Option name	**A34 Chilton junction – north facing slips**				
Description	Completion of all movements junction to improve access from Harwell to strategic highway network and relieve pressure on Milton Interchange.				
Identified problems	The current network has effectively reached capacity and is therefore a barrier to further growth. Investment is required to facilitate planned growth stimulate the economy to enable delivery of the Enterprise Zone and job growth in the area.				
Element	Rating	Justification			
Economic growth	5	*Connectivity*	G	*Reliability*	G
		Resilience	G	*Delivery*	G
Carbon Emissions	2	*Activity*	R	*Embedded C*	R
		Carbon use	A	*Efficiency*	G
Socio-distributional impact	4	*SDIs*	A	*Regeneration*	A
		Regional imbalance & economic growth			G
Local environment	4	*Air Quality*	A	*Noise*	G
		Natural Env	G	*Urban Env*	A
Well being	4	*Severance*	A	*Physical Activity*	A
		Injuries	A	*Crime*	A
		Access	G	*Resilience*	G
Value for Money	3	Expected BCR - 1.5-2.0			
Scale of impact	3	Significant locality wide impact			
Fit with transport objectives	5	Excellent fit – reducing congestion and improving accessibility			
Fit with other objectives	5	Excellent fit – supports economic development and growth			
Degree of consensus	5	Impact clear			
Cost risk	3	Medium risk			
Affordability	3	Assumes construction cost of £10.54M			
Feasibility	5	Feasibility design complete			
Acceptability	4	Not tested / likely to be favourable			
Quality of evidence	5	Feasibility report complete			
Deliverability	4	2 years to construct, medium slippage risk			
Flexibility	1	Very limited scope for variation of design			

Option name	**A34 Improvements Phase 1**				
Description	A route strategy to improve access to and journey times along the A34 throughout Oxfordshire. Phase 1 will include the "quick wins" – approach upgrades, slip road enhancements, local access upgrades and signal integration.				
Identified problems	The A34 is critical to economic development in the 3 priority localities. The fragility of the A34 is currently a barrier to securing business investment and is stifling economic growth.				
Element	Rating	Justification			
Economic growth	5	*Connectivity*	G	*Reliability*	G
		Resilience	G	*Delivery*	G
Carbon Emissions	3	*Activity*	R	*Embedded C*	A
		Carbon use	A	*Efficiency*	G
Socio-distributional impact	4	*SDIs*	G	*Regeneration*	A
		Regional imbalance & economic growth			G
Local environment	4	*Air Quality*	G	*Noise*	G
		Natural Env	A	*Urban Env*	G
Well being	4	*Severance*	A	*Physical Activity*	A
		Injuries	G	*Crime*	A
		Access	G	*Resilience*	A
Value for Money	4	High – Expected BCR = 2.0-4.0 May be (significant) delays during construction			
Scale of impact	5	Significant, countywide impact			
Fit with transport objectives	5	Excellent fit – reducing congestion and improving accessibility			
Fit with other objectives	5	Excellent fit – supports economic development and growth			
Degree of consensus	4	Uncertainty over scheme to be delivered			
Cost risk	2	Relatively high risk due to uncertainty on scheme			
Affordability	1	Assumes capital cost of £20M			
Feasibility	4	Should be no problems but uncertainty on scheme and may be large construction delays			
Acceptability	4	Not tested but likely to be favourable			
Quality of evidence	4	Investigated in Access to Oxford project			
Deliverability	1	5 years to deliver, high risk of project slippage			
Flexibility	4	Can be scaled to budget – but individual items may be expensive			

Option name	**Milton Interchange Improvement**				
Description	The scheme provides an innovative 'hamburger' style roundabout enabling the junction to operate effectively within planned levels of growth for the area and helping to manage traffic onto the A34.				
Identified problems	Milton Interchange is heavily congested and demand exceeds its capacity. This junction is the only access to the strategic road network for Milton Business Park and for local traffic to access the business park.				
Element	Rating	Justification			
Economic growth	5	*Connectivity*	G	*Reliability*	G
		Resilience	G	*Delivery*	G
Carbon Emissions	2	*Activity*	R	*Embedded C*	R
		Carbon use	A	*Efficiency*	G
Socio-distributional impact	4	*SDIs*	A	*Regeneration*	G
		Regional imbalance & economic growth			G
Local environment	3	*Air Quality*	A	*Noise*	A
		Natural Env	A	*Urban Env*	-
Well being	4	*Severance*	A	*Physical Activity*	A
		Injuries	A	*Crime*	A
		Access	G	*Resilience*	G
Value for Money	4	Expected BCR 2.0 - 4.0			
Scale of impact	4	Significant, district-wide			
Fit with transport objectives	5	Excellent fit – improving accessibility, reducing congestion			
Fit with other objectives	5	Excellent Fit – supporting economic growth and development			
Degree of consensus	4	Innovative design			
Cost risk	4	Low/medium risk			
Affordability	3	Assumes total cost of £10.03 million			
Feasibility	5	Design signed off			
Acceptability	4	Untested, expected to be favourable			
Quality of evidence	5	Business case produced			
Deliverability	4	Up to 2 years, medium risk			
Flexibility	1	Little scope for reducing scope of scheme			

Option name	**Bicester: Charbridge Lane Railway Crossing**				
Description	Conversion of current level crossing of A4144 Bicester eastern perimeter road with Oxford-Bletchley Railway line into grade separated over/under-bridge.				
Identified problems	The existing level crossing is adequate for the existing use of the line (one freight train per day); upgrading the crossing, probably to a road bridge over the railway, is essential before East-West Rail services can commence.				
Element	Rating	Justification			
Economic growth	4	*Connectivity*	G	*Reliability*	G
		Resilience	A	*Delivery*	G
Carbon Emissions	2	*Activity*	A	*Embedded C*	R
		Carbon use	A	*Efficiency*	A
Socio-distributional impact	4	*SDIs*	A	*Regeneration*	A
		Regional imbalance & economic growth			G
Local environment	2	*Air Quality*	A	*Noise*	R
		Natural Env	A	*Urban Env*	R
Well being	3	*Severance*	A	*Physical Activity*	A
		Injuries	A	*Crime*	A
		Access	G/A	*Resilience*	A
Value for Money	3	Estimated BCR 1.5-2.0			
Scale of impact	4	Significant, district-wide impact			
Fit with transport objectives	4	Good fit – reduces congestion, improves access to goods and services			
Fit with other objectives	5	Supporting economic development and growth			
Degree of consensus	5	Nature of impacts clear			
Cost risk	3	Medium risk – details of design unknown			
Affordability	4	Assumes construction cost of £8.3 million			
Feasibility	4	No known issues			
Acceptability	4	Untested, expected to be favourable			
Quality of evidence	3	Good assessment of problem			
Deliverability	2	4 years, medium delivery risk			
Flexibility	1	Little scope for scaling scheme.			

