| Option name                 | A34 Chilton   | junction – nort  | h facing     | slips               |         |  |  |
|-----------------------------|---------------|--|--------------|---------------------|---------|--|--|
| Description                 | Completion    | Completion of all movements junction to improve access from  |              |                     |         |  |  |
| ·                           | Harwell to st | rategic highway  | y networ     | k and relieve press | sure on |  |  |
|                             | Milton Interd |  | •            | ·                   |         |  |  |
| Identified problems         |               |  | ectively     | reached capacity a  | nd is   |  |  |
| Tachinea problems           |               |  | •            | •                   |         |  |  |
|                             |               | therefore a barrier to further growth. Investment is required to facilitate planned growth stimulate the economy to enable |              |                     |         |  |  |
|                             |               | _  |              | ob growth in the a  |         |  |  |
| Element                     | Rating        | Justification  | one and j    | ob growth in the a  | irca.   |  |  |
| Economic growth             | 5             | Connectivity   | G            | Reliability         | G       |  |  |
| Leonomic growth             | 3             | Resilience   | G            | Delivery            | G       |  |  |
| Carbon Emissions            | 2             |  | R            | Embedded C          | R       |  |  |
| Carbon Emissions            |               | Activity   |              | - <del> </del>      |         |  |  |
| Code distributional incode  | 4             | Carbon use   | A            | Efficiency          | G       |  |  |
| Socio-distributional impact | 4             | SDIs   | A            | Regeneration        | Α       |  |  |
|                             |               | _  |              | economic growth     | G       |  |  |
| Local environment           | 4             | Air Quality  | A            | Noise               | G       |  |  |
|                             |               | Natural Env  | G            | Urban Env           | Α       |  |  |
| Well being                  | 4             | Severance  | A            | Physical Activity   | А       |  |  |
|                             |               | Injuries   | A            | Crime               | А       |  |  |
|                             |               | Access   | G            | Resilience          | G       |  |  |
| Value for Money             | 3             | Expected BCR   | - 1.5-2.     | 0                   |         |  |  |
|                             |               |  |              |                     |         |  |  |
| Scale of impact             | 3             | Significant loc  | cality wid   | e impact            |         |  |  |
| Fit with transport          | 5             | Excellent fit –  | reducing     | g congestion and    |         |  |  |
| objectives .                |               | improving acc  | -            |                     |         |  |  |
| Fit with other objectives   | 5             | Excellent fit –  | support      | s economic develo   | pment   |  |  |
| •                           |               | and growth   |              |                     |         |  |  |
| Degree of consensus         | 5             | Impact clear   |              |                     |         |  |  |
|                             |               |  |              |                     |         |  |  |
| Cost risk                   | 3             | Medium risk  |              |                     |         |  |  |
|                             |               |  |              |                     |         |  |  |
| Affordability               | 3             | Assumes cons   | struction    | cost of £10.54M     |         |  |  |
| ,,                          |               |  |              |                     |         |  |  |
| Feasibility                 | 5             | Feasibility des  | sign com     | plete               |         |  |  |
| . casisiney                 |               |  | J.B CO       | piete               |         |  |  |
| Acceptability               | 4             | Not tested / li  | ikely to h   | e favourable        |         |  |  |
| receptability               |               | livot tested / II  | incry to b   | e lavourable        |         |  |  |
| Quality of evidence         | 5             | Feasibility rep  | ort com      | olete               |         |  |  |
|                             |               | 223.3, 100   |              | <b></b>             |         |  |  |
| Deliverability              | 4             | 2 years to con   | nstruct. n   | nedium slippage ri  | sk      |  |  |
| 2 Sire Cashiey              | · .           |  | .50. 400, 11 |                     |         |  |  |
| Flexibility                 | 1             | Very limited s   | cope for     | variation of design | n       |  |  |
|                             | -             | 10.7   | 30 pc 101    | .a.iacion of design |         |  |  |
|                             |               | 1  |              |                     |         |  |  |

| Option name                 | A34 Improvements Phase 1 |   |               |                                   |         |  |  |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|---|---------------|-----------------------------------|---------|--|--|
| Description                 |                          | A route strategy to improve access to and journey times along |               |                                   |         |  |  |
|                             | the A34 thro             | the A34 throughout Oxfordshire. Phase 1 will include the      |               |                                   |         |  |  |
|                             | "quick wins"             | "quick wins" – approach upgrades, slip road enhancements,     |               |                                   |         |  |  |
|                             | local access i           | ocal access upgrades and signal integration.                  |               |                                   |         |  |  |
| Identified problems         | The A34 is cr            | The A34 is critical to economic development in the 3 priority |               |                                   |         |  |  |
|                             | localities. Th           | ne fragility of th  | e A34 is o    | currently a barrier               | to      |  |  |
|                             | securing bus             | iness investmer   | nt and is     | stifling economic ${\mathfrak g}$ | growth. |  |  |
| Element                     | Rating                   | Justification   |               |                                   |         |  |  |
| Economic growth             | 5                        | Connectivity  | G             | Reliability                       | G       |  |  |
|                             |                          | Resilience  | G             | Delivery                          | G       |  |  |
| Carbon Emissions            | 3                        | Activity  | R             | Embedded C                        | Α       |  |  |
|                             |                          | Carbon use  | Α             | Efficiency                        | G       |  |  |
| Socio-distributional impact | 4                        | SDIs  | G             | Regeneration                      | Α       |  |  |
|                             |                          | Regional im   | balance &     | economic growth                   | G       |  |  |
| Local environment           | 4                        | Air Quality   | G             | Noise                             | G       |  |  |
|                             |                          | Natural Env   | Α             | Urban Env                         | G       |  |  |
| Well being                  | 4                        | Severance   | Α             | Physical Activity                 | Α       |  |  |
|                             |                          | Injuries  | G             | Crime                             | Α       |  |  |
|                             |                          | Access  | G             | Resilience                        | Α       |  |  |
| Value for Money             | 4                        | High – Expect   | ed BCR =      | 2.0-4.0                           |         |  |  |
|                             |                          | May be (signif  | ficant) de    | elays during constr               | uction  |  |  |
| Scale of impact             | 5                        | Significant, co   | untywid       | e impact                          |         |  |  |
|                             |                          |   |               |                                   |         |  |  |
| Fit with transport          | 5                        |   | -             | g congestion and                  |         |  |  |
| objectives                  |                          | improving acc   |               |                                   |         |  |  |
| Fit with other objectives   | 5                        |   | supports      | s economic develo                 | pment   |  |  |
|                             |                          | and growth  |               |                                   |         |  |  |
| Degree of consensus         | 4                        | Uncertainty o   | ver schei     | me to be delivered                | t       |  |  |
| Cont wint.                  | 2                        | Dalati alebial  | المامات المات |                                   | _       |  |  |
| Cost risk                   | 2                        | , -   | n risk aue    | e to uncertainty or               | 1       |  |  |
| Affordability               | 1                        | scheme  | tal sast a    | f COOM                            |         |  |  |
| Affordability               | 1                        | Assumes capi  | tai cost o    | II £ZUIVI                         |         |  |  |
| Feasibility                 | 4                        | Should be no  | nrohlem       | s but uncertainty of              | n .     |  |  |
| i casionicy                 |                          |   | =             | rge construction d                |         |  |  |
| Acceptability               | 4                        |   |               | be favourable                     | , .     |  |  |
|                             |                          |   |               |                                   |         |  |  |
| Quality of evidence         | 4                        | Investigated i  | n Access      | to Oxford project                 |         |  |  |
|                             |                          |   |               | , ,                               |         |  |  |
| Deliverability              | 1                        | 5 years to del  | iver, high    | risk of project slip              | opage   |  |  |
|                             |                          | -   | . 3           |                                   | . •     |  |  |
| Flexibility                 | 4                        | Can be scaled   | to budge      | et – but individual               | items   |  |  |
|                             |                          | may be expen  | sive          |                                   |         |  |  |

| Option name                   | Milton Interchange Improvement |   |             |   |          |  |  |  |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|-------------|---|----------|--|--|--|
| Description                   | The scheme                     | The scheme provides an innovative 'hamburger' style |             |   |          |  |  |  |
|                               | roundabout                     | enabling the ju                                     | nction to   | operate effectivel                        | ly       |  |  |  |
|                               | within planr                   | ned levels of gro                                   | wth for t   | the area and helpir                       | ng to    |  |  |  |
|                               | manage traf                    | fic onto the A34                                    | 4.          |   |          |  |  |  |
| Identified problems           | Milton Inter                   | change is heavi                                     | ly conges   | sted and demand e                         | xceeds   |  |  |  |
|                               | its capacity.                  | This junction is                                    | the only    | access to the stra                        | tegic    |  |  |  |
|                               | road netwo                     | rk for Milton Bu                                    | siness Pa   | irk and for local tra                     | iffic to |  |  |  |
|                               | access the b                   | usiness 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  | Α           | Efficiency                                | G        |  |  |  |
| Socio-distributional impact   | 4                              | SDIs  | Α           | Regeneration                              | G        |  |  |  |
|                               |                                | Regional im   | balance &   | R economic growth                         | G        |  |  |  |
| Local environment             | 3                              | Air Quality   | Α           | Noise                                     | Α        |  |  |  |
|                               |                                | Natural Env   | Α           | Urban Env                                 | -        |  |  |  |
| Well being                    | 4                              | Severance   | Α           | Physical Activity                         | Α        |  |  |  |
|                               |                                | Injuries  | Α           | Crime                                     | Α        |  |  |  |
|                               |                                | Access  | G           | Resilience                                | G        |  |  |  |
| Value for Money               | 4                              | Expected BCR  | R 2.0 - 4.0 | )   |          |  |  |  |
| Scale of impact               | 4                              | Significant, di                                     | strict-wi   | de  |          |  |  |  |
| Fit with transport objectives | 5                              | Excellent fit – congestion                          | - improvi   | ng accessibility, red                     | ducing   |  |  |  |
| Fit with other objectives     | 5                              |   | - sunnori   | ting economic grov                        | vth and  |  |  |  |
| The with other objectives     |                                | development   |             | ing comonne grov                          | verrana  |  |  |  |
| Degree of consensus           | 4                              | Innovative de                                       |             |   |          |  |  |  |
|                               |                                |   |             |   |          |  |  |  |
| Cost risk                     | 4                              | Low/medium  | risk        |   |          |  |  |  |
| Affordability                 | 3                              | Assumes tota  | l cost of   | £10.03 million                            |          |  |  |  |
| Facility                      |                                | Danier sierre                                       | ı et        |   |          |  |  |  |
| Feasibility                   | 5                              | Design signed                                       | тотт        |   |          |  |  |  |
| Acceptability                 | 4                              | Untested, exp                                       | pected to   | be favourable                             |          |  |  |  |
| Quality of evidence           | 5                              | Business case                                       | produce     | ed  |          |  |  |  |
| Deliverability                | 4                              | Up to 2 years                                       | , mediun    | n risk                                    |          |  |  |  |
| Flexibility                   | 1                              | Little scope fo                                     | or reduci   | 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 ro   | ad with Oxford   | -Bletchle  | y Railway line into | grade  |  |  |
|                             | separated ov   | er/under-bridg   | ge.        |                     |        |  |  |
| Identified problems         | The existing   | level crossing is  | adequat    | te for the existing | use of |  |  |
|                             | the line (one  | freight train pe   | er day); u | pgrading the cross  | sing,  |  |  |
|                             | probably to a  | probably to a road bridge over the railway, is essential befor |            |                     |        |  |  |
|                             | East-West Ra   | ail services can   | commen     | ce.                 |        |  |  |
| Element                     | Rating   | Justification  |            |                     |        |  |  |
| Economic growth             | 4  | Connectivity   | G          | Reliability         | G      |  |  |
|                             |  | Resilience   | А          | Delivery            | G      |  |  |
| Carbon Emissions            | 2  | Activity   | Α          | Embedded C          | R      |  |  |
|                             |  | Carbon use   | Α          | Efficiency          | Α      |  |  |
| Socio-distributional impact | 4  | SDIs   | Α          | Regeneration        | Α      |  |  |
|                             |  | Regional imi   | balance &  | economic growth     | G      |  |  |
| Local environment           | 2  | Air Quality  | Α          | Noise               | R      |  |  |
|                             |  | Natural Env  | А          | Urban Env           | R      |  |  |
| Well being                  | 3  | Severance  | Α          | Physical Activity   | Α      |  |  |
|                             |  | Injuries   | А          | Crime               | А      |  |  |
|                             |  | Access   | G/A        | Resilience          | А      |  |  |
| Value for Money             | 3  | Estimated BC   | R 1.5-2.0  | )                   |        |  |  |
|                             |  |  |            |                     |        |  |  |
| Scale of impact             | 4  | Significant, di  | strict-wio | de impact           |        |  |  |
| Fit with transport          | 4  | Good fit – red   | luces cor  | ngestion, improves  | access |  |  |
| objectives                  |  | to goods and   |            | , ,                 |        |  |  |
| Fit with other objectives   | 5  | Supporting ed  | conomic    | development and     | growth |  |  |
| Degree of consensus         | 5  | Nature of imp  | acts clea  | ır                  |        |  |  |
|                             |  |  |            |                     |        |  |  |
| Cost risk                   | 3  | Medium risk -  | – details  | of design unknowr   | 1      |  |  |
| Affordability               | 4  | Assumes cons   | struction  | cost of £8.3 millio | n      |  |  |
| Feasibility                 | 4  | No known iss   | ues        |                     |        |  |  |
|                             |  |  |            |                     |        |  |  |
| Acceptability               | 4  | Untested, exp  | ected to   | be favourable       |        |  |  |
| Quality of evidence         | 3  | Good assessm   | nent of p  | roblem              |        |  |  |
| Deliverability              | 2  | 4 years, medi  | um deliv   | ery risk            |        |  |  |
|                             |  |  |            |                     |        |  |  |
| Flexibility                 | 1  | Little scope fo  | or scaling | scheme.             |        |  |  |
| Flexibility                 | 1  | Little scope fo  | or scaling | scheme.             |        |  |  |

