between Hicks Gate Roundabout and A37-takes a direct alignment through the potential SDL. 50mph link with no access to the SDL and limited measures to provide connectivity across the link. Connecting to the A37 south of Staunton Lane. Potentially compatible with future dualling. (Purple) | 4. Sgoricart impat | 3. Wodearai mpact | Signtiant impact | Sonicant impat | aritan im | Would be a strategically significant route. How it links with the new SDL, P\&Rs, and caters for the orbital MetroBus are essential factors to consider. | 20282036 |  |  | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | ves |  |
| AAAB7L Lnk |  | South Alignment 3-Single carriageway orbital corridor between Hicks Gate Roundabout and A37 - takes an alignment around the southern eastern extent of the potential SDL. 50mph link with no access to the SDL and limited measures to provide connectivity across the link. Connecting to the A37 north of Gibbet Lane. Potentially compatible with future dualling. (Dotted green) | Signitanatimad | 3, Modeaseie impat | 4. Sginican impar | 4. Sontitantimad | 4. Sgorican impat |  | 22082206 |  | Will likely have engineering constraints and environmental impacts, and impacts on utilities requires further investigation. | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | ${ }^{\text {res }}$ |  |
| AAAB3 L Lnk | ${ }_{50}$ | Suamigavay -ala iloments | 4. Sgoticart inpat | 3. Nodeatei impat | 4. Sgoticant inpat | 4. Sonticart impat | 4. Sgoticant inpat | At this stage modelling indicates that a dual carriageway would not be required - however demand way increase in the future. | 202082038 |  | Will likely have engineering constraints and environmental impacts, and impacts on utilities requires further investigation. | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | yes |  |


| d Phase Assessment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Economic Case |  |  |  |  |  | Financial Case |  |  | Economic Case |  | Financial cas |  |  |  |
| Phase 1 <br> result | Themes | No. | Transort option |  | Air quality $/$ Noise / Carbon emissions/ Landscep $\&$ Townccap/ Biodiversitit / Hertage Water environment |  | Comments - explain any specific major impacts (both adverse and beneficial) impacts (both adverse and beneficial) | Capital Costs | Revenue Costs | Affordability and financial risk | Comments - include capital / revenue cost estimates where known, plus explain affordability assessment |  |  |  |  | (isessment tas | $\xrightarrow{\substack{\text { To be ataken } \\ \text { fowara? }}}$ | dditional Iustific |
| ves | ital Metrous | 1 | MetroBus route from Emersons Green to existing MetroBus infrastructure (via new transport link around South East Bristol) - Gold standard. | 2, Maior beneficial impact | 1, M, Mnor M Moderate | 1, MMors/ Moderate |  | 2, $550 \cdot 100 \mathrm{~m}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{l} 1, \text { Ongoing revenue } \\ \text { supoporinguied }>5 \\ \text { years } \end{array}\right\|$ |  |  | Pass | Pass | Pass | Fail | Fail | No | High financial risk, as there does not seem to be the evidence to support that a gold standard MetroBus route is necessary and that it could support itself financially. |
| ves | ital Merobus | 2 | Metrous route from Emersons Green to Whitchurch and beyond, connecting to exising Melorous infastructure (ua new transport link raund South beat Bristol) Silver standard. | 1, Minor / Moderate beneficial impact | 1, Minor / Moderate beneficial impact | ${ }_{\text {l }}^{\text {1, Mnor / Moderate }}$ beneficilimpact |  | 3, 22.50 m |  | $5\left\|\begin{array}{l} 2, \text { Affordable, but } \\ \text { potentially high costs } \\ + \text { financial risk } \end{array}\right\|$ |  | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Yes | MetroBus of silver standard would be preferable, as this aims for bus lanes in all locations where constraints aren't too high. |
| Yes | tal Metrous | 6 | ${ }^{\text {Enhancea bus senice on new orbital }}$ |  | $\underset{\substack{\text { 1.Minor Moderate } \\ \text { beneficial impact }}}{\text { a }}$ | ${ }_{\text {a }}^{\text {1. Minor Moderate }}$ beneficilimpact |  | 5, < 10 m |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 3, Affordable with } \\ & \text { relatively low costs + } \\ & \text { financial risk } \end{aligned}$ |  | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Yes | A strong orbital bus service may be sufficient to cater for the demands of the corridor if the new link road is built, although it depends on the level of congestion that is although it depends on the experienced at junctions. experionced aljunctions. |
| ves | ${ }^{\text {A37 Link }}$ | ${ }^{11}$ | North Alignment 1 - Single carriageway orbital corridor between Hicks Gate Roundabout and A37 - southerly rout from Hicks Gate to Stockwood Lane improvement to Stockwood Lane parallel route to Stockwood avoiding Stockwood Vale valley. (Yellow/Blue) | Mair beneficial impact | Maior aderese impat | -1, Minor Modearate |  | 3, 22.50 m | 3, No revenue support required / maintenance only | 2, Affordable, but potentially high costs + financial risk |  | Pass | Fail | Pass | Pass | Fail | No | Fails on the environment section of the economic case as this option alignment would require a climbing lane and this option alignment would require significant cutting and earthworks. |
| ves | AA-A37 Link | 12 | North alignment 2 - Single carriageway orbital corridor between Hicks Gate Roundabout and A37 - southerly route parallel route to Stockwood avoiding Stockwood Vale valley. (Yellow/Red/Blue) | 2, Maior beneficial impact | -2, Maior aterese impat | -1, Minor Modearate |  | 3, 225.50 m | 3, No revenue support required / maintenance only | 2, Affordable, but potentially high costs + financial risk |  | Pass | Fail | Pass | Pass | Fail | No | Fails on the environment section of the economic case as <br> his option alignment would require a climbing lane and <br> significant cutting and earthworks |
| ves | AA-A37 L Link | 13 | North Alignment 3 - Single carriageway orbital corridor between Hicks Gate about and A37 - south westerly route from Hicks Gate following Stockwood avoiding Stockwood Vale valley. (Blue) | 2, Maior beneficial impact | $\xrightarrow{-1, \text { Minor Moderate }}$ advesese inpat |  |  | 3, 22.50 m | 3, No revenue support required / maintenance only | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2, Affordable, but } \\ & \text { potentially high costs } \\ & + \text { financial risk } \end{aligned}$ |  | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Yes | Passes as this is the best option alignment in the economic case. The alignment however is still quite general and will require consideration of utilities when general and will require con considering specific route. $\qquad$ |
| ves | stof 337 Link | 14 | Connect from the A37 (at the roundabout with the routes to the east) to Washing Pound Lane, north of the junction with Church Road. Washing Pound Lane would be widened with an junction with Ridgeway Whitchurch Lane. (Grey) |  |  |  |  | 4, 810.25 m | 3, No revenue support required / maintenance only | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2, Affordable, but } \\ & \text { potentially high costs } \\ & + \text { financial risk } \end{aligned}$ |  | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | ves | Passes as there is the need for a route to the west of Whitchurch, as there is evidence of local roads being used instead of the main roads, and with the SDL and potential orbital route A4-A37 Link this issue could worsen will be impacted by this option and the potential orbital route A4-A37 Link. |
| Yes | Itof A37 Link | 15 | Connect from the A37 (at the roundabout with the routes to the east) to Stoneberry Road, which would connect via Half Acre Lane to Whitchurch Lane. It is assumed that Stoneberry Road and Half Acre Lane would be widened, with an improved junction at Whitchurch Lane. (Orange) |  |  |  |  | 4, 810.25 m | 3, No revenue support required/ maintenance only | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2, Affordable, but } \\ & \text { potentially high costs } \\ & + \text { financial risk } \end{aligned}$ |  | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Yes | Whitchurch, as there is eviden local roads being used instead of the main roads, and with the SDL and pote orbital route A4-A37 Link this issue could worsen. will be impacted by this option and the potential orbital route A4-A37 Link. |



|  |  |  |  | Case |  |  |  | ${ }^{\text {Financial case }}$ |  |  |  | Economic case |  |  | Einarcial | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \text { Overall } \\ \text { assessment (as } \\ \text { calculated) } \end{array}$ | To be taken forward? | Additional ustification for Pass of Fail |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ${ }_{\substack{\text { Phase } \\ \text { resut }}}$ | Theme | No. | Transort opion | Connectivity / Reliability /Wider economic impacts / Resilience/ Delivery of <br> housing / |  | Physical activity / Journey qualith /ccidents $/$ security $/$ Access services severfarababe | Comments - explain any specific major impacts (both adverse and beneficial) | Capital costs | Revenue costs | Affordability and financial risk | Comments - include capital / revenue cost estimates where known, plus explain affordability assessment | $\underset{\substack{-1, \text { Minorl } \\ \text { incerate }}}{\substack{\text { Economy. Pass if }}}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Environment. } \\ \text { Pasis } i \gg \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| ves | A-A-37 L Link | 47 | South Alignment 1 - Single carriageway orbital corridor between Hicks Gate Roundabout and A37 - takes a direct alignment through the potential SDL. and significant measures to provide connectivity across the link. Connecting to the A37 south of Staunton Lane. Not compatible with future dualling. (Purple) |  |  |  |  | 3, 825.50 m | $\begin{aligned} & 3, \text { No revenue } \\ & \text { support required / } \\ & \text { maintenance only } \end{aligned}$ | 2, Affordable, but potentially high costs + financial risk |  | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Yes |  |
| ves | AA.A37 Link | 48 | South Alignment 2 - Single carriageway orbital corridor between Hicks Gate alignment through the potential SDL. 50 mph link with no access to the SDL and limited measures to provide connectivity across the link. Connecting to the A37 south of Staunton Lane. Potentially compatible with future dualling. (Purple) |  |  | -1, Minor / Moderate adverse impact | If the route is going through the SDL, it would need to be seen as an urban road and not designed as a rural type A road otherwise would cause high severanc | 3, 25.50 m | 3, No revenue support required / maintenance only | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2, Affordable, but } \\ & \text { potentially high costs } \\ & + \text { financial risk } \end{aligned}$ |  | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Yes |  |
| ves | A-A-37 L Link | 49 | South Alignment 3 - Single carriageway orbital corridor between Hicks Gate Roundabout and A37 - takes an alignment around the southern eastern extent of the potential SDL. 50 mph link with no access to the SDL and limited measures to provide connectivity across Gibbet Lane. Potentially compatible with future dualling. (Dotted green) | 2. Maior beneficial impact | -2, Maio adverse impat |  | Significant environmental constraints to the south of the SDL, including steep gradients and valuable heritage land. | 3, 225.50 m | 3, No revenue support required / maintenance only | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2, Affordable, but } \\ & \text { potentially high costs } \\ & + \text { financial risk } \end{aligned}$ |  | Pass | Fail | Pass | Pass | Fail | ves |  |
| ves | AA-A37 Link | 50 | Iageway -al aligenments | eficial impat | 2.Maior advesse impat | -2, Major adverse impact | Dual carriageway route through the SDL would have a very high negative impac on severance, as it would split the new community. It may also increase accidents, and would have adverse air quality and noise impacts. | 2, 550.100 m | $\begin{aligned} & 3, \text { No revenue } \\ & \text { support required / } \\ & \text { maintenance only } \end{aligned}$ | 2, Affordable, but potentially high costs + financial risk |  | Pass | Fail | Fail | Pass | Fail | No |  |


| Summar |  |  |  |  | Strateic case |  |  | Mange | entcase |  |  | Etonomic case |  |  | Frinacial Case |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Themes | No. | Transort option | Objective 1 <br> Mitigate increased travel <br> demand enabling <br> planned growth (JSP and <br> non-JSP) |  | Objective 3 <br> Increase orbital <br> connectivity to improve <br> access around south-east <br> Bristol, reduce delays on |  | Overal Assessment | stimated timescale <br> for implementation (opening year) | Deliverabily | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { Toten } \\ \substack{\text { tonurar to } \\ \text { Phase ? }} \end{array}\right\|$ | $\underset{\substack{\text { Eanomic } \\ \text { Growt }}}{\text { coser }}$ | Evvionment | Well being | Captat costs | Revenue Costs |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Taken forward for } \\ \text { detailed } \\ \text { assessment? } \end{gathered}$ |
| Ootital Metrous | 1 | MetroBus route from Emersons Green to Whitchurch and beyond, connecting to existing MetroBus infrastructure (via new transport link around South East Bristol) - Gold standard. | Sigificant inpart | Sgenficant imast | Moderati inpatt | Significat inpart | Sginficant impart | ${ }^{2026.236}$ |  | ves | $\begin{gathered} \text { Minor }) \\ \substack{\text { Monerae } \\ \text { benefial } \\ \text { inmacat }} \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Minor } \\ \substack{\text { Monerae } \\ \text { bonefial } \\ \text { inmacat }} \end{gathered}$ | E50.100m |  | Not affordable / very high financial risk | No |
| Orital Metrous | 2 | MetroBus route from Emersons Green to Whitchurch and beyond, connecting to existing MetroBus infrastructure (via new transport link around South East Bristol) - Silver standard. | Moderati impart | Sginficant imact | Moderati impast | Moderatei inpart | Moderate impact | ${ }^{20620365}$ | Deliverable but high complexity/risk | ves |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Minor / } \\ \text { Moderate } \\ \text { beneficial } \\ \text { imnact } \end{gathered}$ |  | E25.50m |  | Affordable, but potentially high costs + financial risk | ves |
| Ootital Metrous | 3 |  | Moderate impact | Moderatie inast | Minorimpart | Minor impat | Minor impat | ${ }^{206-2036}$ | Deliverable with low complexity/risk | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Orital Metrous | 4 | MetroBus route from Emersons Green to Whitchurch and beyond, connecting to existing MetroBus infrastructure (on existing roads, e.g. Whitchurch Lane/Stockwood Ln). | Versmal inpact | Neutral/ adverse | Neutra/ adverse | Neutra/ /atese | Neutra/ advese | ${ }^{206-2036}$ | Unlikely to be deliverabl | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Orital Metrous | 5 | Improvements to city centre interchange between South Bristol and East Fringe bus services. | Versmanli imatt | Versmanli imat | Neutral/ aduese | Neutral/ adverse | Neutral a avesese | ${ }^{\text {Befofre } 2026}$ | Deliverable with low complexity/risk | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Orital Metrous | 6 | ed bus senice on new orital transoort link. | Moderati impart | Minorimpat | Minorimpat | Minorimpat | Minorimpart | 2026.236 | $\underbrace{}_{\substack{\text { Delienable with ow } \\ \text { complextrlisk }}}$ | ves |  | $\underset{\substack{\text { Minor } \\ \text { Morefere } \\ \text { benfial } \\ \text { inpacat }}}{ }$ |  | <flom | Ongoing revenue support required (> 5 years) | Affordable with relatively low costs + financial risk | ves |
| Whithurch par | 7 | apacty fexisings stes | Versmal inpact | smallimpact | Neutral/ aduese | Neutral/ atuese | Neutra/ aduese | Before 2026 |  | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hicts Gate Par | 8 | et the capacity ofesisting ste only. | Minorimpact | Moderatie inast | Neutra/ / aterse | Moderati inpact | Minor impact | Before 2026 |  | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AAAB3 L link | 9 |  | Neutral / aterse | Neutra/ /aterse | Vensmal impart | Verssmal impart | Neutral adeese | Before 2026 | Deliverable with low complexity/risk | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Westof A 3 L Link | 10 | ${ }_{\text {a }}$ | Sigificant mpact | Moderate impact | Moderatei inpart | Significant impart | Modeate imp | Atere 2036 |  | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Themes | No. | Trasport Option | Strategic ${ }_{\text {asas }}$ |  |  |  |  | Management Case |  | $\left.\begin{array}{\|c} \text { Taken } \\ \text { Torwar to } \\ \text { Phase 2? } \end{array} \right\rvert\,$ | Economic Case |  |  | Financial Case |  |  | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Takenf forward for } \\ \text { detailed } \\ \text { assessment? } \end{gathered}\right.$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Objective 1 <br> Mitigate increased travel <br> demand enabling <br> planned growth (ISP and <br> non--SP) <br> ner | Objective 2 <br> Provide a range of <br> convenient and atractive <br> journey options afr south <br> east <br> east |  | mprove jurney time reliability for public transoort along the corridor and orbital | Overall Assessment | Estimated timescales for implementation (opening year) | Deliverability |  | Economic | Environment | Well being | Capital Costs | Revenue Costs | Affordability and financial risk |  |
| A4-A37 Link | 11 |  | Significant impact | Moderate impact | Significant impact | Significant impact | Significant impact | 2026-2036 | Deliverable but high complexity/risk | ves | Minor / Moderate beneficial impact | $\underset{\substack{\text { Major adverse } \\ \text { impact }}}{\text { M }}$ | Minor/ Moderate adverse impact | £ 25-50m | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No revenue support } \\ & \text { required } / \text { maintenance } \\ & \text { only } \end{aligned}$ | Affordable, but potentially high costs + financial risk | No |
| A4-A37 Link | 12 | North alignment 2 - Single carriageway orbital corridor between Hicks Gate Roundabout and A37-southerly route from Hicks Gate to Stockwood Lane - parallel route to Stockwood avoiding Stockwood Vale valley. (Yellow/Red/Blue) | Significant impact | Moderate impact | Significant impact | Significant impact | Significant impact | 2026-2036 | Deliverable but high complexity/risk | ves | Minor/ Moderate beneficial beneficial impact | Major adverse impact | Minor / Moderate adverse impact | £ 25-50m | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No revenue support } \\ & \text { required / maintenance } \\ & \text { only } \end{aligned}$ | Affordable, but potentially high costs + financial risk | No |
| A4-A37 Link | 13 | North Alignment 3 - Single carriageway orbital corridor between Hicks Gate Roundabout and A37 - south westerly route from Hicks Gate following topography - parallel route to Stockwood avoiding Stockwood Vale valley. (Blue) | Significant impact | Moderate impact | Significant impact | Significant impact | Significant impact | 2026-2036 | Deliverable but high complexity/risk | yes | Minor / Moderate beneficia imp | Minor / Moderate adverse impact | Minor / Moderate adverse impact impact | £ 25.50m | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No revenue support } \\ & \text { required d maintenance } \\ & \text { only } \end{aligned}$ | Affordable, but potentially high costs + financial risk | yes |
| West of A37 Link | 14 |  | Significant impact | Minor impact | Significant impact | Minor impact | Moderate impact | 2026-2036 | Deliverable but high complexity/risk | ves | Minor / Moderate beneficial impact | Minor / Moderate adverse impact | Minor / Moderate impact | £ 10-25m | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No revenue support } \\ & \text { required / maintenance } \\ & \text { only } \end{aligned}$ | Affordable, but potentially high costs + financial risk | yes |
| West of A37 Link | 15 | Connect from the A37 (at the roundabout with the routes to the east) t Stoneberry 0 oad, which would connect via Half Acre Lane to Whitchurch Lane. It is assumed that Stoneberry Road and Hall Acre e ane would be widened, with an improved junction at Whitchurch Lane. ( Orange) | Significant impact | Minor impact | Significant impact | Minor impact | Moderate impact | 2026-2036 | Deliverable but high complexity/risk | yes | Minor / Moderate impact | Minor / Moderate adverse impact | Minor / Moderate adverse impact impa | £ $10-25 \mathrm{~m}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No revenue support } \\ & \text { required / maintenance } \\ & \text { only } \end{aligned}$ | Affordable, but potentially high costs + financial risk | yes |


|  |  |  |  |  | Strategic Case |  |  | Managem | nent case |  |  | Economic Case |  |  | Financial Case |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Themes | No. | Transort Option |  | Objective 2 <br> Provide a range of <br> convenient and attractive <br> journey options for south <br> east Bristol to key |  |  | Overall Assessment | Estimated timescales for implementation (opening year) | Deliverability | Traken forward to Phase ? | $\begin{gathered} \text { Economic } \\ \text { Growth } \end{gathered}$ | Environment | Well being | Capital Costs | Revenue Costs | Affordability and financial risk | $\begin{gathered} \text { Taken forward for } \\ \text { detailed } \\ \text { assessment? } \end{gathered}$ |
| West of A37 Link | 16 | Connect around the east of Whitchurch to connect back to the A37 near the boundary between Bristol and Bath \& North East Somerset. Traffic towards Whitchurch Lane would then route along the A37 into Bristol and turn west (then south west) into Ridgeway Lane, which then continues as Whitchurch Lan to the west. (Pink) | vers smal impact | Minor impact | Minor impact | Minor impact | Minor impact | 2026-2036 | Deliverable but high complexity/risk | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hicks Gate Roundabou | 17 | At-grade junction improvement - link between A4 Keynsham and A4174. | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Minor impact | Moderate impact | Before 2026 | Deliverable with low complexity/risk | yes | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Minor / } \\ & \text { Moderate } \\ & \text { beneficial } \\ & \text { impact } \end{aligned}$ | Minor / Moderate $\underset{\substack{\text { adverse } \\ \text { impact }}}{ }$ $\qquad$ | Neutral | < $\ddagger 10 \mathrm{~m}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No revenue support } \\ & \text { required / maintenance } \\ & \text { only } \end{aligned}$ | Affordable with relatively low costs + financial risk | ves |
| Hicks Gate Roundabout | 18 | ade sepration with A1774-AA fly l ver. | Moderate impact | Minor impact | Minor impact | Moderate impact | Minor impact | 2026-2036 | Deliverable but high complexity/risk | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Hicks Gate } \\ & \text { Roundabout } \end{aligned}$ | 19 | Grade separation with A4-AA flyover. | Moderate impact | Very small impact | Minor impact | Minor impact | Minor impact | 2026-2036 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Deliverable but high hemplexty/risk } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Hicks Gate } \\ \text { Roundabout } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 20 | At-grade junction improvement - A t troughabout. | vers small impact | verr smal impact | Neutral/ adverse | Verr small impact | Verr small impact | Before 2026 | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Deliverable with low } \\ \text { complexity/risk } \end{array}$ | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \text { A37 Public } \\ \text { Transport } \end{array}$ | 21 | MetroBus route from Whitchurch to the city centre - gold standard. | Significant impact | Moderate impact | Minor impact | Significant impact | Moderate impact | 2026-2036 | Unlikely to be deliverable | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A37 Public <br> Transport | 22 | MetroBus route from Whitchurch to the city centre - silver standard. | Significant impact | Moderate impact | Minor impact | Significant impact | Moderate impact | 2026-2036 | Unlikely to be deliverable | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \text { A37 Public } \\ \text { Transport } \end{array}$ | 23 | MetroBus route from Whitchurch to the city centre - bronze standard. | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Minor impact | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | 2026-2036 | Unlikely to be deliverable | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \text { A37 Public } \\ \text { Transport } \end{array}$ | 24 | Enhanced bus service on the A37 corridor or via Callington Road Link. | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Minor impact | Minor impact | Moderate impart | Before 2026 | Deliverable with low complexity/risk | yes | $\begin{gathered} \text { Minor / } \\ \text { Moderate } \\ \text { beneficial } \\ \text { impact } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Minor / Moderate beneficia impac | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Minor / } \\ & \text { Moderate } \\ & \text { beneficial } \\ & \text { impact } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | < $\ddagger 10 \mathrm{~m}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \begin{array}{c} \text { No revenue support } \\ \text { required / maintenance } \\ \text { only } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Affordable with relatively | Yes |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Railway Path } \\ & \text { MetroBus and } \\ & \text { Cycle Route } \end{aligned}$ | 25 | Offline MetroBus route from Whitchurch to the city centre via the old Railway Path with strategic cycle route infrastructure. | Significant impact | Moderate impact | Very small impact | Signficiant impact | Moderate impact | After 2036 | Unlikely to be deliverable | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Railway Path MetroBus and Cycle Route | 26 | Strategic cycle route from Whitchurch to the city centre via the old Railway Path. | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Verr small impact | Significant impact | Moderate impact | 2026-2036 | Deliverable but high complexity/risk | yes | $\begin{gathered} \text { Minor/ } / \\ \text { Moderate } \\ \text { beneficical } \\ \text { impact } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Minor/ } \\ \text { Moderate } \\ \text { Meneficial } \\ \text { impact } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Minor/ } \\ \text { Moderate } \\ \text { beneficial } \\ \text { impact } \end{gathered}$ | f 10.25 m | Ongoing revenue support required (> 5 years) | Affordable, but potentially high costs + financial risk | yes |
| Whitchurch PRR | 27 | Site 6 to the west of the A37 between Ridgeway Lane and Maggs Lane. | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Minor impact | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Before 2026 | Deliverable but high complexity/risk | yes |  | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{\|c\|c\|c\|c\|cr} \text { miverectse } \\ \text { impat } \end{array}\right.$ |  | < $£ 10 \mathrm{~m}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Shor-term revenue } \\ & \text { support reauired } k 5 \\ & \text { years) } \end{aligned}$ | Affordable with relatively low costs + financial risk | No |
| Whitchurch PRR | 28 | Site 7 between Fortfield Road and Bamfield, south of Asda Whitchurch store. | Vers small impact | Moderate impact | Very smal impact | Minor impact | Minor impact | Before 2026 | Deliverable but high complexity/risk | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Whitchurch PRR | 29 | site 8 to the west of the A37 north of New Fossway Road. | Minor impact | Moderate impact | Minor impact | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Before 2026 | Unlikely to be deliverable | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Whitchurch PRR | 30 | Site 9 at industrial estate on the corner of Hengrove Lane and Petherton Road. | Vers smal impact | Moderate impact | Verr small impact | Minor impact | Minor impact | Before 2026 | Unlikely to be deliverable | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Themes | No. | Transport Option | Strategic Case |  |  |  |  | Management Case |  | $\left.\begin{array}{\|c} \text { foken } \\ \text { forward to } \\ \text { Phase 2? ? } \end{array} \right\rvert\,$ | Economic Case |  |  | Financial Case |  |  | Taken forward fordetaialeassesment? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Overall Assessment | Estimated timescales for implementation (opening year) | Deliverability |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Economic } \\ \text { Growth } \end{gathered}$ | Enviroment | Well being | Capital Costs | Revenue Costs | Affordability and financial risk |  |
| Whitchurch PRR | ${ }^{31}$ | Site 10 at sports ground north of the A4174 to the west of Tesco Extra. | Very small impact | Minor impact | Very small impact | Very small impact | Very small impact | Before 2026 | Deliverable but high complexity/risk | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Whitchurch PRR | 32 | Site 11 south of Staunton Lane between Sleep Lane and Newlands. | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Minor impact | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Before 2026 | Deliverable but high complexity/risk | Yes | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Minor / } \\ \text { Moderate } \\ \text { beneficial } \\ \text { impact } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Major adverse impact | $\begin{gathered} \text { Minor/ } \\ \text { Moderate } \\ \text { beneficial } \\ \text { impact } \end{gathered}$ | < $\ddagger 10 \mathrm{~m}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Shor-term revenue } \\ & \text { supportreateauired }<5 \\ & \text { years) } \end{aligned}$ | Affordable with relatively low costs + financial risk | No |
| Hicks Gate PRR | 33 | Site 1 NW quadrant of flicks Gate roundabout. | Minor impact | Moderate impact | Verrs small impact | Minor impact | Minor impact | Before 2026 | Deliverable but high complexity/risk | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hicks Gate PRRR | 34 | Site 2 NE quadrant of flicks Sate roundabout. | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Very small impact | Minor impact | Minor impact | Before 2026 | Deliverable but high complexity/risk | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hicks Gate PRR | 35 | ite 3 S quadrant of Hicks Gate roundabou | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Minor impact | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Before 2026 | Unlikely to be deliverable | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hicks Gate PRR | 36 | Site 4 SW quadrant of Hicks Gate roundabout, next to Durley Hill. | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Before 2026 | Deliverable but high complexity/risk | Yes | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Minor / } \\ \text { Moderate } \\ \text { beneficial } \\ \text { impact } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Neutral | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Minor / } \\ \text { Moderate } \\ \text { beneficical } \\ \text { impact } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | < $£ 10 \mathrm{~m}$ | Short-term revenue support required (<5 years) | Affordable with relatively low costs + financial risk | Yes |
| Hicks Gate PRR | 37 | Site 5 SW quadrant of Hicks Gate roundabout, further from roundabout towards Bristol south of A4. | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Minor impart | Minor impact | Moderate impact | Before 2026 | Deliverable with low complexity/risk | ves | Minor / adverse impact | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Minor/ } \\ \text { Moderate } \\ \text { adverse } \\ \text { impact } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Minor / } \\ \text { Moderate } \\ \text { adverse } \\ \text { impact } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | < $£ 10 \mathrm{~m}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Shor-term revenue } \\ & \text { supporat reauired } k 5 \\ & \text { years) } \end{aligned}$ | Affordable with relatively low costs + financial risk | Yes |
| Hicks Gate PRR | 38 | Site 6 NW quadrant of Hicks Gate roundabout, further from roundabout towards Bristol north of A4. | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Verr small impact | Minor impact | Minor impact | Before 2026 | Deliverable with low complexity/risk | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hicks Gate P8RR | 39 | Site 7 SE quadrant of Hicks Gate roundabout, further from roundabout towards Bath south of A4. | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Verrs small impact | Minor i impact | Minor impact | Before 2026 | Deliverable but high complexity/risk | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A37 Public Transport | 40 | Extension to North Fringe Hengrove Metrous. | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Before 2026 | Deliverable but high complexity/risk | yes | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Minor / } \\ \text { Moderate } \\ \text { beneficial } \\ \text { impact } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Minor / Moderate adverse impac | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Minor/ } \\ \text { Moderate } \\ \text { beneficial } \\ \text { impact } \end{gathered}$ | < $£ 10 \mathrm{~m}$ | Short-term revenue support required (<5 years) | Affordable with relatively low costs + financial risk | Yes |
| West of A37 Link | ${ }^{41}$ | Single carriageway road connecting the A37 to Bishop Avenue and Hawkfield Road in the west through an alignment south of Whitchurch village. | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Significant impact | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | 2026-2036 | Deliverable but high complexity/risk | yes | $\begin{gathered} \text { Minor/ } \\ \text { Moderate } \\ \text { beneficial } \\ \text { impact } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Major adverse impact | Minor / Moderate adverse impact | ${ }^{\text {f 22.50m }}$ | No revenue support required / maintenance only | Affordable, but potentially high costs + financial risk | No |
| Whitchurch PRR | 42 | Site 1 west of A37, south of Norton Lane, south of the cricket pitch. | Minor impact | Minor impact | Minor impact | Moderate impact | Minor impact | Before 2026 | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Deliverable but high } \\ \text { complexity/risk } \end{array}$ | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Whitchurch PRR | 43 | Site 2 east of A33, land adjacent to the Cemetery. | Minor impact | Minor impact | Minor impact | Moderate impact | Minor impact | Before 2026 | Deliverable but high complexity/risk | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Whitchurch PRR | 44 | Site 3 east of A37, north of Cemetery. | Minor impact | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Before 2026 | Deliverable but high complexity/risk | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Whitchurch PRR | 45 | ite 4 west of A37, north of Norton Lane. | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Before 2026 | Deliverable but high complexity/risk | yes | Minor / Moderate beneficial | Minor / Moderate beneficial impact impact | Minor / Moderate beneficia | < $£ 10 \mathrm{~m}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No revenue support } \\ & \text { required / maintenance } \\ & \text { only } \end{aligned}$ | Affordable, but potentially high costs + financial risk | yes |
| Whitchurch PRR | 46 | Site 5 west of A37, south of Church Road. | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Before 2026 | Deliverable but high complexity/risk | yes | $\begin{gathered} \text { Minor/ } \\ \text { Moderate } \\ \text { beneficical } \\ \text { impact } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Minor/ beneficial benfical impact | $\begin{gathered} \text { Minor// } \\ \hline \begin{array}{c} \text { Moderate } \\ \text { beneficial } \\ \text { impact } \end{array} \end{gathered}$ | < $£ 10 \mathrm{~m}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Shor.t-erm revenue } \\ & \text { supportrequired } \begin{array}{c} \text { years) } \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | Affordable with relatively low costs + financial risk | Yes |
| A4-A37 Link | 47 | South Alignment 1 - Single carriageway orbital corridor between Hicks Gate Roundabout and A37-takes a direct alignment through the potential SDL. 40 mph link providing access to the SDL and significant measures to provide connectivity across the link. Connecting to the A37 south of Staunton Lane. Not compatible with future dualling. (Purple) staunton Lane. Not compatible with future dualling. (Purple) | Signficant impact | Moderate impact | Significant impact | Significant impact | Significant impact | 2026-2036 | Deliverable but high complexity/risk | yes | Minor / Moderate beneficial impact | Minor / Moderate impact | Minor / Moderate adverse impact | £ 22.50m | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No revenue support } \\ & \text { required / maintenance } \\ & \text { only } \end{aligned}$ | Affordable, but potentially high costs + financial risk | yes |