Option name	**Bicester: London Road Railway Crossing**				
Description	A new all-modes bridge across the railway (or road underpass plus pedestrian overbridge) at London Road, Bicester. Alternatively a new link road from A41 to London Road or a new link road from Charbridge Road to Launton Road.				
Identified problems	The closure of London Road for up to 40 minutes in every hour with East-West rail and Oxford-Marylebone services would stifle Bicester's development plan and alienate residents in south-east quarter of biceser from remainder of town.				
Element	Rating	Justification			
Economic growth	5	*Connectivity*	G	*Reliability*	G
		Resilience	G	*Delivery*	G
Carbon Emissions	3	*Activity*	G	*Embedded C*	R
		Carbon use	A	*Efficiency*	A
Socio-distributional impact	4	*SDIs*	A	*Regeneration*	A
		Regional imbalance & economic growth			G
Local environment	2	*Air Quality*	A	*Noise*	A
		Natural Env	-	*Urban Env*	R
Well being	4	*Severance*	G	*Physical Activity*	A
		Injuries	A	*Crime*	A
		Access	G	*Resilience*	G
Value for Money	2	Estimated BCR 1.0-1.5			
Scale of impact	4	Significant, district-wide impact			
Fit with transport objectives	5	Excellent – reducing congestion and improving accessibility			
Fit with other objectives	5	Excellent – Supporting economic development and growth			
Degree of consensus	5	Impacts clear			
Cost risk	3	Medium risk – scheme details to be resolved			
Affordability	2	Assumes capital cost of £27.4 million for 2 phases of scheme			
Feasibility	2	May be difficulties with land-take and impact on buildings			
Acceptability	3	Untested to date, expected to be mixed			
Quality of evidence	4	Some modelling of problems and outcomes			
Deliverability	1	More than 5 years, medium risk			
Flexibility	1	Static scheme			

Option name	**Bicester London Road level crossing Phase 1 only**				
Description	Provision of phase 1 only of replacement of level crossing - to allow level crossing to close and maintain pedestrian and cycle access across the railway by overbridge.				
Identified problems	The closure of London road for up to 40 minutes in every hour with East-west rail and Oxford-Marylebone services would stifle Bicester's development plan and alienate residents in south-east quarter of biceser from remainder of town.				
Element	Rating	Justification			
Economic growth	4	*Connectivity*	G	*Reliability*	G
		Resilience	A	*Delivery*	A
Carbon Emissions	4	*Activity*	G	*Embedded C*	A
		Carbon use	G	*Efficiency*	G
Socio-distributional impact	5	*SDIs*	G	*Regeneration*	G
		Regional imbalance & economic growth			G
Local environment	5	*Air Quality*	G	*Noise*	G
		Natural Env	-	*Urban Env*	G
Well being	5	*Severance*	G	*Physical Activity*	G
		Injuries	G	*Crime*	A
		Access	G	*Resilience*	G
Value for Money	4	Expected BCR 2.0 - 4.0			
Scale of impact	2	Moderate, town-wide			
Fit with transport objectives	5	Excellent fit – improving accessibility, promoting mode change			
Fit with other objectives	5	Excellent Fit – supporting economic growth and development			
Degree of consensus	5	Impacts clear			
Cost risk	2	Design work still to be carried out			
Affordability	5	Assumes £3.6M capital cost			
Feasibility	4	Limited space for ramps, difficult to deliver once railway is in place			
Acceptability	3	Untested/likely to be mixed - may be resistance to loss of all mode route			
Quality of evidence	4	Some modelling of problems and outcomes			
Deliverability	3	3 years, medium delivery risk			
Flexibility	1	Likely to be limited options for crossing.			

Option name	**Bicester pedestrian/cycle connectivity improvements**				
Description	The project will connect 3 major development sites for pedestrians and cycles with each other and the town centre (rail stations) by overcoming severance problems of the railway line and A41.				
Identified problems	This will help to encourage people to travel sustainably for shorter journeys or linked trips which, in turn, will help reduce congestion, improve air quality and health.				
Element	Rating	Justification			
Economic growth	4	*Connectivity*	A/G	*Reliability*	G
		Resilience	G	*Delivery*	A
Carbon Emissions	5	*Activity*	G	*Embedded C*	G
		Carbon use	G	*Efficiency*	G
Socio-distributional impact	3	*SDIs*	G	*Regeneration*	A
		Regional imbalance & economic growth			G
Local environment	5	*Air Quality*	G	*Noise*	G
		Natural Env	G	*Urban Env*	G
Well being	4	*Severance*	G	*Physical Activity*	G
		Injuries	A	*Crime*	A
		Access	A	*Resilience*	A
Value for Money	2	Low – Expected BCR = 1.0 – 1.5			
Scale of impact	1	Small, town-wide impact			
Fit with transport objectives	5	Reduces congestion and encourages low carbon travel			
Fit with other objectives	5	Supporting economic development and growth			
Degree of consensus	2	Uncertainty over take up of facilities			
Cost risk	1	High risk because of uncertainties over design			
Affordability	5	Assumes construction cost of £4.4M			
Feasibility	3	May be issues on rail/road crossings			
Acceptability	4	Not tested, likely to be favourable			
Quality of evidence	3	Work has been carried out on defining problems but limited on impact of scheme			
Deliverability	2	4 years to deliver, medium risk of programme delays			
Flexibility	3	May be able to do some smaller scale scheme but with significant loss of benefits			

Option name	**Bicester: Peripheral Road Improvements**				
Description	Strategic improvements to improve the capacity and journey times on the routes around the outskirts of the town; measures to slow speeds through the centre of Bicester; measures to improve east-west sustainable links.				
Identified problems	The improvements are an integral part of the significant jobs-led growth planned for the town. The highway network needs to meet the increased demands put upon it to attract new businesses to the town as well as enable existing companies to grow.				
Element	Rating	Justification			
Economic growth	5	*Connectivity*	G	*Reliability*	G
		Resilience	G	*Delivery*	G
Carbon Emissions	3	*Activity*	A	*Embedded C*	R
		Carbon use	G	*Efficiency*	G
Socio-distributional impact	4	*SDIs*	A	*Regeneration*	G
		Regional imbalance & economic growth			G
Local environment	5	*Air Quality*	G	*Noise*	G
		Natural Env	-	*Urban Env*	G
Well being	5	*Severance*	G	*Physical Activity*	G
		Injuries	G	*Crime*	A
		Access	G	*Resilience*	G
Value for Money	3	Estimated BCR 1.5-2.0			
Scale of impact	3	Significant, locality-wide impact			
Fit with transport objectives	5	Excellent – reduces congestion, promotes more sustainable travel			
Fit with other objectives	5	Excellent – supports housing and economic development and growth			
Degree of consensus	3	Scheme details unclear			
Cost risk	2	medium/high risk – scheme details not known			
Affordability	2	Assumes capital cost of £22.5 million			
Feasibility	4	No known issues			
Acceptability	3	Untested, likely to be mixed			
Quality of evidence	3	Good analysis of problems and some of outcomes			
Deliverability	1	More than 5 years, medium risk			
Flexibility	3	Some flexibility in deciding programme, but likely to include significant large items			