| Option name                 | Bicester: London Road Railway Crossing |                   |             |                      |         |  |
|-----------------------------|--|-------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------|--|
| Description                 | A new all-m                            | odes bridge acro  | oss the ra  | ailway (or road und  | lerpass |  |
|                             | plus pedest                            | rian overbridge)  | at Londo    | on Road, Bicester.   | -       |  |
|                             | Alternativel                           | y a new link road | from A      | 41 to London Road    | or a    |  |
|                             | new link roa                           | d from Charbrid   | lge Road    | to Launton Road.     |         |  |
| Identified problems         | The closure                            | of London Road    | for up to   | o 40 minutes in eve  | ery     |  |
|                             | hour with E                            | ast-West rail and | d Oxford    | -Marylebone servi    | ces     |  |
|                             | would stifle                           | Bicester's devel  | opment      | plan and alienate    |         |  |
|                             | residents in                           | south-east quar   | ter of bi   | ceser from remain    | der 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        | А           | Efficiency           | А       |  |
| Socio-distributional impact | 4                                      | SDIs              | Α           | Regeneration         | Α       |  |
|                             |  | Regional imb      | balance &   | economic growth      | G       |  |
| Local environment           | 2                                      | Air Quality       | Α           | Noise                | Α       |  |
|                             |  | Natural Env       | _           | Urban Env            | R       |  |
| Well being                  | 4                                      | Severance         | G           | Physical Activity    | Α       |  |
| Ü                           |  | Injuries          | A           | Crime                | Α       |  |
|                             |  | Access            | G           | Resilience           | G       |  |
| Value for Money             | 2                                      | Estimated BCI     | R 1.0-1.5   |                      |         |  |
| Scale of impact             | 4                                      | Significant, dis  | strict-wi   | de impact            |         |  |
| Fit with transport          | 5                                      | Excellent – red   | ducing co   | ongestion and imp    | roving  |  |
| objectives                  |  | accessibility     |             | . 0                  | . 0     |  |
| Fit with other objectives   | 5                                      | <u> </u>          | pporting    | economic develor     | ment    |  |
|                             |  | and growth        |             |                      |         |  |
| Degree of consensus         | 5                                      | Impacts clear     |             |                      |         |  |
| Cost risk                   | 3                                      | Medium risk -     | - scheme    | e details to be reso | lved    |  |
| Affordability               | 2                                      | Assumes capit     |             | of £27.4 million for | 2       |  |
| Feasibility                 | 2                                      | <u> </u>          |             | h land-take and im   | nact    |  |
| . Casionicy                 | _                                      | on buildings      | a.c.c. vvic | and take and m       | Pacc    |  |
| Acceptability               | 3                                      | <u> </u>          | ate, exp    | ected to be mixed    |         |  |
| Quality of evidence         | 4                                      | Some modelli      | ng of pro   | oblems and outcon    | nes     |  |
| Deliverability              | 1                                      | More than 5 y     | rears, me   | edium risk           |         |  |
| Flexibility                 | 1                                      | Static scheme     |             |                      |         |  |

| Option name                 | Bicester London Road level crossing Phase 1 only |   |             |                        |         |  |  |  |
|-----------------------------|--|---|-------------|------------------------|---------|--|--|--|
| Description                 | Provision of                                     | Provision of phase 1 only of replacement of level crossing - to |             |                        |         |  |  |  |
|                             | allow level co                                   | rossing to close  | and mai     | ntain pedestrian a     | nd      |  |  |  |
|                             | cycle access                                     | cycle access across the railway by overbridge.                  |             |                        |         |  |  |  |
| Identified problems         | The closure                                      | of London road  | for up to   | 40 minutes in eve      | ry hour |  |  |  |
|                             | with East-we                                     | est rail and Oxfo   | rd-Mary     | lebone services wo     | ould    |  |  |  |
|                             | stifle Biceste                                   | r's developmen  | it plan an  | id alienate residen    | ts in   |  |  |  |
|                             | south-east q                                     | uarter of bicese  | er from re  | emainder of town.      |         |  |  |  |
| Element                     | Rating   | Justification   |             |                        |         |  |  |  |
| Economic growth             | 4  | Connectivity  | G           | Reliability            | G       |  |  |  |
|                             |  | Resilience  | А           | Delivery               | Α       |  |  |  |
| Carbon Emissions            | 4  | Activity  | G           | Embedded C             | Α       |  |  |  |
|                             |  | Carbon use  | G           | Efficiency             | G       |  |  |  |
| Socio-distributional impact | 5  | SDIs  | G           | Regeneration           | G       |  |  |  |
|                             |  | Regional im   | balance &   | 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                  | А       |  |  |  |
|                             |  | Access  | G           | Resilience             | G       |  |  |  |
| Value for Money             | 4  | Expected BCR  | 2.0 - 4.0   |                        |         |  |  |  |
|                             |  |   |             |                        |         |  |  |  |
| Scale of impact             | 2  | Moderate, to  | wn-wide     |                        |         |  |  |  |
|                             |  |   |             |                        |         |  |  |  |
| Fit with transport          | 5  | Excellent fit –   | improvii    | ng accessibility,      |         |  |  |  |
| objectives                  |  | promoting mo  |             | _                      |         |  |  |  |
| Fit with other objectives   | 5  |   |             | ing economic grov      | vth and |  |  |  |
|                             |  | development   |             |                        |         |  |  |  |
| Degree of consensus         | 5  | Impacts clear   |             |                        |         |  |  |  |
|                             |  |   |             |                        |         |  |  |  |
| Cost risk                   | 2  | Design work s   | still to be | carried out            |         |  |  |  |
|                             | _  |   |             |                        |         |  |  |  |
| Affordability               | 5  | Assumes £3.6  | M capita    | l cost                 |         |  |  |  |
|                             | _  |   | •           | 1.00                   |         |  |  |  |
| Feasibility                 | 4  | -   |             | os, difficult to deliv | /er     |  |  |  |
|                             | 2  | once railway i  | •           |                        |         |  |  |  |
| Acceptability               | 3  | · ·   | •           | mixed - may be res     | istance |  |  |  |
| Quality of avidance         | A  | to loss of all n  |             |                        |         |  |  |  |
| Quality of evidence         | 4  | Some modelli  | ing of pro  | blems and outcon       | nes     |  |  |  |
| Dolivorability              | 2  | 2 400 00 000 -11:   | المالية     | on, rick               |         |  |  |  |
| Deliverability              | 3  | 3 years, medi   | um deliv    | ery risk               |         |  |  |  |
| Flexibility                 | 1  | Likely to be lik  | mited on    | tions for crossing.    |         |  |  |  |
| Tiexibility                 |  | Likely to be III  | πιευ υρ     | dons for crossing.     |         |  |  |  |
|                             |  |   |             |                        |         |  |  |  |

| Option name  | Bicester ped  | estrian/cycle co   | onnectiv    | ity improvements    |        |  |  |  |
|--|---|--|-------------|---------------------|--------|--|--|--|
| Description  | The project v   | The project will connect 3 major development sites for       |             |                     |        |  |  |  |
| ·  | pedestrians   | pedestrians and cycles with each other and the town centre   |             |                     |        |  |  |  |
|  | (rail stations) by overcoming severance problems of the |  |             |                     |        |  |  |  |
|  | railway line a  |  | ,           |                     |        |  |  |  |
| Identified problems  |   | This will help to encourage people to travel sustainably for |             |                     |        |  |  |  |
| •  |   | shorter journeys or linked trips which, in turn, will help   |             |                     |        |  |  |  |
|  | 1   | estion, improve  | •           | •                   |        |  |  |  |
| Element  | Rating  | Justification  | ,           | ,                   |        |  |  |  |
| Economic growth  | 4   | Connectivity   | A/G         | Reliability         | G      |  |  |  |
| S S  |   | Resilience   | G           | Delivery            | Α      |  |  |  |
| Carbon Emissions   | 5   | Activity   | G           | Embedded C          | G      |  |  |  |
|  |   | Carbon use   | G           | Efficiency          | G      |  |  |  |
| Socio-distributional impact  | 3   | SDIs   | G           | Regeneration        | Α      |  |  |  |
| ·  |   | Regional imi   | balance &   | 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      |  |  |  |
| , and the second |   | Injuries   | A           | Crime               | А      |  |  |  |
|  |   | Access   | Α           | Resilience          | Α      |  |  |  |
| Value for Money  | 2   | Low – Expecte  | ed BCR =    |                     |        |  |  |  |
| ,  |   | '  |             |                     |        |  |  |  |
| Scale of impact  | 1   | Small, town-w  | vide impa   | act                 |        |  |  |  |
| Fit with transport   | 5   | Reduces cong   | estion ar   | nd encourages low   | carbon |  |  |  |
| objectives .   |   | travel   |             | J                   |        |  |  |  |
| Fit with other objectives  | 5   | Supporting ed  | conomic     | development and a   | growth |  |  |  |
| Degree of consensus  | 2   | Uncertainty o  | ver take    | up of facilities    |        |  |  |  |
| Cost risk  | 1   | High risk beca   | use of u    | ncertainties over d | esign  |  |  |  |
| Affordobility  |   | Acquire on accom   | - د ځلم رسل | cost of C4 4N4      |        |  |  |  |
| Affordability  | 5   | Assumes cons   | struction   | cost of £4.4M       |        |  |  |  |
| Feasibility  | 3   | May be issues  | on rail/    | road crossings      |        |  |  |  |
| Acceptability  | 4   | Not tested, lik  | cely to be  | e favourable        |        |  |  |  |
| Quality of evidence  | 3   |  |             | out on defining     |        |  |  |  |
|  |   | -  |             | on impact of schen  |        |  |  |  |
| Deliverability   | 2   | 4 years to del delays  | iver, med   | dium risk of progra | mme    |  |  |  |
| Flexibility  | 3   | 1  | o do son    | ne smaller scale sc | heme   |  |  |  |
|  |   | but with signi   | ficant los  | ss of benefits      |        |  |  |  |

| Option name  | Bicester: Peripheral Road Improvements |  |            |                                      |         |  |  |
|--|--|--|------------|--------------------------------------|---------|--|--|
| Description  | Strategic im                           | provements to i  | mprove     | the capacity and jo                  | ourney  |  |  |
|  | times on the                           | times on the routes around the outskirts of the town;          |            |                                      |         |  |  |
|  | measures to                            | slow speeds th   | rough th   | e centre of Biceste                  | er;     |  |  |
|  | measures to                            | improve east-w   | vest sust  | ainable links.                       |         |  |  |
| Identified problems  | The improve                            | The improvements are an integral part of the significant jobs- |            |                                      |         |  |  |
| ·  | led growth p                           | lanned for the t   | town. Th   | ne highway netwo                     | rk      |  |  |
|  |  |  |            | ds put upon it to a                  |         |  |  |
|  | new busines                            | ses to the town  | as well a  | as enable existing                   |         |  |  |
|  | companies t                            | o grow.  |            | _                                    |         |  |  |
| Element  | Rating                                 | Justification  |            |                                      |         |  |  |
| Economic growth  | 5                                      | Connectivity   | G          | Reliability                          | G       |  |  |
| <u> </u>   |  | 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       |  |  |
| and the state of t |  |  |            | economic growth                      | G       |  |  |
| Local environment  | 5                                      | Air Quality  | G          | Noise                                | G       |  |  |
| Local criviloriment  |  | Natural Env  |            | Urban Env                            | G       |  |  |
| Well being   | 5                                      | Severance  |            | Physical Activity                    |         |  |  |
| Well being   | ]                                      |  | G          | Crime                                | G       |  |  |
|  |  | Injuries   | G          |                                      | A       |  |  |
| V-1 - 5 N  | 2                                      | Access   | G          | Resilience                           | G       |  |  |
| Value for Money  | 3                                      | Estimated BCI  | K 1.5-2.0  |                                      |         |  |  |
| Scale of impact  | 3                                      | Significant, lo  | cality-wi  | de impact                            |         |  |  |
| Fit with transport   | 5                                      | Excellent – re   | duces co   | ngestion, promote                    | es more |  |  |
| objectives   |  | sustainable tr   |            | <b>0</b>                             |         |  |  |
| Fit with other objectives  | 5                                      |  |            | ousing and econor                    | mic     |  |  |
|  |  | development  | • •        | _                                    | -       |  |  |
| Degree of consensus  | 3                                      | Scheme detai   |            |                                      |         |  |  |
|  |  |  |            |                                      |         |  |  |
| Cost risk  | 2                                      | medium/high  | risk – sc  | heme details not k                   | nown    |  |  |
| Affordability  | 2                                      | Assumes capi   | tal cost c | of £22.5 million                     |         |  |  |
| Feasibility  | 4                                      | No known issu  | ues        |                                      |         |  |  |
| Acceptability  | 3                                      | Untested, like   | ly to be   | mixed                                |         |  |  |
| Quality of evidence  | 3                                      | Good analysis of problems and some of outcomes                 |            |                                      |         |  |  |
| Deliverability   | 1                                      | More than 5 y  | /ears, me  | edium risk                           |         |  |  |
| Flexibility  | 3                                      |  |            | iding programme,<br>cant large items | but     |  |  |