|  |  |  | Strategic Case |  |  |  |  | Management Case |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Taken } \\ \text { foward to } \\ \text { Powase ? } \end{gathered}$ | Economic Case |  |  | Financial Case |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Taken forward for } \\ \text { detailed } \\ \text { assessment? } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Themes | No. | Transort Option | Objective 1 <br> Mititate increased travel <br> demand enabling <br> planned drowh (IISP and <br> non-SSP |  |  |  | Overall Assessment | Estimated timescales <br> or implementation (opening year) | Deliverability |  | Economic Growth | Environment | Well being | Capital Costs | Revenue Costs | Affordability and |  |
| A4-A37 Link | 48 | South Alignment 2 - Single carriageway orbital corridor between Hicks Gate Roundabout and A37-takes a direct alignment through the potential SDL. 50 mph link with no access to the SDL and limited measures to provide connectivity across the link. Connecting to the A37 south of Staunton Lane. Potentially compatible with future dualling. (Purple) | Significant impact | Moderate impact | Significant impact | Significant impact | Significant impact | 2026-2036 | Deliverable but high complexity/risk | yes | Minor / Moderate beneficial | Minor / Moderate impact | Minor/ Moderate adverse impact | £ 25.50m | No revenue support required $/$ maintenance only | Affordable, but potentially high costs + financial risk | yes |
| A4-A37 Link | 49 | South Alignment 3 - Single carriageway orbital corridor between Hicks Gate Roundabout and A37-takes an alignment around the southern eastern extent of the potential SDL. 50 mph link with no access to the SDL and limited measures to provide connectivity across the link. Connecting to the A37 north of Gibbet Lane. Potentially compatible with future dualling. (Dotted green) | Significant impact | Moderate impact | Significant impact | Significant impact | Significant impact | 2026-2036 | Deliverable but high complexity/risk | yes | Minor / Moderate beneficia impact | Major adverse impact | Minor / Moderate adverse impact | ${ }_{\text {f 22.50m }}$ | No revenue support required / maintenance only | Affordable, but potentially high costs + financial risk | yes |
| A4-A37 Link | 50 | al carrigeway - all laignments | Significant impact | Moderate impact | Significant impact | Significant impact | Significant impact | 2026-2036 | Deliverable but high complexity/risk | yes | $\begin{gathered} \text { Minor } / 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{\substack{\text { Major adverse } \\ \text { impact }}}{\substack{\text { and }}}$ | Major adverse impact | f 50-100m | No revenue support required / maintenance only | Affordable, but potentially high costs + financial risk | No |


| Summary Shortist |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Objective 1 <br> Mitititate increased travel <br> demand eand <br> planned growh <br> porowh (SSP) <br> nsp and |  |  | Objective 4 <br> mprove journey time reliability for public transport along the corridor and orbita | Overall Assessment | Estimated timescales <br> for implementation (opening year) | Deliverability |  | Economic Growth | Environment | Well being | Capital Costs | Revenue Costs | Affordability and financial risk |  |
| Yes | Orbital Metrobus | 2 | MetroBus route from <br> Emersons Green to <br> Whitchurch and deyond, <br> connecting to existing <br> MetroBus infrastructure (via <br> new transport link around <br> South East Bristol) - Silver <br> standard. | Moderate impact | Significant impact | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | 2026-2036 | Deliverable but high complexity/risk | yes | Minor/ Moderate beneficial impact | Minor / Moderate beneficial impa | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Minor/ } \\ & \text { Moderate } \\ & \text { beneficial } \end{aligned}$ impact | ${ }_{\text {f 25-50m }}$ | Ongoing revenue support required (> 5 years) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Atroraabib, but } \\ & \text { potentially high costs + } \\ & \text { financial risk } \end{aligned}$ | ves |
| Yes | Orbital MetroBus | 6 | Enhanced bus service on new orbital transport link. | Moderate impact | Minor impact | Minor impact | Minor impact | Minor impact | 2026-2036 | Deliverable with low complexity/risk | Yes | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Minor / } \\ & \text { Moderate } \\ & \text { beneficial } \\ & \text { impact } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Minor / } / \\ \text { Moderate } \\ \text { beneficial } \\ \text { impact } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Minor/ } / \\ \text { Moderate } \\ \text { beneficial } \\ \text { impact } \end{gathered}$ | < 10 m | Ongoing revenue support required (> 5 years) | Affordable with relatively low costs + financial risk | Yes |
| Yes | A4-A37 Link | 13 | North Alignment 3-Single carriageway orbital corridor between Hicks Gate Roundabout and A37-south westerly route from Hicks Gate fllowing topography- paralle route to Stokwood avoiding Stockwood Vale valley. (Blue) | Significant impact | Moderate impact | Significant impact | Significant impact | Significant impact | 2026-2036 | Deliverable but high complexity/risk | yes | $\begin{gathered} \text { Minor/ } / \\ \text { Moderate } \\ \text { beneficial } \end{gathered}$ impact | Minor / Moderate adverse impact | Minor/ Moderate adverse impact | f 25.50 m | No revenue support required / maintenance only | Affordable, but potentially high costs + financial risk | ves |
| yes | West of $A 37$ Link | 14 |  | Significant impact | Minor impact | Significant impact | Minor impact | Moderate impact | 2026-2036 | Deliverable but high complexity/risk | yes | Minor / Moderate beneficial impact | Minor / Moderate adverse impact | Minor / Moderate adverse impact | f 10-25m | No revenue support required / maintenance only | Affordable, but potentially high costs + financial risk | ves |
| Yes | West of $A 37$ Link | 15 | Connect from the A37 (at the roundabout with the routes to the east) to Stoneberry Road, which would connect via Half Acre Lane to Whitchurch Lane. It is assumed that Stoneberry Road and Half Acre Lane would be widened, with an improved junction at Whitchurch Lane. (Orange) | Significant impact | Minor impact | Significant impact | Minor impact | Moderate impact | 2026-2036 | Deliverable but high complexity/risk | yes | Minor / Moderate beneficial mpact | Minor / Moderate adverse impact | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Minor / } \\ & \text { Moderate } \\ & \text { adverse } \\ & \text { impact } \end{aligned}$ | £ 10.25 m | No revenue support required /maintenance only | Affordable, but potentially high costs + financial risk | ves |
| Yes | Hicks Gate Roundabout | 17 | At-grade junction <br> improvement - link between <br> A4 Keynsham and A4174. | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Minor impact | Moderate impact | Before 2026 | Deliverable with low complexity/risk | yes | $\begin{gathered} \text { Minor } / \\ \text { Moderate } \\ \text { benericial } \\ \text { impact } \end{gathered}$ | Minor/ Moderate adverse adverse impa | Neutral | < $£ 10 \mathrm{~m}$ | No revenue support required / maintenance only | Affordable with relatively low costs + financial risk | ves |
| Yes | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \text { A37 Public } \\ \text { Transport } \end{array}$ | 24 | Enhanced bus service on the A37 corridor or via Callington Road Link. | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Minor impact | Minor impact | Moderate impact | Before 2026 | Deliverable with low complexity/risk | yes | $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{l} \text { Minor } / \\ \text { Moderate } \\ \text { beneficial } \\ \text { impact } \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | Minor / beneficial impact | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Minor/ } \\ & \text { Monererate } \\ & \text { beficial } \\ & \text { impact } \end{aligned}$ | < $£ 10 \mathrm{~m}$ | No revenue support required / maintenance only | Affordable with relatively low costs + financial risk | Yes |
| Yes | Railway Path Cycle Route Cycle Rout | 26 | Strategic cycle route from <br> Whitchurch to the city centre <br> via the old Railway Path. | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Very small impact | Significant impact | Moderate impact | 2026-2036 | Deliverable but high complexity/risk | yes | Minor $/$ <br> $\begin{array}{c}\text { Moderate } \\ \text { beneficial } \\ \text { impact }\end{array}$ | Minor / Moderate impact impact | $\begin{gathered} \text { Minor / } \\ \text { Moderate } \\ \text { Meneficical } \\ \text { impact } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | ${ }^{\text {f } 10-25 \mathrm{~m}}$ | Ongoing revenue support required (> 5 years) | Affordable, but potentially high costs + financial risk | ves |
| Yes | Hicks Gate P\&R | 36 | Site 4 SW quadrant of Hicks Gate roundabout, next to Durley Hill. | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Before 2026 | Deliverable but high complexity/risk | Yes | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Minor / } / \\ \text { Moderate } \\ \text { beneficical } \\ \text { impact } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Neutral | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Minor/ } \\ & \text { Modereate } \\ & \text { beneficial } \\ & \text { impact } \end{aligned}$ | < $£ 10 \mathrm{~m}$ | Short-term revenue support required (<5 years) | Affordable with relatively low costs + financial risk | Yes |
| Yes | Hicks Gate P\&R | 37 | Site 5 SW quadrant of Hicks Gate roundabout, further from rundabout owards Bristol south of A A. | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Minor impact | Minor impact | Moderate impact | Before 2026 | Deliverable with low complexity/risk | Yes | $\begin{gathered} \text { Minor / } \\ \text { Moderate } \\ \text { adverse } \\ \text { impact } \end{gathered}$ | Minor / Moderate adverse impact | $\begin{gathered} \text { Minor / } \\ \text { Moderate } \\ \text { adverse } \\ \text { impact } \end{gathered}$ | < $£ 10 \mathrm{~m}$ | Short-term revenue support required $\ll 5$ years) | Affordable with relatively low costs + financial risk | ves |
| Yes | A37 Public Transport | 40 | Extension to North Fringe Hengrove MetroBus. | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Before 2026 | Deliverable but high complexity/risk | Yes | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Minor / } \\ & \text { Moderate } \\ & \text { beneficial } \\ & \text { impact } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Minor / } \\ \text { Moderate } \\ \text { adverse } \\ \text { impact } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Minorl } \\ & \text { Moderate } \\ & \text { beneficial } \\ & \text { impact } \end{aligned}$ | < $£ 10 \mathrm{~m}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Shor-t-erm revenue } \\ & \text { support required (<5 } \\ & \text { years) } \end{aligned}$ | Affordable with relatively low costs + financial risk | Ves |
| Yes | Whitchurch P\&R | 45 | Site 4 west of A37, north of Norton Lane. | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Before 2026 | Deliverable but high complexity/risk | yes | Minor $/$ Moderate beneficial impact | Minor / Moderate beneficia impact | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Minor/ } \\ & \text { Moderate } \\ & \text { beneficial } \end{aligned}$ impact | < $\ddagger 10 \mathrm{~m}$ | No revenue support required / maintenance only | Affordable, but potentially high costs + financial risk | ves |


|  |  |  |  | Strategic Case |  |  |  |  | Management Case |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Taken } \\ \text { forward to } \\ \text { Phase 2? } \end{gathered}$ | Economic Case |  |  | Financial Case |  |  | Taken forward fordetailed assessment? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Objective $\mathbf{1}$ <br> Mititagate increased travel <br> demand enabling <br> planned growth (JSP and <br> non-SSP) | Objective 2 Provide arange of convenient and attractive journey options for south-east | Incjective e 3 <br> connectal <br> conectivity to improve <br> acess around south-ast <br> Bristol, reduce delays on | Improbective jurney time <br> reliability for public <br> transport along the <br> corridor and orbital | Overall Assessment | Estimated timescales for implementation (opening year) | Deliverability |  | Economic Growth | Environment | Well being | Capital Costs | Revenue Costs | Affordability and financial risk |  |
| Yes | Whitchurch PRR | 46 | Site 5 west of A37, south of Church Road. | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Moderate impact | Before 2026 | Deliverable but high complexity/risk | yes | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Minor/ } \\ & \text { Moderate } \\ & \text { beneficial } \\ & \text { impact } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Minor/ } \\ \text { Moderate } \\ \text { beneficial } \\ \text { impact } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Minor/ } \\ & \text { Moderate } \\ & \text { beneficial } \\ & \text { impact } \end{aligned}$ | < $£ 10 \mathrm{~m}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Short-term revenue } \\ \text { support required (<5 } \\ \text { years) } \end{gathered}$ | Affordable with relatively low costs + financial risk | Yes |
| yes | A4-A37 Link | 49 | South Alignment 3-Single carriageway orbital corridor between Hicks Gate Roundabout and A37-takes an alignment around the southern eastern extent of the potettiais sD.L. 5mph link with no access to the SDL and limited measures to provide connectivivy across the link. Connecting to the A37 north of Gibbet tane. Potentially compatible with future dualling. (Dotted green) | Significant impact | Moderate impact | Significant impact | Significant impact | Significant impact | 2026-2036 | Deliverable but high complexity/risk | Yes | Minor / Moderate beneficial impact | Major adverse impact | Minor/ adverse impact | £ 25.50m | No revenue support required / maintenance only | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Affordable, but } \\ & \text { potentially high costs + } \\ & \text { financial risk } \end{aligned}$ | Yes |

## Appendix 6.1 Orbital highway schemes concept designs



## 




## PLAN VIEW <br> Scale 1:1000



## fiivivinumun!



|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\Lambda$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{\text {P1 }}$ | 0522,10 | orammo creare |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rem | oas | Ooestion |  |  | cokd | nois |  |


| FOR INFORMMIT | TION | S2 |  |  | OF ENG WP1 | AND |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ^TKINS <br> Copyright (C) Atkins Limited (2014) | The Hub500 Park AvenueAztec WestAlmondsburyBristolBS32 4RZTel: $+44(0) 1454662000$Fax: +44 (0)1372 663333www.atkinsglobal.com |  | A4 - A37 LINK OPTION 2 PROPOSED CONCEPT LIYOUT |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1:1000 | Ec | ${ }^{\text {porm }}$ | ${ }_{\text {AH }}$ |  |
| WEST OF ENGLAND |  |  |  |  | 2aie |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (ex |














| CROSS SECTIONS <br> Scale 1：1000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | DO NOT SCALE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Exising Levels |  | Exising Levels |  | Exising Levels |  | Exising Levels |  | Exising Levels |  |  |  |
|  | Proposed Levels |  | Prooosed Levels |  | Prooosed Levels |  | Proosesed Levels |  | Prooosed Levels |  |  |  |
|  | Proposed Offsels |  | Proposed offsets |  | Proposed offsets |  | Proposed Offsets |  | Proposed Offsels |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\qquad$ － |  | ECTION 2110．000－2110．000 $\qquad$ |  | ECTION 2120．000－2120．000 $\qquad$ |  | SECTION 2130．000－2130．000 $\qquad$ |  | SECTION 2140．000－2140．000 $\qquad$ |  |  |
|  | Existing Levels |  | Exising Levels |  | Exising Levels |  | Exising Levels |  | Exising Levels |  |  |  |
|  | Proposed Levels |  | Proosed Levels |  | Proosed Levels | 竟量景 | Proosesed Levels |  | Proossed Levels |  |  |  |
|  | Proposed Offsets |  | Proosed offrets |  | Proosed offsels |  | Proposed Offsets | $\frac{8}{8}$ | Proposed Offsels |  |  |  |
|  |  | ECTION 2050．000－2050．000 |  | ECTION 2060．000－2060．000 |  | SECTION 2070．000－2070．000 $\qquad$ $\qquad$ |  | SECTION 2080．000－2080．000 $\qquad$ |  | SECTION 2090．000－2090．000 $\qquad$ |  |  |
|  | Existing Levels |  | Exising Levels |  | Exising Levels |  | Exising Levels |  | Exising Levels |  |  |  |
|  | Proposed Levels |  | Prooseed Levels |  | Proosed Levels |  | Prooosed Levels |  | Prooosed Levels |  |  |  |
|  | Proposed Offsets |  | Proosed offsets |  | Proosed offisets |  | Proposed Offsets |  | Proposed Offsels |  |  |  |
|  |  | CTION 2000．000－2000．000 $\qquad$ $\sim$ |  | SECTION 2010．000－2010．000 |  | SECTION 2020．000－2020．000 |  | SECTION 2030．000－2030．000 $\qquad$ |  | $\qquad$ |  |  |
|  | Existing Levels |  | Exising Levels |  | Exising Levels |  | Exising Levels |  | Exising Levels |  |  |  |
|  | Proposed Levels |  | Proposed Levels |  | Prooosed Levels |  | Proosed Levels |  | Proosesed Levels |  |  |  |
|  | Prooseed Offsets |  | Proosed offesets |  | Proosed offisets |  | Proposed Offsets |  | Proposed Offsets |  |  |  |
| Key： |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | FOR INFORMATION |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | A4－A37 LINK OPTON 2 SHEEPT SHES 1119 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | MAINTENANCE／CLEANING NONE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | DECOMMISSIONING／DEMOLITION <br> NONE |  |  |  | WEST OF ENGLAND |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |










## 




## PLAN VIEW <br> Scale 1:1000




## fiivivin!



|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | ${ }^{2720218}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{\text {P1 }}$ | ${ }^{55218}$ | orammo cerareo |  |  |  |  |
| Rew | oase | Desatam |  |  | \%xat 4 ami |  |


| FOR INIFORMATION |  |  | S2 |  |  | OFENG | AND |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ^TKINS |  |  |  | A4 - A37 LINKOPTONCONT PTM LIYOUTSHEET ? 2 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | $\cdots$ | AH |  |
| WEST OF ENGLAND |  |  |  | ${ }_{\text {A1 }}$ |  | Sma |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |














| CROSS SECTIONS <br> Scale 1：1000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | DO NOT SCALE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Exising Levels |  | Exising Levels |  | Exising Levels |  | Existing Levels |  | Exising Levels |  |  |  |
|  | Proposed Levels |  | Proposed Levels |  | Prooosed Levels |  | Proposed Levels |  | Prooosed Levels |  |  |  |
|  | Proposed Offsels |  | Proposed offsets |  | Proposed offsets |  |  |  | Proposed offets |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | SECTON 2 Ba0000－2830000 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Existing Levels |  |  |  |  |  | Exising Levels |  | Existing Levels |  |  |  |
|  | Proposed Levels | 是量部点要 | Proosed Levels |  | Proposed Offsets |  | Proposed Levels | P量最要 | Proosesed Levels | 最最量 |  |  |
|  | Proposed Offsets |  | Proosed offrets |  |  |  | Proposed offsets | $\frac{8}{8}$ | Proosed offisels |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | SECTOON 2070000－2700000 |  |  |  | $\qquad$ |  |  |  |
|  | Existing Levels |  | Existing Levels |  | Exising Levels |  | Exising Levels |  | Exising Levels |  |  |  |
|  | Proposed Levels |  | Proposed Levels |  | Proposed Levels |  | Proosed Levels |  | Proposed Levels |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 边 |  | Proosed offests |  | Proposed Offsets |  | Proposed offsels |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | $\qquad$ |  | SECTION 2020．000－2020．000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Existing Levels |  | Exising Levels |  | Exising Levels |  | Exsiting Levels |  | Exising Levels |  |  |  |
|  | Proosed Levels |  | Proposed Levels |  | Proposed Levels |  | Proposed Levels |  | Proposed Levels |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Proposed Offsets |  | Proosed Offets ${ }^{\text {c／}}$ |  | Proposed Offets |  | Prooseed offsets |  |  |  |
| Key： |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | FOR INFORMATION |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | A4－A37 LINK OPTON SHCEPT SHET 1119 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | MAINTENANCE／CLEANING NONE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | OECOMMISSIONING／DEMOLTION |  |  |  | West of England |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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| Project: | West of England JSP | To: | Helen Young, Kevin O'Connor. Claire <br> Cornelius, Chris Mason, Jodi Savickas |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Subject: | Modelling and Economics <br> Methodology Appendix for <br> WP1/3/6a OARs | From: | Tracey Poole |

This appendix sets out the scope and methodology for the modelling and cost-benefit analysis of the schemes presented in the Options Assessment Report (OAR). The OAR presents the results of the assessments.

### 1.1. Economic Scope

Figure 1 illustrates the full range of economic impacts anticipated from transport interventions, in line with the latest Department for Transport (DfT) guidance and Value for Money (VfM) framework¹.

The monetised impacts captured in the cost-benefit analysis are supported by non-monetised assessments presented in the OAR. This document focusses on the cost-benefit analysis.

Modelling and economic appraisal activities undertaken to date have been focused on quantifying and monetising scheme costs and the majority of Level 1 impacts (Types A and B in Figure 1) as follows:

- Public transport (PT) user benefits - generalised journey time savings for passengers;
- Highway user benefits - time and vehicle operating cost savings to highway users as a result of decongestion impacts from highway enhancements, or reduction in road trips due to mode shift from highway to MetroBus and / or cycling;
- Health benefits to slow mode users as a result of increases in cycling;
- Capital costs and an appropriate allowance for maintenance and renewal of new infrastructure; and
- MetroBus and Park \& Ride service operating costs and generated revenues from new passengers.

For the OARs the non-user impacts in Level 1 (such as accident savings, air quality and noise impacts) and all Levels 2 and 3 (i.e. reliability and wider economic impacts) have not been quantified or monetised. The Level 3 impacts have been assessed as part of the WECA Outline Business Cases (OBC) (quantified or qualitatively, depending on the impact).
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Figure 1 Illustration of the full range of economics impacts from transport interventions Type of economic impacts


Description
Public sector cost of scheme delivery, operation and renewal Changes in revenues to public sector providers / operators Journey time and operating cost savings Disruption impacts during construction and maintenance Related air quality and noise impacts
Reductions in accidents
Costs and revenue impacts
improved journey reliability
improved network resilience
Agglomeration (static)
Labour supply impacts (tax wedge on more people working) Increased econmic output in imperfect competitive market
Agglomeration (dynamic)
Moves into more productive jobs
Welfare impact of induced increase in housing or commercial supply - dependent development
option value
landscape, townscape, heritage, natural habitats, water improved security, reduced severance, access to services, health impacts, impact distribution by social groups

### 1.2. The Models and Analysis

This note sets out the models and assumptions that have been used to estimate the impact of the schemes presented in the OAR. It explains the approach taken to combining model outputs with an appropriate treatment of scheme costs into the cost-benefit analysis of the schemes, which helps to inform VfM.

The following models have been used:

- A PT mode choice model has been developed to test PT schemes ad output PT user benefits, forecast mode shift to PT from car and the resulting generated revenue;
- The Greater-Bristol Area Transport Study (G-BATS4) Strategic model together with TUBA has been used as the basis for modelling the impact on highways - testing the impact of the highway schemes, and also, using outputs from the PT mode choice model and the DfT's Propensity to Cycle Tool ${ }^{2,}$ to capture the highway user benefits from mode shift to PT and cycle;
- Highways England's (HE) VISSIM model has been used to model one of the key junctions in the Thornbury Corridor;
- The DfT's Propensity to Cycle Tool ${ }^{3}$ has been used to forecast mode shift to cycle as a result of increased facilities for cyclists;
- The HEAT (Health Assessment Tool) ${ }^{4}$ has been used to estimate health benefits derived from increases in cycling; and
- Atkins' PT operating cost model has been used to estimate operating costs.

[^1]
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In each of the models the impact of the scheme has been tested compared to a 'Do-Minimum' scenario which includes underlying growth and other committed transport schemes. The benefits, operating costs and revenues from these models have been bought together with capital costs and an allowance for maintenance and renewal with appropriate allowances for inflation, growth, risk and discounting to 2010 present values in accordance with WebTAG.

The rest of this note gives details of the highway modelling, the PT mode choice model and of the assumptions and collation of inputs into the economic analysis.

## Technical note 2. Highway Modelling Overview

### 2.1. Introduction

G-BATS4 has been used for Work Package 1 (Whitchurch) and Work Package 3 (Yate) highway schemes, and provided flows for the VISSM modelling in Work Package 6a (Thornbury).

G-BATS4 model represents the highway network covering the Bristol urban area and wider sub-region, as seen in Figure 2. The base model has been developed and validated using traffic count, road side interview surveys and travel time data collected in 2013. It is important to note that the model has been specifically calibrated on the urbanised area within the M4/M5 box. Outside this area, whilst the network and travel demand is included, there is a limitation around the level of detail for specific corridors and junctions.

As the scheme designs progress, a more detailed appraisal and assessment of the G-BATS4 model functionality in these regions is recommended. Nevertheless, the G-BATS4 model is able to provide strategic analysis of current and expected future issues at the sub-regional level and has helped inform analysis of the potential for mode shift from the private car and the overall performance of the transport network ${ }^{5}$.

### 2.2. Geographic Scope

The area covered is shown in Figure 2. Outside the Bristol urban area, the G-BATS4 model becomes increasingly less detailed, however for a strategic overview of the interventions the model is still adequate.

Figure $2 \quad$ Geographic scope of G-BATS4 model (including uncalibrated area)
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### 2.3. Time Periods

Highway schemes were modelled in all three time periods, AM peak (between 0800 and 0900), inter peak (1000-1600) and PM peak (1700-1800), with annualisation factors utilised in the economic assessment to expand to a 12-hour weekday and all year.

The impact on highways of the PT schemes (decongestion impacts) are modelled for the peak hour only, with a different annualisation factor applied. Note that the PT mode choice model is a 3-hour model (both AM and PM Peaks), and the PT mode choice model supplies a percentage change in car trips, which becomes the basis for decongestion modelling in G-BATS4.

Further details on PT mode choice modelling periods can be found in Section 3.2.3.

### 2.4. Forecast Spatial Planning Scenarios

There are two forecast spatial planning variants considered in this study: The 'core' forecast for the OARs is described as 'Spatially Neutral' (to align with WebTAG) with a 'Joint Spatial Plan' (JSP) sensitivity test.

## Spatially Neutral

The core forecast scenario was updated in January 2018 by CH2M/Jacobs using current WebTAG values of time and the DfT's National Trip End Model (NTEM 7.2) to represent the expected traffic on the network in 2036. Whilst this scenario includes projected demographic, employment and car ownership changes within the region, a large amount of growth will be classified as uncertain hence it is assumed to be spread across the region as per the base distribution of travel demand. This core scenario is therefore described as Spatially Neutral.

The Spatially Neutral scenario is consistent with the DfT WebTAG Unit M4 (Forecasting and Uncertainty) which recommends the establishment of an uncertainty log. This classifies future land development and infrastructure by the likelihood that they will occur. Only specific changes which are considered 'near certain' or 'more than likely', are to be included.

This scenario was created using a Variable Demand Model (VDM). The VDM process modifies the Reference Case demand forecasts to reflect the impact of vehicle operating costs, value of travel time and cost of alternative PT travel, resulting in a without-scheme (Do-Minimum) scenario.

The schemes and land use assumptions included in the Spatially Neutral model are consistent with the uncertainty log, which is included within the traffic forecast report provided by CH2M/Jacobs.

## JSP Scenario

Sensitivity testing was undertaken which assumes proposed housing and employment in the JSP, the 'With JSP' scenario. This was undertaken to demonstrate the impact of adding more demand to the specific development areas and therefore capturing an increased benefit of improving the transport network on some of the short listed schemes/packages given they are designed to directly relate to the JSP developments.

This scenario more accurately reflects the expected highway trip generation and distribution for each Strategic Development Location (SDL) and the changes in housing and employment quanta expected in the JSP. Whilst these SDLs are not yet committed and hence have insufficient certainty to be included in the Core tests, this JSP scenario seeks to provide evidence of the impact of the JSP development on the network and the proposed schemes.

The DfT TEMPro software has a function which allows the user to project trip growth resulting from alternate planning assumptions. These revised growth assumptions, combined with projected SDL trip generation, provided an estimate, within each Unitary Authority, of trip growth compared to the Spatially Neutral highway matrices. ${ }^{6}$
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The planning assumptions for the JSP are detailed in the JSP Transport Topic Paper ${ }^{7}$, Section 3.3.3. The assumptions behind the changes in households and jobs for the JSP are summarised in Table 1.

Table 1 Planning Assumptions for Transport Modelling

|  | 2013 | 2036 |  |  | Increase 2013-2036 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Households | $\begin{gathered} \text { Base } \\ \text { TEMPRO } 7.2 \end{gathered}$ | TEMPRO 7.2 | $\begin{gathered} 2036 \text { Excl } \\ \text { JSP } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2036 \text { Incl } \\ & \text { JSP } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2036 \text { Excl } \\ \text { JSP } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2036 \text { Incl } \\ \text { JSP } \end{gathered}$ | Difference with JSP |
| West of England | 460,482 | 560,927 | 534,925 | 577,580 | 74,443 | 117,098 | 42,655 |
| B\&NES | 74,620 | 85,893 | 86,645 | 91,156 | 12,025 | 16,536 | 4,512 |
| Bristol | 185,375 | 221,583 | 207,583 | - 223,284 | 22,208 | 37,910 | 15,702 |
| North Somerset | 90,265 | 116,631 | 106,249 | 117,016 | 15,984 | 26,751 | 10,767 |
| South Gloucs | 110,222 | 136,820 | 134,449 | 146,124 | 24,227 | 35,901 | 11,675 |
| Jobs | $\begin{gathered} \text { Base } \\ \text { TEMPRO } 7.2 \end{gathered}$ | TEMPRO 7.2 | $\begin{gathered} 2036 \text { Excl } \\ \text { JSP } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2036 \text { Incl } \\ \text { JSP } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2036 \text { Excl } \\ \text { JSP } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2036 \text { Incl } \\ \text { JSP } \end{gathered}$ | Difference with JSP |
| West of England | 598,619 | 665,334 | 642,788 | 693,498 | 44,169 | 94,880 | 50,711 |
| B\&NES | 97,930 | 109,435 | 102,752 | 108,103 | 4,822 | 10,173 | 5,350 |
| Bristol | 256,166 | 284,175 | 266,151 | 286,282 | 9,984 | 30,116 | 20,132 |
| North Somerset | 90,537 | 101,412 | 99,703 | 109,807 | 9,166 | 19,270 | 10,104 |
| South Gloucs | 153,985 | 170,312 | 174,181 | 189,306 | 20,196 | 35,321 | 15,125 |

WoE JSP Transport Topic Paper / NTEM 7.2
Before applying constraints, the expected highway trip demand from the specific SDL was added to the 2036 VDM matrix. This is detailed in the Topic Paper section 3.3.4. A summary of the SDL trip generation is found in Table 2. These SDLs are specific zones: 900XX (see Table 2). The trip distribution was based on nearby zones which match the land use characteristics.