Option name	**West: Improving access to Carterton**				
Description	The scheme is likely to involve the upgrade of route standard and improvement of junctions, potentially leading to its re-designation of route between A361 and A40/Witney as a principal (A) road.				
Identified problems	Carterton and RAF Brize Norton are connected to A40(E) by the B4477 which is substandard in width and alignment. This is likely to impact on the attractiveness of the area for development and investment.				
Element	Rating	Justification			
Economic growth	4	*Connectivity*	G/A	*Reliability*	A
		Resilience	A	*Delivery*	A
Carbon Emissions	3	*Activity*	A	*Embedded C*	A
		Carbon use	A	*Efficiency*	A
Socio-distributional impact	4	*SDIs*	A	*Regeneration*	A
		Regional imbalance & economic growth			G
Local environment	2	*Air Quality*	A	*Noise*	A
		Natural Env	A/R	*Urban Env*	-
Well being	4	*Severance*	A	*Physical Activity*	A
		Injuries	A	*Crime*	A
		Access	G	*Resilience*	A
Value for Money	2	Estimated BCR 1.0-1.5			
Scale of impact	2	Moderate local impact			
Fit with transport objectives	3	Good fit – improved access to jobs and services			
Fit with other objectives	4	Good fit – providing infrastructure to support development			
Degree of consensus	5	Impacts clear			
Cost risk	4	Low/medium – scheme details not known, but likely to be standard scheme			
Affordability	4	Assumes capital cost of £5.95 million			
Feasibility	5	Should have few difficulties – although may be environmental issues to overcome if improvements are made west of Carterton			
Acceptability	3	Untested, likely to be favourable (views west of Carterton less clear cut)			
Quality of evidence	1	Little supporting data			
Deliverability	3	4 year delivery period, low risk			
Flexibility	4	Work to be undertaken can be scaled to funding available			

Option name	**Oxford: West End – City Centre**				
Description	The Project centres on Frideswide Square, Hythe Bridge Street and Park End Street. This package of transport and public realm schemes aims to reduce the current dominance of the motor vehicle in the city centre and create a high quality pedestrian-friendly environment.				
Identified problems	One of the key bottlenecks preventing reliable journey times for people commuting into Oxford from outside the city. It will reduce delays to all road users whilst acting as a catalyst for wider economic growth and regeneration.				
Element	Rating	Justification			
Economic growth	4	*Connectivity*	G	*Reliability*	G
		Resilience	A	*Delivery*	G
Carbon Emissions	4	*Activity*	A	*Embedded C*	A
		Carbon use	G	*Efficiency*	G
Socio-distributional impact	5	*SDIs*	G	*Regeneration*	G
		Regional imbalance & economic growth			G
Local environment	4	*Air Quality*	G	*Noise*	A
		Natural Env	-	*Urban Env*	G
Well being	4	*Severance*	G	*Physical Activity*	G
		Injuries	G	*Crime*	A
		Access	G	*Resilience*	A
Value for Money	4	Estimated BCR 2.0 – 4.0			
Scale of impact	5	Significant countywide impact			
Fit with transport objectives	5	Excellent fit for congestion and accessibility			
Fit with other objectives	5	Excellent fit for promoting development and growth			
Degree of consensus	4	Innovative design may be controversial			
Cost risk	3	Medium risk			
Affordability	4	Assumes construction cost of £8.8 million			
Feasibility	3	Innovative design but within LA control			
Acceptability	4	Untested, likely to be favourable			
Quality of evidence	4	Some modelling occurred but business case not yet approved			
Deliverability	2	Four year delivery period, medium delivery risk			
Flexibility	1	Little scope for scaling scheme			

Option name	**West: A40 Oxford Science Transit**				
Description	The scheme aims to deliver an uplift in public transport provision through the delivery of public transport enhancements along the A40. The scheme is focused on a bus lane from Eynsham to Wolvercote but the project will look at innovative solutions beyond physical infrastructure.				
Identified problems	Journey times and reliability on A40. The project will also support local movements around Northern Gateway as well as supporting further routes that can access the infrastructure along the route.				
Element	Rating	Justification			
Economic growth	5	*Connectivity*	G	*Reliability*	G
		Resilience	G	*Delivery*	G
Carbon Emissions	4	*Activity*	G	*Embedded C*	R
		Carbon use	A	*Efficiency*	G
Socio-distributional impact	4	*SDIs*	G	*Regeneration*	A
		Regional imbalance & economic growth			G
Local environment	3	*Air Quality*	A	*Noise*	A
		Natural Env	A	*Urban Env*	-
Well being	4	*Severance*	A	*Physical Activity*	A
		Injuries	A/G	*Crime*	A
		Access	G	*Resilience*	G
Value for Money	3	Estimated BCR 1.5-2.0			
Scale of impact	5	Significant county-wide impact			
Fit with transport objectives	5	Increases travel choice, reduces carbon, reduces congestion			
Fit with other objectives	4	Good fit – providing infrastructure to support development			
Degree of consensus	4	Uncertainty over level of mode switch			
Cost risk	2	Medium/high – design not complete, may be land-take issues and cost of utilities diversions.			
Affordability	1	Assumes construction cost of £50 million.			
Feasibility	3	Need to specify scheme requirements			
Acceptability	4	Untested, likely to be favourable			
Quality of evidence	3	Work carried out in 1990s needs to be revisited			
Deliverability	1	More than 5 years, medium risk			
Flexibility	4	Scheme could to an extent be scaled down to match funding.			

Option name	**Oxford Science Transit (Phase 1) – Hinksey Hill Interchange**				
Description	The scheme comprises a bus lane on the verge of the A34 approach to the interchange, bus priority on the northbound slip road approach to the signal controlled roundabout, a capacity enhancement around the roundabout, and additional capacity on the southern bypass.				
Identified problems	The junction has severe congestion; traffic flows and concentrations on the road and the slip road up to the interchange are high. Any minor incident can easily lead to traffic flow breakdown impacting on speed and journey time.				
Element	Rating	Justification			
Economic growth	5	*Connectivity*	G	*Reliability*	G
		Resilience	G	*Delivery*	G
Carbon Emissions	4	*Activity*	G	*Embedded C*	R
		Carbon use	G	*Efficiency*	G
Socio-distributional impact	5	*SDIs*	G	*Regeneration*	G
		Regional imbalance & economic growth			G
Local environment	4	*Air Quality*	A	*Noise*	A
		Natural Env	G	*Urban Env*	-
Well being	4	*Severance*	A	*Physical Activity*	A
		Injuries	G	*Crime*	A
		Access	G	*Resilience*	G
Value for Money	4	Forecast BCR of package is 2.9			
Scale of impact	4	Moderate, countywide impact			
Fit with transport objectives	5	Excellent fit – improving accessibility, reducing congestion			
Fit with other objectives	5	Excellent Fit – supporting economic growth and development			
Degree of consensus	4	Depends on transfer to public transport			
Cost risk	3	Medium risk – verge conditions not known but built into cost estimates			
Affordability	2	Assumes total scheme cost of £23.5M			
Feasibility	3	Design details not known			
Acceptability	3	Untested, likely to be mixed			
Quality of evidence	5	Business case produced for DfT			
Deliverability	3	3 years, medium delivery risk			
Flexibility	4	Could drop some parts of package if funding reduced			