| Description T  |  |                               |             | West: Improving access to Carterton |         |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|-------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|---------|--|--|--|--|
| Description  | he scheme i  | is likely to invol            | ve the up   | ograde of route sta                 | ndard   |  |  |  |  |
| a  | and improvement of junctions, potentially leading to its re- |                               |             |                                     |         |  |  |  |  |
| d  | designation of route between A361 and A40/Witney as a        |                               |             |                                     |         |  |  |  |  |
| p  | principal (A) road.  |                               |             |                                     |         |  |  |  |  |
| Identified problems C  | Carterton an   | d RAF Brize Nor               | ton are     | connected to A40(                   | E) by   |  |  |  |  |
| tl   | he B4477 wl  | hich is substand              | dard in w   | idth and alignmen                   | t. This |  |  |  |  |
| is   | s likely to im   | pact on the att               | ractivene   | ess of the area for                 |         |  |  |  |  |
| d  | levelopment  | t and investmer               | nt.         |                                     |         |  |  |  |  |
| Element  | Rating   | Justification                 |             |                                     |         |  |  |  |  |
| Economic growth  | 4  | Connectivity                  | G/A         | Reliability                         | Α       |  |  |  |  |
| 3  |  | Resilience                    | A           | Delivery                            | Α       |  |  |  |  |
| Carbon Emissions   | 3  | Activity                      | Α           | Embedded C                          | Α       |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Carbon use                    | A           | Efficiency                          | Α       |  |  |  |  |
| Socio-distributional impact  | 4  | SDIs                          | A           | Regeneration                        | Α       |  |  |  |  |
| and the second s | ·  |                               |             | economic growth                     | G       |  |  |  |  |
| Local environment  | 2  | Air Quality                   | Α           | Noise                               | A       |  |  |  |  |
| Local cirviloriment  | _  | Natural Env                   | A/R         | Urban Env                           |         |  |  |  |  |
| Well being   | 4  | Severance                     | A           | Physical Activity                   | Α       |  |  |  |  |
| Well bellig  | 4  |                               |             | Crime                               |         |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Injuries                      | A           | Resilience                          | Α       |  |  |  |  |
| Malua fan Manan  |  | Access                        | G           | Resilience                          | A       |  |  |  |  |
| Value for Money  | 2  | Estimated BCI                 | R 1.0-1.5   |                                     |         |  |  |  |  |
| Scale of impact  | 2  | Moderate loca                 | al impact   | t                                   |         |  |  |  |  |
| Fit with transport objectives  | 3  | Good fit – imp                | proved a    | ccess to jobs and s                 | ervices |  |  |  |  |
| Fit with other objectives  | 4  | Good fit – pro<br>development | viding in   | frastructure to sup                 | port    |  |  |  |  |
| Degree of consensus  | 5  | Impacts clear                 |             |                                     |         |  |  |  |  |
| Cost risk  | 4  | -                             |             | e details not know                  | n, but  |  |  |  |  |
| Afferdala la ilitario  | 4  | likely to be sta              |             |                                     |         |  |  |  |  |
| Affordability  | 4  | Assumes capit                 | tai cost o  | f £5.95 million                     |         |  |  |  |  |
|  | 5  | Should have for               | ew diffic   | ulties – although n                 | nay be  |  |  |  |  |
| Feasibility  |  | environmenta                  | al issues t | o overcome if                       |         |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | improvement                   | s are ma    | de west of Carterto                 | on      |  |  |  |  |
| Acceptability  | 3  | Untested, like                | ly to be I  | favourable (views v                 | west of |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Carterton less                | clear cu    | t)                                  |         |  |  |  |  |
| Quality of evidence  | 1  | Little supporti               | ing data    |                                     |         |  |  |  |  |
| Deliverability   | 3  | 4 year deliver                | y period,   | low risk                            |         |  |  |  |  |
| Flexibility  | 4  |                               |             | n can be scaled to                  |         |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | funding availa                | ıble        |                                     |         |  |  |  |  |

| Option name                 | Oxford: Wes   | t End – City Ce  | ntre       |                      |          |  |  |
|-----------------------------|---------------|--|------------|----------------------|----------|--|--|
| Description                 |               | -  |            | uare, Hythe Bridg    | e        |  |  |
| ·                           | Street and Pa | ark End Street.  | This pack  | age of transport a   | ınd      |  |  |
|                             |               |  | •          | the current dom      |          |  |  |
|                             |               |  |            | e and create a hig   |          |  |  |
|                             |               | strian-friendly  | •          | _                    |          |  |  |
| Identified problems         | <u> </u>      | One of the key bottlenecks preventing reliable journey times |            |                      |          |  |  |
| μ.σ.σ.σ.                    |               | •  | •          | om outside the cit   |          |  |  |
|                             |               | _  |            | hilst acting as a ca | •        |  |  |
|                             |               | onomic growth  |            | _                    | , , , ,  |  |  |
| Element                     | Rating        | Justification  |            |                      |          |  |  |
| Economic growth             | 4             | Connectivity   | G          | Reliability          | G        |  |  |
|                             |               | Resilience   | A          | Delivery             | G        |  |  |
| Carbon Emissions            | 4             | Activity   | Α          | Embedded C           | A        |  |  |
| Car son Ennissions          |               | Carbon use   | G          | Efficiency           | G        |  |  |
| Socio-distributional impact | 5             | SDIs   | G          | Regeneration         | G        |  |  |
| 30010 distributional impact |               |  |            | economic growth      | G        |  |  |
| Local environment           | 4             | Air Quality  | G          | Noise Noise          | A        |  |  |
| Local environment           | 4             | Natural Env  | <u> </u>   | Urban Env            |          |  |  |
| Mall lesies                 | 4             |  | -          |                      | G        |  |  |
| Well being                  | 4             | Severance  | G          | Physical Activity    | G        |  |  |
|                             |               | Injuries   | G          | Crime                | A        |  |  |
|                             | _             | Access   | G          | Resilience           | Α        |  |  |
| Value for Money             | 4             | Estimated BC   | R 2.0 – 4  | .0                   |          |  |  |
| Scale of impact             | 5             | Significant co   | untywide   | impact               |          |  |  |
| Fit with transport          | 5             | Excellent fit fo   | or conge   | stion and accessib   | ility    |  |  |
| objectives                  |               | LXCCIICITE III I   | or conges  | stion and accession  | iiicy    |  |  |
| Fit with other objectives   | 5             | Excellent fit fo   | or nromo   | ting development     | and      |  |  |
| The with other objectives   |               | growth   | эг ргоппо  | ting development     | ana      |  |  |
| Degree of consensus         | 4             | + -  | sian may   | be controversial     |          |  |  |
| Degree of consensus         | 4             | iiiiovative de   | sign may   | be controversial     |          |  |  |
| Cost risk                   | 3             | Medium risk  |            |                      |          |  |  |
| Affordability               | 4             | Assumes cons   | struction  | cost of £8.8 millio  | n        |  |  |
| Feasibility                 | 3             | Innovative de  | sign but   | within LA control    |          |  |  |
| ,                           |               |  |            |                      |          |  |  |
| Acceptability               | 4             | Untested, likely to be favourable                            |            |                      |          |  |  |
| Quality of evidence         | 4             |  | ing occur  | red but business o   | ase not  |  |  |
| Deliverability              | 2             | yet approved<br>Four year deli                               | ivery peri | od, medium deliv     | ery risk |  |  |
| Flexibility                 | 1             | Little scope fo  | or scaling | scheme               |          |  |  |
|                             |               |  |            |                      |          |  |  |

| Option name                 | West: A40 C  | xford Science 1  | ransit      |   |          |  |  |
|-----------------------------|--------------|--|-------------|---|----------|--|--|
| Description                 | The scheme   | aims to deliver  | an uplift   | in public transpor                      | t        |  |  |
| ·                           |              | rough the delive   | •           |   |          |  |  |
|                             |              | •  |             | heme is focused o                       | n a bus  |  |  |
|                             |              | _  |             | ut the project will                     |          |  |  |
|                             | •            |  |             | l infrastructure.                       | iook at  |  |  |
| Identified problems         |              | •  | · ·         |   | ulco     |  |  |
| identined problems          |              | ourney times and reliability on A40. The project will also upport local movements around Northern Gateway as wel |             |   |          |  |  |
|                             |              |  |             | n access the infras                     |          |  |  |
|                             |              |  | s tilat cai | i access the iiii as                    | liucture |  |  |
|                             | along the ro |  |             |   |          |  |  |
| Element                     | Rating       | Justification  |             |   |          |  |  |
| Economic growth             | 5            | Connectivity   | G           | Reliability                             | G        |  |  |
|                             |              | Resilience   | G           | Delivery                                | G        |  |  |
| Carbon Emissions            | 4            | Activity   | G           | Embedded C                              | R        |  |  |
|                             |              | Carbon use   | Α           | Efficiency                              | G        |  |  |
| Socio-distributional impact | 4            | SDIs   | G           | Regeneration                            | Α        |  |  |
|                             |              | Regional im  | balance &   | economic growth                         | G        |  |  |
| Local environment           | 3            | Air Quality  | Α           | Noise                                   | Α        |  |  |
| 2000 Cirvii Orini Circ      |              | Natural Env  | Α           | Urban Env                               |          |  |  |
| Well being                  | 4            | Severance  | A           | Physical Activity                       | Α        |  |  |
| Well being                  | 4            |  |             | Crime                                   |          |  |  |
|                             |              | Injuries   | A/G         |   | A        |  |  |
|                             | _            | Access   | G           | Resilience                              | G        |  |  |
| Value for Money             | 3            | Estimated BC   | R 1.5-2.0   | )                                       |          |  |  |
| Scale of impact             | 5            | Significant co   | untv-wid    | e impact                                |          |  |  |
| Scare of impact             |              | Jigiiiiiediii: co  | arrey wia   | c impact                                |          |  |  |
| Fit with transport          | 5            | Increases trav   | el choice   | e, reduces carbon,                      |          |  |  |
| objectives                  |              | reduces cong   |             | ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,, |          |  |  |
| Fit with other objectives   | 4            |  |             | frastructure to su                      | nnort    |  |  |
| The with other objectives   |              | development  | •           | mastractare to sa                       | pport    |  |  |
| Degree of consensus         | 4            | · ·  |             | of mode switch                          |          |  |  |
| Degree of consensus         | 4            | Officer taility of   | ivei ievei  | of mode switch                          |          |  |  |
| Cost risk                   | 2            | Medium/high  | – design    | not complete, ma                        | ay be    |  |  |
|                             | _            |  | •           | ost of utilities dive                   | •        |  |  |
| Affordability               | 1            |  |             | cost of £50 million                     |          |  |  |
| Arrordability               |              | Assumes con.   | struction   | COSt Of ESO Million                     | 1.       |  |  |
| Feasibility                 | 3            | Need to speci  | ify scham   | ne requirements                         |          |  |  |
| i easibility                |              | Need to speci  | ily schen   | ie requirements                         |          |  |  |
| Acceptability               | 4            | Untested, like   | ly to he t  | favourable                              |          |  |  |
| receptubility               | -            | Officested, fixe   | ily to be   | avourable                               |          |  |  |
| Quality of evidence         | 3            | Work carried   | out in 19   | 90s needs to be re                      | evisited |  |  |
|                             |              |  |             |   |          |  |  |
| Deliverability              | 1            | More than 5  | years, me   | edium risk                              |          |  |  |
|                             |              |  |             |   |          |  |  |
| Flexibility                 | 4            |  |             | tent be scaled do                       | wn to    |  |  |
|                             |              | match fundin   | g.          |   |          |  |  |