Table 2 Trip generation of SDLs

|  |  |  |  | AM Peak |  | Inter Peak |  | PM Peak |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Location Name | Residential Dwellings | Employmen t (Ha) | Highway Zone | Out | In | Out | In | Out | In |
| North Keynsham | 1,400 | 14.0 | 90021 | 555 | 923 | 454 | 423 | 796 | 458 |
| Whitchurch | 1,600 | 0.0 | 90020 | 466 | 193 | 215 | 218 | 249 | 412 |
| Brislington | 500 | 0.0 | 90019 | 142 | 59 | 65 | 66 | 76 | 126 |
| Backwell | 700 | 10.5 | 90022 | 1,065 | 961 | 639 | 621 | 943 | 917 |
| Nailsea | 2,575 | - | 90022 | 1,065 | 961 | 639 | 621 | 943 | 917 |
| Churchill Garden Village | 2,675 | 7.4 | 90024 | 857 | 721 | 500 | 487 | 722 | 741 |
| Banwell Garden Village | 1,900 | 5.0 | 90023 | 606 | 499 | 350 | 342 | 502 | 525 |
| Buckover Garden Village | 1,500 | 11.0 | 90028 | 553 | 773 | 410 | 387 | 688 | 463 |
| Charfield | 1,200 | 5.0 | 90026 | 402 | 414 | 256 | 246 | 393 | 344 |
| Coalpit Heath | 1,800 | 5.0 | 90025 | 577 | 487 | 337 | 328 | 487 | 499 |
| Northwest Yate | 1,000 | 0.0 | 90027 | 291 | 121 | 134 | 136 | 156 | 258 |
| West Yate | - | 30.0 | 90030 | 316 | 1,615 | 569 | 497 | 1,240 | 209 |
| Thornbury | 500 | 5.0 | 90029 | 198 | 330 | 162 | 151 | 284 | 164 |
| SDL Total | 17,350 | 92.9 | - | 6,028 | 7,095 | 4,092 | 3,903 | 6,536 | 5,116 |

October 2017 Housing Trajectory and TRICS database
The 2036 matrix, including SDLs was then constrained, by unitary authority, to match the projected NTEM alternate (i.e. JSP scenario) assumption growth. The matrix was furnessed to fit as closely as possible the absolute estimated projected JSP growth rather than percentage change. The overall matrix totals for the AM, IP and PM are shown in Table 3.
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Table $3 \quad$ Highway Matrix Totals and NTEM Growth

|  | AM Peak Model Matrix |  |  |  |  |  |  | AM Peak NTEM |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Base | VDM |  | ExcJSP |  | Inc JSP |  | Car OD (Raw) | Exc JSP | Inc JSP |
|  | 2013 | 2036 | vs Base | 2036 | vs Base | 2036 | vs Base | 2036 vs Base |  |  |
| WoE | 108,450 | 127,444 | 17.5\% | 120,089 | 10.7\% | 130,441 | 20.3\% | 15.2\% | 10.3\% | 19.1\% |
| Bath | 4,858 | 6,190 | 27.4\% | 5,609 | 15.5\% | 6,771 | 39.4\% | 8.8\% | 7.9\% | 13.5\% |
| Bristol | 58,384 | 65,404 | 12.0\% | 62,578 | 7.2\% | 65,508 | 12.2\% | 18.0\% | 10.5\% | 18.9\% |
| NSC | 13,637 | 16,493 | 20.9\% | 13,704 | 0.5\% | 16,609 | 21.8\% | 18.1\% | 9.1\% | 20.2\% |
| SGC | 31,571 | 39,357 | 24.7\% | 38,198 | 21.0\% | 41,553 | 31.6\% | 13.3\% | 12.2\% | 21.9\% |
| External | 17,701 | 21,418 | 21.0\% | 20,793 | 17.5\% | 21,948 | 24.0\% |  |  |  |
|  | Inter Peak Model |  |  |  |  |  |  | Inter Peak NTEM |  |  |
|  | Base | VDM |  | Exc JSP |  | Inc JSP |  | Car OD <br> (Raw) | Exc JSP | Inc JSP |
|  | 2013 | 2036 | vs Base | 2036 | vs Base | 2036 | vs Base | 2036 vs Base |  |  |
| WoE | 93,135 | 113,575 | 21.9\% | 110,257 | 18.4\% | 117,112 | 25.7\% | 18.6\% | 14.1\% | 23.2\% |
| Bath | 3,867 | 4,880 | 26.2\% | 4,439 | 14.8\% | 5,130 | 32.7\% | 16.2\% | 12.1\% | 18.0\% |
| Bristol | 52,325 | 61,093 | 16.8\% | 58,867 | 12.5\% | 61,001 | 16.6\% | 18.7\% | 11.2\% | 19.6\% |
| NSC | 9,558 | 11,729 | 22.7\% | 10,931 | 14.4\% | 12,643 | 32.3\% | 21.9\% | 15.7\% | 27.4\% |
| SGC | 27,385 | 35,873 | 31.0\% | 36,020 | 31.5\% | 38,338 | 40.0\% | 17.7\% | 18.4\% | 28.7\% |
| External | 14,056 | 17,985 | 28.0\% | 17,726 | 26.1\% | 18,267 | 30.0\% |  |  |  |
|  | PM Peak Model Matrix |  |  |  |  |  |  | PM Peak NTEM |  |  |
|  | Base | VDM |  | Exc JSP |  | Inc JSP |  | Car OD (Raw) | Exc JSP | Inc JSP |
|  | 2013 | 2036 | vs Base | 2036 | vs Base | 2036 | vs Base | 2036 vs Base |  |  |
| WoE | 110,278 | 127,626 | 15.7\% | 124,038 | 12.5\% | 134,001 | 21.5\% | 14.0\% | 10.0\% | 18.8\% |
| Bath | 4,817 | 5,568 | 15.6\% | 5,006 | 3.9\% | 5,942 | 23.4\% | 13.1\% | 8.1\% | 13.7\% |
| Bristol | 59,623 | 65,541 | 9.9\% | 63,035 | 5.7\% | 66,527 | 11.6\% | 14.1\% | 6.9\% | 15.0\% |
| NSC | 12,669 | 14,577 | 15.1\% | 13,315 | 5.1\% | 15,587 | 23.0\% | 16.5\% | 12.0\% | 23.3\% |
| SGC | 33,169 | 41,940 | 26.4\% | 42,682 | 28.7\% | 45,945 | 38.5\% | 12.8\% | 14.3\% | 24.2\% |
| External | 15,528 | 19,186 | 23.6\% | 18,885 | 21.6\% | 19,517 | 25.7\% |  |  |  |

Est 12Hr Model Matrix

|  | Est 12Hr Model Matrix |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Base | VDM |  | Exc JSP |  | Inc JSP |  |
|  | 2013 | 2036 | vs Base | 2036 | vs Base | 2036 | vs Base |
| WoE | 1,105,630 | 1,319,125 | 19.3\% | 1,271,860 | 15.0\% | 1,363,777 | 23.3\% |
| Bath | 47,390 | 58,675 | 23.8\% | 53,172 | 12.2\% | 62,563 | 32.0\% |
| Bristol | 608,968 | 693,921 | 14.0\% | 667,235 | 9.6\% | 696,094 | 14.3\% |
| NSC | 123,113 | 148,049 | 20.3\% | 133,134 | 8.1\% | 156,348 | 27.0\% |
| SGC | 326,160 | 418,481 | 28.3\% | 418,320 | 28.3\% | 448,773 | 37.6\% |
| External | 167,409 | 209,420 | 25.1\% | 205,551 | 22.8\% | 213,265 | 27.4\% |

GBATS Highway Matrices and NTEM7.2 data. The JSP matrices include the SDL trips

### 2.5. Use of Outputs in Economics

The outputs from G-BATS4 for highway schemes were run through TUBA using scheme parameters as set out in Section 4.4.

Due to the G-BATS only modelling being based on one year, post-TUBA benefit manipulation was completed. Using Value of Time (from WebTAG guidance) and benefits factors (derived from model change in (passenger car units (PCU) hours), the benefits are discounted back to the scheme opening year. Following this, the horizon year was adjusted, allowing the benefits to reflect the effects of the scheme from the opening year and over the 60-year appraisal period.

### 2.6. Model Caveats

To date, the modelling and analysis has been appropriate for the stage of the scheme development and case making, with no significant enhancements to pre-existing models. During the progress of model
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applications, a number of model limitations were observed, which are summarised below as recommendations for model enhancements in further stages of work:

- Calibration outside the Bristol urban area is minimal, meaning the model could be enhanced to more fully capture the observed/potential delay on key corridors;
- SATURN (the modelling program used) does not fully capture the benefits at junctions, a microsimulation model could be used more widely in future stages to ensure the junctions function correctly and to capture delay and congestion benefits in more detail;
- Capture of the JSP demand in the models is relatively simplistic and reviews of the outputs show that it could be underestimated, also the JSP scenario in G-BATS is also not constrained to NTEM; and
- Currently only one forecast year is modelled, 2036, in future stages a second, more distant future year should be considered.

Potential enhancements to the above limitations is likely to lead to improved benefits capture and a more comprehensive VfM analysis.

### 2.7. VISSIM Modelling for Thornbury

### 2.7.1. Introduction

For the highway scheme being progressed in the A38 corridor (Work Package 6a), at M5 Junction 14, the GBATS4 network is considered unsuitable for detailed testing as a strategic model is unlikely to pick up the full extent of the issues and benefits, and because the junction is in the model 'buffer' (less detailed part of the model). Hence a more detailed analysis has been undertaken using Highway's England's micro-simulation (VISSIM) model. This model has been specifically calibrated in the area, and is able to consider more detailed real time vehicle interactions. The expected strategic forecast change in highway travel demand from the G-BATS4 model has been applied to the validated base VISSIM model in order to assess the impact at this junction using the best available data.

### 2.7.2. Geographic Scope

VISSIM is more suited to junction modelling and for the location of the scheme it is used for in these corridor studies. Figure 3 shows the extent of the VISSIM model.

### 2.7.3. Time Periods

The VISSIM model was run using an AM Peak (07:30-08:30) and PM Peak (16:30-17:30), with a 30 minute warm up period (07:00-07:30 and 16:00-16:30) and a 30-minute cool down period (08:30-09:00 and 17:3018:00). Note that there was no inter peak VISSIM model run, therefore annualisation factors were used to account for off peak benefits in the economics.

### 2.7.4. Modelled Flows

Modelled flows were taken from G-BATS4 for consistency. The base year VISSIM matrices were factored by growth from base year to the future year 2036 for all Origin-Destination (OD) movements in the VISSIM network.

### 2.7.5. Use of Outputs in Economics

The VISSIM model outputs were converted to a TUBA format using an Atkins spreadsheet. TUBA and postTUBA manipulation was then completed.
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Figure $3 \quad$ Geographic scope of VISSIM model


### 2.7.6. M5 Junction 14 Modelling Limitations

As seen in Figure 3 the scope of the VISSIM model is limited, with no more than the junction and adjacent roads being modelled. This means that wider benefits and impacts are not, at this stage, captured. The VISSIM model has different time periods to that in G-BATS and using different software, meaning it is not directly comparable to the other highway schemes in detail, but the outputs give a broad indication of scheme performance. As with the G-BATS model, the HE VISSIM model has only one modelled year, meaning benefits require adjustment.

When the VISSIM model was run it was found that there was a high level of 'un-met demand ${ }^{18}$ with one scheme option tested. This is due to higher levels of congestion. This means that some scenarios appeared to be performing better in TUBA as the demand was lower, despite high levels of congestion and vehicles not being able to enter; i.e. the modelling outputs are not realistic and the junction does not perform adequately to accommodate demand. In this instance, the scheme option was considered to not mitigate the impacts of the traffic flow at the junction.

[^5]
## Technical note

## 3. PT Mode Choice Modelling

### 3.1. Mode Choice Model Overview

The objective of the modelling was to undertake a proportionate assessment to establish which schemes are likely to have a good business case on further development. It is not necessary at this stage to produce detailed forecasts, e.g. for individual bus services. Outputs from the mode choice model were used for economic assessments of the schemes, together with highway impacts taken from G-BATS4. The outputs are for a WECA OBC, which is commensurate with the level of detail of a standard DfT Strategic Outline Business Case.

For PT schemes (MetroBus and Park \& Ride), Atkins undertook PT demand modelling to estimate the level of demand for each of the proposed schemes. A bespoke spreadsheet modelling tool was developed to carry out the demand calculations since the existing transport model (G-BATS4) does not have suitably detailed spatial definition required for PT mode choice modelling outside of the existing urban area.

The requirement of the model was to produce patronage forecasts for bus and Park \& Ride for the proposed schemes, and also resultant mode shift from highway travel which is input to the G-BATS4 model to forecast the impact on congestion. Rail patronage forecasts are not required.

This section sets out the development and specification of the mode choice model, covering:

- Model specification:
- Model data;
- Geographical scope;
- Time periods modelled;
- Functional scope;
- Calibration;
- Limitations;
- Demand growth;
- MetroBus scheme processing;
- Park \& Ride scheme processing; and
- Combining MetroBus and Park \& Ride schemes.


### 3.2. Model Specification

### 3.2.1. $\quad$ Model data

The model uses demand data from the Census Travel to Work (TTW) dataset as an approximation for the AM Peak and the transpose is assumed to be the PM Peak. The volume of all-purpose peak period trips is roughly the same as all day (one way) commuting trips and therefore TTW data is a reasonable approximation. TTW data was used in preference to demand data held within the G-BATS demand model as it was considered to provide a better representation of demand for commuting travel patterns.

The TTW dataset was applied to the G-BATS model zoning system. The mode splits forecast by the model for each O-D movement are applied to the total travel demand for that O-D (taken from the TTW data).

Table 4 lists the elements of journey time and cost in its mode choice calculations considered in the mode choice model.

Table $4 \quad$ Cost terms considered in mode choice modelling

| Public Transport | Highway |
| :--- | :--- |
| In vehicle time (minutes) | In vehicle time (minutes) |
| Fares (£) | Parking cost (£) |
| Access time (minutes) | Tolls (£) |
| Waiting time (minutes) | Car operating costs (£) |
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| Public Transport | Highway |
| :--- | :--- |
| Interchange time (minutes) |  |
| Walk times (minutes) |  |

## Notes:

- Fares, parking costs, tolls and car operating costs are converted to time units (minutes) using standard WebTAG values of time,
- Fares and car operating costs are calculated using unit rates and journey distances, and
- Park \& Ride costs are a combination of highway costs and PT costs

Travel time and other data needed for the generalised cost calculation is taken from the G-BATS model for the 2013 base year. This is close to the 2011 Census year and considered a reasonable fit for the data.

For the purpose of modelling the PT schemes, it has been assumed that only PT cost terms would change, and highway costs stay unchanged from the base.

### 3.2.2. Geographical scope

The PT mode choice model's coverage is approximately equal to the G-BATS model area. For how the geographical scope for each individual scheme is controlled, see Section 3.7.2.

### 3.2.3. Time periods modelled

The mode choice model considers travel in the AM period and the PM period. In each case, travel time characteristics are taken from the GBATS multi-modal model, which includes an AM Peak (0700-1000) and PM Peak (1600-1900) time period.

### 3.2.4. Functional scope

The PT mode choice modelling takes the form of a logit choice model, considering the choice between using the car or PT. The model calculates the mode split for each O-D movement, which when applied to the anticipated demand for that movement, will give an expected patronage figure for the scheme. This is an absolute form of model, calculating the mode split based on the time and cost of travel.

On reviewing the mode choice structure of the existing G-BATS4 model, a nested logit model was identified as the most appropriate approach with two levels:

- Main Mode: Highway / PT;
- Sub Mode Highway: car / Park \& Ride; and
- Sub Mode PT: bus /rail.

Generalised cost formulation follows the form and weights used in G-BATS. The demand data is held in OD (origin-destination) format, not PA (production-attraction) which is more usual for demand models. This is due to limitations of the demand data.

Disaggregation in the model was carried out by purpose and by time of day. There will be no disaggregation by income or by car availability. The model was specified to estimate the split between available modes applied to forecast demand levels and travel patterns. It will not be specified to forecast the amount of demand, or to calculate the distribution of that demand.

The model does not take into account constraining factors such as car availability or car parking capacity.
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### 3.3. Calibration Results

### 3.3.1. Base Year Calibration

Model calibration was achieved by adjusting the mode choice scale parameters and including a limited number of mode specific constants to achieve the required mode split.

TTW data does not specify Park \& Ride usage. It was assumed that all Park \& Ride use is reported within the 'car' mode of travel. Counts from the existing Park \& Ride sites were used in combination with the TTW data to determine the car/Park \& Ride split.

### 3.3.2. Model Parameters

The final calibrated parameters are:

- Main mode choice (lambda): 0.028;
- Sub mode choice PT (lambda): 0.15;
- Sub mode choice highway (lambda): 0.15;
- Mode specific constant rail (minutes): 30; and
- Mode specific constant Park \& Ride (minutes): 5 .

The mode splits observed in the TTW data and achieved by the model are reported below. A number of calibration runs have been carried out, varying the mode choice parameters and the rail and Park \& Ride mode specific constants.

The best results obtained from the calibration test runs are shown below. Since Park \& Ride is not recorded separately in the Census data the Park \& Ride trips are included with car in Table 5.

Table 5 Mode choice demand calibration

| Travel mode | Demand |  | Mode split \% |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | TTW | Model | TTW | Model |
|  <br> Ride | 232,347 | 230,275 | $86.16 \%$ | $85.93 \%$ |
| Bus | 29,975 | 30,831 | $11.11 \%$ | $11.43 \%$ |
| Rail | 6,790 | 7,815 | $2.51 \%$ | $2.90 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 6 9 , 1 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 6 8 , 9 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 0 \%}$ |

This shows a good fit between the model and the TTW data at a total travel demand level.

### 3.3.3. $\quad$ Park \& Ride patronage for Existing Sites

Comparison between modelled and observed Park \& Ride demand (person trips between 8AM and 9AM) at existing sites is in Table 6.

Table 6 Park \& Ride patronage (person trips, AM Peak hour 8-9AM)

| Site | Model patronage | Model split | Count patronage | Count split |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Portway | 251 | $34 \%$ | 79 | $14 \%$ |
| Bath Road | 318 | $42 \%$ | 243 | $44 \%$ |
| Long Ashton | 175 | $24 \%$ | 232 | $42 \%$ |
| Total Park \& Ride | $\mathbf{7 4 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 5 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

Count patronage is based on figures used in CH2M's validated base year Park \& Ride model.

## Technical note

At the mode choice level, Park \& Ride patronage is over-predicted (744 trips in the model as compared to 554 trips from counts). The split between sites is more even in the model than in the count data, with the model overestimating use of the Portway site and underestimating use of the Long Ashton site. However, as the objective of this model is to predict patronage for new Park \& Ride sites, the overall mode split is the more important measure. It is noted that the counted patronage of 79 trips at Portway appears low.

### 3.3.4. Realism testing

A realism test, increasing bus fares by $10 \%$, was undertaken to see the effect on cost trip elasticity and is presented in Table 7.

Table $7 \quad$ Bus fare realism test

|  | Bus fare increase $10 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Calculated own cost trip elasticity | -0.42 |

The elasticity reported is lower (in magnitude) than ideal (WebTAG suggests an elasticity of -0.7 to -0.9), meaning the model is likely to be conservative in estimating the impact of a fare change. However, since the model is only considering mode choice between car and PT and no other responses (such as trip redistribution, not making a trip or switching to walking and cycling) and calibrated only on commuting trips, which are expected to be less elastic than discretionary trips, this is a reasonable result.

PT tests carried out for the specified schemes suggest a reasonable degree of sensitivity of demand response to changing journey times.

### 3.4. Limitations and Next Steps with Model

This model is suitable to assess the likely impact of bus-based improvements on a corridor basis, an appropriate level of robustness to support the OARs. Results from the model can be used to inform operational or economic appraisal to inform decisions on taking schemes forward to a more detailed business case. As with all modelling exercises, and at this stage of development, there are caveats around the model outputs and a list of the limitations of the approach is given below. As appropriate, at subsequent stages of scheme and modelling development commensurate with DfT OBC or Full Business Case (FBC) stage, further modelling refinement will be undertaken either to enhance the PT mode choice model, and/or to enhance G-BATS4 to a greater level of granularity in the specific corridors.

The key limitations of the mode choice model are as follows:

- Forecasts are intended to give a scale of Value for Money, the level of detail is proportionate to the early stage of scheme development;
- There is no trip generation or trip distribution included, the only decision being modelled is the choice of mode applied to forecast demand;
- The modelling does not detail time-of-day choice, peak spreading or period switching;
- The model does not go to the level of boarding and alighting at individual bus stops, or loadings on individual buses;
- Corridor bus patronage is captured at this stage rather than forecasting how demand might move between individual services within each mode, and therefore the modelling is not detailed enough to indicate how many people will switch to MetroBus from existing bus services;
- Patronage forecasts are provided for each key origin for the time period as a whole. This may smooth out the high peak within each peak period;
- Generalised costs are calculated based on assumptions of route choices, and the flows captured for each scheme are manually generated. This may have led to a smaller set of flows captured than would have been if journey time changes are determined through an assignment program;
- The PT mode choice modelling does not consider constraining factors such as car availability or car parking capacity;
- Modelling of PT schemes have only considered changes to PT journey times and costs, and those for car are assumed to be fixed. These are reasonable assumptions for the schemes as specified for this commission; and
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- Each element of modelling undertaken was carried out in line with WebTAG guidance. However, given the simplification at this early stage of development, the modelling approach does not consider the full range of responses set out in WebTAG.

Subsequent stages of scheme development should consider addressing some of the above.
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### 3.5. Summary of Key Assumptions

Table 8 shows the key assumptions made in the PT and mode choice modelling
Table 8 Key PT Mode Choice Modelling Assumptions

| Assumption | Rationale | Impact | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Park \& Ride is modelled in the PT mode choice model for AM only | No reliable Park \& Ride data in PM | Park \& Ride traffic impacts in PM assumed to be reverse of AM | Highway Benefits: Park \& Ride outputs were included in the SATURN PM model and therefore PM benefits are captured in the economic benefits. No IP model was run at this stage therefore benefits may be underestimated. <br> PT Benefits: Annualisation factors were used to uplift the benefits ( 6.83 for AM or 7.09 for PM). Future Park \& Ride modelling would benefit from further data collection (e.g. for inter peak and PMpeak periods) to for better model calibration and forecasting |
| Growth based on highway matrix rather than mode specific growth | No full forecast matrix available | Growth rates may vary slightly compared to all-modes growth | This is a limitation but is proportionate at this stage of analysis and scheme development |
| Census TTW data is used for demand | Client request | Only covers commuting demand; no adjustment made for specific time periods or other trip purposes. | The model forecasts for the AM Peak and uses demand that reflects all commuters, however some commuting will occur outside of the AM Peak period. This is a simplifying assumption for this stage of modelling and whilst use of this data would over represent commuting in the AM Peak, this broadly balances with under representation of other trip purposes. |
| In scope zones - 500m radius at origin end; 1.5km in Bristol | Passengers are unlikely to walk further | There could be a wider catchment from interchange with other buses or cycle therefore patronage may be under estimated a little. | A sensitivity test has been undertaken where this is thought to be a particular issue (Thornbury) to give an indication of an alternative more relaxed assumption. |
| In scope zones - only where directly served by bus stop | Calculating all potential journeys is not proportionate | Could under estimate patronage slightly. | A sensitivity test gives an indication of an alternative assumption. |
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| Assumption | Rationale | Impact | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| No changes to fares | Fares strategy uncertain | Fares are an element of the cost <br> used to calculate mode shift. OpEx <br> revenue calculated separately | This is a limitation but is proportionate at this <br> stage of analysis and scheme development. |
| Bus quality factor of 15\% applied to <br> in vehicle time | MetroBus is higher quality than existing <br> buses | Will make MetroBus more attractive <br> compared to normal bus or car with <br> same journey time | This is an acceptable assumption for this stage of <br> development. It is recommended that further work <br> in later stages of scheme development is <br> undertaken. to confirm the MetroBus 'concept', to <br> what extent this is delivered by the services and <br> infrastructure, the relationship between this and <br> the value of 15\% and whether this is the correct <br> proportion. |
| GBATS used as source of journey <br> times | Best data source for all journeys in <br> Bristol | Model may not be completely <br> accurate in all locations | Alternative sources and more detailed verification <br> could be considered at later stages of scheme <br> development when modelling in more detail. |
| Yate loop passengers take first bus | Passengers unlikely to wait for following <br> bus | Journey time to stops on circle is <br> average of the two directions, not <br> the quickest direct | Simplification is appropriate for this stage of <br> scheme development and analysis. We <br> recommend a reality check on the potential <br> impact (if any) of this simplifying assumption <br> when forecasting in more detail. |
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### 3.6. Demand growth

Growth in demand from base year to future year, 2036, is determined by applying factors at the origin zone, calculated from the G-BATS highway matrices as the best available source at the time the analysis was undertaken. This assumes no change in distribution between base and future years which is a simplifying assumption at this stage of scheme development and could be enhanced in the future.

Two scenarios are considered:

- 'Spatially Neutral' where growth in demand is applied evenly across wide areas; and
- 'With JSP' where growth in demand is targeted in specific zones to reflect new development areas.

As the base year data is only available for existing zones and growth is applied multiplicatively, new zones in the 'With JSP' scenario are paired with an appropriate nearby zone sharing the same journey characteristics. The demand from the 'new' zone is moved to the 'old' zone for the purposes of the mode choice calculations, so that all demand is accounted for in the future year scenario.

### 3.7. MetroBus scheme processing

### 3.7.1. Schemes assessed

The schemes to be tested consist of improvements to bus services on many routes between Bristol City Centre and towns just outside the Bristol urban area. Journey times and bus service details were specified for each section of the route.

### 3.7.2. Zones affected

As the mode choice model is configured to calculate mode splits for each OD pair, it was necessary to define the zones, and the OD pairs, affected by the new bus routes and Park \& Ride sites. The overall principle for this was to capture only the OD pairs directly affected by introducing the new route, and not any others even though they may see a marginal improvement.

The affected zones were defined as:

- Bristol City Centre: any zone within 1.5 km of a stop served by MetroBus, according to the Travelwest website; and
- Outside Bristol: any zone within 500 m of stops served by the new service. Where the services leave the existing MetroBus corridors, this includes the last stop on the shared section of route and all stops thereafter.

Journeys in scope are:

- Journeys between all OD pairs in the 'outside Bristol' range; and
- Journeys between 'Outside Bristol' and 'Bristol City Centre', but not journeys within 'Bristol City Centre'.

The selection of in-scope zones forming the in-scope OD pairs is referred to as a corridor.
Figure 4 is an example of such a corridor. For the A4 scheme, PT journey time changes are considered for movements between all coloured zones.
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Figure $4 \quad$ A4 MetroBus Corridor (Example)


### 3.7.3. Scheme specification

The mode choice model calculates the generalised cost for bus services based on the journey time, frequency, walk and interchange time information provided to it. The data preparation therefore required the relevant information to be updated for those OD pairs in scope of the assessment as set out below. No changes were made to the other journey attributes (distance, fare, access etc).

### 3.7.3.1. Journey time

The journey time for each OD pair was calculated from the journey time specification provided for the scheme, by linking each zone to the nearest bus stop.

The in-vehicle journey time was reduced by $15 \%{ }^{9}$ to reflect the better quality of MetroBus compared to existing bus services, and therefore an improvement in perceived journey quality.

### 3.7.3.2. Waiting time

The waiting time at each bus stop was specified as half the headway for the service, assuming a random arrival profile at the stop. The bus services provided are relatively frequent (10-20 minute headways), so this is a reasonable assumption. Waiting time changes were applied for schemes intended to deliver improved frequency of services along key corridors.
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### 3.7.4. Post-model processing

Output highway demand change matrices are fed back into G-BATS then TUBA is used to calculate highway decongestion benefits. Summary statistics for bus user benefits are fed directly into TUBA.

### 3.8. Park \& Ride site processing

The preparation of Park \& Ride data was independent of the MetroBus data. The Park \& Ride sites modelled are served by the MetroBus schemes being tested, and so share key journey data characteristics with them.

### 3.8.1. Generalised costs

For Park \& Ride sites, the generalised costs are a direct input to the model, and therefore needed to be calculated outside the model.

The generalised cost for a Park \& Ride service consists of several elements:

- Car generalised cost from origin to the zone representing the Park \& Ride site (with adjustments made to reflect differences between the location of the zone and the Park \& Ride site where the two are different);
- Bus in-vehicle time (calculated on the same basis as the MetroBus in-vehicle time);
- Waiting time (half the headway); and
- Interchange time of 10 minutes, reflecting parking time and inconvenience of changing modes.
- Fares are assumed to be the same as MetroBus fares from that location.

The other attributes are unchanged.

### 3.8.2. Zones in scope

The mode choice model only considers the choice of one Park \& Ride site for each OD pair. To calculate which OD pairs should be considered in scope for the purposes of the assessment, the generalised cost of using the new Park \& Ride site was calculated for all OD pairs. If this generalised cost was lower than the existing model generalised cost, that OD pair was allocated to the new Park \& Ride site and considered in scope. For all OD pairs where the generalised cost with the new site was higher than existing, they were considered out of scope and remained with their existing generalised cost and Park \& Ride site option.

### 3.9. Combined scheme (MetroBus and Park \& Ride site) testing

A combined scheme, consisting of both MetroBus and Park \& Ride site testing is input to the model by including both the Park \& Ride and MetroBus scheme inputs. The model uses this information to determine the mode used to travel given the availability of both MetroBus and Park \& Ride options.

## 4. Economics Overview

### 4.1. Introduction

This section explains how the costs, benefits and revenues are brought together into the cost-benefit analysis, and the assumptions or approaches that are adopted.

The Economic Assessment has been carried out using standard procedures and economic parameters as defined by TAG Unit A1- Cost Benefit Analysis with efforts made to quantify and monetise costs and other impacts where appropriate.

A VfM Statement is presented in the OAR to provide a summary of the conclusions from the VfM assessment. The VfM categories and their relationship with benefit-cost ratios (BCRs) generated through cost-benefit analysis, is presented in Table 9. Though it should be noted that other non-monetised considerations should be included in VfM assessments.
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Table 9 DfT VfM categories
DfT Value for Money categories

| BCR | Category |
| :--- | :--- |
| Less than 1.0 | Poor |
| 1.0 to 1.5 | Low |
| 1.5 to 2.0 | Medium |
| 2.0 to 4.0 | High |
| Greater than 4.0 | Very High |

### 4.2. Estimation of Scheme Benefits in TUBA (applicable to all schemes)

The impacts of the options on travel times and vehicle operating costs for trips using the scheme were assessed using the DfT's TUBA program (v1.9.9) ${ }^{10}$.

TUBA is a bespoke software package developed on behalf of the DfT to estimate the impacts of transport schemes in terms of the costs and benefits experienced by users and providers of the transport system, and the associated indirect taxation impacts.

TUBA estimates costs and benefits by comparing transport conditions in a Do-something scenario against conditions in a Do-minimum scenario. To this end, for the schemes tested, TUBA uses information from the transport models to:

- Calculate user benefits by vehicle type and for each element of journey cost (i.e. travel time and vehicle operating costs - fuel and non-fuel);
- Calculate the changes in the indirect tax income received by the government (for highway schemes this primarily reflects the levels of indirect taxation incurred on fuel cost); and
- Calculate the changes in the greenhouse gases emissions.

For the scheme assessments, the user and provider related costs and benefits in each year produced by TUBA were combined with estimates of costs and discounted to 2010 values.

### 4.3. Economic parameters

TUBA provides a complete set of default economic parameters in its standard economics file, including values for variables such as values of time, vehicle operating cost data, tax rates and economic growth rates.

TUBA v1.9.9 has been used which enables appraisal to be undertaken by varying the Value of Time, either by distance-band or as a continuous function varying by distance for the business users, as defined in the WebTAG data book (v1.8.1). It should be noted that for this analysis TUBA method 1 is selected which uses varying values of time by distance for business users.
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### 4.4. Scheme parameters

The scheme related parameters in the TUBA scheme file were largely determined by the parameters used in the forecasting model, namely:

- First year - 2036;
- Last year - 2095;
- Modelled years - 2036, 2037;
- Current (appraisal) year - 2018.

The GBATS model only has one modelled year, 2036, therefore this was taken to be the first year and the second year (required by TUBA) was taken to be 2037. The model outputs were used for both of these years and post-TUBA manipulation was undertaken to account for this and the incorrect opening/first year.

### 4.5. Time slices and annualisation factors for G-BATS4

The TUBA assessment was based on three time slices:

- AM (weekday 07:00 to 10:00);
- IP (weekday 10:00 to 16:00);
- PM (weekday 16:00 to 19:00).

Annualisation factors were applied to expand the G-BATS modelled benefits to represent a 12-hour weekday and full year. The AM and PM Peak hour is multiplied by 3 to get peak periods and is multiplied to account for all working days. For the inter peak, a factor of 1518 was used as there are 6 Inter Peak hours per day. The off-peak periods were omitted, as the majority of benefits from the infrastructure would come from weekday traffic.

### 4.6. Public Transport Benefits

The generalised cost saving (time saving and reduced waiting time) was taken from the PT mode choice model, appropriate values of time from WebTAG were applied and annualisation factors were applied to reflect all time periods. A factor of 6.83 is applied to the AM Peak hour and a factor of 7.09 is applied to the PM Peak hour to convert to a full day and are factored up to cover the full year. The benefits were then factored to adjust for the scheme opening year, as the model used a future year of 2036.

### 4.7. MetroBus and Park \& Ride service operating costs and revenues

In order to calculate bus operating costs, Atkins used its bespoke bus operating cost model. This model takes key inputs, such as one-way journey time (AM Peak, inter peak and PM Peak), frequency, vehicle type and layover time, and provides outputs around the number of vehicles required at peak (Peak Vehicle Requirement), direct and indirect costs, giving a total cost per annum of operation. In order to do this, it is also necessary to make assumptions around hours of operation, including evenings and weekends. The outputs from this model have been benchmarked with known outturn operating costs elsewhere to ensure consistency.