Option name	**Oxford: Oxford Station non-rail improvements**				
Description	A masterplan for improved station and interchange facilities with associated appropriate commercial development to provide an exemplary gateway into Oxford City centre is currently under development. The site area includes the Oxford station area, forecourt and Becket Street car park.				
Identified problems	Improving access to and between development locations in Oxford is essential for its role as a major part in county, the City Deal Vision for Oxford and sub-national growth and development.				
Element	Rating	Justification			
Economic growth	3	*Connectivity*	A	*Reliability*	A
		Resilience	A	*Delivery*	A
Carbon Emissions	2	*Activity*	A	*Embedded C*	R
		Carbon use	A	*Efficiency*	A
Socio-distributional impact	4	*SDIs*	A	*Regeneration*	G
		Regional imbalance & economic growth			G
Local environment	4	*Air Quality*	A	*Noise*	A
		Natural Env	-	*Urban Env*	G
Well being	3	*Severance*	G	*Physical Activity*	A
		Injuries	A	*Crime*	A
		Access	A	*Resilience*	A
Value for Money	2	Estimated BCR 1.0-1.5			
Scale of impact	3	Low, countywide impact (transport)			
Fit with transport objectives	3	Reasonable fit if scheme contributes to reduction in congestion in station area			
Fit with other objectives	5	Excellent – supports economic development and growth			
Degree of consensus	3	Details still to be determined			
Cost risk	2	Medium/high risk due to uncertainty on project details			
Affordability	1	Assumes total cost > £100 million			
Feasibility	3	Scheme details still to be determined			
Acceptability	3	Untested, mixed			
Quality of evidence	4	Some modelling and testing of outcomes undertaken			
Deliverability	1	8 Year delivery period, medium risk			
Flexibility	4	Some flexibility in determining scheme details			

Option name	**Northern Gateway – A40-A44 Link Road**				
Description	Construction of a new dual carriageway link road.				
Identified Problems	Relieve congestion, particularly at Wolvercote Roundabout, and enhance connectivity in A40 east-west corridor to deliver growth in Northern Gateway and other areas				
Element	Rating	Justification			
Economic growth	5	*Connectivity*	G	*Reliability*	G
		Resilience	G	*Delivery*	G
Carbon Emissions	2	*Activity*	A	*Embedded C*	R
		Carbon use	A	*Efficiency*	A
Socio-distributional impact	4	*SDIs*	A	*Regeneration*	A
		Regional imbalance & economic growth			G
Local environment	4	*Air Quality*	G	*Noise*	A
		Natural Env	A	*Urban Env*	G
Well being	4	*Severance*	A	*Physical Activity*	A
		Injuries	G	*Crime*	A
		Access	G	*Resilience*	G
Value for Money	4	High – expected BCR = 2.0-4.0			
Scale of impact	5	Significant, countywide impact			
Fit with transport objectives	5	Excellent – reducing congestion, improving safety and accessibility			
Fit with other objectives	5	Excellent – supporting economic growth and development			
Degree of consensus	4	May be issue of interaction between benefits of scheme and impact of adjacent development			
Cost risk	4	Low-moderate			
Affordability	4	Assumes construction cost of £7.3M			
Feasibility	3	Generally good but may be difficulties with access and links to development			
Acceptability	4	Not tested but thought to be favourable			
Quality of evidence	4	Some modelling as part of Access to Oxford			
Deliverability	3	3 year programme but rated as high risk because of links to adjacent development			
Flexibility	2	Limited scope for reduced scheme			

Option name	**Northern Gateway – A40 Wolvercote Roundabout**				
Description	Advanced traffic management via signalisation at A40 Wolvercote plus local control measures.				
Identified problems	Reduce congestion on A40 east-west corridor and A34/A44 northern entry into Oxford plus opening up of adjacent land for development.				
Element	Rating	Justification			
Economic growth	4	*Connectivity*	G	*Reliability*	G
		Resilience	A	*Delivery*	G
Carbon Emissions	3	*Activity*	A	*Embedded C*	A
		Carbon use	A	*Efficiency*	G
Socio-distributional impact	4	*SDIs*	A	*Regeneration*	A
		Regional imbalance & economic growth			G
Local environment	4	*Air Quality*	G	*Noise*	A
		Natural Env	A	*Urban Env*	G
Well being	4	*Severance*	A	*Physical Activity*	A
		Injuries	G	*Crime*	A
		Access	G	*Resilience*	A
Value for Money	4	High – expected BCR = 2.0-4.0			
Scale of impact	5	Significant, countywide impact			
Fit with transport objectives	5	Excellent – reduce congestion and improve accessibility			
Fit with other objectives	5	Excellent – support economic development and growth			
Degree of consensus	3	May be local disagreement on balance of costs and benefits			
Cost risk	4	Low–moderate – relatively straightforward scheme			
Affordability	5	Assumes LGF contribution of £4.8M			
Feasibility	4	Likely to be relatively straightforward scheme although may be significant construction delays			
Acceptability	3	Not tested, may be mixed			
Quality of evidence	4	Some modelling as part of Access to Oxford			
Deliverability	2	3 year delivery programme but high risk of over-run			
Flexibility	2	Limited ability if traffic signals option followed			

Option name	**Northern Gateway – A40 Cutteslowe Rbt**				
Description	Advanced traffic management via signalisation at Cutteslowe Roundabout				
Identified problems	Unlock congestion along the strategic east-west corridor around the north of Oxford and on A4144 northern entrance into Oxford.				
Element	Rating	Justification			
Economic growth	4	*Connectivity*	G	*Reliability*	G
		Resilience	A	*Delivery*	G
Carbon Emissions	4	*Activity*	G	*Embedded C*	A
		Carbon use	A	*Efficiency*	G
Socio-distributional impact	4	*SDIs*	A	*Regeneration*	A
		Regional imbalance & economic growth			G
Local environment	3	*Air Quality*	A	*Noise*	A
		Natural Env	A	*Urban Env*	A
Well being	3	*Severance*	A	*Physical Activity*	A
		Injuries	G	*Crime*	A
		Access	G	*Resilience*	A
Value for Money	4	High – expected BCR =2.0-4.0			
Scale of impact	4	Significant, countywide impact			
Fit with transport objectives	5	Excellent – reduce congestion and improve accessibility			
Fit with other objectives	5	Excellent – support economic development and growth			
Degree of consensus	3	May be local disagreement on balance of costs and benefits			
Cost risk	4	Low–moderate – relatively straightforward scheme			
Affordability	5	Assumes construction cost of £4.1M			
Feasibility	4	Likely to be relatively straightforward scheme although may be significant construction delays			
Acceptability	4	Not tested, likely to be favourable			
Quality of evidence	4	Some modelling as part of Access to Oxford			
Deliverability	3	2 year programme schedule but high risk of programme slippage			
Flexibility	1	Limited scope for reducing scope of scheme			

