

Weston Package Phase 1  
Major Scheme Business Case

# Appendix 3.6

## NATA Worksheets (including TEE Tables) – Preferred Scheme



West of England Partnership

Bath & North East  
Somerset Council



North  
Somerset  
Council

South Gloucestershire  
Council



South West RDA



Economy:Economic Efficiency of the Transport System(TEE)		WP1 PREFERRED SCHEME					
Consumers	ALL MODES	Road	Bus	Rail			
User benefits	TOTAL						
Travel Time	69646	55382	14830	-566			
Vehicle operating costs	-1806	-1806	0	0			
User charges	-12	0	0	-12			
During Construction & Maintenance	0	0	0	0			
NET CONSUMER BENEFITS	67828	53575	14830	-578			
Business							
User benefits		Personal	Freight	Personal	Freight	Personal	Freight
Travel Time	68802	33094	30119	6081	0	-492	0
Vehicle operating costs	2741	1107	1634	0	0	0	0
User charges	6	0	0	0	0	6	0
During Construction & Maintenance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal	71550	34201	31754	6081	0	-486	0
Private Sector Provider Impacts							
Revenue	7263	0	10865	-3602			
Operating costs	-7910	0	-7910	0			
Investment costs	0	0	0	0			
Grant/subsidy	0	0	0	0			
Subtotal	-647	0	2955	-3602			
Other business Impacts							
Developer contributions	-36220	-36220	0	0			
NET BUSINESS IMPACT	34683						
TOTAL							
Present Value of Transport Economic Efficiency Benefits (PVB)	102511						
Note: Benefits appear as positive numbers, while costs appear as negative numbers.							
Note: All entries are present values discounted to 2002, in 2002 prices							
Public Accounts							
	ALL MODES	Road	Bus	Rail			
Local Government Funding	TOTAL						
Revenue	0	0	0	0			
Operating costs	4791	4791	0	0			
Investment costs	39046	39046	0	0			
Developer Contributions	-36220	-36220	0	0			
Grant/Subsidy Payments	0	0	0	0			
NET IMPACT	7617	7617	0	0			
Central Government Funding							
Revenue	0	0	0	0			
Operating costs	0	0	0	0			
Investment costs	18772	18772	0	0			
Developer Contributions	0	0	0	0			
Grant/Subsidy Payments	0	0	0	0			
Indirect Tax Revenues	-186	-1100	1507	-593			
NET IMPACT	18587	17673	1507	-593			
TOTAL							
TOTAL Present Value of Costs (PVC)	26204						
Note: Costs appear as positive numbers, while revenues and developer contributions appear as negative numbers.							
Note: All entries are present values discounted to 2002, in 2002 prices							
Analysis of Monetised Costs and Benefits							
Non-Exchequer Impacts							
Consumer User Benefits	67828						
Business User Benefits	71550						
Private Sector Provider Impacts	-647						
Other Business Impacts	-36220						
Accident Benefits	6352						
Carbon Benefits	-172						
Net present Value of Benefits (PVB)	108691						
Local Government Funding	7617						
Central Government Funding	18587						
Net present Value Costs (PVC)	26204						
Overall Impact							
Net present Value (NPV)	82487						
Benefit to Cost Ratio (BCR)	4.15						
Appraisal Period	2015 to 2074						
Note: There may also be other significant costs and benefits, some of which cannot be presented in monetised form. Where this is the case, the analysis presented above does NOT provide a good measure of value for money and should not be used as the sole basis for decisions.							



**No. of households experiencing 'Without Scheme' & 'With Scheme' noise levels (given in dB<sub>Leq</sub>) in 15th Year After Opening**

	With Scheme	<45	45-47.9	48-50.9	51-53.9	54-56.9	57-59.9	60-62.9	63-65.9	66-68.9	69-71.9	72-74.9	75-77.9	78-80.9	81+
<b>Without Scheme</b>															
<45		7223	195	4	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
45-47.9		295	3123	225	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
48-50.9		0	301	2454	187	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
51-53.9		0	0	231	2049	185	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
54-56.9		0	0	0	164	1320	97	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
57-59.9		0	0	0	0	187	955	195	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
60-62.9		0	0	0	0	0	105	1204	90	0	0	0	0	0	0
63-65.9		0	0	0	0	0	1	157	1249	46	0	0	0	0	0
66-68.9		0	0	0	0	0	1	1	53	972	8	0	0	0	0
69-71.9		0	0	0	0	0	3	5	1	53	236	0	0	0	0
72-74.9		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	19	1	0	0
75-77.9		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0
78-80.9		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
81+		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Net Present Value of Noise of Proposal  
(60 Year Period)**