| Option name                 | Oxford Scien   | nce Transit (Pha  | se 1) – H  | linksey Hill Interch | nange     |  |
|-----------------------------|--|-------------------|------------|----------------------|-----------|--|
| Description                 |  |                   |            | the verge of the A   |           |  |
|                             | approach to  | the interchange   | e, bus pri | ority on the north   | bound     |  |
|                             |  | _                 | =          | rolled roundabout    |           |  |
|                             |  | nancement arou    | •          |                      | .,        |  |
|                             |  | apacity on the so |            |                      |           |  |
| Identified problems         |  |                   |            |                      |           |  |
| racitimea problems          | The junction has severe congestion; traffic flows and concentrations on the road and the slip road up to the |                   |            |                      |           |  |
|                             |  |                   |            | dent can easily lea  |           |  |
|                             |  | •                 |            | speed and journe     |           |  |
| Element                     |  | Justification     | acting on  | speed and journe     | y tillie. |  |
|                             | Rating   | <del></del>       |            | Deliability          |           |  |
| 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 im       | balance &  | economic growth      | G         |  |
| Local environment           | 4  | Air Quality       | Α          | Noise                | Α         |  |
|                             |  | Natural Env       | G          | Urban Env            | -         |  |
| Well being                  | 4  | Severance         | Α          | Physical Activity    | Α         |  |
|                             |  | Injuries          | G          | Crime                | Α         |  |
|                             |  | Access            | G          | Resilience           | G         |  |
| Value for Money             | 4  | Forecast BCR      |            |                      | -         |  |
| value for iviolity          | 4  | Torecast ben      | от раска   | ge 13 2.3            |           |  |
| Scale of impact             | 4  | Moderate, co      | untvwide   | imnact               |           |  |
| Scale of Impact             | 7  | ivioaciate, co    | arrey wrac | 2 mpace              |           |  |
| Fit with transport          | 5  | Evcellent fit -   | improvi    | ng accessibility, re | ducing    |  |
| objectives                  |  | congestion        | mprovii    | ig accessionity, re- | aucing    |  |
| Fit with other objectives   | 5  | <del> </del>      | cupport    | ing economic grov    | wth and   |  |
| The with other objectives   |  | development       |            | ing economic grov    | vilialiu  |  |
| Dograp of concensus         | 4  | · ·               |            | o public transport   |           |  |
| Degree of consensus         | 4  | Depends on the    | iansiei u  | b public transport   |           |  |
| Cost risk                   | 3  | Madium rick       | vorgo c    | anditions not know   | un hut    |  |
| COST TISK                   | 3  |                   | _          | onditions not knov   | wii but   |  |
| Afferdala litter            | 2  | built into cost   |            |                      |           |  |
| Affordability               | 2  | Assumes tota      | i scheme   | cost of £23.5M       |           |  |
| - 11111                     |  | 5 1 1 1           |            |                      |           |  |
| Feasibility                 | 3  | Design details    | not kno    | wn                   |           |  |
|                             |  |                   |            |                      |           |  |
| Acceptability               | 3  | Untested, like    | ly to be   | mixed                |           |  |
|                             |  |                   |            |                      |           |  |
| Quality of evidence         | 5  | Business case     | produce    | d for DfT            |           |  |
|                             |  |                   |            |                      |           |  |
| Deliverability              | 3  | 3 years, medi     | um deliv   | ery risk             |           |  |
|                             |  |                   |            |                      |           |  |
| Flexibility                 | 4  | Could drop so     | me parts   | s of package if fund | ding      |  |
|                             |  | reduced           |            |                      |           |  |

| Option name                 | Oxford: Oxford Station non-rail improvements |   |             |                     |          |  |  |
|-----------------------------|--|---|-------------|---------------------|----------|--|--|
| Description                 | A masterplai                                 | n for improved  | station a   | nd interchange fac  | cilities |  |  |
|                             | with associa                                 | ted appropriate   | commer      | cial development    | to       |  |  |
|                             | provide an e                                 | xemplary gatev  | vay into (  | Oxford City centre  | is       |  |  |
|                             |  |   | •           | te area includes th |          |  |  |
|                             |  | •   |             | ecket Street car pa |          |  |  |
| Identified problems         |  | mproving access to and between development locations in |             |                     |          |  |  |
| •                           |  |   |             | ajor part in county |          |  |  |
|                             |  |   |             | iational growth an  | -        |  |  |
|                             | ,<br>developmen                              |   |             | Ü                   |          |  |  |
| Element                     | Rating                                       | Justification   |             |                     |          |  |  |
| Economic growth             | 3  | Connectivity  | А           | Reliability         | А        |  |  |
|                             |  | Resilience  | A           | Delivery            | Α        |  |  |
| Carbon Emissions            | 2  | Activity  | A           | Embedded C          | R        |  |  |
| Carbon Emissions            | _  | Carbon use  | <u></u>     | Efficiency          | Α        |  |  |
| Socio-distributional impact | 4  | SDIs  | A           | Regeneration        | G        |  |  |
|                             | 4  |   |             | economic growth     |          |  |  |
| Local and discount          | 4  | _   |             | ,                   | G        |  |  |
| Local environment           | 4  | Air Quality   | Α           | Noise               | Α        |  |  |
|                             | _  | Natural Env   | -           | Urban Env           | G        |  |  |
| Well being                  | 3  | Severance   | G           | Physical Activity   | Α        |  |  |
|                             |  | Injuries  | A           | Crime               | Α        |  |  |
|                             |  | Access  | Α           | Resilience          | Α        |  |  |
| Value for Money             | 2  | Estimated BC  | R 1.0-1.5   |                     |          |  |  |
| Scale of impact             | 3  | Low, countyw  | vide impa   | ct (transport)      |          |  |  |
| Fit with transport          | 3  | Reasonable fi   | t if schen  | ne contributes to   |          |  |  |
| objectives                  |  |   |             | n in station area   |          |  |  |
| Fit with other objectives   | 5  |   |             | conomic developn    | nent     |  |  |
| The with other objectives   |  | and growth  | pports co   | conomic acveropn    | iciic    |  |  |
| Degree of consensus         | 3  | Details still to  | ho dotor    | minod               |          |  |  |
| Degree or consensus         | 3  | Details still to  | be deter    | IIIIIeu             |          |  |  |
| Cost risk                   | 2  | Medium/high   | risk due    | to uncertainty on   | project  |  |  |
|                             |  | details   |             |                     |          |  |  |
| Affordability               | 1  | Assumes tota  | l cost > £  | 100 million         |          |  |  |
| Feasibility                 | 3  | Scheme detai  | Is still to | be determined       |          |  |  |
|                             |  |   |             |                     |          |  |  |
| Acceptability               | 3  | Untested, mix   | ked         |                     |          |  |  |
| Quality of evidence         | 4  |   | ing and te  | esting of outcome   | S        |  |  |
| Deliverability              | 1  | undertaken<br>8 Year deliver                            | ry period,  | , medium risk       |          |  |  |
| Flexibility                 | 4  | Some flexibili  | ty in dete  | ermining scheme o   | letails  |  |  |
|                             |  |   |             |                     |          |  |  |

| Option name                 | Northern Ga   | ateway – A40-A   | 44 Link I  | Road                                     |     |  |  |
|-----------------------------|---|--|------------|--|-----|--|--|
| Description                 | Construction  | 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   | Α          | Embedded C                               | R   |  |  |
|                             |   | Carbon use   | Α          | Efficiency                               | Α   |  |  |
| Socio-distributional impact | 4   | SDIs   | Α          | Regeneration                             | Α   |  |  |
|                             |   | Regional im  | balance &  | & economic growth                        | G   |  |  |
| Local environment           | 4   | Air Quality  | G          | Noise                                    | Α   |  |  |
|                             |   | Natural Env  | Α          | Urban Env                                | G   |  |  |
| Well being                  | 4   | Severance  | A          | Physical Activity                        | Α   |  |  |
|                             |   | Injuries   | G          | Crime                                    | Α   |  |  |
|                             |   | Access   | G          | Resilience                               | G   |  |  |
| Value for Money             | 4   | High – expect  | ed BCR =   | = 2.0-4.0                                |     |  |  |
| Scale of impact             | 5   | Significant, co  | ountywid   | le impact                                |     |  |  |
| Fit with transport          | 5   | Excellent – reducing congestion, improving                                       |            |  |     |  |  |
| objectives                  |   | safety and acc   | cessibilit | У  |     |  |  |
| Fit with other objectives   | 5   | Excellent – su development   | pporting   | g economic growth                        | and |  |  |
| Degree of consensus         | 4   | •  |            | action between ber<br>fadjacent developr |     |  |  |
| Cost risk                   | 4   | Low-moderat  | e          |  |     |  |  |
| Affordability               | 4   | Assumes cons   | struction  | cost of £7.3M                            |     |  |  |
| Feasibility                 | 3   | Generally goo  |            | ay be difficulties w<br>velopment        | ith |  |  |
| Acceptability               | 4   |  |            | nt to be favourable                      |     |  |  |
| Quality of evidence         | 4   | Some modelli   | ng as pa   | rt of Access to Oxfo                     | ord |  |  |
| Deliverability              | 3   | 3 year programme but rated as high risk because of links to adjacent development |            |  |     |  |  |
| Flexibility                 | 2   | Limited scope  |            |  |     |  |  |

| Option name                 | Northern Ga | ateway – A40 W                                       | olverco    | te Roundabout        |         |  |  |  |
|-----------------------------|-------------|--|------------|----------------------|---------|--|--|--|
| Description                 | Advanced tr | Advanced traffic management via signalisation at A40 |            |                      |         |  |  |  |
|                             | Wolvercote  | Wolvercote plus local control measures.              |            |                      |         |  |  |  |
| Identified problems         | Reduce cong | gestion on A40 e                                     | east-wes   | t corridor and A34,  | /A44    |  |  |  |
|                             | northern en | try into Oxford p                                    | olus ope   | ning up of adjacent  | t land  |  |  |  |
|                             | for develop | ment.  |            |                      |         |  |  |  |
| Element                     | Rating      | Justification  |            |                      |         |  |  |  |
| Economic growth             | 4           | Connectivity   | G          | Reliability          | G       |  |  |  |
|                             |             | Resilience   | Α          | Delivery             | G       |  |  |  |
| Carbon Emissions            | 3           | Activity   | Α          | Embedded C           | Α       |  |  |  |
|                             |             | Carbon use   | А          | Efficiency           | G       |  |  |  |
| Socio-distributional impact | 4           | SDIs   | Α          | Regeneration         | Α       |  |  |  |
|                             |             | Regional imb   | balance 8  | R economic growth    | G       |  |  |  |
| Local environment           | 4           | Air Quality  | G          | Noise                | Α       |  |  |  |
|                             |             | Natural Env  | А          | Urban Env            | G       |  |  |  |
| Well being                  | 4           | Severance  | А          | Physical Activity    | Α       |  |  |  |
|                             |             | Injuries   | G          | Crime                | А       |  |  |  |
|                             |             | Access   | G          | Resilience           | Α       |  |  |  |
| Value for Money             | 4           | High – expect  | ed BCR =   | = 2.0-4.0            |         |  |  |  |
| Scale of impact             | 5           | Significant, co                                      | untywid    | e impact             |         |  |  |  |
| Fit with transport          | 5           | Excellent – red                                      | duce cor   | ngestion and impro   | ve      |  |  |  |
| objectives                  |             | accessibility  |            | ,                    |         |  |  |  |
| Fit with other objectives   | 5           |  | pport ec   | onomic developm      | ent and |  |  |  |
| Degree of consensus         | 3           | May be local of                                      | disagree   | ment on balance o    | f costs |  |  |  |
| Cost risk                   | 4           |  | e – relat  | ively straightforwa  | ırd     |  |  |  |
| Affordability               | 5           | Assumes LGF  | contribu   | tion of £4.8M        |         |  |  |  |
| Feasibility                 | 4           | •  | •          | straightforward scl  |         |  |  |  |
| Acceptability               | 3           | Not tested, m  |            |                      | 2.2.0,0 |  |  |  |
| Quality of evidence         | 4           | Some modelli   | ng as pa   | rt of Access to Oxfo | ord     |  |  |  |
| Deliverability              | 2           | 3 year delivery programme but high risk of over-run  |            |                      |         |  |  |  |
| Flexibility                 | 2           |  | if traffio | signals option fol   | owed    |  |  |  |

| Option name                   | Northern Gateway – A40 Cutteslowe Rbt                       |  |            |                                  |             |  |
|-------------------------------|---|--|------------|----------------------------------|-------------|--|
| Description                   | Advanced traffic management via signalisation at Cutteslowe |  |            |                                  |             |  |
| Identified problems           | _   | k congestion along the strategic east-west corridor d the north of Oxford and on A4144 northern entrance |            |                                  |             |  |
| Element                       | Rating  | Justification  |            |                                  |             |  |
| Economic growth               | 4   | Connectivity<br>Resilience   | G<br>A     | Reliability<br>Delivery          | G<br>G      |  |
| Carbon Emissions              | 4   | Activity Carbon use  | G<br>A     | Embedded C Efficiency            | A<br>G      |  |
| Socio-distributional impact   | 4   | SDIs   | Α          | Regeneration<br>Reconomic growth | A<br>G      |  |
| Local environment             | 3   | Air Quality Natural Env  | A<br>A     | Noise<br>Urban Env               | A<br>A      |  |
| Well being                    | 3   | Severance<br>Injuries  | A<br>G     | Physical Activity Crime          | A<br>A<br>A |  |
|                               | _   | Access   | G          | Resilience                       | A           |  |
| Value for Money               | 4   | High – expected BCR =2.0-4.0   |            |                                  |             |  |
| Scale of impact               | 4   | Significant, co  | untywid    | e impact                         |             |  |
| Fit with transport objectives | 5   | Excellent – reaccessibility  | duce cor   | ngestion and impro               | ve          |  |
| Fit with other objectives     | 5   | Excellent – su<br>growth   | pport ec   | onomic developme                 | ent and     |  |
| Degree of consensus           | 3   |  | disagree   | ment on balance o                | f costs     |  |
| Cost risk                     | 4   | Low-moderat  | te – relat | ively straightforwa              | ırd         |  |
| Affordability                 | 5   | Assumes cons   | struction  | cost of £4.1M                    |             |  |
| Feasibility                   | 4   |  | •          | straightforward sch              |             |  |
| Acceptability                 | 4   | Not tested, lik  |            |                                  | - 1-        |  |
| Quality of evidence           | 4   | Some modelling as part of Access to Oxford   |            |                                  |             |  |
| Deliverability                | 3   | 2 year programprogramme sl   |            | nedule but high risk             | of          |  |
| Flexibility                   | 1   |  |            | ucing scope of sche              | me          |  |