Option name	**Oxford: Eastern Arc Improvements**				
Description	A package of transport measures including projects to improve the quality, speed and reliability of orbital bus routes, park & ride, traffic and parking management and measures to encourage more walking and cycling.				
Identified problems	To facilitate development in the Headington/East Oxford area to support growth at key healthcare, business park and manufacturing sites in Cowley close to Oxford ring road.				
Element	Rating	Justification			
Economic growth	4	*Connectivity*	G	*Reliability*	G/A
		Resilience	G	*Delivery*	G
Carbon Emissions	4	*Activity*	G	*Embedded C*	A
		Carbon use	G	*Efficiency*	G
Socio-distributional impact	5	*SDIs*	G	*Regeneration*	G
		Regional imbalance & economic growth			G
Local environment	5	*Air Quality*	G	*Noise*	G
		Natural Env	-	*Urban Env*	G
Well being	5	*Severance*	G	*Physical Activity*	G
		Injuries	G	*Crime*	A
		Access	G	*Resilience*	G
Value for Money	3	Estimated BCR 1.5-2.0			
Scale of impact	4	Significant, district-wide impact			
Fit with transport objectives	4	Good fit - improves accessibility to services, reduces congestion			
Fit with other objectives	5	Excellent fit – supporting economic growth and development			
Degree of consensus	3	Will depend on scheme(s) chosen			
Cost risk	4	Low/medium risk - scheme details not known but likely to be programme of smaller works			
Affordability	4	Assumes construction cost of £8 million			
Feasibility	4	Likely to mostly be use of existing highways but some uncertainty at present			
Acceptability	3	Untested, likely to be mixed			
Quality of evidence	2	Some informal analysis			
Deliverability	3	4 years, low risk			
Flexibility	5	Highly flexible – can be scaled to funding available.			

Option name	**Oxford: Headington – Phase 1**				
Description	A package of four key transport schemes to alleviate congestion, enable planned and future economic growth and development of a comprehensive bus service for the area.				
Identified problems	The main roads that access Headington suffer from significant congestion for long periods of the day; a number of junctions are major pinch points causing delay and queueing, disrupt bus services and vehicle access and undermine confidence in the transport system.				
Element	Rating	Justification			
Economic growth	4	*Connectivity*	G	*Reliability*	G
		Resilience	A	*Delivery*	G
Carbon Emissions	4	*Activity*	G	*Embedded C*	A
		Carbon use	G	*Efficiency*	G
Socio-distributional impact	5	*SDIs*	G	*Regeneration*	G
		Regional imbalance & economic growth			G
Local environment	5	*Air Quality*	G	*Noise*	G
		Natural Env	-	*Urban Env*	G
Well being	4	*Severance*	G	*Physical Activity*	A
		Injuries	A	*Crime*	A
		Access	G	*Resilience*	A
Value for Money	4	Estimated BCR 2.0 – 4.0			
Scale of impact	4	Significant, district-wide impacts			
Fit with transport objectives	5	Excellent fit for congestion and accessibility			
Fit with other objectives	5	Excellent fit for promoting development and growth			
Degree of consensus	4	Uncertainty over level of mode switch			
Cost risk	2	Medium – high : nature of schemes not clear			
Affordability	5	Assumes capital cost of £3.5 million			
Feasibility	4	Should be straightforward, but details still unresolved			
Acceptability	4	Untested, expected to be favourable			
Quality of evidence	3	Good analysis of problems			
Deliverability	3	3 year programme, medium risk			
Flexibility	4	Could reduce number of elements delivered			

Option name	**Science Vale: Access to Culham SC**				
Description	A second access road into Culham Science Centre from the east and a bypass to Clifton Hampden. This new access could be used by vehicles travelling to from the north via the A4074 and would remove the need for vehicles travel through the Clifton Hampden junction and on to the A415.				
Identified problems	Congestion is currently experienced on the A415 which provides the main access to the Culham Science Centre, which is further affected by the two Thames road bridges at Culham and Clifton Hampden which are at capacity**.**				
Element	Rating	Justification			
Economic growth	5	*Connectivity*	G	*Reliability*	G
		Resilience	G	*Delivery*	G
Carbon Emissions	3	*Activity*	G	*Embedded C*	R
		Carbon use	A	*Efficiency*	A
Socio-distributional impact	4	*SDIs*	A	*Regeneration*	G
		Regional imbalance & economic growth			G
Local environment	2	*Air Quality*	A	*Noise*	A
		Natural Env	R	*Urban Env*	-
Well being	4	*Severance*	A	*Physical Activity*	A
		Injuries	G	*Crime*	A
		Access	A	*Resilience*	G
Value for Money	3	Estimated BCR 2.0 – 4.0			
Scale of impact	3	Moderate, district-wide impact			
Fit with transport objectives	5	Excellent – reduces congestion, improves accessibility			
Fit with other objectives	5	Excellent - supports economic development and growth			
Degree of consensus	5	Transport benefits clearly defined			
Cost risk	3	Medium risk – details of scheme design unknown			
Affordability	3	Assumes £20 million capital cost			
Feasibility	4	Likely to be high feasibility but gound investigations not undertaken to date			
Acceptability	3	Untested, likely to be mixed			
Quality of evidence	2	Some informal analysis undertaken			
Deliverability	2	4 years, medium delivery risk			
Flexibility	1	Static scheme, little flexibility following preferred scheme choice.			