The process of calculating revenue generation begins with the outputs from the PT mode choice model. Using peak hour boarders from the model, Atkins first estimated annual patronage, using known factors from other work to convert from the AM Peak to all day, before converting from all day to annual. It is then necessary to multiply annual patronage by an assumed yield per passenger to derive total revenue. The yield per passenger calculation takes account of the likely mix of users of the service - for example, some users may be children, some may have a concessionary pass (and hence are eligible to travel free of charge during the hours of the scheme - albeit with the bus operator receiving a level of reimbursement for each journey made), and some may be making regular commuting journeys using some form of season or multijourney ticket. To take account of this range of users and ticket types, Atkins used its revenue generation model which is based on a 'basket' of fares, covering adult and child single, return, daily, weekly and monthly tickets (using operator websites to access ticket prices for appropriately comparable journeys). The
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assessment also makes an assumption regarding the level of concessionary reimbursement that the operator could be expected to receive.

Having determined operating costs and revenue, a direct comparison can be made to determine the extent to which the service is likely to be commercially viable. If revenue is below operating costs, this may mean that the service is not commercially viable, unless there are other factors to consider such as funding from new development.

### 4.8. Capital and Maintenance and Renewal Costs

Scheme costs were calculated by Atkins based on the scheme concept designs. The costs produce include:

- Construction costs;
- Preparatory costs, including detailed design and business case fees (a variable percentage was applied for detailed design, and business case fees were $10 \%$ of construction costs);
- Site supervision costs;
- Land costs; and
- Risk budget, at $40 \%$ due to the early stage of the schemes, and Optimism Bias of $44 \%$ included in the PVC used in the BCR calculation.

Schemes were costed based on 2D or 3D concept designs. 3D design focused on schemes with the greatest changes in vertical alignment, which allowed the volume of cut and fill to be estimated to inform excavation and disposal costs. It should be noted, that schemes designed in 3D are to concept design level, not detailed design.

Works costs were built up on a 'per m2' or 'per m3' or 'per item' basis for different elements, using rates from similar projects, including:

- Rates derived from live projects under construction in the West of England area;
- Typical industry standard rates where the above were not appropriate;
- Consultation with local industry, and professionals; and
- Peer review and benchmarking against completed schemes.

These unit rates have been used alongside appropriate percentage allowances for preliminary items and design fees. This approach is a proportionate hybrid between a high level 'per km' costing and a full Bill of Quantities. Items such as fencing, landscaping and utility diversions were calculated using an average percentage of the total scheme costs found on similar projects. Land costs were based on an indicative unit rate of $£ 40 \mathrm{k} /$ per hectare for all land, there have been no discussions with landowners at this stage.

Structures were calculated at a high level based on the scale of works anticipated, and have amended where necessary dependant on the size and location.

Percentage allowances were included for preparation, site supervision, risk and environmental mitigation.
To derive outturn costs (to include inflation to allow for opening year), schemes costs were profiled evenly over the relevant time period based on the high-level programme in the OAR. The costs were profiled according to the schemes' opening year and period of construction and appropriate inflation and discounting were applied. ${ }^{11}$ Scheme opening years are generally based on previous work by the councils in relation to the proposed housing trajectories in the JSP. Adjustments were made if the opening year needed to be extended to allow for preparation and design. Appropriate construction and design periods have been specified ahead of opening year, and including a period back to present day for preparatory work on developing a business case and gaining funding, planning permission and land purchase.
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Relevant Construction Price inflation, at 2.5\% until 2021 and 4\% thereafter, was included to calculate the outturn cost for the financial case and affordability considerations, where Optimism Bias is also excluded.

Maintenance and renewal costs, taken as $4 \%$ of construction costs, over the 60-year appraisal period. At this early stage of scheme design and development Park \& Ride operating costs have not been specifically estimated but there is an indicative allowance for maintenance and renewal assumed at $4 \%$ of the construction cost.

### 4.9. Cost-benefit Analysis Collation

The monetised benefits output from the PT mode choice model and from TUBA are collated together with the HEAT benefits calculated using the DfT tool. The capital, maintenance and renewal and bus operating costs were collated with generated revenue to give the inputs for the PVC.

The scheme benefits and costs were input into an Atkins spreadsheet to produce the Present Value Costs and Benefits (PVC and PVB) used for the BCR calculation. All present values reported are in 2010 prices, discounted over a 60-year appraisal period and are quoted in the market price unit of account unless otherwise stated.

### 4.10. Sensitivity Tests

Two sensitivity tests have been provided to provide a range due to the potential uncertainties around the modelling.

## Catchment Sensitivity Test (Thornbury only)

The central assumption for capturing MetroBus trips was based on being within approximately a 10 minute walk of the MetroBus stop at the 'home' end. In Bristol city centre, a distance equating to a 20 minute walk was assumed, on the basis that people are more inclined to walk further in city centres to access their chosen mode. In this sensitivity test, the catchment of bus passengers was relaxed to capture access via bus services feeding into the newly proposed services.

## JSP ‘Off-Model' Sensitivity Test (Thornbury and Whitchurch only)

Given the reasonably coarse level of granularity of the models as developed to date, the full extent of the demand from JSP developments is not considered to be fully demonstrated. To estimate the impact of the JSP demand more fully, a relatively simplistic uplift has been applied using an 'off-model' estimation of trips generated by the JSP. This trip generation estimate uses a DfT dataset for the number of bus trips in South Gloucestershire, which is converted to trips per head based on population, and then used to factor from size of dwelling for the developments. The impact on modelled benefit to capture this uplift is a simple pro rating on the basis of difference in demand rather than modelling the relationship between additional trips and benefit generation, therefore is a simple approximation at this stage. There is a small element of overestimation with the simplistic sensitivity analysis approach as the Spatially Neutral scenario includes some of the JSP demand but not in the specific locations.
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## 5. Summary

This appendix has set out the modelling and economics methodology.
For the highway schemes in WP1 and WP3 the G-BATS4 model was used and for WP6a HE's VISSIM model was used. These models were run in a Spatially Neutral scenario, where growth was added across the area based on existing housing, and in a 'With JSP' scenario, where the growth for each SDL was added to the specific location. Limitations at this stage of scheme development have been noted, including granularity of coverage for the areas, the presence of only one future year forecast and there are some additional benefits that could be captured at later stages of scheme development such as reliability, accidents and Wider Economic Impacts. Economic results were obtained using the DfT's programme TUBA, and adjusted to reflect the relevant opening year and appraisal period.

PT schemes were modelled using a bespoke spreadsheet tool to estimate the mode shift to MetroBus/Park \& Ride services. This gave an estimate of the PT patronage and the generalised cost savings, which was used to calculate the economic benefit of the scheme to PT users. These results, as well as the increase in cyclists and the associated health benefits, calculated using the DfT's Propensity to Cycle Tool, were then used to adjust the G-BATS4 highway model and obtain decongestion benefits in TUBA. Finally, Atkins PT operating cost model was used to obtain PT operating costs and revenues.

The benefits calculated were combined with the costs, extrapolated over the 60 year appraisal period with appropriate growth and discounted to 2010 prices, to produce BCRs, which helps to inform the VfM of the schemes.

## Appendix 6.3 Environmental Assessment worksheets

## Contents

This workbook provides WebTAG worksheets, and proformas consistent with WebTAG principles for the following scheme options:
Orbital Route A4-A37 North Alignment 1 and South Alignment 1 (Option A)
Orbital Route A4-A37 North Alignment 1 and South Alignment 2 (Option B)
Orbital Route West of A37
Washing Pound Lane (Option C)
Orbital Route West of A37
Hicks Gate Junction Improvement
Half Acre Lane (Option D)
At-grade improvement A4174-A4 (Option E)

Scheme option worksheets are grouped by environmental impact:
Section 1
Section 2
Section 3
Section 4
Section 5
Section 6
Section 7
Noise (NO)
Air Quality (AQ)
Landscape (LA)
Townscape (TO)
Historic Environment (HE)
Biodiversity (BI)
Water Environment (WE)

- How many households will be affected by the scheme?
- Could the scheme lead to a change in traffic flow $\mathbf{> 2 5 \%}$ or change in average speeds $\mathbf{> 1 0 k p h}$ ?

Assessment
There are no noise important areas within 200 m of the proposed link road route alignment, although a number of noise
Likely Slightly important areas are located on roads that may experience a change in traffic flow volume due to the scheme.

There are approximately 65 noise sensitive receptors located within 200 m of the proposed route alignment, and facades of these receptors could be exposed to an increase in noise directly from the scheme, however a number of these same noise sensitive receptors may also benefit from decreases in noise on other facades due to the rerouting of traffic. There is the potential for minor to moderate increases in noise at properties located in Bifield Road due to the bypass itself, with the potential for nearby properties located on Stockwood Lane to experience a minor decrease due to traffic rerouting.

There are approximately 6600 noise sensitive receptors located within 200 m of roads that may be expected to experience a decrease in road traffic volume due to the scheme, including ~230 which are located within designated noise important areas.

There are just over 2000 noise sensitive receptors located within 200 m of roads that may be expected to experience an increase in road traffic volume due to the scheme (A4174, A4175, A37), including $\sim 400$ which are located within designated noise important areas.

It is anticipated that these changes in road traffic volume in the wider area are likely to result in a negligible change in road traffic noise experienced at the majority of these noise sensitive receptors.

| - How many households will be affected by the scheme? |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| - Could the scheme lead to a change in traffic flow $\mathbf{> 2 5 \%}$ or change in average speeds >10kph? | Assessment |
| There is 1 noise important area within 200 m of the proposed link road route alignment, this same noise <br> important area is located on a road that is anticipated to experience a decrease in road traffic volume due to the <br> scheme. | Likely Slightly <br> Adverse |
| There are approximately 340 noise sensitive receptors within 200 m of the proposed route alignment, and could |  |
| be exposed to an increase in noise directly from the scheme, of which $\sim 16$ are located within a designated noise |  |
| important area. Properties located on Washing Pound Lane, Churchways, Charnwood Road, and Maggs Lane |  |
| might be expected to experience a minor to moderate increase in noise due to the introduction of the new link. |  |$\quad$.

## - How many households will be affected by the scheme?

- Could the scheme lead to a change in traffic flow $\mathbf{> 2 5 \%}$ or change in average speeds $\mathbf{> 1 0 k p h}$ ?

There are no noise important areas within 200 m of the proposed link road route alignment, although
there is a noise important area located on a road anticipated to experience a decrease in road traffic

There are approximately 470 noise sensitive receptors within 200 m of the proposed route alignment, and could be exposed to an increase in noise directly from the scheme. Properties located on Stoneberry Road, Church Road, Half Acre Lane, and Charnwood Road might be expected to experience a minor to moderate increase in noise due to the introduction of the new link.

There are just over 4200 noise sensitive receptors located within 200 m of roads that may be expected to experience a decrease in road traffic volume due to the scheme, including $\sim 69$ which are located within designated noise important areas.

There are just over 1000 noise sensitive receptors located within 200m of roads that may be expected to experience an increase in road traffic volume due to the scheme (Whitchurch Lane).

It is anticipated that these changes in road traffic volume in the wider area are likely to result in a negligible change in road traffic noise experienced at the majority of these noise sensitive receptors.

| - How many households will be affected by the scheme? |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| - Could the scheme lead to a change in traffic flow $\mathbf{> 2 5 \%}$ or change in average speeds $\mathbf{> 1 0 k p h}$ ? | Assessment |
| No noise important areas or noise sensitive receptors are located within 200 m of the proposed Hicks Gate <br> roundabout junction improvements (for both the at-grade and grade-separated options). | Neutral |


| Summary of Key Impacts | Assessment (see key) |
| :--- | :--- |
| No AQMA within 200 m of the link road. The Bristol AQMA (encompassing the A4 and the A37) could <br> benefit if traffic is redirected from the A4174 to the link road. There are approximately 65 sensitive <br> properties within 200 m of roads that could be positively affected. There are no designated sites within <br> 200m of the proposed route. An increase in traffic on the A4174, the A4175 and the A37 could adversely |  |
| affect air quality at over 2,000 sensitive receptors, 920 of which are within 200 m of Defra's PCM model |  |
| links with roadside concentrations above the EU Limit Value of $40 ~ \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m3}$ in 2015 ; these receptors are on |  |
| the A4174 between the A420 and Gallagher Retail Park. The reduction in traffic on alternative routes |  |
| could positively affect 6,600 sensitive properties, including 540 within the Bristol AQMA and Keynsham |  |
| High Street AQMA. There may be an overall reduction in NO2 and PM10, depending on the magnitude |  |
| of traffic changes. |  |


|  | PCM links and/or AQMA/designated <br> sites with increases and overall likely <br> neaative outcome |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | PCM links and/or AQMA/designated <br> sites with increases and overall likely <br> neutral outcome OR overall likely <br> negative outcome |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | PCM links and/or AQMA/designated <br> sites or > 100 properties with <br> deterioration but overall likely <br> neutral/ positive outcome |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | No PCM, AQMA or designated sites <br> with increases, >100 properties with <br> deterioration but overall likely <br> neutral/beneficial outcome |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | No PCM, AQMA or designated sites <br> or <100 properties with increases, <br> and overall likely neutra/beneficial <br> outcome |


| Summary of Key Impacts | Assessment (see key) |
| :--- | :--- |
| No AQMAs or designated ecological sites within 200 m of the link road. There |  |
| are approximately 340 sensitive properties within 200 m of the link road itself |  |
| which would have an deterioration in air quality. |  |
| The expected reduction in traffic in Hengrove could result in an improvement |  |
| at 4,200 sensitive properties whilst the increase of traffic on Whitchurch Lane |  |
| could adversely affect 1,000 sensitive properties. There may be an overall |  |
| reduction in NO2 and PM10, depending on the magnitude of traffic changes. |  |


|  | PCM links and/or AQMA/designated sites with increases and overall likely negative outcome |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | PCM links and/or AQMA/designated sites with increases and overall likely neutral outcome OR overall likely negative outcome |
| 3 | PCM links and/or AQMA/designated sites or > 100 properties with deterioration but overall likely neutral/ positive outcome |
|  | No PCM, AQMA or designated sites with increases, >100 properties with deterioration but overall likely neutral/beneficial outcome |
|  | No PCM, AQMA or designated sites or <100 properties with increases, and overall likely neutral/beneficial outcome |


| Summary of Key Impacts | Assessment (see key) |
| :--- | :--- |
| No AQMAs or designated ecological sites within 200 m of the link road. There are <br> approximately 470 sensitive properties within 200 m of the link road itself. <br> The expected reduction in traffic in Hengrove could result in an improvement at 4,200 <br> sensitive properties whilst the increase of traffic on Whitchurch Lane could adversely affect <br> 1,000 sensitive properties. Overall, there may be a positive change in NO2 and PM10, <br> depending on the magnitude of traffic changes. |  |


|  | PCM links and/or AQMA/designated sites with increases and overall likely negative outcome |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | PCM links and/or AQMA/designated sites with increases and overall likely neutral outcome OR overall likely negative outcome |
|  | PCM links and/or AQMA/designated sites or > 100 properties with deterioration but overall likely neutral/ positive outcome |
|  | No PCM, AQMA or designated sites with increases, >100 properties with deterioration but overall likely neutral/beneficial outcome |
|  | No PCM, AQMA or designated sites or <100 properties with increases, and overall likely neutra/beneficial outcome |


| Summary of Key Impacts | Assessment (see key) |
| :--- | :--- |
| No AQMAs, sensitive properties or designated ecological sites within 200 m of <br> the proprosed junction changes. The effect on air quality is therefore <br> assessed as neutral at this stage. | 5 |

TAG Landscape Impacts Worksheet - Option A\&B - Orbital Route A4-A37-Blue Route

|  | Step 2 | Step 3 |  |  |  | Step 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Features | Description | Scale it matters | Rarity | Importance | Substitutability | Impact |
| Pattern | Undulating landscape with medium scale irregular shap pastoral fields \& meadows, with some arable farmland, bounded by hedgerows \& woodland copses. <br> Tributary valleys have intimate character enclosed by hedges, trees and side slopes. <br> Sinuous \& meandering form of the River Avon \& River Chew with its associated bankside vegetation defines the area $N \& E$ of the scheme. <br> Low ridge to the E forms along Stockwood Vale forms the <br> Valley and Stockwood Vale. | Local - features are valued at the local level. | Pattern of landscape common at a local level with River Avon a distinctive feature within the landscape | High at the local level - the pattern of the landscape is distinctive and a key component of the character of this landscape type. | Limited opportunity for substitution, but consideration of design \& allowance of mitigation for any loss of features and disturbance of pattern. | The proposed scheme would pass through rural andscape adjacent to urban fringe settlements, linking the A4 with the A37, \& with asso earthworks \& junctions. Pastoral fields, hedgerows and trees would be severed as a result. The scheme would alter the local pattern of the landscape \& landform in the vicinity. <br> Judged on the scale of the impacts through permanent modification of field patterns, the impacts are considered to be slight - moderate adverse. |
| Tranquilily | The busy transport corridors of the A4, A4174, A4175, A37 \& the railway on the fringe of Keynsham, Stockwood \& Brislington, mean that there is a low level of tranquility $N$, W \& S of the route. The hedge \& tree lined transport corridors provide some visual screening, particularly along A4175 \& Scotland Lane $N \& W$ of the route but with mor Away from these busy areas, the wider rural landscape, some of which the route passes through is tranquil especially to valley floors, despite being near urban centres. <br> Users of recreational routes (PRoWs, River Avon Trail, Two Rivers Way trail \& National Cycle Routes 3 \& 16) experience limited tranquility in the vicinity of these transport corridors, however the sense of tranquility \& isolation increases rapidly away from them \& the urban areas. | Local - tranquility is valued at the local level. | Rare at a local level due to busy transport corridors \& urban centres. | High at the local level - valued due to the diminishing rural landscape away from urban centres \& busy transport corridors. | Limited opportunity for substitition but consideration of design in mitioation features could aid eperception of greater ranquility | The proposed scheme is located in an area which has variable levels of tranquility. The rural area currently experience higher levels of tranquility, \& as a result of the scheme, would experience increased levels of disturbance. <br> The impact on tranquility is judged to be slight moderate adverse |
| Cutural | The main settlements of Longwell Green, Keynsham, Brisington, Stockwood \& Whitchurch to the NW, W, NW $\& W$ respectively, dominate the area, with more isolated farms \& clusters of dwellings interspersed between them \& office developments at Durley Park, \& small industrial estate on the flatter land by the River Avon. These areas are linked by busy transport corridors. <br> There are a few areas of Common Land \& Village Greens, including Hanham Common within 1.8 km N of the scheme $\& 3$ areas of Common Land within $1.5 \mathrm{~km} \mathrm{NE} \& \mathrm{SE}$ of the scheme. Horseworld is within the scheme extents on the edge of Whitchurch/Stockwood. <br> There are designated historical features within 1 km , <br> including 2 SM's (Roman Settlement at Keynsham Hams <br>  <br> Brisington House Registered Park \& Garden approx 500 m to the W. <br> Farmsteads are scattered within the landscape. <br> Local, regional \& national recreational routes are also in the area, including 2 PRoW's crossing the scheme (including those in passes close to the scheme along the A4 \& the River Avon Trail within 500 m of scheme, linking with the Two Rivers Way trail to the E . | Settlements \& transport corridors valued at regional level. <br> SM's \& Reg Park \& Garden valued at national level Recreational routes valued at regional \& local level. | Modern settlements \& transport corridors not rare at all levels. <br> SM's rare at local \& national level. <br> Regional recreational routes not rare at local or regional level. PRoWs common at all levels. | High importance of settlements \& designated features at all levels. <br> Medium importance of recreational routes. | SM's \& Reg Park \& Garden not substitutable. <br> Limited opportunity for substitution of features associated with modern settlements \& recreational routes. | Due to the extent of the scheme, impacts on cultural features would be likely. <br> Main settlements, isolated properties, farmsteads and associated recreational facilities are within 1 km of the scheme, some of which are directly adjacent. <br> Recreational routes within 500 m may experience some minor degradation in visual quality. There is partial visual connectivity with other cultural features \& they may experience degredation in their visual setting due to the proximity to the scheme. <br> The impact on cultural features is judged to be slight-moderate adverse. |
| Landoover | Outside the urban areas, landcover comprises medium scale, irregular shaped fields of mainly pastora farmland. Fields are bounded by clipped or overgrown hedgerows. The LCA area is largely unwooded, however the localised area linear belts to the valley floors close to the route to the E \& W and the designated Bickley \& Cleeve Ancient Woodland \& Bickley Wood SSSI which follow the line of the River Avon 0.8 km north of the scheme. | SSSI \& Ancient Woodland valued at national level. | SSSI \& Ancient Woodland are rare at national, regional \& local levels. Pastora fields hedgerows, woodland \& linear tree belts common at all levels. | High importance of nationally designated sites \& Ancient Woodland as a rapidly diminishing resource. <br> eatures \& elements such as fields, trees \& hedgerows, of medium - high importance within the local landscape. | Opportunity for substitution with incorporation of mitigation planting. |  |
| Summary of character | Landscape in this area is designated as Greenbelt by Bristol City Council, B\&NES Council \& South A medium scale landscap $\&$ influenced by busy trans areas, valley floors, low ridges \& outlying tarms \& small settlements. <br> The rural character is of medium scale, with mainly pastora fields bounded by hedgerows of varying quality. Woodland is limited to linear woodland along the River Avon, along shallow valley sides to the $\mathrm{E} \& \mathbb{W}, \mathcal{\&}$ along the road corridors, the later helping to contain the disuntive influence of the roads over the wider landscape, allowing tranquil pockets to remain in the rural areas separating the settements. | Some features valued at national level. <br> Many landscape elements valued at mainly local level. | Some features, eg designated sites, are rare at national, regional \& local level. <br> Many landscape features are commonplace at all levels. | Designated sites are of high importance at national, regional \& local level. <br> Many landscape elements are of medium - high importance at the local level. | Designated sites \& Ancient Woodland are not substitutable at any level. <br> Some opportunity for substitution of features associated with modern settlements \& recreational routes. Some opportunity for substitution of landscape elements, eg trees, linear woodland \& grassland, \& re- creation of appropriate landforms. | No impacts on designated sites are anticipated, although there may be minor impacts on Greenbelt. <br> The route is large in scale, altering the pattern of the landscape in the immediate vicinity, with loss of some landscape elements (hedgerows, trees). <br> Mitigation planting for screening \& recreating severed or lost linear elements, would not have appreciable benefits for up to 15 years. Although the scheme would be seen in context with the existing road network \& other urban influences in close proximity to the scheme. <br> The impacts of the scheme on completion are judged to be slight-moderate adverse. <br> With mitigation planting after 15 years impacts judged to be neutral - slight adverse. |

BENESL Landscape Character Assessment
South Gloucestershire Landscape Character Assessment (2014)
South Gloucestershire Land
Natural Ingland
Orunanco Survey Mapping
Aerial Mapping
Magic - Geographical mapping
Magic -
Sustrans
Step 5-Summary Assessment Score

Qualitative Comments
A 2 km offset from the scheme boundary has been prescribed for the study area within this local character area of which baseline assessment only has been conducted due to the early stages of this design $\&$ optioneering stage. It is considered that significant effects are
Unlikely beyond this.
its physical presence in the landscape

TAG Landscape Impacts Worksheet - Option C - Orbital Route West of A37 (Washing Pound Lane) - Grey Route

|  | Step 2 | Step 3 |  |  |  | Step 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Features | Description | Scale it matters | Rarity | Importance | Substitutability | Impact |
| Pattern | A rolling open landscape with medium scale irregular shaped pastoral fields, bounded by hedgerows \& trees. Low ridge to the $S \& E$ forms the backbone to the landscape with slopes down to the Avon Valley and Stockwood Vale. | Local - features are valued at the local level. | Pattern of landscape common at a local level. | Medium at the local level - the pattern of the landscape is commonplace but also a key component of the character of this landscape type. | Some opportunity for substitution, <br>  <br> allowance of mitigation for any <br> loss of features and disturbance of <br> pattern. | The proposed scheme would pass through rural landscape adjacent to the urban fringe, linking A37 with Church Road \& Maggs Lane SE of Whitchurch. The proposals would incorporate associated earthworks \& new junctions. Pastoral fields and their associated hedgerows and trees would be severed. The scheme would alter the ocal pattern of the landscape and landform within the adjacent vicinity. <br> Judged on the scale of the impacts through permanent modification of field pattern offset place and urban influence, the impacts would be considered to be slight adverse. |
| Tranquilily | Due to the proximity to urban settlements and the presence of the A37 bisecting through Whitchurch \& Stockwood, the tranquility is relatively low within this landscape. <br> Away from these settlements, the wider rural landscape, some of which the route passes through is more tranquil, despite being near urban centres. <br> Users of recreational routes (PRoWs, Three Peaks Walk Trail \& National Cycle Route 3) experience limited tranquility in the vicinity of these transport corridors and urban areas, however the sense of tranquility \& isolation increases away from these areas further S . | Local - tranquility is valued at the local level. | Rare at a local level due to busy transport corridors \& urban centres. | High at the local level - valued due to the diminishing rural landscape away from urban centres \& busy transport corridors. | Limited opportunity for sibustitution but consideration of design m intiotion features could aid percention of greater ranauility. | The proposed scheme is located in an area which has mixed levels of tranquility. The rural areas experience higher levels of tranquility \& therefore would experience increased disturbance as a result of the scheme. <br> The impact on tranquility is judged to be slight adverse. |
| Cutural | The main settlements of Stockwood \& Whitchurch to the N \& W respectively, dominate the area, with more isolated farms \& clusters of dwellings interspersed between them Horseworld is within the study area on the edge of Whitchurch/Stockwood. <br> There are designated historical features within 1 km , including 1 SM (Maes Knoll Camp) located 1 km SW of the scheme. <br> Lyons Court Farm \& Church Farm are adjacent to the scheme. <br> Local, regional \& national recreational routes are also in the area, with 2 PRoW's crossing the scheme (including those in the vicinity) \& National Cycle Route 3 passing across the eastern end of the route \& Three Peaks Walk 1 km SW. <br> Other recreational facilities such as Whitchurch Cricket Club \& Bristol Barbarians Rugby Club \& Whitehall Garden Centre are adjacent or within 300 m of the eastern end of the route. | Settlements \& transport corridors valued at regional level. <br> SM valued at national level. Recreational routes valued at regional \& local level. | Modern settlements \& transport corridors not rare at all levels. <br> SM rare at local \& national level. <br> Regional recreational routes not rare at local or regional level. PRoWs common at all levels. | Medium importance of settlements \& designated features at all levels. <br> Medium importance of recreational routes. | SM not substitutable. <br> Limited opportunity for substitution of features associated with modern settlements \& recreational routes. | Due to the scale of the scheme, impacts on cultural features will be likely. Main settlements, isolated properties, farmsteads 1 km of the scheme, some of which are directly adjacent, particularly the Rugby Club through which the scheme passes. Recreational routes within 500 m may experience some minor degradation in visual quality. There is partial visual connectivity with other cultural features such as Maes Knoll Camp SM \& impacts on its setting are likely to be adverse due to the proximity to the scheme. <br> The impact on cultural features is judged to be slight-moderate adverse |
| Landover | Outside the urban areas, landcover comprises medium scale, irregular shaped fields of mainly pastoral farmland Fields are bounded by clipped or overgrown hedgerows. The LCA is largely unwooded with some tree belts to field boundaries. | Local - landcover is valued at the local level. | Pastoral fields, hedgerows, woodland \& linear tree belts common at all levels. | Features \& elements such as fields, trees \& hedgerows, of medium - high importance within the local landscape. | Opportunity for subssitution with incorporation of mitigation planting. | The proposed scheme would result in a loss of pastoral agricultural land, including loss of trees \& hedgerows, however mitigation through replacement planting would help recreate these features over time. When judged on the scale of the scheme and quantity of featureseffected the impact on landcover is judged to be slight adverse. |
| Summary of character | Landscape in this area is designated as Greenbelt by Bristol City Council, B\&NES Council \& South Gloucestershire Council. <br> A medium scale landscape influenced by busy transport corridors, adjacent urban areas \& outlying farms \& small settlements. <br> The rural character is of medium scale, with mainly pastoral fields bounded by hedgerows and trees of varying quality. Tree \& hedges provide screening to settlements \& transport routes which help to contain the urban edge influence, allowing tranquil pockets to remain in the rural areas separating the setlements. areas separating the settlements. | Some features valued at national level Landscape e elements valued at mainly local level. | Some features, eg designated sites, are rare at national, regional \& local level. Many landscape features are commonplace at all levels. | Designated sites are of high importance at national, regional \& local level. <br> Many landscape elements are of medium importance at the local level. |  | No impacts are anticipated on designated sites, with minor impacts anticipated on Greenbelt pattern with limited loss of landscape elements (hedgerows, trees). There would be a slight loss of tranquility \& adverse impact on cultural features. <br> Initial mitigation would consist of careful design \& location of intersection with existing roads. Mitigation planting for screening \& recreating severed or lost linear elements, would not have appreciable benefits for up to 15 years Overall, the scheme would be seen in context influen existing road network \& other urban <br> The impacts of the scheme on completion are judged to be slight adverse. <br> With mitigation planting after 15 years impacts judged to be neutral - slight adverse. |

Reference Sources
BRNES Landscape Character Assessment
South Gloucestershire Landscape Character Assessment (2014)
South Gloucestershire Land
Natural Ingland
Ordnance Survey Mapping
Ordnance Eurvey Mapping
Aerial Mapping
Magic - Geographical mapping
Sustrans
Step 5 - Summary Assessment Score
Sight adverse on completion
Neutral - slight adverse after 15 years.

A 2km offset trom the scheme boundary has been prescribed for the study area within this local character area of which baseline assessment only has been conducted due to the early stages of this design \& optioneering stage. It is considered that significicant effects are
unlikely beyond this.
The assessment considers the scheme design and alignment and considers the impacts as at year one of opening. This approach has been undertaken due to the absence of a tormal mitigation strategy and to enable the comparison of the impacts of the scheme as a result of
The assessment consididrs the scheme
its physical presence in the landscape.