| Option name                             | Oxford: East | ern Arc Improv   | ements                                 |                       |             |  |  |
|---|--------------|--|--|-----------------------|-------------|--|--|
| Description                             |              | •  |  | luding projects to    |             |  |  |
| •                                       |              | •  |  | bility of orbital bus | S           |  |  |
|   | •            | • •  |  | ng management a       |             |  |  |
|   | -            | measures to encourage more walking and cycling.              |  |                       |             |  |  |
| Identified problems                     |              | To facilitate development in the Headington/East Oxford area |  |                       |             |  |  |
| lacitifica problems                     |              | to support growth at key healthcare, business park and       |  |                       |             |  |  |
|   |              | •  |  | to Oxford ring roa    |             |  |  |
| Element                                 | Rating       | Justification  | ey close                               | to Oxioid filig foa   | u.          |  |  |
|   |              | <del> </del>   |  | Daliabilit            | C / A       |  |  |
| 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 im  | balance &                              | 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                 | Α           |  |  |
|   |              | Access   | G                                      | Resilience            | G           |  |  |
| Value for Money                         | 3            | Estimated BC   | R 1.5-2.0                              | )                     |             |  |  |
| ·                                       |              |  |  |                       |             |  |  |
| Scale of impact                         | 4            | Significant, di  | strict-wic                             | de impact             |             |  |  |
| Fit with transport                      | 4            | Good fit - imp   | roves ac                               | cessibility to servi  | ces.        |  |  |
| objectives                              |              | reduces cong   |  |                       | ,           |  |  |
| Fit with other objectives               | 5            |  |  | ng economic grov      | vth and     |  |  |
|   |              | development  |  |                       |             |  |  |
| Degree of consensus                     | 3            | Will depend of   |  | e(s) chosen           |             |  |  |
| 2 - 2 - 3 - 3 - 3 - 3 - 3 - 3 - 3 - 3 - |              | Triii depend e   | ,,, ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,, | c(3) 01103C11         |             |  |  |
| Cost risk                               | 4            | Low/medium   | risk - scl                             | neme details not k    | nown        |  |  |
|   | ·            | •  |  | mme of smaller w      |             |  |  |
| Affordability                           | 4            | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·                        |  | cost of £8 million    | 21.13       |  |  |
| Arroradomey                             |              | Assumes cons   | straction                              | COSC OF LO ITIMION    |             |  |  |
| Feasibility                             | 4            | Likely to most   | tly ha uso                             | of existing highw     | avs hut     |  |  |
| 1 Casibility                            |              | some uncerta   | -                                      |                       | aysbut      |  |  |
| Acceptability                           | 3            | Untested, like   |  |                       |             |  |  |
| Acceptability                           | 3            | Jintesteu, iike  | iy to be i                             | IIIAEU                |             |  |  |
| Quality of evidence                     | 2            | Some informa   | al analysi                             | c                     |             |  |  |
| Quality of evidence                     |              |  | ai airaiysi                            | J                     |             |  |  |
| Deliverability                          | 3            | 4 years, low r   | ick                                    |                       |             |  |  |
| Deliverability                          | 3            | years, low r   | JCI                                    |                       |             |  |  |
| Flexibility                             | 5            | Highly flevible  | a – can ho                             | e scaled to funding   | <del></del> |  |  |
| rickibility                             |              | available.   | _ can be                               | . scaled to fulldill  | 5           |  |  |
|   |              | available.   |  |                       |             |  |  |

| Option name                   | Oxford: Headington – Phase 1 |  |            |                      |          |  |  |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|--|------------|----------------------|----------|--|--|
| Description                   | A package o                  | A package of four key transport schemes to alleviate |            |                      |          |  |  |
|                               | congestion,                  | enable planned                                       | and futu   | ire economic grow    | th and   |  |  |
|                               | developmen                   | it of a comprehe                                     | ensive bu  | us service for the a | rea.     |  |  |
| Identified problems           | The main ro                  | ads that access                                      | Heading    | ton suffer from sig  | nificant |  |  |
|                               | _                            | • .  |            | ay; a number of jur  |          |  |  |
|                               |                              |  |            | and queueing, dis    |          |  |  |
|                               |                              |  | ess and    | undermine confide    | nce in   |  |  |
|                               | the transpor                 | _  |            |                      |          |  |  |
| Element                       | Rating                       | Justification  | 1          |                      |          |  |  |
| Economic growth               | 4                            | Connectivity   | G          | Reliability          | G        |  |  |
|                               |                              | Resilience   | Α          | Delivery             | G        |  |  |
| Carbon Emissions              | 4                            | Activity   | G          | Embedded C           | Α        |  |  |
|                               |                              | Carbon use   | G          | Efficiency           | G        |  |  |
| Socio-distributional impact   | 5                            | SDIs   | G          | Regeneration         | G        |  |  |
|                               | _                            | _  | ı          | R economic growth    | G        |  |  |
| Local environment             | 5                            | Air Quality  | G          | Noise                | G        |  |  |
|                               | _                            | Natural Env  | -          | Urban Env            | G        |  |  |
| Well being                    | 4                            | Severance  | G          | Physical Activity    | Α        |  |  |
|                               |                              | Injuries   | A          | Crime                | Α        |  |  |
|                               |                              | Access   | G          | Resilience           | Α        |  |  |
| Value for Money               | 4                            | Estimated BC   | R 2.0 – 4  | 1.0                  |          |  |  |
| Scale of impact               | 4                            | Significant, di                                      | strict-wi  | de impacts           |          |  |  |
| Fit with transport objectives | 5                            | Excellent fit fo                                     | or conge   | stion and accessibi  | lity     |  |  |
| Fit with other objectives     | 5                            | Excellent fit for growth                             | or promo   | oting development    | and      |  |  |
| Degree of consensus           | 4                            | Uncertainty o  | ver level  | of mode switch       |          |  |  |
| Cost risk                     | 2                            | Medium – hig   | gh : natui | re of schemes not o  | clear    |  |  |
| Affordability                 | 5                            | Assumes capi   | tal cost o | of £3.5 million      |          |  |  |
| Feasibility                   | 4                            |  | aightforv  | vard, but details st | ill      |  |  |
|                               | _                            | unresolved   |            |                      |          |  |  |
| Acceptability                 | 4                            | Untested, exp  | pected to  | be favourable        |          |  |  |
| Quality of evidence           | 3                            | Good analysis  | of prob    | lems                 |          |  |  |
| Deliverability                | 3                            | 3 year progra  | mme, m     | edium risk           |          |  |  |
| Flexibility                   | 4                            | Could reduce   | number     | of elements delive   | ered     |  |  |

| Option name                           | Science Vale | : Access to Cull                                      | nam SC        |                          |         |  |  |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|---|---------------|--------------------------|---------|--|--|
| Description                           | A second acc | cess road into C                                      | ulham Sc      | cience Centre from       | the     |  |  |
| ·                                     | east and a b | ypass to Clifton                                      | Hampde        | n. This new acces        | s could |  |  |
|                                       |              |   | -             | n the north via the      |         |  |  |
|                                       |              |   | _             | cles travel through      |         |  |  |
|                                       |              | oden junction a                                       |               | _                        |         |  |  |
| Identified problems                   |              | Congestion is currently experienced on the A415 which |               |                          |         |  |  |
| raemmea problems                      | _            |   |               | am Science Centre        |         |  |  |
|                                       | I '          |   |               | es road bridges at       | -       |  |  |
|                                       |              | lampden which   |               | _                        | Camani  |  |  |
| Element                               | Rating       | Justification   | ure at ce     | apacity:                 |         |  |  |
| Economic growth                       | 5            | Connectivity  | G             | Reliability              | G       |  |  |
| Leonomic growth                       |              | Resilience  | G             | Delivery                 | G       |  |  |
| Carban Emissions                      | 3            | i   | G             | Embedded C               |         |  |  |
| Carbon Emissions                      | 3            | Activity  |               | · <del> </del>           | R       |  |  |
|                                       |              | Carbon use  | Α             | Efficiency               | A       |  |  |
| Socio-distributional impact           | 4            | SDIs  | Α             | Regeneration             | G       |  |  |
|                                       |              |   |               | economic growth          | G       |  |  |
| Local environment                     | 2            | Air Quality   | A             | Noise                    | Α       |  |  |
|                                       |              | Natural Env   | R             | Urban Env                | =       |  |  |
| Well being                            | 4            | Severance   | Α             | Physical Activity        | Α       |  |  |
|                                       |              | Injuries  | G             | Crime                    | Α       |  |  |
|                                       |              | Access  | Α             | Resilience               | G       |  |  |
| Value for Money                       | 3            | Estimated BC  | R 2.0 – 4.    | .0                       |         |  |  |
| Scale of impact                       | 3            | Moderate, dis   | strict-wid    | le impact                |         |  |  |
| Fit with transport                    | 5            | Excellent – re  | duces co      | ngestion, improve        | S       |  |  |
| objectives                            |              | accessibility   | 44005 00      |                          | J       |  |  |
| Fit with other objectives             | 5            | •   | nnorts e      | conomic developn         | nent    |  |  |
| The men dener day conved              |              | and growth  | рро. со с     | conorme developin        |         |  |  |
| Degree of consensus                   | 5            | Transport ber   | nefits cle    | arly defined             |         |  |  |
| Degree or consensus                   |              | Transport ber   | icitis cici   | arry acrifica            |         |  |  |
| Cost risk                             | 3            | Medium risk -   | - details     | of scheme design         |         |  |  |
|                                       |              | unknown   |               | 2. 202 465,811           |         |  |  |
| Affordability                         | 3            | Assumes £20   | million c     | anital cost              |         |  |  |
| ratoraubility                         |              | 7.55diffes £20  |               | apital cost              |         |  |  |
| Feasibility                           | 4            | Likely to be bi                                       | igh feasik    | pility but gound         |         |  |  |
| Casionity                             |              |   | •             | ertaken to date          |         |  |  |
| Acceptability                         | 3            | Untested, like  |               |                          |         |  |  |
| Acceptability                         | ]            | Jintesteu, iike                                       | iy to be i    | IIIAEU                   |         |  |  |
| Quality of evidence                   | 2            | Some informa  | al analysi    | s undertaken             |         |  |  |
|                                       |              |   |               |                          |         |  |  |
| Deliverability                        | 2            | 4 years, medi   | um deliv      | ery risk                 |         |  |  |
| Flexibility                           | 1            | Static scheme   | e. little fle | exibility following      |         |  |  |
| , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , | _            |   |               |                          |         |  |  |
| Flexibility                           | 1            | Static scheme preferred sch                           |               | exibility following ice. |         |  |  |

| Option name                  | Access to Didcot Station – Additional Platforms |                       |              |                        |          |
|------------------------------|---|-----------------------|--------------|------------------------|----------|
| Description                  | The project is                                  | likely to compris     | se a new 'i  | island' platform with  | one or   |
|                              | two new plat                                    | form faces to the     | north of     | the existing that cou  | ıld be   |
|                              | · ·   | ional services.       |              | · ·                    |          |
| Identified problems          | The station h                                   | as five existing pl   | atforms, k   | out with future servi  | ce       |
| '                            | improvement                                     | ts it is likely these | will be in   | adequate to cater fo   | or       |
|                              | ·   | •                     |              | e scheme would give    |          |
|                              |   | •                     |              | pacity to regulate se  |          |
|                              | _   |                       |              | es Valley towards Ro   |          |
|                              |   | and interchange v     |              | •                      | eadii 18 |
| Element                      |   | Justification         | vitir otrici | Services.              |          |
|                              | Rating<br>5                                     | Connectivity          | G            | Poliability            |          |
| Economic growth              | 3   | Resilience            |              | Reliability            | G        |
| Carbon Emissions             | 3   |                       | G            | Delivery<br>Embedded C | G        |
| Carbon Emissions             | 3   | Activity              | R            |                        | R        |
| Conin distributional incorpe | 4   | Carbon use            | G            | Efficiency             | G        |
| Socio-distributional impact  | 4   | SDIs                  | A            | Regeneration           | G        |
|                              | _   |                       |              | economic growth        | G        |
| Local environment            | 4   | Air Quality           | A            | Noise                  | A        |
|                              |   | Natural Env           | -            | Urban Env              | G        |
| Well being                   | 4   | Severance             | А            | Physical Activity      | Α        |
|                              |   | Injuries              | A            | Crime                  | Α        |
|                              |   | Access                | G            | Resilience             | G        |
| Value for Money              | 3   | Medium – ex           | pected B     | CR = 1.5-2.0           |          |
| Scale of impact              | 4   | Moderate, co          | untywide     | e impact               |          |
| Fit with transport           | 5   | Excellent fit –       | improvii     | ng accessibility,      |          |
| objectives .                 |   | promoting me          | ode chan     | ge                     |          |
| Fit with other objectives    | 5   |                       |              | ing economic grov      | vth and  |
| •                            |   | development           |              |                        |          |
| Degree of consensus          | 5   | Impacts clear         |              |                        |          |
| Cost risk                    | 2   | Medium high           | risk from    | n unquantified esti    | mate     |
| Affordability                | 3   | Assumes capi          | tal cost c   | f £14M                 |          |
| Feasibility                  | 3   | Some importa          | ant const    | raints to be worke     | d        |
| Acceptability                | 3   | Untested, like        | ely to be    | favourable             |          |
| Quality of evidence          | 3   | Good analysis         | of probl     | em, some of solut      | ion      |
| Deliverability               | 1   | 4 year deliver        | y progra     | mme, high risk         |          |
| Flexibility                  | 3   | Moderate flex         | xibility     |                        |          |
|                              |   |                       |              |                        |          |