Option name	**Access to Didcot Station – Additional Platforms**				
Description	The project is likely to comprise a new 'island' platform with one or two new platform faces to the north of the existing that could be used by additional services.				
Identified problems	The station has five existing platforms, but with future service improvements it is likely these will be inadequate to cater for longer and/or more frequent trains. The scheme would give greater resilience to delay, and extra capacity to regulate services before they continue through the Thames Valley towards Reading and London and interchange with other services.				
Element	Rating	Justification			
Economic growth	5	*Connectivity*	G	*Reliability*	G
		Resilience	G	*Delivery*	G
Carbon Emissions	3	*Activity*	R	*Embedded C*	R
		Carbon use	G	*Efficiency*	G
Socio-distributional impact	4	*SDIs*	A	*Regeneration*	G
		Regional imbalance & economic growth			G
Local environment	4	*Air Quality*	A	*Noise*	A
		Natural Env	-	*Urban Env*	G
Well being	4	*Severance*	A	*Physical Activity*	A
		Injuries	A	*Crime*	A
		Access	G	*Resilience*	G
Value for Money	3	Medium – expected BCR = 1.5-2.0			
Scale of impact	4	Moderate, countywide impact			
Fit with transport objectives	5	Excellent fit – improving accessibility, promoting mode change			
Fit with other objectives	5	Excellent Fit – supporting economic growth and development			
Degree of consensus	5	Impacts clear			
Cost risk	2	Medium high risk from unquantified estimate			
Affordability	3	Assumes capital cost of £14M			
Feasibility	3	Some important constraints to be worked through			
Acceptability	3	Untested, likely to be favourable			
Quality of evidence	3	Good analysis of problem, some of solution			
Deliverability	1	4 year delivery programme, high risk			
Flexibility	3	Moderate flexibility			

Option name	**Access to Didcot Station – Car Park Expansion**				
Description	To increase the capacity of Didcot Station Car Park (Foxhall Rd) through decking including associated car park access improvements through provision of an improved footbridge into the Station and widening of Foxhall Road bridge to enable two way working .				
Identified problems	It is estimated around 500 additional spaces are needed on site to cope with increased background demand and support associated with growth across Science Vale area. It is also directly related to enabling the Didcot Gateway development which currently includes a temporary car park used by rail passengers.				
Element	Rating	Justification			
Economic growth	4	*Connectivity*	A	*Reliability*	A
		Resilience	G	*Delivery*	G
Carbon Emissions	4	*Activity*	A	*Embedded C*	R
		Carbon use	G	*Efficiency*	G
Socio-distributional impact	4	*SDIs*	A	*Regeneration*	G
		Regional imbalance & economic growth			G
Local environment	4	*Air Quality*	A	*Noise*	A
		Natural Env	-	*Urban Env*	G
Well being	3	*Severance*	A	*Physical Activity*	A
		Injuries	A	*Crime*	A
		Access	A	*Resilience*	A
Value for Money	3	Medium – expected BCR = 1.5-2.0			
Scale of impact	4	District-wide, significant impact			
Fit with transport objectives	5	Excellent fit – improving accessibility, promoting mode change			
Fit with other objectives	5	Excellent Fit – supporting economic growth and development			
Degree of consensus	4	Depends on transfer to public transport			
Cost risk	3	Medium risk			
Affordability	4	Assumes £9.5M cost			
Feasibility	4	Need for rail industry buy-in			
Acceptability	4	Untested, likely to be favourable			
Quality of evidence	3	Good analysis of problems and some of outcome			
Deliverability	3	4 years, medium delivery risk – see feasibility			
Flexibility	2	Little scope for reducing scheme, except by dropping elements			

Option name	**Access to Didcot Station – Northern Entrance**				
Description	A new entrance to the north of Didcot and pedestrian/cycle crossing. The project includes a new entrance hall, with ticket office, lift and stairs leading to a new bridge over the railway, along with associated footpaths, and drop-off facilities.				
Identified problems	The existing station entrance is located on the south side of the station, away from the existing and planned residential areas to the north of the line. Didcot Station is already constrained by its size, with out-of-date facilities.				
Element	Rating	Justification			
Economic growth	4	*Connectivity*	G	*Reliability*	A
		Resilience	G	*Delivery*	G
Carbon Emissions	4	*Activity*	G	*Embedded C*	A
		Carbon use	A	*Efficiency*	G
Socio-distributional impact	4	*SDIs*	A	*Regeneration*	G
		Regional imbalance & economic growth			G
Local environment	4	*Air Quality*	A	*Noise*	A
		Natural Env	-	*Urban Env*	G
Well being	3	*Severance*	A	*Physical Activity*	A
		Injuries	A	*Crime*	A
		Access	A	*Resilience*	A
Value for Money	3	Medium – expected BCR = 1.5-2.0			
Scale of impact	3	Significant, locality-wide impact			
Fit with transport objectives	5	Excellent fit – improving accessibility, promoting mode change			
Fit with other objectives	5	Excellent Fit – supporting economic growth and development			
Degree of consensus	5	Impacts clear			
Cost risk	2	Based on unquantified estimate			
Affordability	3	Assumes construction cost of £17.5M			
Feasibility	4	Land ownership constraints and unknown site conditions			
Acceptability	4	Untested, expected to be favourable			
Quality of evidence	2	Informal analysis			
Deliverability	3	5 years, medium risk ((possession requirements)			
Flexibility	2	Little scope for reducing scheme, except by dropping elements			

Option name	**Access to Didcot Station – 4-track railway (Didcot-Oxford)**				
Description	The scope of the work required is still to be identified, but could comprise full four-tracking throughout, or a combination of all or some of the following: dynamic passing loops, station passenger loops and new or extended platforms, to provide four tracks at key locations to achieve more network capacity.				
Identified problems	This project seeks to deliver the infrastructure necessary to operate the forecasted increase in freight traffic up to 2043, and the more intensive passenger service that is vital, economically, to Oxfordshire and Science Vale.				
Element	Rating	Justification			
Economic growth	4	*Connectivity*	G/A	*Reliability*	G/A
		Resilience	G	*Delivery*	G
Carbon Emissions	3	*Activity*	A	*Embedded C*	R
		Carbon use	G	*Efficiency*	G
Socio-distributional impact	4	*SDIs*	A	*Regeneration*	G
		Regional imbalance & economic growth			G
Local environment	2	*Air Quality*	A	*Noise*	A
		Natural Env	R	*Urban Env*	-
Well being	4	*Severance*	A	*Physical Activity*	A
		Injuries	A	*Crime*	A
		Access	G	*Resilience*	G
Value for Money	3	Large benefits, but very high cost			
Scale of impact	4	Moderate, countywide impact			
Fit with transport objectives	5	Excellent fit – improving accessibility, promoting mode change			
Fit with other objectives	5	Excellent Fit – supporting economic growth and development			
Degree of consensus	4	Depends on transfer to rail, which in turn depends on level of service provided			
Cost risk	2	Medium/high			
Affordability	1	Assumes £250 million construction cost			
Feasibility	3	Unknown at present			
Acceptability	4	Untested, expected to be generally favourable			
Quality of evidence	3	Good analysis of problems			
Deliverability	1	More than 5 years, high risk			
Flexibility	4	Scope for tailoring scheme to funds			