**548,500**

\*positive value reflects a **net benefit** (i.e. noise reduction)

**Estimated Population Annoyed (Without Scheme):**

**4730**

**Estimated Population Annoyed (With Scheme):**

**4698**

**Net Noise Annoyance Change in 15th Year After  
Opening (no. of people):**

**-32**

\*positive value reflects an **increase** in people annoyed by noise

**Traffic Data Sources:** Atkins model

---

---

**Population Data Sources:** WebTAG default level of 2.36 per dwelling.

---

---

**Assumptions:**

- The terrain of the study area is flat.
- No benefit from any low noise surfaces.
- Average traffic speeds are based upon the speed limit for the road.
- Percentage HGV assumed 5.1 for most links.
- Only major links have been included within the noise model.

---

---

**Assessment scores:**

- Change in number of people annoyed: -32
- NPV: £548,500

---

---

**Qualitative Comments:**

The decrease in the number of people annoyed is mostly due to a redistribution of traffic over the network. An estimated 64 properties would be exposed to a level above 68 dBLAeq. Nighttime noise levels likely to remain unchanged.

---

---

Worksheet 1a - OPTION A – Preferred Scheme

Link Number	Number of Residential Properties Within the Distance Bands				Do Minimum (DM)										Something (DS)										DM		DS													
					Conc 20 m from Road Centre		Conc 70 m from Road Centre		Conc 115 m from Road Centre		Conc 175 m from Road Centre		NO2 Conc Multiplied by Number of Properties		PM10 Conc Multiplied by Number of Properties		Conc 20 m from Road Centre		Conc 70 m from Road Centre		Conc 115 m from Road Centre		Conc 175 m from Road Centre						NO2 Conc Multiplied by Number of Properties		PM10 Conc Multiplied by Number of Properties									
	0-50	50-100	100-150	150-200	NO2	PM10	NO2	PM10	NO2	PM10	NO2	PM10	NO2	PM10	NO2	PM10	NO2	PM10	NO2	PM10	NO2	PM10	NO2	PM10	NO2	PM10	NO2	PM10	NO2	PM10	NO2	PM10	NO2	PM10	NO2	PM10				
	0-50	50-100	100-150	150-200	0-50	50-100	100-150	150-200	0-50	50-100	100-150	150-200	0-50	50-100	100-150	150-200	0-50	50-100	100-150	150-200	0-50	50-100	100-150	150-200	0-50	50-100	100-150	150-200	0-50	50-100	100-150	150-200	0-50	50-100	100-150	150-200				
1	42	124	70	37	13.88	17.06	11.58	16.01	10.93	15.72	10.73	15.63	583	1436	765	397	717	1985	1100	578	13.41	16.55	11.44	15.86	10.89	15.67	10.71	15.61	563	1419	762	396	695	1967	1097	578	3181	4380	3140	4336
7	7	5	18	22	12.06	15.94	11.04	15.68	10.75	15.61	10.66	15.58	84	55	194	235	112	78	281	343	11.74	15.86	10.94	15.65	10.72	15.60	10.65	15.58	82	55	193	234	111	78	281	343	568	814	564	813
11	0	0	35	73	13.41	16.48	11.44	15.84	10.88	15.66	10.71	15.60	0	0	394	782	0	0	548	1139	13.65	16.60	11.51	15.87	10.91	15.67	10.72	15.61	0	0	382	783	0	0	548	1140	1163	1687	1164	1688
21	116	240	356	383	11.17	15.75	10.77	15.62	10.66	15.59	10.63	15.58	1296	2585	3795	4071	1827	3749	5550	5967	11.50	15.86	10.87	15.65	10.70	15.60	10.64	15.58	1334	2609	3809	4075	1640	3756	5554	5967	11747	17093	11827	17117
23	37	121	141	160	14.32	16.70	11.71	15.90	10.98	15.68	10.75	15.61	530	1417	1548	1935	618	1924	2211	2810	13.81	16.53	11.56	15.85	10.92	15.66	10.73	15.61	511	1399	1540	1931	612	1918	2208	2810	5430	7562	5381	7547
28	23	78	61	114	13.79	16.20	11.55	15.96	10.92	15.70	10.73	15.62	317	901	666	1223	389	1245	958	1781	14.12	17.14	11.65	16.03	10.96	15.72	10.74	15.63	325	909	669	1224	394	1250	959	1782	3107	4372	3126	4385