TAG Landscape Impacts Worksheet - Option D-Orbital Route West of A37 (Half Acre Lane) - Orange Route

|  | Step 2 | Step 3 |  |  |  | Step 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Features | Description | Scale it matters | Rarity | Importance | Substitutability | Impact |
| Pattern |  | Local - features are valued at the local level. | Pattern of landscape common at a local level. | Medium at the local level - the patterm of the landscape is commonnlace but also a key component of the character of this landscape type. | Some opportunity for substitution, <br>  <br> allowance of mitigation for any <br> loss of features and disturbance of <br> pattern. | The proposed scheme would pass through rural andscape adjacent to urban fringe settlements Linking A37 with Stoneberry Road \& Whitchurch Lane SE of Whitchurch. The proposals would incorporate associated earthworks \& new junctions. Pastoral fields and their associated hedgerows and trees would be severed. The scheme would alter the local pattern of the landscape and landform within the adjacent vicinity. <br> Judged on the scale of the impacts through with the presence of current road network in place and urban influence, the impacts would be considered to be slight adverse. |
| Tranquililit | Due to the proximity to urban settlements and the presence of the A37 bisecting through Whitchurch \& Stockwood, the tranquility is relatively low within this landscape <br> Away from these settlements, the wider rural landscape, some of which the route passes through is more tranquil, despite being near urban centres. <br> Users of recreational routes (PRoWs, Three Peaks Walk Trail \& National Cycle Route 3) experience limited tranquility in the vicinity of these transport corridors and urban areas, however the sense of tranquility \& isolation increases away from these areas further $S$. increases away from these areas further S . | Local - tranquility is valued at the local level. | Rare at a local level due to busy transport corridors \& urban centres. | High at the local level - valued due to the diminishing rural landscape away from urban centres \& busy transport corridors. |  | The proposed scheme is located in an areawhich has mixed levels of trancuility. The ruralareas experience higher levels of tranquilitytherefore would experience increaseddisturbance as a result of the scheme.The impact on tranquility is judged to be slight <br> adverse. |
| Cultural | The main settlements of Stockwood \& Whitchurch to the N \& W respectively, dominate the area, with more isolated farms \& clusters of dwellings interspersed between them Horseworld is within the study area on the edge of Whitchurch/Stockwood. <br> There are designated historical features within 1 km , including 1 SM (Maes Knoll Camp) located 1 km SW of the scheme. <br> Lyons Court Farm \& Church Farm are adjacent to the scheme. <br> Local, regional \& national recreational routes are also in the area, with 2 PRoW's crossing the scheme (including those in the vicinity) \& National Cycle Route 3 passing across the eastern end of the route \& Three Peaks Walk 1 km SW. <br> Other recreational facilities such as Whitchurch Cricket Club \& Bristol Barbarians Rugby Club \& Whitehall Garden Centre are adjacent or within 300 m of the eastern end of the route. | Settlements \& transport corridors valued at regional level. <br> SM valued at national level. Recreational routes valued at regional \& local level. | Modern settlements \& transport corridors not rare at all levels. <br> SM rare at local \& national level. <br> Regional recreational routes not rare at local or regional level. PRoWs common at all levels. | Medium importance of settlements \& designated features at all levels. <br> Medium importance of recreational routes. | SM not substitutable. <br> Limited opportunity for substitution of features associated with modern settlements \& recreational routes. | Due to the scale of the scheme, impacts on cultural features would be likely. <br> Main settlements, isolated properties, farmsteads and associated recreational facilities are within 1 km of the scheme, some of which directly adjacent. Mitigation planting \& design consideration would help reduce these impacts over time. <br> Recreational routes within 500 m may experience some minor degradation in visual quality. There is partial visual connectivity with other cultural features such as Maes Knoll Camp SM \& impacts on its setting are likely to be adverse due to the proximity to the scheme. <br> The impact on cultural features is judged to be slight adverse. |
| Landoover |  | Local - landcover is valued at the local level. | Pastoral fields, hedgerows, woodland $\&$ linear tree belts common at all levels. | Features \& elements such as fields, trees \& hedgerows, of medium - high importance within the local landscape. | Opportunity for substitution with incorporation of mitigation planting. | The proposed scheme would result in a loss of pastoral agricultural land, including loss of trees \& hedgerows, however mitigation through replacement planting would help recreate these eatures over time. <br> When judged on the scale of the scheme and quantity of features effected, the impact on landcover is judged to be slight adverse. |
| Summary of character | Landscape in this area is designated as Greenbelt by Bristol City Council, B\&NES Council \& South Gloucestershire Council. <br> A medium scale landscape influenced by busy transport corridors, adjacent urban areas \& outlying farms \& small settlements. <br> The rural character is of medium scale, with mainly pastoral fields bounded by hedgerows and trees of varying quality. Tree \& hedges provide screening to settlements \& transport routes which help to contain the urban edge influence, allowing tranquil pockets to remain in the rural areas separating the settlements. | Some features valued at national level. Landscape elements valued at mainly local level. | Some features, eg designated sites, are rare at national, regional \& local level. <br> Many landscape features are commonplace at all levels. | Designated sites are of high importance at national, regional \& local level. <br> Many landscape elements are of medium importance at the local level. |  | No impacts are anticipated on any designated sites, with minor impacts anticipated on regionally designated Greenbelt. The route would cut through the landscape pattern with loss of landscape elements (hedgerows, trees). There would be a slight loss of tranquility \& adverse impact on cultural features. <br> Initial mitigation would consist of careful design \& location of intersection with existing roads. Mitigation planting for screening \& recreating appreciable benefits for up to 15 years. Overall, would be seen in context with the existing road network \& other urban influences. <br> The impacts of the scheme on completion are judged to be slight adverse. <br> With mitigation planting after 15 years impacts judged to be neutral - slight adverse. |

B\&NES Landscape Character Assessment
south Giouces
Natural England
Ordnance Surve
Aerial Mapping
Magic - Geographical mapping
Sustrans
Step 5-Summary Assessment Score
Sight adverse on completion
Neutral - slight adverse ater 15
Qualitative Comments
A 2km offset from the scheme boundary has been prescribed for the study area within this local character area of which baseline assessment only has been conducted due to the early stages of this design \& optioneering stage. It is considered that significant effects are
unlikely beyond this.
The assessment considers the scheme design and alignment and considers the impacts as at year one of opening. This approach has been undertaken due to the absence of a formal mitigation strategy and to enable the comparison of the impacts of the scheme as a result of its physical presencoe in the landscape.

TAG Landscape Impacts Worksheet - Option E - Hicks Gate Junction Improvement - Brown Route

|  | Step 2 | Step 3 |  |  |  | Step 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Features | Description | Scale it matters | Rarity | Importance | Substitutability | Impact |
| Pattern | Relatively flat landscape with medium scale irregular shaped pastoral fields \& meadows, with some arable tarmland, bounded by hedgerows \& woodland cooses Sinuous \& meandering form of the River Avon with its associated bankside vegetation defines the area N of the scheme. <br> Low ridge to the S forms the backbone to the landscape with slopes down to the Avon Valley and Stockwood Vale. Tree lined transport routes provide localised screening to roads, especially in views from the $S$. | Local - features are valued at the local level. | Pattern of landscape common at a local level with River Avon a distinctive feature within the landscape. | High at the local level - the pattern of the landscape is distinctive and a key component of the character of this landscape type. | Opportunity for local substitution with consideration of design to ensure minimal disturbance and allowance of mitigation for any oss of features and disturbance of pattern. | The proposed scheme would involve junction improvements to the Hicks Gate roundabout with associated earthworks that would slightly alter the local pattern of the landscape and andform within the immediate vicinity only Judged on the scale of the impacts with only minor changes to the roundabout, the impacts on landscape pattem would be considered to be neutral. |
| Tranquility | The busy transport coridors of the A4, the A4174 railway on the tringe of Keysham, Stockwood \& Bisisington, mean that there is a low level of tranquility in the area The tree lined transpor the area. The tree lined transport coridors provide visual screening in views, particularly to the $S \& S E$, which help contain the disturbance associated with these routes. The presence of the Keynnham Motoc disurutive feature in the vicinity. Away trom these busy areas, the wider rural landscape is tranquil, oespite being near urban cenires. Users of recreational routes (PRoWs, River Avon Trail, Two Rivers Way trail \& National Cycle Route16) experience limited tranquility in the vicinity of these transport corridors, however the sense of tranquility \& isolation increases rapidly away from them \& the urban areas. | Local - tranquility is valued at the local level. | Rare at a local level due to busy transport corridors \& urban centres. | High at the local level - valued due to the diminishing rural landscape away from urban centres \& busy transport corridors. | Limited opportunity tor <br> substidutition but consideraion of <br> designintigatio features could <br> aid perection of <br> ranquility. | The proposed scheme is located in an area which is not tranquil. It would be evident over a restricted area \& mainly to road users \& users of the PRoWs \& Trails which intersect with the site area. Users of the Keynsham Motocross area, \& the Avon Fire \& Rescue centre would also have views of the scheme. <br> However, due to the linear vegetation belts along the transport corridors both within the scheme \& offsite along adjacent routes, receptors further afield $\&$ in the wider landscape would be unlikely to experience visual intrusion or loss of tranquility as a result of the scheme. <br> The impact on tranquility is judged to be neutral. |
| Cultural | The main settlements of Longwell Green, Keynsham, Stockwood, \& Brislington to the NE, E, SW \& W $\&$ clusters of dwellings interspersed between them $\&$ office developments at Durley Park, \& small industrial estate on the flatter land by the River Avon. These areas are linked by busy transport corridors. <br> There are a few areas of Common Land, including Hanham Common within 1 km of the scheme. There are designated historical features within 2 km , including a SM (Roman Settlement at Keynsham Hams) located 900 m E of the scheme \& Brislington House Registered Park \& Garden approx. 700m to the W. Local, regional \& national recreational routes are also in the area, including 3 PRoW's \& National Cycle Route 16 which intersect with the scheme \& the River Avon Trail within 250 m of scheme, linking with the Two Rivers Way trail to the E. | Settlements \& transport corridors valued at regional level. <br> SM \& Reg Park \& Garden valued at national level. Recreational routes valued at regional \& local level. | Modern settlements \& transport corridors not rare at all levels. <br> SM rare at local \& national level. <br> Regional recreational routes not rare at local or regional level. PRoWs common at all levels. | High importance of settlements \& designated features at all levels. <br> Medium importance of recreational routes. | SM \& Reg Park \& Garden not substitutable. <br> Limited opportunity for substitution of features associated with modern settlements \& recreational routes. | Due to the localised extent of the scheme impacts on cultural features will be limited. Settlements are not within 1 km of the scheme, \& intervening vegetation, roads \& distance would reduce the scale of any impacts. Keynsham Motocross site, which is adjacent to the scheme, would experience some impacts due to loss of land \& screening. Recreational routes within 500 m may experience some minor degradation in visual quality, but mitigation planting would improve this over time. There is limited visual connectivity with other cultural features and impacts on their setting are considered neutral due to the presence of the existing A4 <br> The impact on cultural features is judged to be neutral-slight adverse. |
| Landover | Outside the urban areas, landcover comprises medium scale, irregular shaped fields of mainly pastoral farmland. Fields are bounded by clipped or overgrown hedgerows. Bickley \& Cleeve Ancient Woodland \& Bickley Wood SSSI which follow the line of the River Avon 250 m north of the scheme. | SSSI \& Ancient Woodland valued at national level. | SSSI \& Ancient Woodland are rare at national, regional \& local levels. Pastoral fields, hedgerows \& linear tree belts common at all levels. | High importance of nationally designated sites \& Ancient Woodland as a rapidly diminishing resource. <br> Features \& elements such as fields, trees \& hedgerows, of medium - high importance within the local landscape. | Some opportunity for substitution with incorporation of mitigation planting. | The proposed scheme would result in no loss of pastoral agricultural land. Minor loss of land \& screening associated with Keynsham <br> Motorcross, including some loss of trees \& hedgerows. <br> No impacts are anticipated on the SSSI \& Ancient Woodland. <br> The impact on landcover overall is judged to be neutral-slight adverse. |
| Summary of character | Landscape in this area is designated as Greenbelt by Bristol City Council, B\&N Gloucestershire Council. <br> A medium scale landscape, diverse \& discordant in nature $\&$ heavily influenced by busy transport corridors, adjacent urban areas \& outlying farms \& small settlements. The rural character is of medium scale, with mainly pastoral fields bounded by hedgerows of varying quality. Woodland is limited to linear woodland along the River Avon, along shallow valley sides to the $\mathrm{S}, \&$ along the main road corridors, the latter helping to contain the disruptive influence of the roads over the wider landscape, allowing tranquil pockets to remain in the rural areas separating the settlements. | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { Some features valued at national } \\ \text { level. } \\ \text { Mann landscape elements } \\ \text { valued at mainly local level. } \end{array}$ | Some features, eg designated sites are rare at national, regional \& local level <br> Many landscape features are commonplace at all levels. | Designated sites are of high importance at national, regional \& local level. <br> Many landscape elements are of medium - high importance at the local level. | Designated sites \& Ancient Woodland are not substitutable at any level. Someopportunity for substitution of features associated with modern settlements \& recreational routes. Someo opportunity for substitution of landscape elements, eg trees, linear highway woodland \& grassland, \& re-creation of appropriate landforms. | The proposals are limited in scale \& extent \& providing linear tree belts along the main road coridors are unaffected, impacts would be contained. <br> There would be no change to landscape pattern or tranquility but there would be minor loss of andscape elements (hedgerows, trees). No mpacts are anticipated on designated sites. Very minor impacts anticipated on regionally designated Greenbelt. <br> Overall, anticipated impacts are of small scale \& the scheme would be seen in context with the existing road network \& contained within a small area <br> The impacts of the scheme on completion are judged to be neutral - slight adverse. <br> With mitigation planting after 15 years impacts judged to be neutral. |

[^9]TAG Townscape Impacts Worksheet - Option A\&B - Orbital Route A4-A37-Blue Route

|  | Step 2 | Step 3 |  |  |  |  | Step 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Features | Description | Scale it matters | Rarity | Importance | Substitutability | Changes in Withoutscheme case | Impact |
| Layout | The townscape within the study area is characterised as being suburban located on edge of Bristol city bordering the rural context. The area is influenced by the busy A4, A4174 \& A37 corridors \& Bristol to Bath railway. The area is dominated by residential use with some retail \& commercial areas. Settlements within the study area include Keynsham, Brislington, Stockwood, Queen Charlton \& Whitchurch interspersed with isolated properties \& farmsteads. | Local | Common at the local level | Low at the local level | Some opportunity for substitution | Medium potential for change to layout, eg introduction of new housing developments \& other urban elements such as retail/industrial units. | It is not anticipated that there would be any notable impacts on the layout as a result of the scheme due to its distance from townscape features and passing through open farmland, therefore the impact is judged to be neutral. |
| Density and mix | Density is of low - medium scale within a suburban \& rural edge context comprising mainly residential housing linked with road networks intermixed with some retail, industry and commercial use. | Local | Common at the local level | Medium at the local level | Some opportunity for substitution | Medium potential for crange eg in areas of regeneration, brownfield sites \& urban fringe areas \& alteration to mix of urban elements. | Density \& mix will increase slightly with the introduction of a new visually intrusive Whitchurch \& Keynsham. <br> It is anticipated that there would be visual disturbance on townscape features SE Whitchurch, S of Stockwood \& Queen Charton, therefore the impact is judged to be slight adverse. |
| Scale | Built elements are mainly of a domestic scale, generally 1-3 storey including residential properties with some areas retail \& industry use. | Local | Common at the local level | Low at the local level | Some opportunity for substitution | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Medium potential for } \\ & \text { change to built } \\ & \text { environment. } \end{aligned}$ | It is not anticipated that there would be any notable impacts on the scale as a result of the scheme due to its distance from townscape features and passing through open farmland, therefore the impact is judged to be neutral. |
| Appearance | The housing is a mixture of ages with modern, private, commercial offices \& retail buildings. Some features/buildings retain historical associations which add to the local distinctiveness of the area. | Local | Common at the local level | Medium at a local level | Some opportunity for substitution | Medium potential for change to built environment. | It is not anticipated that there would be any notable impacts on the appearance of the townscape as a result of the scheme due to its distance from townscape features and passing through open farmland, therefore the impact is judged to be neutral. |
| Human interaction | The primary human interaction is focused around domestic use such as schools, shops, pubs, churches, community facilities etc. with some retail \& commercial use. | Local | Common at the local level | Low at the local level | Some opportunity for substitution | Medium potential for change as a result of land use, density \& mix \& layout. | It is not anticipated that there would be any notable impacts on human interaction as a result of the scheme due to its distance from townscape features and passing through open farmland, therefore the impact is judged to be neutral. |
| Cultural | There is a mix of council housing \& post war development with some more modern features interspersed with areas of historical interest including Listed Buildings within Keynsham, Queen Chartton \& Whitchurch village to the S, NE \& SW of the scheme. <br> The main settlements of Keynsham, Brislington, Stockwood \& Whitchurch to the NW, W, NW \& W respectively, dominate the area, with more isolated farms \& clusters of dwellings interspersed between them. <br> Office developments at Durley Park, \& a small industrial estate on the flatter land by the River Avon are also in the localised vicinity. These areas are linked by busy transport corridors. Horseworld is within the scheme extents on the edge of Whitchurch/Stockwood. <br> There are designated historical features within 1 km , including various Listed Buildings \& 2 SM's (Roman Settlement at Keynsham Hams \& Maes Knoll Camp) located 1 km E \& W of the scheme. <br> Keynsham \& Queen Charlton are designated as Conservation Areas. | Settlements \& transport corridors valued at regional level. <br> SM's, Listed Buildings, \& CA's valued at national level. | Rare at local level | Medium at local level <br> Medium at Regional \& National level | Limited opportunity for | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Low potential for change } \\ & \text { due to imited opportunity } \\ & \text { tor substitution. } \end{aligned}$ for substitution. | It is anticipated that there would be visual disturbance on the setting of cultural features close to the scheme due to the introduction of a new urban element, therefore the impact is judged to be slight adverse. |
| Land use | Land use is primarily domestic including residential \& recreational areas with some retail, industry \& commercial use. | Local | Common at the local level | Low at the local level | Some opportunity for substitution | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Medium potential for } \\ & \text { change to land use. } \end{aligned}$ | It is not anticipated that there would be any notable impacts on land use as a result of the scheme due to its distance from townscape features and passing through open farmland, therefore the impact is judged to be neutral. |
| Summary of character | The study area is characterised as a suburban townscape on the edge of Bristol transitioning to rural landscape with primarily residential settlements with some historic \& cultural associations. These are connected with the busy transport corridors \& network of rural lanes linking smaller settlements \& farmsteads. | Some features valued a national level. Many townscape elements valued at local level. | Some features, eg designated cultural sites, are rare at national, regional \& local level. Many townscape features are commonplace at alt levels. | Low to medium at local, regional \& national level | Some opportunity for substitution | Low-medium potential for change as a result of other influences |  |

Reference Sources
B8NES Landscape Character Assessment
South Gloucestershire Landscape Character Assessment (2014)
Ordrances survey Mapping
Aerial Mapoing
Aerial Mapping
Magic- - eoographical mapping
Briso
tep 5 - Summary Assessment Score
Slight adverse

Qualitative Comments
A 1 km offset from the scheme boundary has been prescribed for the study area within this townscape area of which baseline assessment only has been conducted due to the early stages of this design $\&$ optioneering stage. It is considered that significant effects are Anlikely beyond this. he assessment considers the scheme design

TAG Townscape Impacts Worksheet - Option C - Orbital Route West of A37 (Washing Pound Lane) - Grey Route

|  | Step 2 | Step 3 |  |  |  |  | Step 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Features | Description | Scale it matters | Rarity | Importance | Substitutability | Changes in Withoutscheme case | Impact |
| Layout | The townscape within the study area is characterised as being suburban located on edge of Bristol city bordering the rural context. The area is influenced by the busy A37 corridor with minor roads connecting surrounding settlements. The area is dominated by residential use with some retail, industry \& commercial areas towards Hengrove. Settlements include Stockwood \& Whitchurch to the N \& W respectively interspersed with isolated properties \& farmsteads. | Local | Common at the local level | Low at the local level | Some opportunity for substitution | Medium potential for change to layout, eg introduction of new housing developments \& other urban elements such as retailindustrial units. | It is not anticipated that there would be any notable impacts on the layout as a result of the scheme due to its distance from townscape features and passing through mainly open farmland, therefore the impact is judged to be neutral. |
| Density and mix | Density is of low - medium scale within a suburban \& rural edge context comprising mainly residential housing linked with road networks intermixed with some retail, industry and commercial use | Local | Common at the local level | Medium at the local level | Some opportunity for substitution | Medium potential for change eg in areas of regeneration, brownfield sites \& urban fringe areas \& alteration to mix of urban elements. | Density \& mix will increase slightly with the introduction of a new visually intrusive urban element to the edge of Whitchurch. <br> It is anticipated that there would be visual disturbance on townscape features $S$ of Whitchurch, therefore the impact is judged to be slight adverse. |
| Scale | Built elements are mainly of a domestic scale, generally 1-3 storey including residential properties with some areas retail \& industry use. | Local | Common at the local level | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Low at the local } \\ & \text { level } \end{aligned}$ | Some opportunity for substitution | Medium potential for change to built environment. | It is not anticipated that there would be any notable impacts on the scale as a result of the scheme due to its distance from townscape features and passing through mainly open farmland, therefore the impact is judged to be neutral. |
| Appearance | The housing is a mixture of ages with modern, private, commercial offices \& retail buildings. Some features/buildings retain historical associations which add to the local distinctiveness of the area. | Local | Common at the local level | Medium at a local level | Some opportunity for substitution | Medium potential for change to built environment. | It is not anticipated that there would be any notable impacts on the appearance of the townscape as a result of the scheme due to its distance from townscape features and passing through mainly open farmland, therefore the impact is judged to be neutral. |
| Human interaction | The primary human interaction is focused around domestic use such as schools, shops, pubs, churches, community facilities etc. with some retail \& commercial use. | Local | Common at the local level | Low at the local level | Some opportunity for substitution | Medium potential for change as a result of land use, density \& mix \& layout. | It is not anticipated that there would be any notable impacts on human interaction as a result of the scheme due to its distance from townscape features and passing through mainly open farmland, therefore the impact is judged to be neutral. |
| Cultural | There is a mix of council housing \& post war development with some more modern features interspersed with areas of historical interest including Listed Buildings \& traditional houses within Whitchurch village N of the scheme. <br> Horseworld is within the study area on the edge of Whitchurch/Stockwood. <br> There are designated historical features within 1 km , including 1 SM (Maes Knoll Camp) located 1km SW of the scheme. <br> Lyons Court Farm \& Church Farm are adjacent to the scheme. <br> Other recreational facilities such as Whitchurch <br>  | Settlements \& transport corridors valued at regional level. <br> SM's, Listed Buildings \& Reg Park \& Garden valued at national level. | Rare at local level | Medium at local level <br> Medium at Regional \& National level | Limited opportunity for substitution | Low potential for change due to limited opportunity for substitution. | It is anticipated that there would be visual disturbance on the setting of some cultural features to the edge of Whitchurch due to the introduction of a new urban element, therefore the impact is judged to be slight adverse. |
| Land use | Land use is primarily domestic including residential \& recreational areas with some retail, industry \& commercial use. | Local | Common at the local level | Low at the local level | Some opportunity for substitution | Medium potential for change to land use. | It is not anticipated that there would be any notable impacts on land use as a result of the scheme due to its distance from townscape features and passing through mainly open farmland, therefore the impact is judged to be neutral. |
| Summary of character | The study area is characterised as a suburban townscape on the edge of Bristol transitioning to rural landscape with primarily residential settlements with some historic \& cultural associations. These are connected with the busy A37 corridor \& network of rural lanes linking smaller settlements \& farmsteads. | Some features valued at national level. <br> Many townscape elements valued at local level. | Some features, eg designated cultural sites, are rare at national, regional \& local level. Many townscape features are commonplace at all levels. | Low to medium at local, regional \& national level. | Some opportunity for substitution | Low-medium potential for change as a result of other influences. | Mitigation for this scheme would consist of careful design \& location of elements within the urban edge, along with planting for visual screening \& to recreate severed landscape features within the rural area. It is not anticipated that there would be many notable impacts on this townscape as a result of the scheme due to its distance from urban areas. However, adverse impacts are anticpated on density \& mix \& on the setting of cultural features close to the scheme as a result of visual disturbance The overall impacts therefore judged to be slight adverse. |

Reference Sources
B\&NES Landscape Character Assessment
South Gloucestershhire Landscape Character Assessment (2014)
Ordnance Survey Mapping
Aerial Mapping
Magic - Geograp
Magic - Geographical mapping
Bristol City Council
Step 5 - Summary Assessment Scor
Slight adverse

## Qualitative Comment

A 1 km offset from the scheme boundary has been prescribed for the study area within this townscape area of which baseline assessment only has been conducted due to the early stages of this design \& optioneering stage. It is considered that signids
cons the impacts as at year one of opening. This approach has been undertaken due to the absence of a formal mitigation strategy and to enable the comparison of the impacts of the scheme as a result of its physical presence in the townscape

TAG Townscape Impacts Worksheet - Option D - Orbital Route West of A37 (Half Acre Lane) - Orange Route

|  | Step 2 | Step 3 |  |  |  |  | Step 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Features | Description | Scale it matters | Rarity | Importance | Substitutability | Changes in Withoutscheme case | Impact |
| Layout | The townscape within the study area is characterised as being suburban located on edge of Bristol city bordering the rural context. The area is influenced by the busy A37 corridor with minor roads connecting surrounding settlements. The area is dominated by residential use with some retail, industry \& commercial areas towards Hengrove. Settlements include Stockwood \& Whitchurch to the N \& W respectively interspersed with isolated properties \& farmsteads. | Local | Common at the local level | Low at the local level | Some opportunity for substitution | Medium potential for change to layout, eg introduction of new housing developments \& other urban elements such as retail/industrial units. | It is not anticipated that there would be any notable impacts on the layout as a result of the scheme due to its distance from townscape features and passing through mainly open farmland, therefore the impact is judged to be neutral. |
| Density and mix | Density is of low - medium scale within a suburban \& rural edge context comprising mainly residential housing linked with road networks intermixed with some retail, industry and commercial use. | Local | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \begin{array}{l} \text { Common at the local } \\ \text { level } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Medium at the local level | Some opportunity for substitution | Medium potential for change eg in areas of regeneration, brownfield sites \& urban fringe areas \& alteration to mix of urban elements. | Density \& mix will increase slightly with the introduction of a new visually intrusive urban element to the edge of Whitchurch. <br> It is anticipated that there would be visual disturbance on townscape features S of Whitchurch, therefore the impact is judged to be slight adverse. |
| Scale | Built elements are mainly of a domestic scale, generally $1-3$ storey including residential properties with some areas retail \& industry use. | Local | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Common at the local } \\ \text { level } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Low at the local } \\ & \text { level } \end{aligned}$ | Some opportunity for substitution | Medium potential for change to built environment. | It is not anticipated that there would be any notable impacts on the scale as a result of the scheme due to its distance from townscape features and passing through mainly open farmland, therefore the impact is judged to be neutral. |
| Appearance | The housing is a mixture of ages with modern, private, commercial offices \& retail buildings. Some features/buildings retain historical associations which add to the local distinctiveness of the area. | Local | Common at the local level | Medium at a local level | Some opportunity for substitution | Medium potential for change to built environment. | It is not anticipated that there would be any notable impacts on the appearance of the townscape as a result of the scheme due to its distance from townscape features and passing through mainly open farmland, therefore the impact is judged to be neutral. |
| Human interaction | The primary human interaction is focused around domestic use such as schools, shops, pubs, churches, community facilities etc. with some retail \& commercial use. | Local | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \begin{array}{l} \text { Common at the local } \\ \text { level } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Low at the local } \\ & \text { level } \end{aligned}$ | Some opportunity for substitution | Medium potential for change as a result of land use, density \& mix \& layout. | It is not anticipated that there would be any notable impacts on human interaction as a result of the scheme due to its distance from townscape features and passing through mainly open farmland, therefore the impact is judged to be neutral. |
| Cultural | There is a mix of council housing \& post war development with some more modern features interspersed with areas of historical interest including Listed Buildings \& traditional houses within Whitchurch village N of the scheme. <br> Horseworld is within the study area on the edge of Whitchurch/Stockwood. <br> There are designated historical features within 1 km , including 1 SM (Maes Knoll Camp) located 1km SW of the scheme. <br> Lyons Court Farm \& Church Farm are adjacent to the scheme. <br> Other recreational facilities such as Whitchurch Cricket <br> Club \& Bristol Barbarians Rugby Club \& Whitehall | Settlements \& transport corridors valued at regional level. <br> SM's, Listed Buildings \& Reg Park \& Garden valued at national level. | Rare at local level | Medium at local level <br> Medium at Regional \& National level | Limited opportunity for substitution | Low potential for change due to limited opportunity for substitution. | It is anticipated that there would be visual disturbance on the setting of some cultural features to the edge of Whitchurch due to the introduction of a new urban element, therefore the impact is judged to be slight adverse. |
| Land use | Land use is primarily domestic including residential \& recreational areas with some retail, industry \& commercial use. | Local | Common at the local level | Low at the local level | Some opportunity for substitution | Medium potential for change to land use. | It is not anticipated that there would be any notable impacts on land use as a result of the scheme due to its distance from townscape features and passing through mainly open farmland, therefore the impact is judged to be neutral. |
| Summary of character | The study area is characterised as a suburban townscape on the edge of Bristol transitioning to rural landscape with primarily residential settlements with some historic \& cultural associations. These are connected with the busy A37 corridor \& network of rural lanes linking smaller settlements \& farmsteads. | Some features valued at national level. <br> Many townscape elements valued at local level. | Some features, eg designated cultural sites, are rare at natitonal, regional \& local level. MMny townscape features are commonplace at all levels. | Low to medium at local, regional \& national level. | Some opportunity for substitution | Low-medium potential for change as a result of other influences. | Mitigation for this scheme would consist of careful design \& location of elements within the urban edge, along with planting for visual screening \& to recreate severed landscape features within the rural area. <br> It is not anticipated that there would be many notable impacts on this townscape as a result of the scheme due to its distance from urban areas. However, adverse impacts are anticipated on density \& mix \& on the setting of cultural features close to the scheme as a result of visual disturbance. The overall impacts are therefore judged to be slight adverse. |

## Reference Sources

BKNES Landscape Character Assessment
South Gloucestershire Landscope
South Gloucestershire Landscape Character Assessment (2014)
Ordnance Surve
Aerial Mapping
Magic-Geograp
Merial Mapping - Geographical mapping
Bristol City Council
Step 5 - Summary Assessment Score
Slight adverse

## Qualitative Comments

A 1 km offset from the scheme boundary has been prescribed for the study area within this townscape area of which baseline assessment only has been conducted due to the early stages of this design \& optioneering stage. It is considered that significant effects are unikely beyond this.
The assessment considers the scheme design and alignment and considers the impacts as at year one of opening. This approach has been undertaken due to the absence of a formal mitigation strategy and to enable the comparison of the impacts of the scheme as a result of its physical presence in the townscape.