Option name	**Access to Didcot Station – Building Enhancements**				
Description	The project envisages a three-storey building: a ground floor having ticket office, retail space, toilets, and rail staff facilities; a second floor with a concourse giving access onto platform 1, as well as rail management offices; and a third floor with passenger space leading to a new footbridge that will connect to all the platforms.				
Identified problems	The existing single storey station building was built in 1985 and is inadequate for the number of people now using the station. Its size means there is little space to provide the facilities people now expect.				
Element	Rating	Justification			
Economic growth	3	*Connectivity*	A	*Reliability*	A
		Resilience	A	*Delivery*	A
Carbon Emissions	2	*Activity*	A	*Embedded C*	R
		Carbon use	A	*Efficiency*	A
Socio-distributional impact	4	*SDIs*	A	*Regeneration*	G
		Regional imbalance & economic growth			G
Local environment	4	*Air Quality*	A	*Noise*	A
		Natural Env	-	*Urban Env*	G
Well being	4	*Severance*	G	*Physical Activity*	A
		Injuries	A	*Crime*	A
		Access	A	*Resilience*	A
Value for Money	1	Not primarily justified on transport grounds			
Scale of impact	3	Significant, locality wide impact			
Fit with transport objectives	2	Encourages mode switch			
Fit with other objectives	5	Excellent Fit – supporting economic growth and development			
Degree of consensus	2	Depends on transfer to rail, which in turn depends on level of service provided			
Cost risk	2	Details not known at present			
Affordability	2	Assumes cost of £25 million			
Feasibility	3	Details not known at present			
Acceptability	4	Untested, likely to be favourable			
Quality of evidence	2	Informal analysis			
Deliverability	2	5 years, medium risk			
Flexibility	4	Design can be refined and elements scaled to fit funding available.			

Option name	**Science Vale: Access to EZ – A417 improvements**				
Description	The proposed scheme will deliver capacity enhancements at Rowstock Roundabout and carriageway improvements along the A417, including village junction improvements and public transport infrastructure.				
Identified problems	This scheme is a key part of a package of strategic schemes required across the area to provide a reliable and resilient transport network. The Wantage Eastern Link Road and improvements at Steventon lights and along Featherbed Lane are directly reliant on this scheme being delivered.				
Element	Rating	Justification			
Economic growth	4	*Connectivity*	G	*Reliability*	G
		Resilience	A	*Delivery*	G
Carbon Emissions	3	*Activity*	A	*Embedded C*	R
		Carbon use	A	*Efficiency*	A
Socio-distributional impact	4	*SDIs*	A	*Regeneration*	G
		Regional imbalance & economic growth			G
Local environment	3	*Air Quality*	A	*Noise*	A
		Natural Env	A	*Urban Env*	-
Well being	4	*Severance*	A	*Physical Activity*	A
		Injuries	A	*Crime*	A
		Access	G	*Resilience*	A
Value for Money	3	Estimated BCR 1.5 – 2.0			
Scale of impact	4	District-wide problem, significantly alleviated			
Fit with transport objectives	4	Good fit; reduces congestion, provides improved transport choice			
Fit with other objectives	5	Excellent fit: developing infrastructure to support economic growth			
Degree of consensus	4	Generally clear impacts, but may be issues with effectiveness of Rowstock scheme			
Cost risk	4	Low-medium risk (not designed, low cost)			
Affordability	5	Assumes £4 million capital cost			
Feasibility	4	No known design issues			
Acceptability	4	Untested, likely to be favourable			
Quality of evidence	3	Good analysis of problems, some of outcomes			
Deliverability	3	3 years, medium risk			
Flexibility	5	Scheme could be scaled to match funding availability			

Option name	**Access to Harwell Link Road – Phase 1**				
Description	A link road from A4130 east of Milton Interchange to the A417 plus bringing current substandard Hagbourne Hill road up to current standards and improve junctions at either end.				
Identified problems	The current network has effectively reached capacity and is therefore a barrier to further growth. Investment is required to facilitate planned growth identified and enable delivery of the Enterprise Zone and job growth in the area.				
Element	Rating	Justification			
Economic growth	5	*Connectivity*	G	*Reliability*	G
		Resilience	G	*Delivery*	G
Carbon Emissions	2	*Activity*	R	*Embedded C*	R
		Carbon use	A	*Efficiency*	A
Socio-distributional impact	4	*SDIs*	A	*Regeneration*	A
		Regional imbalance & economic growth			G
Local environment	4	*Air Quality*	A	*Noise*	G
		Natural Env	R	*Urban Env*	G
Well being	4	*Severance*	A	*Physical Activity*	A
		Injuries	G	*Crime*	A
		Access	G	*Resilience*	G
Value for Money	2	High – Expected BCR = 2.0 – 4.0			
Scale of impact	4	Significant, district-wide impact			
Fit with transport objectives	5	Excellent fit – reducing congestion and improving accessibility			
Fit with other objectives	5	Excellent fit – supporting economic development and growth			
Degree of consensus	4	Generally accepted benefits – although may be issue of impact of generated traffic			
Cost risk	5	Low risk			
Affordability	3	Assumes 16.2M capital cost			
Feasibility	4	Straightforward scheme with few challenges			
Acceptability	5	Tested, favourable			
Quality of evidence	3	Some analysis undertaken			
Deliverability	1	5+ years to deliver, high risk to programme			
Flexibility	1	Little/no scope for reduced scope scheme			

Option name	**Science Vale: Cycle network improvements**				
Description	The proposed scheme includes elements such as cycle including infrastructure (routes, parking), cycle hire scheme including hubs at key locations (business parks, town centres, train stations), and better information and signage for cyclists using the latest technologies.				
Identified problems	With all of the growth planned, cycling improvements and innovations are needed to underpin modal choice in Science Vale, network resilience and connectivity to give a real alternative to the private vehicle.				
Element	Rating	Justification			
Economic growth	4	*Connectivity*	G	*Reliability*	G/A
		Resilience	G	*Delivery*	G
Carbon Emissions	5	*Activity*	G	*Embedded C*	A
		Carbon use	G	*Efficiency*	G
Socio-distributional impact	5	*SDIs*	G	*Regeneration*	G
		Regional imbalance & economic growth			G
Local environment	5	*Air Quality*	G	*Noise*	G
		Natural Env	G	*Urban Env*	G
Well being	4	*Severance*	A	*Physical Activity*	G
		Injuries	A	*Crime*	A
		Access	G	*Resilience*	A
Value for Money	4	Estimated BCR 2.0-4.0			
Scale of impact	3	District-wide, moderate impact			
Fit with transport objectives	5	Increases travel choice, reduces carbon, reduces congestion			
Fit with other objectives	5	Provides infrastructure to support economic growth, improves public health			
Degree of consensus	3	Uncertainty over amount of use of facilities, especially in rural areas			
Cost risk	4	Low-medium risk (not designed, low cost)			
Affordability	5	Assumes £4.9 million capital cost			
Feasibility	4	No known design issues			
Acceptability	3	Untested, likely to be mixed			
Quality of evidence	3	Good analysis of problems, some of outcomes			
Deliverability	3	4 years, low risk			
Flexibility	5	Programme can be easily scaled to match funding			