| Option name  | Access to Didcot Station – Car Park Expansion  |   |            |                       |          |  |  |
|--|--|---|------------|-----------------------|----------|--|--|
| Description  |  |   |            | on Car Park (Foxhall  | Rd)      |  |  |
|  | through deck   | ing including asso                            | ociated ca | r park access improv  | vements  |  |  |
|  | _  | -   |            | ridge into the Statio |          |  |  |
|  |  | •   |            | ole two way working   |          |  |  |
| Identified problems  |  |   |            | aces are needed on    |          |  |  |
| The second secon |  |   | •          | d and support assoc   |          |  |  |
|  | · .  | •   |            | • • •                 |          |  |  |
|  | with growth across Science Vale area. It is also directly related enabling the Didcot Gateway development which currently in |   |            |                       |          |  |  |
|  |  | car park used by                              | •          | •                     | includes |  |  |
| Element  | Rating   | Justification                                 | ran passer | 16013.                |          |  |  |
| Economic growth  | 4  | Connectivity                                  |            | Reliability           | ^        |  |  |
| Economic growth  | 4  | Resilience                                    | A<br>G     | Delivery              | A        |  |  |
| Carban Emissions   | 4  |   | !<br>!     | Embedded C            | G        |  |  |
| Carbon Emissions   | 4  | Activity                                      | A          | . <del> </del>        | R        |  |  |
| Conin distributional immedia   | 4  | Carbon use                                    | G          | Efficiency            | G        |  |  |
| Socio-distributional impact  | 4  | SDIs  | A          | Regeneration          | G        |  |  |
|  |  | _   | ı          | economic growth       | G        |  |  |
| Local environment  | 4  | Air Quality                                   | A          | Noise                 | A        |  |  |
|  | _  | Natural Env                                   | -          | Urban Env             | G        |  |  |
| Well being   | 3  | Severance                                     | Α          | Physical Activity     | Α        |  |  |
|  |  | Injuries                                      | А          | Crime                 | A        |  |  |
|  |  | Access  | Α          | Resilience            | Α        |  |  |
| Value for Money  | 3  | Medium – ex                                   | pected B   | CR = 1.5-2.0          |          |  |  |
| Scale of impact  | 4  | District-wide,                                | significa  | nt impact             |          |  |  |
| Fit with transport   | 5  | Excellent fit –                               | · improvii | ng accessibility,     |          |  |  |
| objectives   |  | promoting me                                  | ode chan   | ge                    |          |  |  |
| Fit with other objectives  | 5  | Excellent Fit -                               | - support  | ing economic grov     | th and   |  |  |
|  |  | development                                   |            |                       |          |  |  |
| Degree of consensus  | 4  | Depends on t                                  | ransfer t  | o public transport    |          |  |  |
| Cost risk  | 3  | Medium risk                                   |            |                       |          |  |  |
| Affordability  | 4  | Assumes £9.5                                  | SM cost    |                       |          |  |  |
| Feasibility  | 4  | Need for rail i                               | industry   | buy-in                |          |  |  |
| Acceptability  | 4  | Untested, likely to be favourable             |            |                       |          |  |  |
| Quality of evidence  | 3  | Good analysis of problems and some of outcome |            |                       |          |  |  |
| Deliverability   | 3  |   | um deliv   | ery risk – see feasi  | bility   |  |  |
| Flexibility  | 2  | Little scope for dropping eler                |            | ng scheme, except     | by       |  |  |

| Option name                 | Access to Didcot Station – Northern Entrance |                            |            |                      |           |  |
|-----------------------------|--|----------------------------|------------|----------------------|-----------|--|
| Description                 | A new entra                                  | nce to the north           | n of Didco | ot and pedestrian,   | /cycle    |  |
|                             | crossing. The                                | e project includ           | les a new  | entrance hall, wit   | th ticket |  |
|                             | office, lift an                              | d stairs leading           | to a new   | bridge over the r    | ailway,   |  |
|                             |  | _                          |            | drop-off facilities  |           |  |
| Identified problems         |  | •                          |            | ed on the south si   |           |  |
| racinita problems           |  |                            |            | nd planned reside    |           |  |
|                             |  | •                          | _          | nt Station is alread |           |  |
|                             |  |                            |            |                      | У         |  |
|                             |  | by its size, with          | out-oi-a   | ate racilities.      |           |  |
| Element                     | Rating                                       | Justification              |            |                      |           |  |
| Economic growth             | 4  | Connectivity               | G          | Reliability          | A         |  |
|                             | _  | Resilience                 | G          | Delivery             | G         |  |
| Carbon Emissions            | 4  | Activity                   | G          | Embedded C           | A         |  |
|                             |  | Carbon use                 | Α          | Efficiency           | G         |  |
| Socio-distributional impact | 4  | SDIs                       | Α          | Regeneration         | G         |  |
|                             |  |                            |            | economic growth      | G         |  |
| Local environment           | 4  | Air Quality                | Α          | Noise                | A         |  |
|                             |  | Natural Env                | -          | Urban Env            | G         |  |
| Well being                  | 3  | Severance<br>              | Α          | Physical Activity    | A         |  |
|                             |  | Injuries                   | A          | Crime                | A         |  |
| \(\frac{1}{2}\)             | 2  | Access                     | A          | Resilience           | Α         |  |
| Value for Money             | 3  | Medium – ex                | pected B   | CR = 1.5-2.0         |           |  |
| Scale of impact             | 3  | Significant, lo            | cality-wid | de impact            |           |  |
| Fit with transport          | 5  | Excellent fit –            | improvir   | ng accessibility,    |           |  |
| objectives .                |  | promoting me               | -          | •                    |           |  |
| Fit with other objectives   | 5  | +                          |            | ing economic grov    | wth and   |  |
|                             |  | development                |            | _                    |           |  |
| Degree of consensus         | 5  | Impacts clear              |            |                      |           |  |
| Cost risk                   | 2  | Based on unq               | uantified  | estimate             |           |  |
| Affordability               | 3  | Assumes cons               | struction  | cost of £17.5M       |           |  |
| Feasibility                 | 4  | Land ownersh               | nip consti | raints and unknow    | n site    |  |
| ,                           |  | conditions                 | •          |                      |           |  |
| Acceptability               | 4  | Untested, exp              | ected to   | be favourable        |           |  |
| Quality of evidence         | 2  | Informal analysis          |            |                      |           |  |
| Deliverability              | 3  | 5 years, medi requirements | -          | (possession          |           |  |
| Flexibility                 | 2  | •                          | r reducir  | ng scheme, except    | by        |  |
|                             | l .  | 1 2.1 2 PP 9 C.C.          |            |                      |           |  |

| Option name                 | Access to Di  | idcot Station – 4-track railway (Didcot-Oxford)                  |               |                      |         |  |  |  |
|-----------------------------|---------------|--|---------------|----------------------|---------|--|--|--|
| Description                 | The scope of  | the work require   | d is still to | be identified, but o | ould    |  |  |  |
| ·                           | comprise full | four-tracking thr  | oughout,      | or a combination of  | all or  |  |  |  |
|                             | some of the f | ollowing: dynami   | ic passing    | loops, station passe | enger   |  |  |  |
|                             |               |  |               | o provide four track |         |  |  |  |
|                             |               | achieve more netv  |               | •                    | ,       |  |  |  |
| Identified problems         |               | project seeks to deliver the infrastructure necessary to operate |               |                      |         |  |  |  |
| identified problems         |               |  |               | up to 2043, and the  | •       |  |  |  |
|                             |               |  |               | economically, to     | inorc   |  |  |  |
|                             |               | and Science Vale.  | at is vitai,  | economicany, to      |         |  |  |  |
| El                          |               |  |               |                      |         |  |  |  |
| Element                     | Rating        | Justification  | 6/4           | D 1: 1:1:            | 6/4     |  |  |  |
| Economic growth             | 4             | Connectivity   | G/A           | Reliability          | G/A     |  |  |  |
|                             | _             | Resilience   | G             | Delivery             | G       |  |  |  |
| Carbon Emissions            | 3             | Activity   | Α             | Embedded C           | R       |  |  |  |
|                             |               | Carbon use   | G             | Efficiency           | G       |  |  |  |
| Socio-distributional impact | 4             | SDIs   | А             | Regeneration         | G       |  |  |  |
|                             |               | Regional im  | balance &     | economic growth      | G       |  |  |  |
| Local environment           | 2             | Air Quality  | Α             | Noise                | Α       |  |  |  |
|                             |               | Natural Env  | R             | Urban Env            | -       |  |  |  |
| Well being                  | 4             | Severance  | Α             | Physical Activity    | Α       |  |  |  |
|                             |               | Injuries   | Α             | Crime                | Α       |  |  |  |
|                             |               | Access   | G             | Resilience           | G       |  |  |  |
| Value for Money             | 3             | Large benefits   | s, but ve     | ry high cost         |         |  |  |  |
| Scale of impact             | 4             | Moderate, co   | untywid       | e impact             |         |  |  |  |
| Fit with transport          | 5             | Excellent fit -  | improvi       | ng accessibility,    |         |  |  |  |
| objectives .                |               | promoting me   | •             |                      |         |  |  |  |
| Fit with other objectives   | 5             |  |               | ing economic grov    | vth and |  |  |  |
| ,                           |               | development  |               |                      |         |  |  |  |
| Degree of consensus         | 4             | Depends on t   | ransfer t     | o rail, which in tur | n       |  |  |  |
|                             |               |  |               | rvice provided       |         |  |  |  |
| Cost risk                   | 2             | Medium/high  |               |                      |         |  |  |  |
| Affordability               | 1             | Assumes £250   | 0 million     | construction cost    |         |  |  |  |
| Feasibility                 | 3             | Unknown at p   | resent        |                      |         |  |  |  |
| Acceptability               | 4             | Untested, expected to be generally favourable                    |               |                      |         |  |  |  |
| Quality of evidence         | 3             | Good analysis of problems  |               |                      |         |  |  |  |
| Deliverability              | 1             | More than 5 y  | years, hig    | gh risk              |         |  |  |  |
| Flexibility                 | 4             | Scope for tail   | oring sch     | eme to funds         |         |  |  |  |
|                             | l .           |  |               |                      |         |  |  |  |

| Option name                 | Access to Di   | o Didcot Station – Building Enhancements |            |                           |           |  |
|-----------------------------|----------------|--|------------|---------------------------|-----------|--|
| Description                 | The project e  | nvisages a three-                        | storey bu  | ilding: a ground floo     | r having  |  |
|                             | ticket office, | retail space, toile                      | ts, and ra | il staff facilities; a se | cond      |  |
|                             | floor with a c | oncourse giving a                        | ccess on   | to platform 1, as wel     | l as rail |  |
|                             | management     | offices; and a thi                       | rd floor v | vith passenger space      | eleading  |  |
|                             | to a new foot  | tbridge that will c                      | onnect to  | all the platforms.        | _         |  |
| Identified problems         |                |  |            | ng was built in 1985      | and is    |  |
| racinities problems         |                |  |            | ow using the station      |           |  |
|                             | · ·            |  |            | ne facilities people no   |           |  |
|                             | expect.        | is near space to p                       | novide ti  | ie racincies people in    |           |  |
| Element                     | Rating         | Justification                            |            |                           |           |  |
| Economic growth             | 3              | Connectivity                             | A          | Reliability               | A         |  |
| Economic growth             | 3              | Resilience                               |            |                           |           |  |
| Cauban Engineiana           | 2              |  | A          | Delivery                  | A         |  |
| Carbon Emissions            | 2              | Activity                                 | A          | Embedded C                | R         |  |
|                             | _              | Carbon use                               | Α          | Efficiency                | A         |  |
| Socio-distributional impact | 4              | SDIs                                     | Α          | Regeneration              | G         |  |
|                             |                | _  |            | & economic growth         | G         |  |
| Local environment           | 4              | Air Quality                              | A          | Noise                     | Α         |  |
|                             |                | Natural Env                              | -          | Urban Env                 | G         |  |
| Well being                  | 4              | Severance                                | G          | Physical Activity         | Α         |  |
|                             |                | Injuries                                 | A          | Crime                     | A         |  |
|                             |                | Access                                   | Α          | Resilience                | Α         |  |
| Value for Money             | 1              | Not primarily                            | justified  | on transport grou         | nds       |  |
| Scale of impact             | 3              | Significant, lo                          | cality wi  | de impact                 |           |  |
| Fit with transport          | 2              | Encourages m                             | node swi   | tch                       |           |  |
| objectives .                |                |  |            |                           |           |  |
| Fit with other objectives   | 5              | Excellent Fit -                          | - suppor   | ting economic grov        | vth and   |  |
| ,                           |                | development                              | • •        | o o                       |           |  |
| Degree of consensus         | 2              | Depends on t                             | ransfer t  | o rail, which in tur      | n         |  |
| - C                         |                | -  |            | ervice provided           |           |  |
| Cost risk                   | 2              | Details not kn                           | own at p   | present                   |           |  |
| Affordability               | 2              | Assumes cost                             | of £25 r   | nillion                   |           |  |
| Feasibility                 | 3              | Details not kn                           | own at p   | oresent                   |           |  |
| Acceptability               | 4              | Untested, like                           | ly to be   | favourable                |           |  |
| Quality of evidence         | 2              | Informal anal                            | ysis       |                           |           |  |
| Deliverability              | 2              | 5 years, medi                            | um risk    |                           |           |  |
| Flexibility                 | 4              | Design can be funding availa             |            | and elements scal         | ed to fit |  |