TAG Townscape Impacts Worksheet - Option E-Hicks Gate Junction Improvement - Brown Route

|  | Step 2 | Step 3 |  |  |  |  | Step 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Features | Description | Scale it matters | Rarity | Importance | Substitutability | Changes in Withoutscheme case | Impact |
| Layout | The townscape within the study area of Hicks Gate roundabout is characterised as being suburban located on edge of Bristol city. The area is influenced by the busy A4 \& A4174 corridors \& Bristol to Bath railway. The area is dominated by residential use with some retail \& commercial areas. Settlements within the study area include Keynsham, Hanham, Brislington, Stockwood, Queen Chartton \& Whitchurch interspersed with isolated properties \& farmsteads. | Local | Common at the local level | Low at the local level | Some opportunity for substitution | Medium potential for change to layout within suburban context, eg introduction of new housing developments \& other urban elements such as retailindustrial units. | It is not anticipated that there would be any notable impacts on the layout as a result of the scheme due to its scale \& distance from townscape features, therefore the impact is judged to be neutral. |
| Density and mix | Density is of low - medium scale within a suburban \& rural edge context comprising mainly residential housing linked with road networks intermixed with some retail, industry and commercial use. | Local | Common at the local level | Medium at the local level | Some opportunity for substitution | Medium potential for change eg in areas of regeneration, brownfield sites \& urban fringe areas \& alteration to mix of urban elements. | It is not anticipated that there would be any notable impacts on the density and mix as a result of the scheme due to its scale \& distance from townscape features, therefore the impact is judged to be neutral. |
| Scale | Built elements are mainly of a domestic scale, generally $1-3$ storey including residential properties with some areas retail \& industry use. | Local | Common at the local level | Low at the local level | Some opportunity for substitution | Medium potential for change to built environment. | It is not anticipated that there would be any notable impacts on the scale as a result of the scheme due to its scale \& distance from townscape features, therefore the impact is judged to be neutral. |
| Appearance | The housing is a mixture of ages with modern, private, commercial offices \& retail buildings. Some features/buildings retain historical associations which add to the local distinctiveness of the area. | Local | Common at the local level | Medium at a local level | Some opportunity for substitution | Medium potential for change to built environment. | It is not anticipated that there would be any notable impacts on the appearance of the townscape as a result of the scheme due to its scale \& distance from townscape features, therefore the impact is judged to be neutral. |
| Human interaction | The primary human interaction is focused around domestic use such as schools, shops, pubs, churches, community facilities etc. with some retail \& commercial use. | Local | Common at the local level | Low at the local level | Some opportunity for substitution | Medium potential for change as a result of land use, density \& mix \& layout. | It is not anticipated that there would be any notable impacts on human interaction as a result of the scheme due to its scale \& distance from townscape features, therefore the impact is judged to be neutral. |
| Cultural | There is post war development mixed with modern features interspersed with areas of historical interest, such as Brislington \& Keynsham Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings within the study area. Most notably, Keynsham contains various historical features including Listed Buildings which line Bristol Road \& The High Street. Also, The Abbey SM in Keynsham is in close proximity to the scheme alongside the A4. <br> The Park \& Garden to Brislington House is a Reg Park \& Garden with associated Listed Buildings within 1km of the scheme. <br> There are also office developments at Durley Park, \& a small industrial estate on the flatter land by the River Avon. These areas are linked by busy transport corridors. | Settlements \& transport corridors valued at regional level. <br> SM's, CA's \& Listed Buildings valued at national level. | Rare at local level | Medium at local level <br> Medium at Regional \& National level | Limited opportunity for substitution | Low potential for change due to limited opportunity for substitution. | It is not anticipated that there would be any notable impacts on cultural features as a result of the scheme due to its scale \& distance from townscape features, therefore the impact is judged to be neutral. |
| Land use | Land use is primarily domestic including residential \& recreational with some retail, commercial \& industry use. | Local | Common at the local level | Low at the local level | Some opportunity for substitution | Medium potential for change to land use. | It is not anticipated that there would be any notable impacts on land use as a result of the scheme due to its scale \& distance from townscape features, therefore the impact is judged to be neutral. |
| Summary of character | The study area is characterised as a suburban townscape on the edge of Bristol transitioning to rural landscape with primarily residential settlements with some historic \& cultural associations. These are connected with the busy transport corridors \& network of rural lanes linking smaller settlements \& farmsteads. | Some features valued at national level. <br> Many townscape elements valued at local level. | Some features, eg designated cultural sites, are rare at national, regional \& local level. Many townscape features are commonplace at all levels. | Low to medium at local, regional \& national level. | Some opportunity for substitution | Low-medium potential for change as a result of other influences. | It is not anticipated that there would be any notable impacts on townscape as a result of the scheme due to its scale \& distance from townscape features, therefore the impact is judged to be neutral. |

Reterence Sources
B\&NES Landscape Character Assessment
Suoth Gloucestershire Landscape Character Assessment (2014)
Sranance Survey Mapping
Magic - Geographical mapping
Step 5 - Summary Assessment Score
Neutral

Qualitative Comments
A 1 km offset from the scheme boundary has been prescribed for the study area within this townscape area of which baseline assessment only has been conducted due to the early stages of this design \& optioneering stage. It is considered that significant effects are unlikely beyond this.
The assessment considers the scheme design and alignment and considers the impacts as at year one of opening. This approach has been undertaken due to the absence of a formal mitigation strategy and to enable the comparison of the impacts of the scheme as a result of its physical presence in the townscape.

| Scheme | Option | Summary of Key Impacts | Assessment |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Obrital Highway Route | Option A\&B Orbital Route A4-A37 - Blue Route | The WP1-A4A37 Link Road Scheme (BlueLine) has potential for impacts on the: Mells Valley SAC (19.6km south east), Bath and Bradford on Avon Bats SAC (15km east), North Somerset and Mendip Bat Sites SAC ( 15 km west) or Wye Valley and Forest of Dean Bat Sites SAC ( 28 km south east). This is through loss of commuting or foraging habitat for bats within the local area linked to this SAC. One SSSI is present within 1 km of the Scheme which is designated for geographical reasons, considering the geological nature of the site and the distance away from the Scheme it is considered unlikely that there will be impacts on this site as a result of the Scheme. One LNR and five SNCls are within 1 km distance from the Scheme route. The River Avon SNCl is situated 540 m south east of the route. Considering the distances of the sites away from the Scheme area and the nature of the Scheme it is considered unlikely that the Scheme will result in impacts to these sites. <br> The WP1-A4A37 Link Scheme may result in loss of deciduous woodland, hedgerows and agricultural habitats. Wood pasture, parkland Priority Habitats and traditional orchards are present within 1 km of the Scheme, these are not predicted to be impacted. <br> There is a Granted European Protected Species Application within 1 km of the Scheme, this was granted in $8 / 10 / 2015$ and ends in 7/10/2020, this is for Common pipistrelle, Soprano pipistrelle, Lesser horseshoe, Serotine and Whiskered bats. Loss of trees, hedgerow, grassland, scrub habitats and ponds could result in loss of areas potentially suitable for associated protected species. Overall, due to the scale of the off-line scheme and potential impacts to habitats of value to bats over a wide area, impacts to these SACs are possible. <br> Mitigation against the loss of habitat and landscape features incurred as a result of this Scheme could include re-planting of hedgerows lost. | Slight adverse |
| Orbital Highway Route | Option C - <br> Orbital Route <br> West of A37 <br> (Washing <br> Pound Lane) - <br> Grey Route | The WP1-A4-A37 Whitchurch Option 2 (GreyLine) has potential for impacts to, Mells Valley SAC (13km south east), Bath and Bradtord on Avon Bats SAC (16km west) or Wye Valley and Forest of Dean Bat Sites SAC (29km south east). This is through loss of commuting or foraging habitat for bats within the local area linked to this SAC . No designated sites within 1 km . Two SNCls are within 1 km from the Scheme route. Considering the distances of the sites away from the Scheme area and the nature of the Scheme it is considered unlikely that the Scheme will result in impacts to these sites. <br> The WP1-A4A37 Link may result in loss of hedgerows and agricultural habitats. There are areas of Priority Habitat (including deciduous woodland, wood pasture and parkland, and traditional orchards) within 1 km of the Scheme, these are not predicted to be impacted. No previously granted European Protected Species Applications have been found within 1 km of the Scheme. Loss of hedgerow, grassland, scrub habitats and ponds could result in loss of areas potentially suitable for associated protected species. Overall, due to the scale of the off-line scheme and potential impacts to habitats of value to bats over a wide area, impacts to these SACs are possible. Mitigation against the loss of habitat and landscape features incurred as a result of this Scheme could include re-planting of hedgerows lost. | Slight adverse |
| Orbital Highway Route | Option D Orbital Route West of A37 (Half Acre Lane) Orange Route | The WP1-A4-A37 (OrangeLine) has potential for impacts on the Mells Valley SAC (13km south east), Bath and Bradford on Avon Bats SAC (16km west) or Wye Valley and Forest of Dean Bat Sites SAC (29km south east). This is through loss of commuting or foraging habitat for bats within the local area linked to this SAC. Two SNCls are within 1 km of the Scheme, considering the distances of the sites away from the Scheme area and the nature of the Scheme it is considered unlikely that the Scheme will result in impacts to these sites. The WP1-A4A37 (Orange Line) Link may result in loss of hedgerows and agricultural habitats. Unlike the Blue option, it does not cut through a section of deciduous woodland. There are areas of Priority Habitats (deciduous woodland, wood pasture and parkland and traditional orchards) within 1 km of the Scheme, these are not predicted to be impacted. There are no Granted European Protected Species Applications within 1 km of the Scheme. Loss of hedgerow, grassland, scrub habitats and ponds could result in loss of areas potentially suitable for associated protected species. Overall, due to the scale of the off-line scheme and potential impacts to habitats of value to bats over a wide area, impacts to these SACs are possible. Mitigation against the loss of habitat and landscape features incurred as a result of this Scheme could include re-planting of hedgerows lost. | Slight adverse |


| Step 2 |  | Step 3 |  |  |  | Step 4Magnitude of <br> impact | Step 5 Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area | Description of feature/ atribute | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \begin{array}{c} \text { Scale (at which } \\ \text { attribute matters) } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Importance (of attribute) | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Trend (in relation } \\ \text { to target) } \end{array}$ | Biodiversity and earth heritage value |  |  |
| Bickley Wood SSSI (approximately 600 m north west of the north end of the Scheme) | (Geographical) Most extensive exposure of carboniferous downend group of carboniferous friation in the Bristol coalfields | National | $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{l} \text { High - site } \\ \text { designated as a } \\ \text { sSSI } \end{array} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | N/A | High | Neutral | Neutral |
| Avon Valley Woodland LNR (approximately 600 m north west, part of Bickley wood SSSI | Maturing broadleaved woodlands- oak, willow scrub and pasture | Regional | Medium - site designated at a local level fo nature | N/A | Medium | Neutral | Neutral |
| Stockwood Open Space SNCI, LNR and Avon Wildlife Trust Nature Reserve (approximately 260 m west at Scheme line mid-point) | Grassland meadows, thick headgerows and woodland | Regional | Medium - site designated at a local level for not nature conservation | N/A | Medium | Neutral | Neutral |
| Stockwood Vale Woods SNCI (approximately 240 m west) | Broad leaved woodlands | Regional | Medium - site designated at a local level fo nature | N/A | Medium | Neutral | Neutral |
| Charlton Bottom \& Queen Charlton Watercourse SNCI (approximately 510 m south west) | Running water (streams), with associated marginal habitats, seminatural broadleaved woodland and scrub. | Regional | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Medium - site } \\ & \text { designated at a } \\ & \text { local level for } \end{aligned}$ | N/A | Medium | Neutral | Neutral |
| West Keynsham Field SNCI (approximately 200 m west) | Unimproved and semi-improved neutral grassland, marshy grassland, hedges and scrub. | Regional | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Medium - site } \\ & \text { designate at a } \\ & \text { locallevel for } \\ & \text { nature } \\ & \text { consenation } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | N/A | Medium | Neutral | Neutral |
| Stockwood Golf Course SNCI (approximately 240 m north west) | Unimproved calcareous grassland | Regional | Medium - site designated at a local level fo nature conservation | N/A | Medium | Neutral | Neutral |
| Sturminster Road SNCI (approximately 410 meast ) | Woodland, scrub, tall ruderal vegetation, grassland \& stream, with associated marginal vegetation | Regional | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Medium - site } \\ & \text { designate at a } \\ & \text { local level for } \\ & \text { nature } \\ & \text { conservation } \end{aligned}$ | N/A | Medium | Neutral | Neutral |
| River Avon SNCI (approximately 540m south east) | Invertebrates and aquatic plants | Regional | Medium - sit designated at a local level for nature conservation | N/A | Medium | Neutral | Neutral |
| Mells Valley SAC (approximately 19.6 km south east). | Sites known for Greater horseshoe bat populations, cave networks. | International | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Versiryaigu } \\ & \text { internitionaly } \\ & \text { designated site } \end{aligned}$ | N/A | Very high | Neutral | Neutral |
| North Somerset and Mendip Bat SAC sites (approximately 15 km west). | Sites known for Lesser horseshoe and greater horseshoe bat roost populations | International | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Very high - } \\ & \text { interationally } \\ & \text { designated site } \end{aligned}$ | N/A | Very high | Minor negative | Slight adverse |
| Wye Valley and Forest of Dean Bat Sites SAC (approximately 28 km south east). | Sites known for Lesser horseshoe and Greater horseshoe bat roost populations | International | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Very high - } \\ & \text { interationally } \\ & \text { designated site } \end{aligned}$ | N/A | Very high | Minor negative | Slight adverse |
| Bath and Bradford on Avon Bats SAC (approximately 15 km east). | Sites known for Greater horseshoe, Lesser horseshoe and Bechstein's ba roost populations | International | Very high internationally designated site | N/A | Very high | Minor negative | Slight adverse |

## 路

Magic Maps - http://www.magic.goov.ukMagicMap.aspx
http:/map. .: somerset. gov.ukssouthgos. htm
Summary Assessment Score

Qualitative Comments

As a result of this assessment, a slight adverse assessment score was given to this Scheme as this was the highest assessment score found within the features assessed.

TAG Biodiversity Impacts Worksheet - Option C - Orbital Route West of A37 (Washing Pound Lane) - Grey route

| Step 2 |  | Step 3 |  |  |  | Step 4 | Step 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area | Description of feature/ attribute | Scale (at which attribute matters) | Importance (of attribute) | Trend (in relation to target) | Biodiversity and earth heritage value | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Magnitude of } \\ & \text { impact } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Assessment } \\ & \text { Score } \end{aligned}$ |
| Sturminster Road SNCI (approximately 600 m east) | Woodland, scrub, tall ruderal vegetation, grassland \& stream, with associated marginal vegetation | Regional | Medium-site designated at a local level for nature conservation | N/A | Medium | Neutral | Neutral |
| Mells Valley SAC (approximately 13km south east) | Sites designated for greater horseshoe bat populations, cave networks. | International | Very highinternationally designated site | N/A | Very high | Minor negative | Slight adverse |
| Bath and Bradford on Avon bats SAC (approxiamtely 16 km west). | Sites designated for Greater horseshoe, Lesser horseshoe and Bechstein's bat roost populations | International | Very highinternationally designated site | N/A | Very high | Minor negative | Slight adverse |
| Wye Valley and Forest of Dean Bat Sites SAC (approximately 29 km south east). | Sites designated for Lesser horseshoe and Greater horseshoe bat roost populations | International | Very highinternationally designated site | N/A | Very high | Minor negative | Slight adverse |

Habitats assemblage consist mainly of trees, hedgerow, grassland, scrub habitats and ponds. The Scheme could result in loss of areas these areas which ar
dormouse, great crested newts and other amphibians, reptiles, birds and invertebrates

## Reference Sources

> Magic Maps - http://www.magic.gov.uk/MagicMap.aspx, http:///map..--somerset.gov.u.k//outhglos.html https://isharemaps.bathnes.gov.uk/atmycouncil.aspx

## Summary Assessment Score

Slight adverse

## Qualitative Comments

As a result of this assessment, a slight adverse assessment score was given to this Scheme as this was the highest assessment score found within the features assessed.

TAG Biodiversity Impacts Worksheet - Option D - Orbital Route West of A37 (Half Acre Lane) - Orange route

| Step 2 |  | Step 3 |  |  |  | Step 4 | Step 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area | Description of feature/ attribute | Scale (at which attribute matters) | Importance (of attribute) | Trend (in relation to target) | Biodiversity and earth heritage value | Magnitude of impact | Assessment Score |
| Sturminster Road SNCI (approximately 560 m east) | Woodland, scrub, tall ruderal vegetation, grassland \& stream, with associated marginal vegetation | Regional | Medium-site designated at a local level for nature conservation | N/A | Medium | Neutral | Neutral |
| Mells Valley SAC (approximately 13km south east) | Sites designated for Greater horseshoe bat populations, cave networks. | International | Very highinternationally designated site | N/A | Very high | Minor negative | Slight adverse |
| Bath and Bradford on Avon Bats SAC (approximately 16 km west). | Sites designated for Greater horseshoe, Lesser horseshoe and Bechstein's bat roost populations | International | Very highinternationally designated site | N/A | Very high | Minor negative | Slight adverse |
| Wye Valley and Forest of Dean Bat Sites SAC (approximately 29 km south east). | Sites designated for Lesser horseshoe and Greater horseshoe bat roost populations | International | Very highinternationally designated site | N/A | Very high | Minor negative | Slight adverse |

Habitats assemblage consist mainly of trees, hedgerow, grassland, scrub habitats and ponds. The Scheme could result in loss of areas these areas which are potentially suitable for associated protected species, including bats, dormouse, great crested newts and other amphibians, reptiles, birds and invertebrates.

## Reference Sources

|Nagic maps - nttp://www.magic.gov.uk/wagicmap.aspx
http://map.n-somerset.gov.uk/southglos.html

Summary Assessment Score

## Slight adverse

## Qualitative Comments

As a result of this assessment, a slight adverse assessment score was given to this Scheme as this was the highest assessment score found within the features assessed.

TAG Biodiversity Impacts Worksheet - Option E - Hicks Gate Junction Improvement - Brown Route

| Step 2 |  | Step 3 |  |  |  | Step 4 | Step 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area | Description of feature/ atribute | Scale (at which attribute matters) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Importance (of } \\ & \text { attribute) } \end{aligned}$ | Trend (in relation to target) | Biodiversity and earth heritage value | Magnitude of impact | Assessment Score |
| Bickley Wood ancient and semi-natural woodland SSSI (approximately 540 m north) | (Geographical) Most extensive exposure of carboniferous downend group striation in the Bristol coalfields | National | $\begin{aligned} & \text { High-sited } \\ & \text { designated as a } \\ & \text { SSSI } \end{aligned}$ | N/A | High | Neutral | Neutral |
| Avon valley woodland LNR ( 520 m north). | Maturing broadleaved woodlands | Regional | Medium- site designated at local level for nature conservation | N/A | Medium | Neutral | Neutral |
| Stockwood open space LNR (approximately 800 m south west), | Old farm meadows, hedgerows, broadleaved \& coniferous woodland, scrub, marshland, ponds, a stream, a reedbed and a restored tip. | Regional | Medium- site designated at local level for nature conservation | N/A | Medium | Neutral | Neutral |
| East Wood and Keynsham Humpy Tumps Comples SNCI (approximately 200 m south) | Floristically rich acidic grassland | Regional | Medium- site designated at local level for nature conservation | N/A | Medium | Neutral | Neutral |
| Stockwood Vale Woods SNCI (approximately 760 m south west) | Semi-natural broadleaved woodland and scrub | Regional | Medium- site designated at local level for nature conservation | N/A | Medium | Neutral | Neutral |
| Charlton Bottom and Queen Charlton watercourse SNCI (approximately 810 m south west) | Running water (streams), with associated marginal habitats, semi-natural broadleaved woodland and scrub. | Regional | Medium- site designated at local level for nature conservation | N/A | Medium | Neutral | Neutral |
| River Avon SNCI (approximately 700 m east) | Invertebrates and aquatic plants | Regional | Medium- site designated at local level for nature conservation | N/A | Medium | Neutral | Neutral |
| Mells Valley SAC (approximately 13km south east) | Sites known for Greater horseshoe bat populations, cave networks. | International | Very highinternationally designated site | N/A | Very high | Neutral | Neutral |
| Bath and Bradford on Avon Bats SAC (approxiamtely 16 km west) | Sites known for Greater horseshoe, Lesser horseshoe and Bechstein's bat roost populations | International | Very highinternationally designated site | N/A | Very high | Neutral | Neutral |
| Wye Valley and Forest of Dean Bat Sites SAC (approximately 29 km south east) | Sites known for Lesser horseshoe and Greater horseshoe bat roost populations | International | Very highinternationally designated site | N/A | Very high | Neutral | Neutral |
| North Somerset and Mendip Bat Sites SAC (approximately 16 km south west) | Sites known for Lesser horseshoe and Greater horseshoe bat roost populations | International | Very highinternationally designated site | N/A | Very high | Neutral | Neutral |
| Habitats present that could be lost include arable farmland, hedgerow, grassland, scrub habitats and ponds could result in loss of areas potentially suitable for associated protected species. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reference Sources |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Magic Maps - http://www.magic.gov.uk/MagicMap.aspx, https://isharemaps.bathnes.gov.uk/atmycouncil.aspx http://maps.bristol.gov.uk/policies/ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Summary Assessment Score |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Neutral |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Qualitative Comments

As a result of this assessment, a neutral assessment score was given to this Scheme as all features assessed were found to have neutral assessment scores.

| Feature Step 2 Descrition |  | Step 3 |  |  | ${ }_{\text {Step } 4}^{\text {Impact }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Scale it matters | There are 11 Grade II listed buildings of medium value within the study area. <br> The conservation area presents important local architectural design and a secluded riverside landscape enhanced by an 18 th century settlement pattern, and also contains one of the first purpose built/private lunatic asylums in Britain and is therefore considered to be of medium to high value. | Raritv regionally, with the exception of Grade II listed Durley Cottage, which has been described as a 'modest but rare example of the local cottage vernacular' as part of its listings entry. <br> The form of the conservation area is not rare in a regional context. |  |
| Form | There are 11 Grade III listed buildings within an approximate 500 m study area surrounding the proposed scheme $[1365675,1384637,1384612,1384613$, 1384638, 1129499, 1384633, 1136454, 1129500, 1384635, 1365674]. |  |  |  | Negligible - there will be no change to the form of any of the dentified designated heritage assets. <br> No physical impacts or significant adverse setting impacts on designated heritage assets are anticipated. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | A small part of the Avon Valley Conservation Area is present within the most western extent of the study area. Predominant architectural features are pantiled and slate eoofos, random stone walling, painted rendered walls with timber window irames and doors, generally proportioned and detailed in the cottage vernacular of the period. |  |  |  |  |
| Survival | The level of survival of the listed buildings is generally good. Aside from some alterations, additions and repairs (internally and externally), which represent multiple phases of development and use, the buildings have mainly retained their characteristic elements <br> The survival of the conservation area is generally good with limited development within its boundary since its designation in 1980. | The survival of the listed buildings is a matter of local to regional interest. <br> The survival of the conservation area is a matter of regional to national interest. | The survival of the listed buildings is important in <br> understanding the historic developement of the study <br> area. <br> The survival of the conservation area within the study <br> area is central to is significance as a regionally and <br> nationally important asset. | The survival of listed buildings similar to those present <br> within the study area is not rare in this region. <br> The survival of the conservation area similar to those <br> present within the study area is not rare in this region. | Negligible - there will be no change to the survival of any of he identified designated heritage assets. <br> No physical impacts or significant adverse setting impacts on designated heritage assets are anticipated. |
| Condition | The condition of the listed buildings is generally good. The majority of buildings are in residential use (aside from the morturary chapels and the milestone). <br> The condition of the conservation area is generally good. | The condition of the listed buildings is a matter of local to regional interest. <br> The condition of the conservation area is a matter of regional to national interest. | The condition of the listed buildings is important due to their association with the development of the area. The condition of the conservation area is important to ensure its long term survival. | The condition of the listed builidings is not rare. The condition of the conservation area is not rare. | Negligible - there will be no change to the condition of any of the identified designated heritage assets. <br> No physical impacts or significant adverse setting impacts on designated heritage assets are anticipated. |
| Complexity | The listed buildings are generally of low to moderate complexity. The conservation area is generally of low to moderate complexity. | The complexity of the listed buildings is a matter of local to regional interest. <br> The complexity of the conservation area is a matter of regional to national interest. | The complexity of the listed buildings represents some variety in form and function of post-medieval buildings. <br> The complexity of the conservation area largely represents 18th century settlements patterns stretching alongside the river. This forms an important component of its significance | The level of complexity of the listed buildings is not rare. <br> The level of complexity of the conservation area is not rare. | Negligible -there will be no change to the <br> No physical inpoacts or significant adverse setting impacts on designated heritage assels are anticiopated. |
| Context |  | The context of the listed buildings is largely valued at a local level, while the conservation area is valued at a regional to national level. The selting of these assets is also a material consideration under national policy. |  | The context of the listed buildings is not rare. The context of the conservation area is not rare. | Minor Adverse - there is potential for adverse setting impacts to the identified designated heritage assets. The assets are likely to have visibility to and from the proposed scheme, and creating a new link road between Stockwood and Queen Charlton will harm the rural setting that currently still exists between the two settlements. |
| Period | All of the listed buildings date to the post-medieval period. <br> The conservation area largely traces the 18 th century settlement pattern and therefore primarily dates to the post-medieval area. | The period captured by the listed buildings and conservation area (i.e. post-medieval) is typical and of regional and national interest. | The listed duildings cover the post-medieval period which is well reppesented within the wider area. Furthermore, the post-medieval period is also well represented within the conservation area. | The period represented by the listed buildings and conservation area is not considered rare in this region | Negligible - there will be no significant change to the periods represented by assets within the scheme study area. |
| Reference Sources |  |  |  |  |  |
| Historic Englands The National Heritage List for England (NHLE) database, Know Your Place (for Conservaion Areas in Bistol City Council) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Step 5-Summary Assessment Score |  |  |  |  |  |
| This opion is is likely to have an overal Slight Adverse Eftect on Cutural Heritage. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Qualitative Comments |  |  |  |  |  |
| The adverse | elate to the potential setting impacts on the above identified designated heritage a | sent within the study area. Appropriate design to red | eting impacts (i.e screening), could potentially red | e effect to Neutral. |  |

TAG Historic Environment Impacts Worksheet - Option C - Orbital Route West of A37 (Washing Pound Lane) - Grey Route

| Step 2 |  | Step 3 |  |  | Step 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Feature | Description | Scale it matters | Significance | Rarity | Impact |
| Form | There are 8 listed buildings within an approximate 500 m study area surrounding the proposed scheme [1136454, 1129499, 1129502, <br> $1136453,1365675,1136442,1129498,1365674]$. Out of these 2 are Grade II* [Church of St Nicholas 1136442; Lyons Court Farmhouse 1136453] and 6 are Grade II. The Grade It listed church can be found to the east of the scheme at the junction between Bristol Road and Church Road, while the Grade IIt farmhouse is located to the west of the scheme south of Church Road. <br> With the exception of Grade II* Lyons Court Farmhouse, which is located to the west of the scheme, the remaining listed buildings are all located within the eastern and south-eastern extent of the study area. <br> The buildings consist of various forms including a milestone, a monument in a churchyard, a church, an 18th century manor house, a 15th and 17th century farmhouse, a 17th century cottage and an 18 th century house with gatepiers. | The Grade II* listed buildings are of high importance, while the Grade II buildings are of medium importance. | There are 2 Grade II* of high value, and 6 Grade II listed buildings of medium value within the study area. | The form of the listed buildings is not rare locally or regionally, however, the Grade Il" church is a good example of a potential early-medieval (12th century) church and is not common in both a local and regional context. | Negligible - there will be no change to the form of any of the identified designated heritage assets. <br> No physical impacts or significant adverse setting impacts on designated heritage assets are anticipated. |
| Survival | The level of survival of the listed buildings is generally good. Aside from some alterations, additions and repairs (internally and externally) which represent multiple phases of development and use, the buildings have mainly retained their characteristic elements. | The survival of the listed buildings is a matter of regional to national interest. | The survival of the listed buildings is important in understanding the historic developement of the study area | The survival of the listed buildings is not rare, while good survival of post-Norman conquest churches is not common. | Negligible - there will be no change to the survival of any of the identified designated heritage assets. <br> No physical impacts or significant adverse setting impacts on designated heritage assets are anticipated. |
| Condition | The listed buildings are generally in a good condition. The majority of buildings are in residential use (aside from the church, churchyard monuments and milestone). | The condition of the listed buildings is a matter of regional to national interest. | The condition of the listed buildings is important due to their association with the development of their area. | The condition of the listed buildings is not rare. | Negligible - there will be no change to the condition of any of <br> the identified designated heritage assets. <br> No physical impacts or significant adverse setting impacts on desiq |
| Complexity | The listed buildings are generally of low to moderate complexity, with the church and the manor farmhouses presenting moderate complexity levels due to their alterations which either span across multiple centuries or having now been subdivided. | The complexity of the listed buildings is a matter of regional to national interest. | The complexity of the listed buildings represents some variety in form and function of medieval and post-medieval buildings. | The complexity of the listed buildings is not uncommon, however, the church is a good example of an early-medieval church, which has been subject to change over the centuries, representing moderate complexity. | Negligible - there will be no change to the complexity of any of the identified designated heritage assets. <br> No physical impacts or significant adverse setting impacts on designated heritage assets are anticipated. |
| Context | The landscape surrounding the scheme is largely rural to the east, south and west. At its northern point, the scheme connects to a residential development at Whitchurch <br> The context of the majority of the listed buildings presents a mixture between a sub-urban to semi-rural environment which has been subject to development pressures to the north of the scheme. | The context of the listed buildings is largely valued at a local level. <br> The setting of such assets is also a material consideration under national policy. | The context of the listed buildings within the study area reflects the local and wider regional changes in settlement pattern and development. | The context of the listed buildings within the study area is not rare. Even the context of the Grade II ${ }^{*}$ listed church is not uncommon on a national level. | Minor Adverse - there is potential for adverse impacts on the setting of designated heritage assets. The assets are likely to have visibility to and from the proposed scheme. |
| Period | With the exception of the medieval church, the remaining listed buildings are of post-medieval date. | The post-medieval period is typical within the area and of regional and national interest. The medieval period (represented by the church) is of regional to national interest. | The medieval and post-medieval periods are well represented within the wider study area | The medieval and post-medieval periods are not rare. | Negligible - there will be no significant change to the periods represented by assets within the scheme study area. |

Reference Sources
Historic England's The Nationa/ Heritage List for England (NHLE) database
Step 5-Summary Assessment Score
This option is likely to have an overall Slight Adverse Effect on Cultural Heritage.

## Qualitative Comments

The main adverse effects relate to potential temporary setting impacts during the construction of the scheme. Sensitive design and appropriate mitigation such as screening could reduce the overall effect of the scheme to Neutral.

| Step 2 |  | Step 3 |  |  | Step 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Feature | Description | Scale it matters | Significance | Rarity |  |
| Form |  $1129498,1365674,1202259$. Out of these 2 are Grade II' ${ }^{\text {I Church of St Nicholas }}$ 1136442; Lyons Court Farmhouse 1136453] and 7 are Grade II. The Grade II" listed <br>  south of Church Rooad. <br> With the exceeption of Grade It Lyons Court Farmhouse and Grade II Bridge Farmhouse, which are located to the west of the scheme, the remaining listed buildings are all located within the eastern and south-eastern extent of the study area. <br> The buildings consist of various forms including a milestone, a monument in a churchyard, a church, an 18th century manor house, a 15 th and 17 th century farmhouse, a 17 th century cottage and an 18th century house with gatepiers. | The Grade II* listed buildings are of high importance, while the Grade II buildings are of medium importance. | There are 2 Grade II* of high value, and 7 Grade II listed buildings of medium value within the study area. | The form of the listed buildings is not rare locally or regionally, however, the Grade IIt church is a good example of a potential eary-medieval (12th century) church and is not common in both a local and regional context. | Negligible - there will be no change to the form of any of the dentified designated heritage assets. <br> No physical impacts or significant adverse setting impacts on designated heritage assin designated hertitage assets are anticipated. |
| Survival | The level of survival of the listed buildings is generally good. Aside trom some aterations, additions and repairs (internally and externally which represent multiple phases of development and use, the buildings have mainly retained their characteristic elements | The survival of the listed builiding is a matter of regional to national interest. | The survival of the listed buildings is important in understanding the historic developement of the study area. | The survival of the listed buildings is not rare, while good survival of post-Norman conquest churches is not common. | Negligible - there will be no change to the <br> No physical impacts or significant adverse setting impacts on designated heritage assets are anticipated. |
| Condition | The listed buildings are generally in a good condition. The majority of buildings are in residential use (aside from the church, churchyard monuments and milestone). | The condition of the listed buildings is a matter of regional to national interest. of regional to national interest. | The condition of the listed buildings is important due to their association with the development of their area. | The condition of the listed buildings is not rare. | Negligible - there will be no change to the condition of any of the identified designated heritage assets. <br> No physical impacts or significant adverse setting impacts on |
| Complexity | The listed buildings are generally of low to moderate complexity, with the church and the manor farmhouses presenting moderate complexity levels due to their alterations which either span across multiple centuries or having now been subdivided. | The complexity of the listed buildings is a matter of regional to national interest. | The complexity of the listed buildings represents some variety in form and function of medieval and post-medieval buildings. | The complexity of the listed buildings is not uncommon, however, the church is a good ex subject to change over the centuries been subject to change over the centuries, representing moderate complexity. | Negligible -there will be no change to the complexity of any of the identified designated heritage assets. <br> No physical impacts or significant adverse setting impacts on designated hertage assets are anticipated. |
| Context | The landscape surrounding the scheme is largely rural to the east, south and west. At its northern point, the scheme connects to a residential development at Whitchurch. <br> The context of the majority of the listed buildings presents a mixture between a suburban to semi-rural environment which has been subject to development pressures to the north of the scheme. | The context of the listed buildings is largely valued at a local level. The seting of such assets is also a material consideration under national policy. | The context of the listed buildings within the staduy area reflects the local and wider regional changes in settement pattern and development. | The context of the listed buildings within the study area is not rare. Even the context of the Grade II iisted church is not uncommon on a national level. | Minor Adverse - there is potential for adverse impacts on the setting of designated heritage assets. The assets are likely to have visibility to and from the proposed scheme. |
| od | With the exception of the medieval church, the remaining listed buildings are of postmedieval date. | The post-medieval period is typical within the area and of regional and national interest. The medieval period (represented of regional to national interest. | The medieval and post-medieval periods are well represented within the wider study area. | The medieval and post-medieval periods are not rare. | Negligible - there will be no significant change to the periods represented by assets within the scheme study area. |

## Reference Sources

Historic England's The National Hertiage List for England (NHLE) database
Step 5 - Summary Assessment Scor
This option is likely to have an overall Slight Adverse Effect on Cultural Heritage
Qualitative Comments

```
The main adverse effects relate to potential temporary setting impacts during the construction of the scheme. Sensitive design and appropiate mitigation such as screening could reduce the overall effect of the scheme to Neutra
```

| Step? |  | Step 3 |  |  | Step 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Feature | Description | Scale it matters | Significance | Rarity | Impact |
| Form | There are 7 Grade Il listed buildings within an approximate 500 m study area surrounding the proposed scheme [1384614, 1384612, 1116829, 1409195, 1230936, 1410955, 1384613]. <br> All of the buildings are located to the east of the scheme (either towards Keynsham or north of the River Avon). <br> The buildings consist of various forms including converted hunting lodges, late 18th century to late 19th century houses and/or cottages, a bridge, a stream culvert and mortuary chapels. | The listed buildings are of medium importance (mostly on local to regional level). | There are 7 Grade II listed buildings of medium value within the study area. |  | Negligible - there will be no change to the <br> form of any of the identified designated <br> heritage assets. <br> No physical impacts or significant adverse <br> setting impacts on designated heritage assets <br> are anticipated. |
| Survival | The level of survival of the listed buildings is generally good. Aside from some alterations, additions and repairs (internally and externally) which represent multiple phases of development and use, the buildings have largely retained their characteristic elements | The survival of the listed buildings is a matter of local to regional interest. | The survival of the listed buildings is important in understanding the historic developement of the study area. | As a collection, the survival of the listed buildings within the study area is not rare. | Negligible - there will be no change to the <br> survival of any of the identified designated <br> heritage assets. <br> No physical impacts or significant adverse <br> setting impacts on designated heritage assets <br> are anticipated. setting impacts on designated heritage assetsare anticipated are anicipaled. |
| Condition | The listed buildings are generally in a good condition. The majority of buildings are in residential use (aside from the bridge, the culvert and the morturary chapels). | The condition of the listed buildings is a matter of local to regional national interest. | The condition of the listed buildings is important due to their association with the development of their area. | The conditions of the listed buildings are not rare. | Negligible -there will be no change to the <br> condition of any of the identified designated <br> heritage assets. <br> No physical impacts or significant adverse <br> setting impacts on designated heritage assets <br> are anticipated. |
| Complexity | The listed buildings are generally of low to moderate complexity. | The complexity of the listed buildings is a matter of local to regional interest. | The complexity of the listed buildings represents some variety in form and function of post-medieval buildings. | The level of complexity represented by the listed buildings within the study area is not uncommon for the area. | Negligible -there will be no change to the <br> complexity of any of the identified designated <br> heritage assets. <br> No physical impacts or significant adverse <br> setting impacts on designated heritage assets <br> are anticipated. |
| Context | The landscape surrounding the scheme is largely rural, with the larger towns of Longwell Green, Keynsham and Stockwood to the north, east and south, and the City of Bristol to the west (between $1-1.5 \mathrm{~km}$ distances). <br> The context of the listed buildings is semi-rural in character, which has previously been impacted by the addition of the major road network (A4174 and A4) between Bristol and Keynsham. | The context of the listed buildings is largely valued at a local level. <br> The setting of listed buildings is also a material consideration under national policy | The context of the listed buildings within the study area reflects the local and wider regional changes in settlement pattern and development. | The context of the listed buididings is not rare. |  |
| Period | All of the listed buildings are of post-medieval origin. | The period captured by the listed buildings (i.e. post-medieval) is typical within the area and of regional and national interest. | The listed buildings identified stretch across the post-medieval period which is well represented within the wider study area. | Post-medieval listed buildings are not rare within the study area or wider landscape. | Negligible - there will be no significant <br> change to the periods represented by assets <br> within the scheme study area. change to the eeriods represenwithin the scheme study area. |
| Reference Sources |  |  |  |  |  |

Step 5 - Summary Assessment Score
This option is likely to have a Slight Adverse Effect on Cultural Heritage.
Qualitative Comments
The main adverse effects relate to potential temporary setting impacts during the construction of the scheme. Sensitive design and appropriate mitigation such as screening could reduce the overall effect of the scheme to Neutral.