Option name	**Science Vale: Didcot Science Bridge**				
Description	The scheme will see a new bridge over the Great Western railway. It offers improved access through and around Didcot and access to key locations in Science Vale, in particular Milton Park, the PowerStation, and Harwell Campus.				
Identified problems	Manor Bridge lies on the A4130 between the Basil Hill and Mendip Heights roundabouts. These are reaching capacity and additional growth planned will increase the pressure on the junctions, stifling growth and preventing business investment and the delivery of the Science Vale EZ.				
Element	Rating	Justification			
Economic growth	5	*Connectivity*	G	*Reliability*	G
		Resilience	G	*Delivery*	G
Carbon Emissions	2	*Activity*	A	*Embedded C*	R
		Carbon use	A	*Efficiency*	A
Socio-distributional impact	4	*SDIs*	A	*Regeneration*	G
		Regional imbalance & economic growth			G
Local environment	2	*Air Quality*	A	*Noise*	R
		Natural Env	-	*Urban Env*	R
Well being	4	*Severance*	A	*Physical Activity*	A
		Injuries	G	*Crime*	A
		Access	G	*Resilience*	G
Value for Money	3	Estimated BCR 2.0 – 4.0			
Scale of impact	3	Moderate, district-wide impact			
Fit with transport objectives	5	Excellent – reduces congestion, improves accessibility			
Fit with other objectives	5	Excellent – supports economic growth and development			
Degree of consensus	5	Straightforward impacts			
Cost risk	1	High cost risk – scheme details to be determined, unusual scheme			
Affordability	2	Assumes construction cost of £34.9M			
Feasibility	3	Feasibility study to be undertaken			
Acceptability	3	Untested, likely to be mixed			
Quality of evidence	1	Scheme at early stage of development			
Deliverability	1	More than 5 years, high delivery risk			
Flexibility	1	Low flexibility for scheme			

Option name	**Featherbed Lane**				
Description	Bring route up to current standards, remove the severe bends and improve the junctions at either end.				
Identified problems	Route is heavily used but is of sub-standard width for most of its length and has a double dog-leg bend midway along its length; exiting the road is difficult.				
Element	Rating	Justification			
Economic growth	4	*Connectivity*	G	*Reliability*	G
		Resilience	A	*Delivery*	G
Carbon Emissions	2	*Activity*	A	*Embedded C*	R
		Carbon use	A	*Efficiency*	A
Socio-distributional impact	4	*SDIs*	A	*Regeneration*	A
		Regional imbalance & economic growth			G
Local environment	3	*Air Quality*	A	*Noise*	A
		Natural Env	A	*Urban Env*	A
Well being	4	*Severance*	A	*Physical Activity*	A
		Injuries	G	*Crime*	A
		Access	G	*Resilience*	A
Value for Money	3	Medium – expected BCR = 1.5-2.0			
Scale of impact	4	Significant, locality-wide impact			
Fit with transport objectives	5	Excellent fit – improving accessibility, reducing congestion			
Fit with other objectives	5	Excellent Fit – supporting economic growth and development			
Degree of consensus	4	Impact of on-line improvements clear			
Cost risk	4	Relatively high because at early design stage			
Affordability	5	Assumes capital cost of £6.5M			
Feasibility	3	Should be relatively straightforward but requires land acquisition			
Acceptability	4	Untested but likely to be favourable			
Quality of evidence	2	Some informal analysis of problem			
Deliverability	2	5 years / low programme risk			
Flexibility	2	Could only deliver some elements of scheme but at reduced benefits.			

Option name	**Science Vale: Jubilee Way Improvement Scheme**				
Description	The improvements comprise the realignment of Hitchcock to the north-east and alternations to the roundabout to improve the operation of and capacity of the junction and help deliver more developable land in the town centre.				
Identified problems	This junction currently experiences congestion (with journey time delay and long queue lengths) and this will only increase with additional growth. If congestion in this area is not improved then the sustainability and vitality of the town centre will suffer making the town centre unattractive.				
Element	Rating	Justification			
Economic growth	5	*Connectivity*	G	*Reliability*	G
		Resilience	G	*Delivery*	G
Carbon Emissions	2	*Activity*	R	*Embedded C*	R
		Carbon use	A	*Efficiency*	A
Socio-distributional impact	4	*SDIs*	A	*Regeneration*	G
		Regional imbalance & economic growth			G
Local environment	4	*Air Quality*	G	*Noise*	A
		Natural Env	-	*Urban Env*	G
Well being	4	*Severance*	A	*Physical Activity*	A
		Injuries	A	*Crime*	A
		Access	G	*Resilience*	G
Value for Money	2	Estimated BCR 2.0 – 4.0			
Scale of impact	3	Significant, locality wide impact			
Fit with transport objectives	5	Excellent – reduces congestion, improves accessibility			
Fit with other objectives	5	Excellent – supports economic growth and development			
Degree of consensus	5	Straightforward impacts			
Cost risk	3	Medium risk – scheme details to be determined			
Affordability	4	Assumes capital cost of £6.5 million			
Feasibility	4	May be issue of suitability of land			
Acceptability	4	Untested, expected to be favourable			
Quality of evidence	5	Options modelled in detail			
Deliverability	3	3 years, medium risk			
Flexibility	1	Little scope for adapting preferred scheme			

Option name	**Wantage Eastern Link Road**				
Description	A Link Road from A338 to the A417 to act as a perimeter road for Wantage to take traffic off the town centre routes and also for the Crab Hill development.				
Identified problems	Wantage and Grove are set to expand by around 5,000 dwellings by 2030 and the cumulative impact of this growth needs to be mitigated as well as an attractive route provided to encourage growth.				
Element	Rating	Justification			
Economic growth	4	*Connectivity*	G	*Reliability*	A
		Resilience	G	*Delivery*	G
Carbon Emissions	3	*Activity*	A	*Embedded C*	A
		Carbon use	A	*Efficiency*	G
Socio-distributional impact	4	*SDIs*	G	*Regeneration*	A
		Regional imbalance & economic growth			G
Local environment	4	*Air Quality*	G	*Noise*	A
		Natural Env	A	*Urban Env*	G
Well being	3	*Severance*	A	*Physical Activity*	A
		Injuries	A	*Crime*	A
		Access	G	*Resilience*	G
Value for Money	4	High – expected BCR =2.0-4.0			
Scale of impact	3	Significant locality-wide impact			
Fit with transport objectives	5	Excellent fit – improving accessibility, reducing congestion			
Fit with other objectives	5	Excellent fit – supporting economic growth and development			
Degree of consensus	3	Will depend on details of preferred scheme			
Cost risk	2	Relatively high risk until details of scheme determined			
Affordability	4	Assumes capital cost of £14 M			
Feasibility	4	Likely to be relatively straightforward scheme			
Acceptability	3	Untested/mixed			
Quality of evidence	4	Has been modelling of overall strategy but limited of particular scheme			
Deliverability	4	3 years, low risk of slippage			
Flexibility	3	Some scope for variation of route			