| Option name  | Science Vale   | : Access to EZ -   | - A417 in  | provements          |         |  |
|--|--|--|------------|---------------------|---------|--|
| Description  |  |  |            | pacity enhanceme    | nts at  |  |
| ·  | Rowstock Roundabout and carriageway improvements along       |  |            |                     |         |  |
|  | the A417, including village junction improvements and public |  |            |                     |         |  |
|  | transport infrastructure.                                    |  |            |                     |         |  |
| Identified problems  |  |  | a packag   | e of strategic sche | mes     |  |
| ·  |  | • •  |            | reliable and resili |         |  |
|  | transport ne   | twork. The Wa  | ntage Ea   | stern Link Road an  | ıd      |  |
|  | improvemer   | nts at Steventon   | lights ar  | nd along Featherbe  | ed Lane |  |
|  | are directly r   | reliant on this so   | cheme be   | eing delivered.     |         |  |
| Element  | Rating   | Justification  |            |                     |         |  |
| Economic growth  | 4  | Connectivity   | G          | Reliability         | G       |  |
|  |  | Resilience   | Α          | Delivery            | G       |  |
| Carbon Emissions   | 3  | Activity   | Α          | Embedded C          | R       |  |
|  |  | Carbon use   | A          | Efficiency          | Α       |  |
| Socio-distributional impact  | 4  | SDIs   | Α          | Regeneration        | G       |  |
| para transfer pa |  |  |            | economic growth     | G       |  |
| Local environment  | 3  | Air Quality  | Α          | Noise               | Α       |  |
|  |  | Natural Env  | A          | Urban Env           |         |  |
| Well being   | 4  | Severance  | A          | Physical Activity   | Α       |  |
|  |  | Injuries   | A          | Crime               | Α       |  |
|  |  | Access   | <i>C</i>   | Resilience          | Α       |  |
| Value for Money  | 3  | Estimated BC   |            |                     | ,,      |  |
| value for mone,  |  | Estimated Bell 1.3 2.0   |            |                     |         |  |
| Scale of impact  | 4  | District-wide problem, significantly alleviated  |            |                     |         |  |
| ·  |  | and the processing and the proce |            |                     |         |  |
| Fit with transport   | 4  | Good fit; reduces congestion, provides   |            |                     |         |  |
| objectives .   |  | improved transport choice  |            |                     |         |  |
| Fit with other objectives  | 5  | Excellent fit: developing infrastructure to  |            |                     |         |  |
| -  |  | support economic growth  |            |                     |         |  |
| Degree of consensus  | 4  | Generally clea   | ar impact  | s, but may be issu  | es with |  |
|  |  | effectiveness  | •          | •                   |         |  |
| Cost risk  | 4  | Low-medium   | risk (not  | designed, low cos   | t)      |  |
|  |  |  |            |                     |         |  |
| Affordability  | 5  | Assumes £4 n   | nillion ca | pital cost          |         |  |
|  |  |  |            |                     |         |  |
| Feasibility  | 4  | No known de:   | sign issue | es ————             |         |  |
|  |  |  |            |                     |         |  |
| Acceptability  | 4  | Untested, like   | ly to be   | favourable          |         |  |
|  |  |  |            |                     |         |  |
| Quality of evidence  | 3  | Good analysis  | of probl   | ems, some of outo   | comes   |  |
|  |  |  |            |                     |         |  |
| Deliverability   | 3  | 3 years, medi  | um risk    |                     |         |  |
|  |  |  |            |                     |         |  |
| Flexibility  | 5  | Scheme could   | l be scale | d to match fundin   | g       |  |
|  |  | availability   |            |                     |         |  |

| me Access t         | o Harwell Link Roa   | d – Phase                                     | e 1                |   |  |  |
|---------------------|--|---|--------------------|---|--|--|
| on A link ro        | A link road from A4130 east of Milton Interchange to the     |   |                    |   |  |  |
| A417 pl             | A417 plus bringing current substandard Hagbourne Hill road   |   |                    |   |  |  |
| up to cu            | up to current standards and improve junctions at either end. |   |                    |   |  |  |
|                     | The current network has effectively reached capacity and is  |   |                    |   |  |  |
|                     | e a barrier to furth   | •   | • •                |   |  |  |
|                     | ate planned growth   | _   |                    | • |  |  |
|                     | erprise Zone and job   |   |                    | , |  |  |
| Ratin               | •  |   |                    |   |  |  |
| growth 5            | Connectivity   | G   | Reliability        | G |  |  |
| _                   | Resilience   | G   | Delivery           | G |  |  |
| missions 2          | Activity   | R   | Embedded C         | R |  |  |
|                     | Carbon use   | Α   | Efficiency         | А |  |  |
| ributional impact 4 | SDIs   | Α   | Regeneration       | Α |  |  |
|                     | Regional im  | balance &                                     | economic growth    | G |  |  |
| ironment 4          | Air Quality  | Α   | Noise              | G |  |  |
|                     | Natural Env  | R   | Urban Env          | G |  |  |
| g 4                 | Severance  | Α   | Physical Activity  | Α |  |  |
|                     | Injuries   | G   | Crime              | Α |  |  |
|                     | Access   | G   | Resilience         | G |  |  |
| Money 2             | High – Expect  | ted BCR =                                     | 2.0 – 4.0          |   |  |  |
| ,                   |  |   |                    |   |  |  |
| npact 4             | Significant, di  | Significant, district-wide impact             |                    |   |  |  |
| ansport 5           | Excellent fit -  | Excellent fit – reducing congestion and       |                    |   |  |  |
|                     | improving ac   | improving accessibility                       |                    |   |  |  |
| ther objectives 5   | Excellent fit -  | Excellent fit – supporting economic           |                    |   |  |  |
|                     | development  | development and growth                        |                    |   |  |  |
| consensus 4         | Generally acc  | Generally accepted benefits – although may be |                    |   |  |  |
|                     | issue of impa  | ct of gen                                     | erated traffic     | - |  |  |
| 5                   | Low risk   |   |                    |   |  |  |
| lity 3              | Assumes 16.2   | 2M capita                                     | al cost            |   |  |  |
|                     |  |   |                    |   |  |  |
| 4                   | Straightforwa  | Straightforward scheme with few challenges    |                    |   |  |  |
| ility 5             | Tested, favou  | Tested, favourable                            |                    |   |  |  |
| evidence 3          | Some analysi   | Some analysis undertaken                      |                    |   |  |  |
| ility 1             | 5+ years to d  | 5+ years to deliver, high risk to programme   |                    |   |  |  |
| 1                   | Little/no scop   | Little/no scope for reduced scope scheme      |                    |   |  |  |
| evidence 3 ility 1  | Some analysi 5+ years to d                                   | s underta<br>eliver, hig                      | gh risk to program |   |  |  |

| Option name                 | Science Vale   | : Cycle networl   | k improv          | ements                                |        |  |
|-----------------------------|--|---|-------------------|---------------------------------------|--------|--|
| 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, |   |                   |                                       |        |  |
|                             |  | •   | •                 | • •                                   | •      |  |
|                             |  | n stations), and better information and signage for cyclists g the latest technologies. |                   |                                       |        |  |
| Identified problems         |  |   |                   | ng improvements                       | and    |  |
| racitimea problems          |  | •   |                   | modal choice in So                    |        |  |
|                             |  |   | •                 | tivity to give a real                 |        |  |
|                             | ·  | o the private ve  |                   | civity to give a real                 |        |  |
| Element                     | Rating   | Justification   | THEIC.            |                                       |        |  |
| Economic growth             | 4  | Connectivity  | G                 | Reliability                           | G/A    |  |
| Leonomic growth             | 4  | Resilience  | G                 | Delivery                              | G<br>G |  |
| Combon Emissions            | 5  |   |                   | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |        |  |
| Carbon Emissions            | 5  | Activity  | G                 | Embedded C                            | A      |  |
|                             | _  | Carbon use  | G                 | Efficiency                            | G      |  |
| Socio-distributional impact | 5  | SDIs  | G                 | Regeneration                          | G      |  |
|                             |  | Regional im   | balance &         | economic growth                       | G      |  |
| Local environment           | 5  | Air Quality   | G                 | Noise                                 | G      |  |
|                             |  | Natural Env   | G                 | Urban Env                             | G      |  |
| Well being                  | 4  | Α   | Physical Activity | G                                     |        |  |
|                             |  | Injuries  | Α                 | Crime                                 | Α      |  |
|                             |  | Access G Resilience   |                   |                                       |        |  |
| Value for Money             | 4  | Estimated BCR 2.0-4.0   |                   |                                       |        |  |
| Scale of impact             | 3  | District-wide, moderate impact  |                   |                                       |        |  |
| Fit with transport          | 5  | Increases travel choice, reduces carbon,  |                   |                                       |        |  |
| objectives                  |  | reduces congestion  |                   |                                       |        |  |
| Fit with other objectives   | 5  | Provides infrastructure to support economic   |                   |                                       |        |  |
|                             |  | growth, improves public health  |                   |                                       |        |  |
| Degree of consensus         | 3  | <del> </del>  | · ·               | unt of use of facilit                 | -iec   |  |
| Degree of consensus         |  | especially in r   |                   |                                       | 1103,  |  |
| Cost risk                   | 4  | <u> </u>  |                   | designed, low cos                     | +)     |  |
| COSCIISIO                   |  | LOW Inculain  | וטוו) אכוו        | acaigned, iow cos                     | ٠,     |  |
| Affordability               | 5  | Assumes £4.9  | million           | capital cost                          |        |  |
| Faceibility                 | 4  | No les serves de  | -lan ! :          |                                       |        |  |
| 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 confunding  | an be eas         | sily scaled to matc                   | h      |  |

| Option name                 | Science Vale  | : Didcot Science  | e Bridge  |                      |       |  |
|-----------------------------|---|---|-----------|----------------------|-------|--|
| Description                 | The scheme will see a new bridge over the Great Western   |   |           |                      |       |  |
| •                           | railway. It offers improved access through and around Di  |   |           |                      |       |  |
|                             |   | •   |           | e Vale, in particula |       |  |
|                             |   | •   |           | •                    |       |  |
| Identified problems         | 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 |   |           |                      |       |  |
|                             |   |   |           |                      | •     |  |
|                             |   | •   |           | ncrease the pressu   | re on |  |
|                             | 1 -   | , ,   | •         | eventing business    |       |  |
|                             | investment a  | and the delivery  | of the S  | cience 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 Emissions            | _   | Carbon use  | ^\A       | Efficiency           | Α     |  |
| Cocio distributional impost | 1   |   |           |                      |       |  |
| Socio-distributional impact | 4   | SDIs  | Α         | Regeneration         | G     |  |
|                             |   |   | paiance & | economic growth      | G     |  |
| Local environment           | 2   | Air Quality   | A         | Noise                | R     |  |
|                             |   | Natural Env   | -         | Urban Env            | R     |  |
| Well being                  | 4   | Severance   | Α         | Physical Activity    | Α     |  |
|                             |   | Injuries  | G         | Crime                | Α     |  |
|                             |   | 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          | 5   | Excellent – reduces congestion, improves                |           |                      |       |  |
| ·                           |   |   |           |                      |       |  |
| objectives                  |   | accessibility  Excellent – supports economic growth and |           |                      |       |  |
| Fit with other objectives   | 5   | 1   | pports e  | conomic growth ai    | าต    |  |
|                             |   | development   |           |                      |       |  |
| Degree of consensus         | 5   | Straightforwa   | rd impac  | ts                   |       |  |
| Cost risk                   | 1   | High cost risk  | – schem   | e details to be      |       |  |
|                             |   | determined, unusual scheme                              |           |                      |       |  |
| Affordability               | 2   |   |           | cost of £34.9M       |       |  |
| Foosibility                 | 3   | Fooribility   | du +0 bc  | undortokon           |       |  |
| Feasibility                 | 3   | Feasibility stu   | ay 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 sche  | me                   |       |  |