TAG Water Environment Impacts Worksheet - Option A\&B - Orbital Route A4-A37-Blue Route

| Description of study area/ summary of potential impacts | environmental resource | Features | Quality | Scale | Rarity | Substitutability | Importance | Magnitude | Significance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Study area: A4 Whitchurch to A37 Hicks Gate Bristol. <br> Highway Orbital Route A4/A37 - Blue Route |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Potential Impacts: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Charlton Bottom watercourse (tributary of the River Avon) and floodplain | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Conveyance of } \\ & \text { flood flows and } \\ & \text { floodplain } \\ & \text { storage } \end{aligned}$ | The Proposed scheme crosses Surface Water floodplain and could potentially reduce conveyance and storage | Local | At a local levelthe floodplainprovided by thesite is importantin helping toreduce floodingto residential andcommercialproperties.Charlton Bottomand the QueenCharltonwatersourses areboth designatedas Sites ofNatureConservationImportance(SNCI). Theyalso provide asource ofrecreational valueto the area.For the reasonsstated above thesite is considered | At this stage of <br> design assumed <br> to not be possible <br> for this site | Medium | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { Moderate } \\ \text { Adverse } \end{array}$ | Low Significance |
| The scheme appears to cross several small watercourses/ditches and surface water flow paths therefore new culverts or watercourse diversions are likely to be necessary as part of the Scheme. These would need to ensure conveyance of flows is maintained and floodplain storage is not reduced. |  | Conveyance of <br> filod flows and <br> fioodplain <br> storage | The Proposed scheme crosses crosses Surface Water floodplain and could potentially reduce conveyance and storage |  |  | At this stage of design assumed to not be possible for this site | Medium | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Moderate } \\ & \text { Adverse } \end{aligned}$ | Low Significance |
| Increased runoff resulting from increase in impermeable area from the proposed link road. Mitigation will be required to ensure runoff rates are not increased as a result of the scheme, SuDS should be used where appropriate. A Drainage Strategy would be required if this site is taken forward. |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Surface water } \\ \text { runoff } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { The River Avon is currently classified } \\ & \text { by the EA As Moderate' tor ecological } \\ & \text { and Good 'for chemical water quality } \\ & \text { ratings. } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | At this stage of <br> design assumed <br> to not be possible <br> for this site | Medium | Major Adverse | Significant |
| Discharge of pollutants from road runoff; potential impacts on water quality of the watercourse, with potential implications on Water Framework Directive (WFD) status. The Scheme crosses several watercourses/ditches and therefore new culverts or watercourse diversions are likely to be necessary, this also has the potential to impact WFD status. SuDS should be used to ensure pollutants are managed on site, both during construction and operation. A Drainage Strategy would be required if this site is taken forward. |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Water quality / } \\ & \text { WFD } \end{aligned}$ | The River Avon is used for recretional fish and boat navigation. The River Avon is currently classified by the EA as 'Moderate' for ecological and 'Good' for chemical water quality ratings. |  |  | At this stage of design assumed to not be possible for this site | Medium | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { Moderate } \\ \text { Adverse } \end{array}$ | Low Significance |
| Reference Sources |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| https://flood-map-for-planning.service.gov.uk/ <br> http://environment.data.gov.uk/catchment-planning/RiverBasinDistrict/9 <br>  Bing Maps <br> Google Maps |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Summary Assessment Score |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The scheme is considered to have a Significant adverse impact on the water environment (excluding mitigation) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Qualitative Comments |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  <br>  Strategy. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Description of study area/ summary of potential impacts | $\substack{\text { Key } \\ \text { environmental } \\ \text { resource }}$ | Features | Quality | Scale | Rarity | Substitutability | Importance | Magnitude | Significance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Study area: <br> Highway Orbital Route West of A37-Grey Route Whitchurch, South Bristol. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Potential Impacts: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The route length sits within the upper reaches of the Brisington Brook catchment, a tributary of the River Avon. The entire route length is within Flood Zone 1. Aerial mapping and the RoFSW maps indicate that at least 3 Ordinary Watercourses/ditches are crossed by the route. The route is therefore within the $3.3 \%$ AEP event floodplain in a number of locations. The RoFSW flood maps indicate a number of overland flow and Ordinary Watercourse crossings across the route. Dependent on the proposals within these floodplain areas there s a potential for a loss of floodplain storage. Mitigation (such as compensatory floodplain storage areas) measures may be required to nsure that flood risk upstream and downstream is not increased; such mitigation would need to take into account the impacts of climate change. Some form of hydraulic modelling and mitigation testing will be required to assess the potential impacts on the Ordinary Watercourses. | Upper reaches of Brislington Brook watercourse (tributary of the River Avon) and floodplain | Conveyance of fliod flows and flioodplain storage | The Proposed scheme crosses crosses Surface Water Flood Zones and could potentially reduce conveyance and storage | Local | At a local leve the floodplain provided by the in helping to reduce flooding to residential and properties. For the reasons stated above the site is consideredto have a high rarity. | At this stage of <br> design assumed <br> to not be possibe <br> tor tht <br> or tis site | High | Major Adverse | Highly Significant |
| There appear to be at least three watercourse/ditch crossings along the route length, therefore new culverts or watercourse diversions are likely to be required necessary as part of the Scheme. If required these would need to ensure conveyance of flows is maintained and floodplain storage is not reduced. |  | Conveyance of flood flows and filoodplain storage | The Proposed scheme crosses crosses Surface Water Flood Zones and could potentially reduce conveyance and storage |  |  |  <br> At this stage of <br> desigig assumed <br> to no b possibe <br> for this site | High | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { Moderate } \\ \text { Adverse } \end{array}$ | Significant |
| Increased runoff resulting from increase in impermeable area from the new highway, the increase in runoff is likely to be greater than for Option 1 owing to the longer route length. Mitigation will be required to ensure runoff rates are not increased as a result of the scheme, SuDS should be used where appropriate. A Drainage Strategy would be required if this site is taken forward. |  | Surface water runoff | The Brislington Brook is a tributary of the River Avon, which is currently classified by the EA as 'Moderate' for ecological and 'Good' for chemical water quality ratings. |  |  | At this stage of <br> design assumed <br> to not be possible <br> for this site | High | Major Adverse | Significant |
| Discharge of pollutants from road runoff; potential impacts on water quality of the watercourse, with implications on Water Framework Directive status. There appears to be at least three watercourses/ditches along the route length, therefore new culverts or watercourse diversions are likely to be required, and thus a WFD assessment may be needed. SuDS should be used to ensure pollutants are managed on site, both during construction and operation. A Drainage Strategy would be required if this site is taken forward. |  | $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{l} \text { Water quality / } \\ \text { WFD } \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | The Brislington Brook is a tributary of the River Avon is used for recretional fish and boat navigation. The River Avon is currently classified by the EA as 'Moderate' for ecological and 'Good' for chemical water quality ratings. |  |  | At this stage of <br> design assumed <br> to not be possibe <br> for this site | High | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { Moderate } \\ \text { Adverse } \end{array}$ | Significant |

## eference Sources


htppilivnvionn
Bing Maps
Google Maps
Summary Assessment Score
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## Qualitative Comments

Because the scheme has the potential to increase flood risk to residential and commercial properties, and potentially have impacts on water quality, a more detailed assessment would be required, including a Flood Risk Assessment and potentially hydrological and hydraulic modelling. A WFD assessmen is ikely to be required given the requirement tor watercourse crossingsldiversions. Mitigation measures such as SuDS and potentially flood compensatory storage would be required as part of the scheme these would need to be tested as as part of the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy

| Description of study area/ summary of potential impacts | Key <br> environmental <br> resource | Features | Quality | Scale | Rarity | Substitutability | Importance | Magnitude | Significance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Study area: <br> Highway Orbital Route Wst of A37 - Orange Route Whitchurch, South Bristol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Potential Impacts: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The route length sits within the upper reaches of the Brislington Brook catchment, a tributary of the River Avon. The entire route length is within Flood Zone 1. Aerial mapping and the RoFSW maps indicate that at least 3 Ordinary Watercourses/ditches are crossed by the route. The route is therefore within the 3.3\% AEP event floodplain in a number of locations. The RoFSW flood maps indicate a number of overland flow and Ordinary Watercourse crossings across the route. Dependent on the proposals within these floodplain areas there is a potential for a loss of floodplain storage. Mitigation (such as compensatory floodplain storage areas) measures may be required to ensure that flood risk upstream and downstream is not increased; such mitigation would need to take into account the impacts of climate change. Some form of hydraulic modelling and |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Conveyance of } \\ & \text { flood flows and } \\ & \text { floodplain } \\ & \text { storage } \end{aligned}$ | The Proposed scheme crosses crosses Surface Water Flood Zones and could potentially reduce conveyance and storage | Local | At a local level <br> the floopdlain <br> provided by the <br> site <br> sit is inportant <br> in helping to <br> reduce flooding <br> to residential and <br> lommercial <br> properties. | At this stage of design assumed to not be possible for this site | High | Major Adverse | Highly Significant |
| There appear to be at least three watercourse/ditch crossings along the route length, therefore new culverts or watercourse diversions are likely to be required necessary as part of the Scheme. If required these would need to ensure conveyance of flows is maintained and floodplain storage is not reduced. | Upper reaches of Brislington Brook | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Conveyance of } \\ & \text { flood flows and } \\ & \text { floodplain } \\ & \text { storage } \end{aligned}$ | The Proposed scheme crosses crosses Surface Water Flood Zones and could potentially reduce conveyance and storage |  | stated above the site is considered to have a high rarity. | At this stage of design assumed to not be possible for this site | High | Moderate Adverse | Significant |
| Increased runoff resulting from increase in impermeable area from the new highway. Mitigation will be required to ensure runoff rates are not increased as a result of the scheme, SuDS should be used where appropriate. A Drainage Strategy would be required if this site is taken forward. | watercourse <br> (tributary of the River Avon) and floodplain | Surface water runoff | The Brislington Brook is a tributary of the River Avon, which is currently classified by the EA as 'Moderate' for ecological and 'Good' for chemical water quality ratings. |  |  | At this stage of design assumed to not be possible for this site | High | Major Adverse | Significant |
| Discharge of pollutants from road runoff; potential impacts on water quality of the watercourse, with implications on Water Framework Directive status. There appears to be at least three watercourses/ditiches along the route length, therefore new culverts or watercourse diversions are likely to be required, and thus a WFD assessment may be needed. SuDS should be used to ensure pollutants are managed on site, both during construction and operation. A Drainage Strategy would be required if this site is taken forward. |  | Water quality / <br> WFD | The Brislington Brook is a tributary of the River Avon is used for recretional fish and boat navigation. The River Avon is currently classified by the EA as 'Moderate' for ecological and Good' for chemical water quality ratings. |  |  | At this stage of <br> design assumed <br> to not be <br> possible for this <br> site | High | Moderate Adverse | Significant |

## Reference Sources

## https://flood-map-for-planning.service.gov.uk/ <br> thp:/envirolda.a.av.uk catchment-planning/RiverBasinDistrict/9

Bing Maps
Google Maps
Summary Assessment Score
The scheme is considered to have a Highly Significant adverse impact on the water environment (excluding mitigation)

## Qualitative Comments

Because the scheme has the potential to increase flood risk to residential and commercial properties, and potentially have impacts on water quality, a more detailed assessment would be required, including a Flood Risk Assessment and potentially hydrological and hydraulic modelling. A WF assessment is likely to be required given the requirement for watercourse crossings/diversions. Mitigation measures such as SuDS and potentially flood compensatory storage would be required as part of the scheme - these would need to be tested as part of the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy.

| Description of study area/ summary of potential impacts | $\begin{gathered} \text { Key } \\ \text { environmental } \\ \text { resource } \end{gathered}$ | Features | Quality | Scale | Rarity | Substitutability | Importance | Magnitude | Significance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Study area: <br> Hicks Gate Junction Improvement - Brown Route |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Potential Impacts: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A small proportion of the embankment works on the north-west side of the existing roundabout falls within Flood Zone 2 and 3, and the scheme crosses the Scotland Bottom watercourse (extension of an existing crossing). The majority of the site however is in Flood Zone 1. The RoFSW flood maps indicate limited overland flow routes across the site. The proposals within these floodplain areas will lead to a potential loss of floodplain storage. Mitigation (such as compensatory floodplain storage areas) may be required to ensure that flood risk upstream and downstream is not increased; such mitigation would need to take into account the impacts of climate change. Works are located in Flood Zone 2 and 3 and require an extension of an existing culvert, thus hydrological and hydraulic modelling and mitigation testing will be required. Other nearby watercourses include the Brislington Brook ( 2.6 km North), the River Avon ( 4 km North East) and the River Chew (approximately 3.1 km South). | Scotland Bottom watercourse <br> (tributary of the <br> River Avon) and floodplain | Conveyance of flood flows and floodplain storage | The Proposed scheme crosses Flood Zones 2 and 3 , and surface water floodplains, and could potentially reduce conveyance and storage | Local | At a local level the floodplain provided by the site is importan in helping to reduce flooding to residential and commercia For the reasons stated above the site is considere to have a high rarity. | At this stage of <br> design assumed <br> to not be <br> possible for this <br> site | High | Major Adverse | Highly Significant |
| The Scotland Bottom watercourse is crossed by the scheme and will therefore require a culvert extension or watercourse diversion. This would need to ensure conveyance of flows is maintained and floodplain storage is not reduced. |  | Conveyance of flood flows and floodplain storage | The Proposed scheme crosses Flood Zones 2 and 3 , and surface water floodplains, and could potentially reduce conveyance and storage |  |  | At this stage of design assumed to not be possible for this site | High | Major Adverse | Highly Significant |
| Increased runoff resulting from increase in impermeable area from the new road embankment. Mitigation will be required to ensure runoff rates are not increased as a result of the scheme, SuDS should be used where appropriate. A Drainage Strategy would be required if this site is taken forward. |  | Surface water runoff | The River Avon is currently classified by the EA as 'Moderate' for ecological and 'Good' for chemical water quality ratings. |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { Site } \\ \text { At this stage of } \\ \text { design assumed } \\ \text { to not be } \\ \text { possible for this } \\ \text { site } \end{array}$ | High | Moderate Adverse | Significant |
| Discharge of pollutants from road runoff; potential impacts on water quality of the watercourse, with potential implications on Water Framework Directive status. There is a watercourse crossing required, therefore a culvert extension or watercourse diversion is likely to be necessary. A WFD assessment is likely to be needed. SuDS should be used to ensure pollutants are managed on site, both during construction and operation. A Drainage Strategy would be required if this site is taken forward. |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Water quality / } \\ & \text { WFD } \end{aligned}$ | The River Avon is used for recreational fish and boat navigation. The River Avon is currently classified by the EA as 'Moderate' for ecological and 'Good' for chemical water quality ratings. |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { At this stage of } \\ & \text { design assumed } \\ & \text { to not be } \\ & \text { possible for this } \\ & \text { site } \end{aligned}$ | High | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Moderate } \\ & \text { Adverse } \end{aligned}$ | Significant |

## Reference Sources

```
htts:///lood-map-For-plannin.Service.gov.uk
htp://environment.data.gov.uk.ukcatchment-planning/RiverBasinDistrict/9
```

Bing Maps
Google Maps

Summary Assessment Score
The scheme is considered to have a Highly Significant adverse impact on the water environment (excluding mitigation)
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## Appendix 7.1 Whitchurch P\&R concept plans






## Appendix 7.2 Environmental Assessment worksheets: A37 schemes

## Contents

This workbook provides WebTAG worksheets, and proformas consistent with WebTAG principles for the following scheme options:
Enhanced bus service on the A37 Option J. No assessments undertaken as scheme involves no infrastructure change.
Whitchurch P\&R
Site 4 (Option K1)
Whitchurch P\&R
Site 5 (Option K2)

Scheme option worksheets are grouped by environmental impact:
Section $1 \quad$ Noise (NO)
Section 2
Section 3
Section 4
Section 5
Section 6
Air Quality (AQ)
Landscape (LA)
Townscape (TO)
Historic Environment (HE)
Biodiversity (BI)
Water Environment (WE)

| Option | - How many households will be affected by the scheme? <br> - Could the scheme lead to a change in traffic flow $\mathbf{> 2 5 \%}$ or change in average speeds $\mathbf{> 1 0 k p h}$ ? | Assessment |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Option K1 (Site 4) | There are no noise important areas within 200 m of the proposed park and ride, although there are 10 noise important areas located on roads anticipated to experience a decrease in road traffic flow volume due to model shifts induced by the scheme. <br> There $\sim 76$ noise sensitive receptors within 200 m of the proposed site, and could be exposed to an increase in noise directly from the scheme. Additionally, noise from the park and ride itself would likely be sufficiently different in nature to be notable at the very nearest NSRs. <br> There are just over 23800 noise sensitive receptors located within 200 m of roads that may be expected to experience a decrease in road traffic volume due to modal shifts induced by the scheme, including just over 1250 which are located within designated noise important areas, although it is anticipated that these changes in road traffic volume are likely to result in a negligible change in road traffic noise experienced at the majority of these noise sensitive receptors. | Likely Neutral |
| Option K2 (Site 5) | There is 1 noise important area within 200 m of the proposed park and ride, and a further 9 noise important areas are located on roads anticipated to experience a decrease in road traffic flow volume due to model shifts induced by the scheme. <br> There are $\sim 186$ noise sensitive receptors within 200 m of the proposed site, and could be exposed to an increase in noise directly from the scheme, including 15 which are located within designated noise important areas. Additionally, noise from the park and ride itself would likely be sufficiently different in nature to be notable at the very nearest NSRs. <br> There are just over 23800 noise sensitive receptors located within 200 m of roads that may be expected to experience a decrease in road traffic volume due to modal shifts induced by the scheme, including just over 1250 which are located within designated noise important areas, although it is anticipated that these changes in road traffic volume are likely to result in a negligible change in road traffic noise experienced at the majority of these noise sensitive receptors. | Likely Neutral |


| Option | Summary of Key Impacts | Assessment (see key) |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Option K1 <br> (Site 4) | There are no AQMAs or designated ecological sites within 200 m of the option. There are approximately <br> 75 sensitive properties within 200 m of the site which could be affected by a deterioration in air quality <br> arising from additional traffic emissions. <br> The anticipated reduction of traffic on the roads within 1 km of the A37 bus route which would serve the <br> P\&R could positively affect up to 23,800 sensitive properties. Overall, there may be neutral impact on <br> NO2 and PM10 depending on the magnitude of changes in traffic flow. | 5 |
| Option K2 <br> (Site 5) | No AQMAs or designated ecological sites within 200 m of the option. There are approximately 185 <br> sensitive properties within 200 m which could be affected which could be affected by a deterioration in <br> air quality arising from additional traffic emissions. <br> The anticipated reduction of traffic induced on the roads within 1 km of the A37 bus route which would <br> serve the P\&R could positively affect up to 23,800 sensitive properties. Overall, there may be neutral <br> impact on NO2 and PM10 depending on the magnitude of changes in traffic flow. |  |


|  | PCM links and/or AQMA/designated sites with increases and overall likely negative outcome |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | PCM links and/or AQMA/designated sites with increases and overall likely neutral outcome OR overall likely negative outcome |
|  | PCM links and/or <br> AQMA/designated sites or > 100 properties with deterioration but overall likely neutral/ positive outcome |
|  | No PCM, AQMA or designated sites with increases, >100 properties with deterioration but overall likely neutra//beneficial outcome |
|  | No PCM, AQMA or designated sites or <100 properties with increases, and overall likely |


|  | Step 2 | Step 3 |  |  |  | Step 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Features | Description | Scale it matters | Rarity | Importance | Substitutability | mpact |
| Paterm | A rolling open landscape with medium scale irregular shaped pastoral fields, bounded by hedgerows \& trees. Low ridge to the S \& forms the backbone to the landscape with slopes down to the Avon Valley and Stockwood Vale | Local - features are valued at the local level. | Paterer of landscape common at a local level. | Medium at the local level - the pattern of the landscape is commonplace but also a key component of the character of this landscape type. | Opportunity for substitution, with consideration of design \& allowance of mitigation for any loss of features and disturbance of pattern. |  |
| Tranquilily |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Local - tranquility is valued at } \\ \text { the local level. } \end{array}$ | Rare at a local level due to busy transport coridors \& urban centres. | High at the local level - valued due way from urban centres $\&$ busy transport corridors. transport corridors. | Limited opportunity for substitution, but consideration of design \& mitigation features could did perception of greater tranquilility. |  adverse. |
| Cultural | The main settlements of Stockwood \& Whitchurch to the 1 <br>  HorseW orld is within the study area on the edge of Whitchurch/Stockwood. <br> There are designated historical features within 1 km , including 1 SM (Maes Knoll Camp) located 1 km SW of the scheme. Local. re <br> the area, with 3 PRow's passing within 500 m of the scheme \& National Cycle Route 3 passing adiacent to the E of the scheme along the A37 then Sleep Lane \& Three Peaks Walk km sW . Ciurecreatonal facilites such as Whitchurch Cricket Club \& Whitehall Garden Centre are within 500 \& \& Bristol Barbarans Rugby Clua adjoining the southern edge of the scheme. | Settlements \& transport corridors valued at regional level. <br> SM valued at national level. Recreational routes valued at regional \& local level. | Modern settlements \& transport corridors not rare at all levels. <br> SM rare at local \& national level. <br> Regional recreational routes not rare at local or regional level. PRoWs common at all levels. | Medium importance of settlements \& designated features at all levels. <br> Medium importance of recreational routes. | SM not substitutable. <br> Limited opportunity for substitution of features associated with modern settlements \& recreational routes. | Due to the relatively localised extent of the scheme, impacts on cultural features will be limited. <br> armsellements, isolated properties, farmsteads and associated recreational facilities directly adjacent, particularly the Rugby Club in which the scheme adjoins \& properties along A37 will experience visual impact. Recreational routes within 500 m may experience some minor degradation in visual quality. <br> There is some visual connectivity with other <br>  \& impacts on its setting are likely to due to the proximity to the scheme. <br> The impact on cultural features is judged to be neutral-slight adverse. |
| Landover | Outside the urban areas, landcover comprises medium scale, irregular shaped fields of mainly pastoral farmland. Fields are bounded by clipped or overgrown hedgerows. The LCA is largely unwooded with some tree belts to field boundaries. | Local - landcover is valued at the local level. | Pastoral fields, hedgerows, woodland zatinear tree betts common at all levels. | Features \& elements such as fields, trees \& hedgerows, of medium - high importance within the local landscape. | Opportunity for substitution with incorporation of mitigation planting. | The proposed scheme would result in a loss of <br> pastoral agricultural land, including loss of trees <br> \& hedgerows. <br> When judged on the scale of the scheme and <br> quantity of features effected the impact on <br> landcover is judged to be slight adverse. |
| Summary of <br> character | Landscape in this area is designated as Greenbelt by Bistol City Council, BRNES Council \& South Gioucestershire Council. <br> A medium scale landscape influenced by busy transport corridors, adjacent urban areas \& outlying farms \& small settlements. <br> The rural character is of medium scale, with mainly pastoral fields bounded by hedgerows and trees of varying quality. Tree \& hedges provide screening to settlements \& transport routes which help to contain the urban edge influence allowing tranauil pockets 10 areas separating the settlements. | Some features valued at national level. Landscape elements valued at mainly local level. | Some features, e.g. designated sites are evel. <br> Many landscape features are commonplace at all levels. | Designated sites are of high importance at national, regional \& local level. <br> Many landscape elements are of medium importance at the local level. | Designated sites are not substitutable at any level. <br> Some opportunity for substitution <br> of features associated with <br>  <br> Some opportunity for substitution <br> of landscape elements, e.g. trees, linear woodland \& grassland, \& re creation of appropriate landforms. |  |

[^12]|  | Step 2 | Step 3 |  |  |  | Step 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Features | Description | Scale it matters | Rarity | Importance | Substitutability | Impact |
| Pattern | A rolling open landscape with medium scale irregular shaped pastoral fields, bounded by hedgerows \& trees. Low ridge to the S \& E forms the backbone to the landscape with slopes down to the Avon Valley and Stockwood Vale. | Local - features are valued at the local level. | Patern of landscape common at a | Medium at the local level - the pattern of the landscape is commonplace but also a key component of the character of this landscape type. tanascape lype. | Opportunity for substitution, with consideration of design \& allowance of mitigation for any loss of features and disturbance of pattern. |  |
| Tranquillity |  | Local - tranquility is valued at the local level. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Rare at a local level due to busy } \\ & \text { transport corridors \& urban centres. } \end{aligned}$ | High at the local level - valued due to the diminishing rural landscape away from urban centres \& busy transport corridors | design \& mitigation features could aid percention coound aid perception of greater tranquility. |  |
| Cultural | The main settlements of Stockwood \& Whitchurch to the N \& W respectively, dominate the area, with more isolated farms \& clusters of dwellings interspersed between them. Properties to the southern edge of Whitchurch adjoin the site to the N. <br> HorseW orld is within the study area on the edge of Whitchurch/Stockwood. <br> There are designated historical features within 1 km , including 1 SM (Maes Knoll Camp) located 1 km SW of the scheme. <br> Local, regional \& national recreational routes are also in the area, with 3 PRoW's passing within 500 m of the scheme \& National Cycle Route 3 passing close to the SE of the scheme along the A37 then Sleep Lane \& Three Peaks Walk 1 km SW. <br> Other recreational facilities such as Whitchurch Cricket Club, Bristol Barbarians Rugby Club \& Whitehall Garden Centre are within 500 m of the scheme. | Settlements \& transport corridors valued at regional level. <br> SM valued at national level. Recreational routes valued at regional \& local level. | Modern settlements \& transport corridors not rare at all levels. <br> SM rare at local \& national level. <br> Regional recreational routes not rare at local or regional level. PRoWs common at all levels. | Medium importance of settlements \& designated features at all levels. <br> Medium importance of recreationa routes. | SM not substitutable. <br> Limited opportunity for substitution of features associated with modern settlements \& recreational routes | Due to the relatively localised extent of the scheme impacts on cullural features will be limited. <br> Main settlements, isolated properties, farmsteads and associated recreational facilities are within 1 km of the scheme, some of which directly adjacent, particularly properties to the southern edge of Whitchurch in which the scheme adjoins \& properties along A37 will experience visual impact. experience some minor doan may quality. <br> There is some visual connectivity with or cultural features such as Maes Knoll Camp SM \& impacts on its setting are likely to be minor due to the proximity to the scheme. <br> The impact on cultural features is judged to be neutral-slight adverse neutral-slight adverse |
| Landover | Outside the urban areas, landcover comprises medium scale, irregular shaped fields of mainly pastoral farmland. Fields are bounded by clipped or overgown hedgerows. Fields are bounded by clipped or vergrown hedgerows. The LCA is largely unwooded with some tree belts to field boundaries. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Local - landoover is valued at } \\ & \text { the local level. } \end{aligned}$ | Pastoral fields, hedgerows, woodlanda <br> liverears. tree betts common at all$\|$ | Features \& elements such as fields, trees \& hedgerows, of medium - high importance within the local landscape. | Opportunity for substitution with incorporation of mitigation planting. | The proposed scheme would result in a loss of <br> pastora agricultural land, including loss of trees <br> \& hedgenows. <br> When judged on the scale of the scheme and <br> quannity of features effected, the impact on <br> landcover is judged to be slight adverse. |
| Summary of character | Landscape in this area is designated as Greenbelt by Bristol City Council, B\&NES Council \& South Gloucestershire Council. <br> A medium scale landscape influenced by busy transport corridors, adjacent urban areas \& outlying farms \& small settlements. <br> The rural character is of medium scale, with mainly pastoral fields bounded by hedgerows and trees of varying quality. Tree \& he wges provide screein the urban edge influence, allowing tranquil pockets to remain in the rural areas separating the settlements. | Some features valued at national level. Landscape elem mainly local level. | Some features, eg designated sites, are rare at national, regional \& local level. <br> Many landscape features are commonplace at all levels. | Designated sites are of high importance at national, regional \& local level. <br> Many landscape elements are of level. |  |  |
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TAG Townscape Impacts Worksheet - Option K1 - Whitchurch P\&R (Site 4)

|  | Step 2 | Step 3 |  |  |  |  | Step 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Features | Description | Scale it matters | Rarity | Importance | Substitutability | Changes in Withoutscheme case | Impact |
| Layout | The townscape within the study area is characterised as being suburban located on edge of Bristol city bordering the rural context. The area is influenced by the busy A37 corridor with minor roads connecting surrounding settlements. The area is dominated by residential use with some retail, industry \& commercial areas towards Hengrove. Settlements include Stockwood \& Whitchurch to the $N$ \& W respectively interspersed with isolated properties \& farmsteads. | Local | Common at the local level | Low at the local level | Some opportunity for substitution | Medium potential for change to layout, e.g. introduction of new housing developments \& other urban elements such as retail/industrial units. | It is not anticipated that there would be any notable impacts on the layout as a result of the scheme due to its proximity from townscape features, therefore the affect is judged to be neutral. |
| Density and mix | Density is of low - medium scale within a suburban \& rural edge context comprising mainly residential housing linked with road networks intermixed with some retail, industry and commercial use. | Local | Common at the local level | Medium at the local level | Some opportunity for substitution | Medium potential for change e.g. in areas of regeneration, browntield sites \& urban fringe areas \& alteration to mix of urban elements. | Density \& mix will increase slightly with the introduction of a new visually intrusive urban element to the edge of Whitchurch. <br> It is anticipated that there would be visual disturbance on properties SE of Whitchurch, therefore the affect is judged to be slight adverse. |
| Scale | Buitt elements are mainly of a domestic scale, generally 1 3 storey including residential properties with some areas retail \& industry use . | Local | Common at the local level | Low at the local level | Some opportunity for substitution | Medium potential for change to built environment. | It is not anticipated that there would be any notable impacts on the scale as a result of the scheme due to its proximity from townscape features, therefore the affect is judged to be neutral. |
| Appearance | The housing is a mixture of ages with modern, private, commercial offices \& retail buildings. Some features/buildings retain historical associations which add to the local distinctiveness of the area. | Local | Common at the local level | Medium at a local level | Some opportunity for substitution | Medium potential for change to built environment. | It is not anticipated that there would be any notable impacts on the appearance of the townscape as a result of the scheme due to its proximity from townscape features, therefore the affect is judged to be neutral. |
| Human interaction | The primary human interaction is focused around domestic use such as schools, shops, pubs, churches, community facilities etc. with some retail \& commercial use. | Local | Common at the local level | Low at the local level | Some opportunity for substitution | Medium potential for change as a result of land use, density \& mix \& layout. | It is not anticipated that there would be any notable impacts on human interaction as a result of the scheme due to its proximity from townscape features, therefore the affect is judged to be neutral. |
| Cultural | There is a mix of council housing \& post war development with some more modern features interspersed with areas of historical interest including Listed Buildings \& traditional houses within Whitchurch village N of the scheme. HorseWorld is within the study area on the edge of Whitchurch/Stockwood. <br> There are designated historical features within 1 km , including 1 SM (Maes Knoll Camp) located 1km SW of the scheme. <br> Other recreational facilities such as Whitchurch Cricket Club \& Whitehall Garden Centre are within 500 m \& Bristol Barbarians Rugby Club adjoining the southern edge of the scheme. | Settlements \& transport corridors valued at regional level. <br> SM's \& Listed Buildings valued at national level. | Rare at local level | Medium at local level <br> Medium at Regional <br> \& National level | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Limited opportunity } \\ & \text { for substitution } \end{aligned}$ | Low potential for change due to limited opportunity for substitution. | It is anticipated that there would be visual disturbance on the setting of some cultural features to the edge of Whitchurch as a result of the introduction of a new visually intrusive urban element SE of Whitchurch, therefore the affect is judged to be neutral - slight adverse. |
| Land use | Land use is primarily domestic including residential \& recreational with some retail, industry \& commercial use. | Local | Common at the local level | Low at the local level | Some opportunity for substitution | Medium potential for change to land use. | It is not anticipated that there would be any notable impacts on land use as a result of the scheme due to its proximity from townscape features, therefore the affect is judged to be neutral. |
| Summary of character | The study area is characterised as a suburban townscape on the edge of Bristol transitioning to rural landscape with primarily residential settlements with some historic \& cultural associations. These are connected with the busy A37 corridor \& network of rural lanes linking smaller settlements \& farmsteads. | Some features valued at national level. <br> Many townscape elements valued at local level. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Some features, e.g. } \\ & \text { designated cultural } \\ & \text { sites, are rare at } \\ & \text { national, regional \& } \\ & \text { local level. } \\ & \text { Many townscape } \\ & \text { features are } \\ & \text { commonplace at all } \\ & \text { levels. } \end{aligned}$ | Low to medium at local, regional \& national level. | Some opportunity for substitution | Low-medium potential for change as a result of other influences. | Mitigation for this scheme would consist of careful design of layout \& implementation of planting to screen the site from nearby urban elements. It is not anticipated that there would be many notable impacts on this townscape as a result of the scheme due to its distance from urban areas. However, there may be adverse impacts on density \& mix \& on the settings of cultural features close to the scheme. <br> Impacts are judged to be neutral - slight adverse. |