| 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 mo    |   |                                      |                       |         |  |
|                             | its length an  | nd has a double o                                 | dog-leg k                            | oend midway along     | its     |  |
|                             | length; exiti  | ng the road is di                                 | fficult.                             |                       |         |  |
| Element                     | Rating   | Justification                                     |                                      |                       |         |  |
| Economic growth             | 4  | Connectivity                                      | G                                    | Reliability           | G       |  |
|                             |  | Resilience  | Α                                    | Delivery              | G       |  |
| Carbon Emissions            | 2  | Activity  | Α                                    | Embedded C            | R       |  |
|                             |  | Carbon use  | А                                    | Efficiency            | А       |  |
| Socio-distributional impact | 4  | SDIs  | Α                                    | Regeneration          | Α       |  |
|                             |  | Regional imb                                      | balance 8                            | R economic growth     | G       |  |
| Local environment           | 3  | Air Quality                                       | Α                                    | Noise                 | Α       |  |
|                             |  | Natural Env                                       | А                                    | Urban Env             | Α       |  |
| Well being                  | 4  | Severance   | Α                                    | Physical Activity     | Α       |  |
|                             |  | Injuries  | G                                    | Crime                 | Α       |  |
|                             |  | Access  | G                                    | Resilience            | А       |  |
| Value for Money             | 3  | Medium – exp                                      | ected B                              | CR = 1.5-2.0          |         |  |
|                             |  |   |                                      |                       |         |  |
| Scale of impact             | 4  | Significant, lo                                   | Significant, locality-wide impact    |                       |         |  |
| Fit with transport          | 5  | Excellent fit – improving accessibility, reducing |                                      |                       |         |  |
| objectives                  |  | congestion  |                                      |                       |         |  |
| Fit with other objectives   | 5  | <u> </u>  | support                              | ting economic grov    | vth and |  |
| j                           |  | development                                       | • •                                  |                       |         |  |
| Degree of consensus         | 4  | Impact of on-                                     | Impact of on-line improvements clear |                       |         |  |
| Cost risk                   | 4  | Relatively high                                   | n becaus                             | se at early design st | age     |  |
| Affordability               | 5  | Assumes capit                                     | tal cost o                           | of £6.5M              |         |  |
| Feasibility                 | 3  | Should he rela                                    | atively st                           | raightforward but     |         |  |
| · casionicy                 |  | requires land                                     | •                                    | •                     |         |  |
| Acceptability               | 4  | Untested but likely to be favourable              |                                      |                       |         |  |
| - P 7                       |  |   | - /                                  |                       |         |  |
| Quality of evidence         | 2  | Some informal analysis of problem                 |                                      |                       |         |  |
| Deliverability              | 2  | 5 years / low programme risk                      |                                      |                       |         |  |
| Flexibility                 | 2  | Could only de                                     | liver son                            | ne elements of sch    | eme     |  |
| ···calonity                 | _  | but at reduce                                     |                                      |                       |         |  |

| 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  Local Element  Local Element  Air Quality  Air Quality  Air Quality  Air Quality  Combose  A Cribon Environment  Air Quality  Access  A Crime  B Crime  A Crime  B Crime  | Option name                    | Science Vale | : Jubilee Way                              | Improver   | ment Scheme        |         |  |
|--|--------------------------------|--------------|--|------------|--------------------|---------|--|
| the operation of and capacity of the junction and help deliver more developable land in the town centre.  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 Resilience G Delivery 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 Cordistributional impact 4 Air Quality G Noise A Natural Env - Urban Env G Noise A Natural Env - Urban Env G Noise A Access G Resilience G | Description                    |              |  |            |                    |         |  |
| more developable land in the town centre.  | ·                              | · · · · · ·  |  |            |                    |         |  |
| more developable land in the town centre.  |                                | ·            |  |            |                    |         |  |
| 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 Resilience G Resilience G Regional imbalance & economic growth G Resilience G Notice A Natural Env - Urban Env G Noise A Natural Env - Urban Env G Resilience G Resili |                                |              |  |            |                    |         |  |
| 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 Resilience G Delivery G Activity R Embedded C R Carbon Emissions 2 Activity R Embedded C R Carbon use A Efficiency A Regional imbalance & economic growth G Regional imbalance & economic gr | Identified problems            |              | •  |            |                    | urnev   |  |
| 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 Resilience G Delivery G Activity R Embedded C R Carbon Emissions A Efficiency A Socio-distributional impact A SDIs A Regeneration G Regional imbalance & economic growth G A SOIS A Regeneration G Regional imbalance & economic growth G A Natural Env - Urban Env G Noternal Env - Urban Env G Natural Env - 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 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 Untested, expected to be favourable  Quality of evidence 5 Options modelled in detail  Deliverability 3 3 years, medium risk  | μ.σ.σ.σ.                       |              |  |            | • •                | -       |  |
| 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 Resilience G Delivery G Activity R Embedded C R Carbon Emissions 2 Activity R Embedded C R Regional impact A SDIS A Regeneration G Regional imbalance & economic growth and development G Regional imbalance & economic growth G Regional imbalance & econ |                                |              | • .  | 0 ,        | •                  |         |  |
| Centre will suffer making the town centre unattractive.  |                                |              | _  | _          |                    |         |  |
| Element Rating Justification  Economic growth 5 Connectivity G Reliability G Resilience G Delivery G Activity R Embedded C Activity R Embedded C Activity R Embedded C Activity R Embedded C A Activity R Embedded C A Activity R Embedded C A A Regeneration G Regional imbalance & economic growth G A Regional imbalance & economic growth G A Air Quality G Noise A Natural Env - Urban Env G Reverance A Physical Activity A Injuries A Crime A Access G Resilience G Access G Resilience G Resil |                                | -            |  | =          |                    |         |  |
| Economic growth  5   | Flement                        |              |  |            |                    |         |  |
| Resilience G Delivery G Activity R Embedded C R Carbon use A Efficiency A Socio-distributional impact 4 SDIs A Regeneration G Regional imbalance & economic growth G Air Quality G Noise A Natural Env - Urban Env G Notural Env - Urban Env G Notural Env - Urban Env G Noise A Access G Resilience G Resilienc |                                | -            | <del> </del>                               | G          | Relighility        | G       |  |
| Carbon Emissions       2       Activity       R       Embedded C       R         Socio-distributional impact       4       SDIs       A       Regeneration       G         Local environment       4       Air Quality       G       Noise       A         Well being       4       Severance       A       Physical Activity       A         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       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       Untested, expected to be favourable         Quality of evidence       5       Options modelled in de   | Leonomic growth                |              | <u> </u>                                   |            | ļ                  |         |  |
| Carbon use   A   Efficiency   A  | Carbon Emissions               | 2            |  |            | · ' '              |         |  |
| Socio-distributional impact   4   SDIs   A Regeneration   G Regional imbalance & economic growth   G   | Carbon Emissions               |              |  |            | <del> </del>       |         |  |
| Regional imbalance & economic growth   G   | Carta dial dia translation and | 4            |  |            |                    |         |  |
| Local environment  4   | Socio-distributional impact    | 4            |  |            |                    |         |  |
| 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 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   |                                | _            |  |            |                    |         |  |
| Well being       4       Severance Injuries       A Crime A Crime A A Crime A A Crime A A Cress G Resilience G       A Crime A A Crime A A Crime A A Crime A A 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  | Local environment              | 4            |  | G          |                    |         |  |
| Injuries   |                                |              | Natural Env                                | -          |                    | G       |  |
| AccessGResilienceGValue for Money2Estimated BCR 2.0 – 4.0Scale of impact3Significant, locality wide impactFit with transport objectives5Excellent – reduces congestion, improves accessibilityFit with other objectives5Excellent – supports economic growth and developmentDegree of consensus5Straightforward impactsCost risk3Medium risk – scheme details to be determinedAffordability4Assumes capital cost of £6.5 millionFeasibility4May be issue of suitability of landAcceptability4Untested, expected to be favourableQuality of evidence5Options modelled in detailDeliverability33 years, medium risk  | Well being                     | 4            | Severance                                  | Α          | Physical Activity  | Α       |  |
| 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  |                                |              | Injuries                                   | Α          | Crime              | Α       |  |
| Scale of impact  3 Significant, locality wide impact  Fit with transport objectives  Fit with other 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  |                                |              | Access G Resilience G                      |            |                    |         |  |
| Fit with transport objectives  Fit with other ob | Value for Money                | 2            | Estimated BC                               | R 2.0 – 4. | 0                  |         |  |
| objectives       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  | Scale of impact                | 3            | Significant, locality wide impact          |            |                    |         |  |
| objectives       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  | Fit with transport             | 5            | Excellent – reduces congestion, improves   |            |                    |         |  |
| Fit with other objectives  5   | •                              |              |  |            |                    |         |  |
| development   Degree of consensus   5   Straightforward impacts  | •                              | 5            |  |            |                    |         |  |
| 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 years, medium risk   | ,                              |              |  |            |                    |         |  |
| 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   | Degree of consensus            | 5            |  |            |                    |         |  |
| 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  |                                |              |  |            |                    |         |  |
| 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  | Cost risk                      | 3            | Medium risk -                              | – scheme   | details to be dete | ermined |  |
| Acceptability  4 Untested, expected to be favourable  Quality of evidence  5 Options modelled in detail  Deliverability  3 3 years, medium risk  | Affordability                  | 4            | Assumes capi                               | tal cost o | of £6.5 million    |         |  |
| Quality of evidence 5 Options modelled in detail  Deliverability 3 3 years, medium risk  | Feasibility                    | 4            | May be issue of suitability of land        |            |                    |         |  |
| Deliverability 3 3 years, medium risk  | Acceptability                  | 4            | Untested, expected to be favourable        |            |                    |         |  |
|  | Quality of evidence            | 5            | Options modelled in detail                 |            |                    |         |  |
| Flexibility 1 Little scope for adapting preferred scheme   | Deliverability                 | 3            | 3 years, medium risk                       |            |                    |         |  |
|  | Flexibility                    | 1            | Little scope for adapting preferred scheme |            |                    |         |  |

| Option name                 | Wantage Eas  | stern Link Road  |                     |  |          |  |
|-----------------------------|--|--|---------------------|--|----------|--|
| Description                 | A Link Road from A338 to the A417 to act as a perimeter road |  |                     |  | er 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          |  |                     |  |          |  |
| lacitatica problems         | _  |  | •                   | e impact of this gr                    |          |  |
|                             |  |  |                     | ittractive route pro                   |          |  |
|                             |  | _  | en as an a          | itti active route pri                  | ovided   |  |
| Flamant                     | to encourage   |  |                     |  |          |  |
| Element                     | Rating   | Justification  |                     |  |          |  |
| Economic growth             | 4  | Connectivity   | G                   | Reliability                            | Α        |  |
|                             |  | Resilience   | G                   | Delivery                               | G        |  |
| Carbon Emissions            | 3  | Activity   | A                   | Embedded C                             | Α        |  |
|                             |  | Carbon use   | Α                   | Efficiency                             | G        |  |
| Socio-distributional impact | 4  | SDIs   | G                   | Regeneration                           | Α        |  |
|                             |  | Regional im  | balance &           | economic growth                        | G        |  |
| Local environment           | 4  | Air Quality  | G                   | Noise                                  | Α        |  |
|                             |  | Natural Env  | А                   | Urban Env                              | G        |  |
| Well being                  | 3  | Severance  | Α                   | Physical Activity                      | Α        |  |
|                             |  | Injuries   | Α                   | Crime                                  | Α        |  |
|                             |  | Access   | G                   | Resilience                             | G        |  |
| Value for Money             | 4  | High – expect  |                     | i i                                    | •        |  |
| value for Money             |  | Trigit – expect  | eu ben -            | 2.0-4.0                                |          |  |
| Scale of impact             | 3  | Significant locality-wide impact                           |                     |  |          |  |
| ·                           |  | Sometime of the second party                               |                     |  |          |  |
| Fit with transport          | 5  | Excellent fit – improving accessibility, reducing          |                     |  |          |  |
| objectives                  |  | congestion   |                     |  |          |  |
| Fit with other objectives   | 5  |  | support             | ing economic grow                      | vth and  |  |
| The men dener dajedences    |  | Excellent fit – supporting economic growth and development |                     |  |          |  |
| Degree of consensus         | 3  |  |                     | of preferred sche                      | me       |  |
| Degree or consensus         |  | vviii depend e   | on actains          | or preferred serie                     |          |  |
| Cost risk                   | 2  | Relatively hig   | h risk unt          | til details of schem                   | 10       |  |
| COSCIISK                    |  | determined   | II IISK UIII        | in details of scrien                   | ic       |  |
| Affordability               | 4  | Assumes capi   | tal cost o          | AF £1.4 N.4                            |          |  |
| Affordability               | 4  | Assumes capi   | tai cost c          | JI E14 IVI                             |          |  |
| Faccibility                 | 4  | Likola ka laa  | ا المعالمة المعالمة | ************************************** | h o no o |  |
| Feasibility                 | 4  | Likely to be re  | eiatively s         | straightforward sc                     | neme     |  |
| A contability               | 2  | Linkooka al /u. t  | . a d               |  |          |  |
| Acceptability               | 3  | Untested/mix   | lea                 |  |          |  |
| Ouglity of avidence         | 4  | Hachaer  | ا مااانم د د ا      | overell stretter. It                   | +        |  |
| Quality of evidence         | 4  |  | _                   | overall strategy b                     | ut       |  |
| D.P. and P.                 |  | limited of par   |                     |  |          |  |
| Deliverability              | 4  | 3 years, low risk of slippage                              |                     |  |          |  |
| EL 11-111                   |  |  |                     |  |          |  |
| Flexibility                 | 3  | Some scope f   | or variati          | on of route                            |          |  |
|                             |  |  |                     |  |          |  |