## Reference Sources
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&NES Landscape Character Assessment
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\
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```

Step 5 - Summary Assessment Score
Neutral - slight adverse

## Qualitative Comment

A 1km offset from the scheme boundary has been prescribed for the study area within this townscape area of which baseline assessment only has been conducted due to the early stages of this design \& optioneering stage. It is considered that significant effects are unlikely beyond this.
$\qquad$ impacts of the scheme as a result of its physical presence in the townscape

TAG Townscape Impacts Worksheet - Option K2 - Whitchurch P\&R (Site 5)

|  | Step 2 | Step 3 |  |  |  |  | Step 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Features | Description | Scale it matters | Rarity | Importance | Substitutability | Changes in Withoutscheme case | Impact |
| Layout | The townscape within the study area is characterised as being suburban located on edge of Bristol city bordering the rural context. The area is influenced by the busy A37 corridor with minor roads connecting surrounding settlements. The area is dominated by residential use with some retail, industry \& commercial areas towards Hengrove. Settlements include Stockwood \& Whitchurch to the N \& W respectively interspersed with isolated properties \& farmsteads. | Local | Common at the local level | Low at the local level | Some opportunity for substitution | Medium potential for change to layout, e.g. introduction of new housing developments \& other urban elements such as retail/industrial units. | It is not anticipated that there would be any notable impacts on the layout as a result of the scheme due to its distance from townscape features, therefore the impact is judged to be neutral. |
| Density and mix | Density is of low - medium scale within a suburban \& rural edge context comprising mainly residential housing linked with road networks intermixed with some retail, industry and commercial use. | Local | Common at the local level | Medium at the local level | Some opportunity for substitution | Medium potential for change e.g. in areas of regeneration, brownfield sites \& urban fringe areas \& alteration to mix of urban elements. | Density \& mix will lincrease slightly with the introduction of a new visually intrusive urban element to the edge of Whitchurch. <br> It is anticipated that there would be visual disturbance on properties SE of Whitchurch, therefore the impact is judged to be slight adverse. |
| Scale | Built elements are mainly of a domestic scale, generally 1 3 storey including residential properties with some areas retail \& industry use | Local | Common at the local level | Low at the local level | Some opportunity for substitution | Medium potential for change to built environment. | It is not anticipated that there would be any notable impacts on the scale as a result of the scheme impacts on the scale as a result of the schem, due to its distance from townscape features, therefore the impact is judged to be neutral. |
| Appearance | The housing is a mixture of ages with modern, private, commercial offices \& retail buildings. Some features/buildings retain historical associations which add to the local distinctiveness of the area. | Local | Common at the local level | Medium at a local level | Some opportunity for substitution | Medium potential for change to built environment. | It is not anticipated that there would be any notable impacts on the appearance of the townscape as a result of the scheme due to its distance from townscape features, therefore the impact is judged to be neutral. |
| Human interaction | The primary human interaction is focused around domestic use such as schools, shops, pubs, churches, community facilities etc. with some retail \& commercial use. | Local | Common at the local level | Low at the local level | Some opportunity for substitution | Medium potential for change as a result of land use, density \& mix \& layout. | It is not anticipated that there would be any notable impacts on human interaction as a result of the scheme due to its distance from townscape features, therefore the impact is judged to be neutral. |
| Cultural | There is a mix of council housing \& post war development with some more modern features interspersed with areas of historical interest including Listed Buildings \& traditional houses within Whitchurch village $N$ of the scheme. HorseWorld is within the study area on the edge of Whitchurch/Stockwood. <br> There are designated historical features within 1 km , including 1 SM (Maes Knoll Camp) located 1km SW of the scheme. <br> Other recreational facilities such as Whitchurch Cricket Club, Bristol Barbarians Rugby Club \& Whitehall Garden Centre are within 500 m of the scheme. | Settlements \& transport corridors valued at regional level. <br> SM's \& Listed Buildings valued at national level. | Rare at local level | Medium at local level <br> Medium at Regional \& National level | Limited opportunity for substitution | Low potential for change due to limited opportunity for substitution. | It is anticipated that there would be visual disturbance on the setting of some cultural features to the edge of Whitchurch as a result of the introduction of a new visually intrusive urban element SE of Whitchurch, therefore the impact is judged to be neutral - slight adverse. |
| Land use | Land use is primarily domestic including residential \& recreational with some retail, industry \& commercial use. | Local | Common at the local level | Low at the local level | Some opportunity for substitution | Medium potential for change to land use. | It is not anticipated that there would be any notable impacts on land use as a result of the scheme due to its distance from townscape features, therefore the impact is judged to be neutral. |
| Summary of character | The study area is characterised as a suburban townscape on the edge of Bristol transitioning to rural landscape with primarily residential settlements with some historic \& cultural associations. These are connected with the busy A37 corridor \& network of rural lanes linking smaller settlements \& farmsteads. | Some features valued at national level. Many townscape elements valued at local level. | Some features, e.g. designated cultural sites, are rare at national, regional \& local level. Many townscape features are commonplace at all levels. | Low to medium at local, regional \& national level. | Some opportunity for substitution | Low-medium potential for change as a result of other influences. | Mitigation for this scheme would consist of careful design of layout \& implementation of planting to screen the site from nearby urban elements. It is not anticipated that there would be many notable impacts on this townscape as a result of the scheme due to its distance from urban areas. However, there may be adverse impacts on density \& mix \& on the settings of cultural features close to the scheme. <br> Impacts are judged to be neutral - slight adverse. |

Reference Sources
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Step 5-Summary Assessment Score
Neutral - slight adverse

## Quative Commen

A 1km offset from the scheme boundary has been prescribed for the study area within this townscape area of which baseline assessment only has been conducted due to the early stages of this design \& optioneering stage. It is considered that significant effects are unlikely beyond this.
and ans considers the impacts as at year one of opening. This approach has been undertaken due to the absence of a formal mitigation strategy and to enable the comparison of the mpacts of the scheme as a result of its physical presence in the townscape.

TAG Biodiversity Impacts Worksheet - Option K1 - Whitchurch P\&R (Site 4)

| Step 2 |  | Step 3 |  |  |  | Step 4 | Step 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area | Description of feature/ attribute | Scale (at which attribute matters) | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Importance (of } \\ & \text { attribute) } \end{aligned}$ | Trend (in relation to target) | Biodiversity and earth heritage value | Magnitude of impact | Assessment Score |
| Sturminster Road SNCI (approximately 110 m north) | Woodland, scrub, tall ruderal vegetation, grassland \& stream, with associated marginal vegetation | Regional | Medium- site designated at local level for nature conservation | N/A | Medium- site designated at local level for nature conservation | Neutral | Neutral |
| Stockwood Open Space LNR SNCI (approximately 200m north) | Mature grassland and unploughed meadows on lime-rich clay soils. | Regional | Medium- site designated at local level for nature conservation | N/A | Medium- site designated at local level for nature conservation | Neutral | Neutral |
| Charlton Bottom and Queen Charlton watercourse SNCI (approximately 400 m north west) | Running water (streams), with associated marginal habitats, semi-natural broadleaved woodland and scrub. | Regional | Medium- site designated at local level for nature conservation | N/A | Medium- site designated at local level for nature conservation | Neutral | Neutral |
| Mells Valley SAC (approximately 9.8km south east). | Sites known for Greater horseshoe bat populations, cave networks. | International | Very highinternationally designated site | N/A | Very highinternationally designated site | Neutral | Neutral |
| Bath and Bradford on Avon Bats SAC (approximately 14km east). | Sites known for Greater horseshoe, Lesser horseshoe and Bechstein's bat roost populations | International | Very highinternationally designated site | N/A | Very highinternationally designated site | Neutral | Neutral |
| Wye Valley and forest of Dean Bat Sites SAC (29km south east). | Sites known for lesser horseshoe and greater horseshoe bat populations | International | Very highinternationally designated site | N/A | Very highinternationally designated site | Neutral | Neutral |
| North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC (approximately 11 km south west) | Sites known for Lesser horseshoe and greater horseshoe bat populations | International | Very highinternationally designated site | N/A | Very highinternationally designated site | Neutral | Neutral |

Habitats present that could be lost include arable farmland, hedgerow, grassland, scrub habitats and ponds could result in loss of areas potentially suitable for associated protected species.

## Reference Sources

Magic Maps - http://www.magic.gov.uk/MagicMap.aspx,
http://map.n-somerset.gov.uk/southglos.html
https://isharemaps.bathnes.gov.uk/atmycouncil. aspx

## Summary Assessment Score

Neutral

Qualitative Comments

As a result of this assessment, a neutral assessment score was given to this Scheme as all features assessed were found to have neutral assessment scores.

TAG Biodiversity Impacts Worksheet - Option K2 - Whitchurch P\&R (Site 5)

| Step 2 |  | Step 3 |  |  |  | Step 4 | Step 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area | Description of feature/ attribute | Scale (at which attribute matters) | Importance (of attribute) | Trend (in relation to target) | Biodiversity and earth heritage value | Magnitude of impact | Assessment Score |
| Sturminster Road SNCI (approximately 120m north) | Woodland, scrub, tall ruderal vegetation, grassland \& stream, with associated marginal vegetation | Regional | Medium- site designated at local level for nature conservation | N/A | Medium- site designated at local level for nature conservation | Neutral | Neutral |
| Stockwood Open Space LNR SNCI (approximately 210m north) | Old grassland and unploughed meadows on lime-rich clay soils. | Regional | Medium- site designated at local level for nature conservation | N/A | Medium- site designated at local level for nature conservation | Neutral | Neutral |
| Charlton Bottom and Queen Charlton Watercourse SNCI (approximately) | Running water (streams), with associated marginal habitats, semi-natural broadleaved woodland and scrub. | Regional | Medium- site designated at local level for nature conservation | N/A | Medium- site designated at local level for nature conservation | Neutral | Neutral |
| Mells Valley SAC (approximately 9.8km south east) | Sites known for Greater horseshoe bat populations, cave networks. | International | Very highinternationally designated site | N/A | Very highinternationally designated site | Neutral | Neutral |
| Bath and Bradford on Avon Bats SAC (approximately 14 km east) | Sites known for Greater horseshoe, Lesser horseshoe and Bechstein's bat roost populations | International | Very highinternationally designated site | N/A | Very highinternationally designated site | Neutral | Neutral |
| Wye Valley and Forest of Dean Bat Sites SAC (approximately 29 km south east) | Sites known for Lesser horseshoe and Greater horseshoe bat populations | International | Very highinternationally designated site | N/A | Very highinternationally designated site | Neutral | Neutral |
| North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC (approximately 11 km south west) | Sites known for Lesser horseshoe and Greater horseshoe bat populations | International | Very highinternationally designated site | N/A | Very highinternationally designated site | Neutral | Neutral |

Habitats present that could be lost include arable farmland, hedgerow, grassland, scrub habitats and ponds could result in loss of areas potentially suitable for associated protected species.

Reference Sources
Magic Maps - http://www.magic.gov.uk/MagicMap.aspx,
http://map.n-somerset.gov.uk/southglos.html
https:///isharemaps.bathnes.gov.uk/atmycouncil.aspx
Summary Assessment Score

Qualitative Comments
As a result of this assessment, a neutral assessment score was given to this Scheme as all features assessed were found to have neutral assessment scores

TAG Historic Environment Impacts Worksheet - Option K1 - Whitchurch P\&R (Site 4)

| Step 2 |  | Step 3 |  |  | Step 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Feature | Description | Scale it matters | Significance | Rarity | Impact |
| Form | There are 6 listed buildings within an approximate 500 m study area surrounding the proposed scheme (1 Grade II* and 5 Grade III [ $1365675,1129498,1129499,1136454,1136442,1365674]$. The Grade II* building [Church of St Nicholas 1136442] is located just within the northern extent of the study area at the junction of Bristol Road and Church Road. <br> With the exception of a listed milestone which is located to the east of the scheme on Queen Charlotte Lane, the remaining buildings are located to the north of the scheme within Whitchurch. <br> The buildings consist of various forms including a 17th century and an 18th century manor farmhouse, unidentified monuments within a churchyard, an 18th century house with gatepiers, a church of possible early-medieval origin and a milestone. | The Grade II* listed buildings are of high importance, while the Grade II buildings are of medium importance. | buildings of medium value, and one Grade II* listed building of high value within the study area | The form of the listed buildings is not rare locally or regionally, however, the Grade II* church is a good example of a potential earlymedieval (12th century) church and is not common in both a local and regional context. | Negligible - there will be no change to the form of any of the identified designated heritage assets. <br> No physical impacts or significant adverse setting impacts on designated heritage assets are anticipated. |
| Survival | The level of survival of the listed buildings is generally good. Aside from some alterations, additions and repairs (internally and externally) which represent multiple phases of development and use, the buildings have mainly retained their characteristic elements. | The survival of the listed buildings is a matter of regional to national interest. | The survival of the listed buildings is important in understanding the historic development of the study area. | The survival of the listed buildings is not rare, while good survival of post-Norman conquest churches is not common. | Negligible - there will be no change to the survival of any of the identified designated heritage assets. <br> No physical impacts or significant adverse setting impacts on designated heritage assets are anticipated |
| Condition | The listed buildings are generally in a good condition. The majority of buildings are in residential use (aside from the church, churchyard monuments and milestone). | The condition of the listed buildings is a matter of regional to national interest. | The condition of the listed buildings s important due to their association with the development of their area. | The condition of the listed buildings is not rare. | Negligible - there will be no change to the condition of any of the identified designated heritage assets. <br> No physical impacts or significant adverse setting impacts on designated heritage assets are anticipated |
| Complexity | The listed buildings are generally of low to moderate complexity, with the church and the manor farmhouses presenting moderate complexity levels due to their alterations which either span across multiple centuries or having now been subdivided. | The complexity of the listed buildings is a matter of regional to national interest. | The complexity of the listed buildings represents some variety in form and function of medieval and post-medieval buildings. | The complexity of the listed buildings is not uncommon, however, the church is a good example of an early-medieval church, which has been subject to change over the centuries, representing moderate complexity. | Negligible - there will be no change to the complexity of any of the identified designated heritage assets. <br> No physical impacts or significant adverse setting impacts on designated heritage assets are anticipated |
| Context | The landscape surrounding the scheme is largely rural to the east, south and west. At its northern point, the scheme connects to a residential development at Whitchurch. <br> The context of the majority of the listed buildings presents a mixture between a sub-urban to semi-rural environment which has been subject to development pressures to the north of the scheme. | The context of the listed buildings is largely valued at a local level. <br> The setting of such assets is also a material consideration under national policy. | The context of the listed building within the study area reflects the local and wider regional changes in settlement pattern and development. | The context of the listed buildings within the study area is not rare. Even the context of the Grade II* listed church is not uncommon on a national level. | Minor Adverse - there is potential for adverse impacts on the setting of designated heritage assets. The assets are likely to have visibility to and from the proposed scheme. |
| Period | With the exception of the medieval church, the remaining listed buildings are of post-medieval date. | The post-medieval period is typical within the area and of regional and national interest. The medieval period (represented by the church) is of regional and national interest | The medieval and post-medieval periods are well represented within the wider study area. | The medieval and post-medieval periods are not rare. | Negligible - there will be no significant change to the periods represented by assets within the scheme study area. |

## Reference Sources

Historic England's The National Heritage List for England (NHLE) database
Step 5 - Summary Assessment Score
This option is likely to have an overall Slight Adverse Effect on Cultural Heritage.
Qualitative Comments
The main adverse effects relate to potential temporary setting impacts during the construction of the scheme. Sensitive design and appropriate mitigation such as screening could reduce the overall effect of the scheme to Neutral

| Step 2 |  | Step 3 |  |  | Step 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Feature | Description | Scale it matters | Significance | Rarity | Impact |
| Form | There are 6 listed buildings within an approximate 500 m study area surrounding the proposed scheme ( 1 Grade II" and 5 Grade II) [1365675, 1129498, 1129499, 1136454, 1136442, 1365674]. The Grade II* building [Church of St Nicholas 1136442 ] is located just within the northern extent of the study area at the junction of Bristol Road and Church Road. <br> With the exception of a listed milestone which is located to the east of the scheme on Queen Charlotte Lane, the remaining buildings are located to the north of the scheme within Whitchurch. <br> The buildings consist of various forms including a 17 th century and an 18th century manor farmhouse, unidentified monuments within a churchyard, an 18th century house with gatepiers, a church of possible early-mediel origin and a milestone. hurch of possibe early-medieval origin and a milestone. | The Grade II* listed building is of high importance, while the Grade II listed buildings are of medium importance. | There are 5 Grade II listed buildings of medium value, and a Grade II* listed building of high value within the study area |  | Negligible - there will be no change to the form of any of the identified designated heritage assets. <br> No physical impacts or significant adverse setting impacts on designated heritage assets are anticipated. |
| Survival | The level of survival of the listed buildings is generally good. Aside from some alterations, additions and repairs (internally and externally) which represent multiple phases of development and use, the buildings have mainly retained their characteristic elements. | The survival of the listed buildings is a matter of regional to national interest. | The survival of the listed buildings is important in understanding the historic development of the study area. | The survival of the listed buildings is not rare, while good survival of post-Norman conquest churches is not common. | Negligible - there will be no change to the survival of any of the identified designated heritage assets. <br> No physical impacts or significant adverse setting impacts on designated heritage assets are anticipated. |
| Condition | The listed buildings are generally in a good condition. The majority of buildings are in residential use (aside from the church, churchyard monuments and milestone). | The condition of the listed buildings is a matter of regional to national interest. | The condition of the listed buildings is important due to their association with the development of their area | The condition of the isted buildings is not rare. | Negligible - there will be no change to the condition of any of the identified designated heritage assets. <br> No physical impacts or significant adverse setting impacts on designated heritage assets are anticipated. |
| Complexity | The listed buildings are generally of low to moderate complexity, with the church and the manor farmhouses presenting moderate complexity levels due to their alterations which either span across multiple centuries or having now been subdivided. | The complexity of the listed buildings is a matter of regional to national interest. | The complexity of the listed building represents some variety in form and function of medieval and postmedieval buildings. | The complexity of the listed buildings is not uncommon, however, the church is a good example of an early-medieval church, which has been subject to change over the centuries, epresenting moderate complexity. | Negligible - there will be no change to the complexity of any of the identified designated heritage assets. <br> No physical impacts or significant adverse setting impacts on designated heritage assets are anticipated. |
| Context | The landscape surrounding the scheme is largely rural to the east, south and west. At its northern point, the scheme connects to a residential development at Whitchurch. <br> The context of the majority of the listed buildings presents a mixture between a sub-urban to semirural environment which has been subject to development pressures to the north of the scheme. | The context of the listed buildings is largely valued at a local level <br> The setting of such assets is also a material consideration under national policy. | The context of the listed buildings within the study area reflects the local and wider regional changes in settlement pattern and development. | The context of the listed buildings within the study area is not rare. Even the context of the Grade Il ${ }^{\text {s listed church is not uncommon on a }}$ national level. | Minor Adverse - there is potential for adverse impacts on the setting of designated heritage assets. The assets are likely to have visibility to and from the proposed scheme. |
| Period | With the exception of the medieval church, the remaining listed builidings are of post-medieval date. | The p post-medieval period is typical within the area and of regional and national interest. The medieval church is of regional to national interest. | The medieval and post-medieval periods are well represented within the wider study area. | The medieval and post-medieval periods are not rare. | Negligible - there will be no significant change to the periods represented by assets within the scheme study area. |
| Reference Sources |  |  |  |  |  |
| Historic England's The National Heritage List for England (NHLE) database |  |  |  |  |  |

Step 5 - Summary Assessment Score
This option is likely to have an overall Slight Adverse Effect on Cultural Heritage.
Qualitative Comments
main adverse effects relate to potential temporary setting impacts during the construcion of the scheme. Sensitive design and appropriate mitioation such as screening could reduce the overall effect of the scheme to Neutral

TAG Water Environment Impacts Worksheet - Option K1 - Whitchurch P\&R (Site 4)

| Description of study area/ summary of potential impacts | $\begin{gathered} \text { Key } \\ \begin{array}{c} \text { environmental } \\ \text { resource } \end{array} \end{gathered}$ | Features | Quality | Scale | Rarity | Substitutability | Importance | Magnitude | Significance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Study area: Whitchurch Park and Ride Site 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Potential Impacts: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The site is in Flood Zone 1. The RoFSW flood maps indicate there are no overland flow routes across the site, but there are floodplains shown approximately 300 m north of the site. Mapping indicates there are no watercourses/ditches crossed by the site. However, the design proposals are limited to a dot on a plan so exact boundaries are not available. Other major nearby watercourses include the River Avon (4km North East) and the River Chew (approximately 3.5 km South). | Brislington Brook watercourse (tributary of the River Avon) and floodplain | Conveyance of flood flows and floodplain storage | The Proposed scheme is in Flood Zone 1 and is not within any Surface Water floodplain. | Local | At a local levelthe floodplainprovided by thesite is importantin helping toreduce floodingto commercialproperties.For the reasonsstated above thesite isconsidered tohave a highrarity. | At this stage of design assumed to not be possible for this site | High | Minor Adverse | Low Significance |
| There do not appear to be any watercourses/ditches within the site boundary therefore new culverts or watercourse diversions are not considered necessary as part of the Scheme. If required these would need to ensure conveyance of flows is maintained and floodplain storage is not reduced. |  | Conveyance of flood flows and floodplain storage | The Proposed scheme is in Flood Zone 1 and is not within any Surface Water floodplain. |  |  | At this stage of <br> design assumed <br> to not be <br> possible for this <br> site | High | Minor Adverse | Low Significance |
| Increased runoff resulting from increase in impermeable area from Park and Ride. Mitigation will be required to ensure runoff rates are not increased as a result of the scheme, SuDS should be used where appropriate. A Drainage Strategy would be required if this site is taken forward. |  | Surface water runoff | The River Avon is currently classified by the EA as 'Moderate' for ecological and 'Good' for chemical water quality ratings. |  |  | At this stage of design assumed to not be possible for this site | Medium | Major Adverse | Significant |
| Discharge of pollutants from road / parking runoff; potential impacts on water quality of the watercourse, with potential implications on Water Framework Directive status. SuDS should be used to ensure pollutants are managed on site both during construction and operation. A Drainage Strategy would be required if this site is taken forward. |  | Water quality / WFD | The River Avon is used for recreational fish and boat navigation. The River Avon is currently classified by the EA as 'Moderate' for ecological and 'Good' for chemical water quality ratings. |  |  | At this stage of <br> design assumed <br> to not be <br> possible for this <br> site | Medium | Moderate Adverse | Low Significance |

## Reference Source

## thtps://flood-map-For-planning.service.gov.uk <br> http://environment data.gov.uk/catchment-planning/RiverBasinDistrict/ <br> sing Maps <br> Summary Assessment Score

The scheme is considered to have a Significant adverse impact on the water environment (excluding mitigation)

## Qualitative Comments

ecause the . ase flood risk to residential and commercial properties, and potentially have impacts on water quality, a more detailed assessment would be required, including a Flood Risk Assessm

| Description of study area/ summary of potential impacts | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Key } \\ \text { environmental } \\ \text { resource } \end{array}$ | Features | Quality | Scale | Rarity | Substitutability | Importance | Magnitude | Significance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Study area: <br> Whitchurch <br> Park and Ride Site 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Potential Impacts: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Conveyance of flood flows and floodplain storage | The Proposed scheme is in Flood Zone 1 but crosses Surface Water floodplains and could potentially reduce conveyance and storage | Local | At a local levelthe floodplaianprovided by thesite is importantin helping toreduce floodingto commercialproperties.Fror the easonsStataded above thesite is aconsidered tohave a highharity. |  | High | Major Adverse | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \text { Highly } \\ \text { Significant } \end{array}$ |
| It appears that new culverts or watercourse diversions are likely to be necessary as part of the Scheme. If required these would need to ensure conveyance of flows is maintained and floodplain storage is not reduced. |  | Conveyance of flood flows and floodplain storage | The Proposed scheme is in Flood Zone 1 but crosses Surface Water lioodplains and could potentially reduce conveyance and storage res |  |  | At this stage of design assumed to not be possible for this site | High | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Moderate } \\ & \text { Adverse } \end{aligned}$ | Significant |
| Increased runoff resulting from increase in impermeable area from Park and Ride. Mitigation will be required to ensure runoff rates are not increased as a result of the scheme, SuDS should be used where appropriate. A Drainage Strategy would be required if this site is taken forward. |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Surface water } \\ & \text { runoff } \end{aligned}$ | The River Avon is currently classified by the EA as 'Moderate' for ecological and 'Good' for chemical water quality and ratings. |  |  | At this stage of design assumed to not be possible for this site | Medium | Major Adverse | Significant |
| Discharge of pollutants from road / parking runoff; potential impacts on water quality of the watercourse, with potential implications on Water Framework Directive status. As new culverts or watercourse diversions may be necessary a WFD assessment may be required to ensure no detiment to waterbodies. SuDS should be used to ensure pollutants are managed on site, both during construction and operation. A Drainage Strategy would be required if this site is taken forward. |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Water quality/ } \\ & \text { wFD } \end{aligned}$ | The River Avon is used for recreational fish and boat navigation. The River Avon is currently classififed by the EA as 'Moderate for ecological and Good ' 'or chemical water quality ratings. |  |  | At this stage of design assumed to not be possible for this site | Medium | Moderate Adverse | Low Significance |

## Reference Sources



Summary Assessment Score
The scheme is considered to have a Highly Significant adverse impact on the water environment (excluding mitigation

## Qualitative Comments




[^0]:    ${ }^{11}$ DfT Value for Money Framework (July 2017)
    https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment data/file/630704/value-for-moneyframework.pdf

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ Propensity to Cycle Tool https://www.pct.bike/
    ${ }^{3}$ Propensity to Cycle Tool https://www.pct.bike/
    ${ }^{4}$ HEAT http://www.heatwalkingcycling.org/

[^2]:    ${ }^{5}$ West of England Joint Transport Study, Final Report (October 2017)

[^3]:    ${ }^{6}$ The 2036 Spatially Neutral highway matrices were based on the outputs from the updated multi-modal variable demand model. The JSP highway matrices are derived from these outputs rather than a full re-run of the VDM.

[^4]:    ${ }^{7}$ JSP Transport Topic Paper

[^5]:    8 'Unmet demand' is when a vehicle cannot enter the network, due to congestion extending along the link preventing the vehicle from entering in their interval, meaning they are removed from the modelling.

[^6]:    ${ }^{9}$ This factor was based on the factor used in the Cambridge multi-modal model to represent their highquality and guided bus services.

[^7]:    ${ }^{10}$ The most recent TUBA program (v1.9.10) was released part of the way through the appraisal, however, for consistency, it was decided to continue the appraisal with v1.9.9.

[^8]:    ${ }^{11}$ Inflation values were agreed with the Client Role as $2.5 \%$ until 2021 and $4 \%$ beyond that. Discounting values were -2.44\%.

[^9]:    BRNES Landscape Character Assessment
    South Giloucesteesh hire Landerscapape Characterer Assessment (2014)
    latural England
    Natural England
    Ordrance as
    Aerial Mapey Mapping

    | Aetial Mapping |
    | :--- |
    | $\begin{array}{l}\text { Magi- Ceographical mapping } \\ \text { Sustran }\end{array}$ |

    Step 5 - Summary Assessment Score
    Neutrals-sight adverse on completion
    Neutral ater 15 years

    Qualitative Comments
    A 2 km oftset from the scheme boundary has been prescribed for the study area within this local character area of which baseline assessment only has been conducted due to the early stages of this design \& optioneering stage. It is considered that significant effects are Alikely beyond this.
    The assessment considers the scheme
    its physical presence in the landscape.

[^10]:    The scheme is considered to have a Highly Significant adverse impact on the water environment (excluding mitigation)

[^11]:    ualitative Comments
    Because the scheme has the potential to increase flood risk to residential and commercial properties, and potentially have impacts on water quality, a more detailed assessment would be required, including a WFD and a Flood Risk Assessment, and hydrological and hydraulic modelling. Mitigation measures such as SuDS and potentially flood compensatory storage would be required as part of the scheme - these would need to be tested as part of the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy. The extended watercourse crossing needs to ensure that conveyance of flows

[^12]:    RNES Landscape Character Assessm
    
    Natural Engatard
    Ordanance Suvey Mappin
    Aerial Mapping
    Magic. Geographical mapping
    Sustans
    Siligh a averese on completion

    Qualitative Comments
    Qualitative Comments
    unikely beyond this.
    The assessment considers the scheme design
    result of it phyysical presence in the landscape.