29	0	8	9	0	10.71	15.60	10.64	15.58	10.62	15.57	10.61	15.57	0	85	96	0	0	125	140	0	12.33	16.01	11.12	15.70	10.78	15.61	10.67	15.59	0	89	97	0	0	126	140	0	181	265	186	266
30	0	2	13	60	10.61	15.57	10.61	15.57	10.61	15.57	10.61	15.57	0	21	138	637	0	31	202	934	12.69	16.11	11.22	15.73	10.81	15.62	10.69	15.59	0	22	141	641	0	31	203	935	796	1168	804	1170
31	0	0	0	0	11.26	15.73	10.80	15.62	10.67	15.59	10.63	15.58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13.50	16.37	11.46	15.80	10.89	15.65	10.72	15.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
32	3	5	28	62	13.12	16.33	11.35	15.79	10.86	15.64	10.70	15.60	39	57	304	663	49	79	438	967	11.70	15.94	10.93	15.68	10.72	15.61	10.65	15.58	35	55	300	660	48	78	437	966	1064	1533	1050	1529
34	0	4	11	34	13.15	16.34	11.36	15.80	10.86	15.65	10.70	15.60	0	45	119	364	0	63	172	530	11.80	15.90	10.96	15.67	10.73	15.60	10.65	15.58	0	44	118	362	0	63	172	530	529	766	524	764
44	59	280	331	411	11.68	15.88	10.92	15.66	10.71	15.80	10.65	15.58	689	3058	3545	4377	937	4385	5164	6403	11.63	15.87	10.91	15.66	10.71	15.60	10.65	15.58	686	3055	3545	4377	936	4385	5164	6403	11669	16889	11663	16888
47	0	31	49	33	11.60	15.85	10.90	15.65	10.71	15.80	10.65	15.58	0	338	525	351	0	485	764	514	11.81	15.90	10.96	15.67	10.73	15.60	10.65	15.58	0	340	526	351	0	486	764	514	1214	1764	1217	1764
46	0	15	20	34	13.77	16.37	11.55	15.81	10.92	15.65	10.73	15.60	0	173	218	365	0	237	313	530	14.08	16.43	11.64	15.82	10.95	15.65	10.74	15.60	0	175	219	365	0	237	313	530	756	1081	759	1081
48	1	1	1	33	13.35	16.34	11.42	15.79	10.88	15.65	10.71	15.60	13	11	11	353	16	16	16	515	13.63	16.63	11.50	15.88	10.91	15.67	10.72	15.61	14	12	11	354	17	16	16	515	389	563	390	563
49	0	0	0	0	11.72	16.01	10.94	15.70	10.72	15.61	10.65	15.59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11.93	16.09	11.00	15.72	10.74	15.62	10.66	15.59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
55	0	7	40	49	12.35	16.18	11.12	15.75	10.78	15.63	10.67	15.59	0	78	431	523	0	110	625	764	12.33	16.15	11.12	15.74	10.78	15.63	10.67	15.59	0	78	431	523	0	110	625	764	1032	1499	1032	1499
56	37	77	96	102	12.07	16.04	11.04	15.71	10.75	15.62	10.66	15.59	447	850	1032	1087	593	1210	1500	1590	11.90	16.01	10.99	15.70	10.74	15.61	10.66	15.59	440	846	1031	1087	592	1209	1499	1590	3416	4893	3405	4890
61	0	2	53	57	14.56	17.01	11.78	15.99	11.00	15.71	10.76	15.62	0	24	583	613	0	32	833	890	13.73	16.59	11.53	15.87	10.92	15.67	10.73	15.61	0	23	579	612	0	32	831	890	1220	1755	1213	1752
63	12	83	118	132	13.27	16.23	11.39	15.76	10.87	15.63	10.71	15.60	159	945	1283	1414	195	1308	1844	2059	13.64	16.36	11.51	15.80	10.91	15.65	10.72	15.60	164	955	1287	1415	196	1311	1847	2059	3801	5406	3821	5414
65	0	1	36	81	13.34	16.22	11.42	15.88	10.88	15.67	10.71	15.61	0	11	392	868	0	16	564	1264	11.65	16.01	10.86	15.67	10.69	15.60	10.74	15.58	0	11	385	862	0	16	562	1262	1271	1844	1258	1839
68	15	33	76	111	14.37	16.63	11.73	15.88	10.98	15.67	10.75	15.61	216	387	834	1193	249	524	1191	1733	13.85	16.44	11.57	15.82	10.93	15.66	10.73	15.60	208	382	831	1191	247	522	1190	1732	2630	3697	2611	3690
70	1	31	177	254	13.47	16.50	11.46	15.84	10.89	15.66	10.72	15.61	13	355	1928	2723	17	491	2772	3965	13.72	16.59	11.53	15.87	10.92	15.67	10.73	15.61	14	357	1933	2725	17	492	2774	3965	5019	7244	5029	7247
72	95	172	153	219	12.48	16.20	11.16	15.75	10.79	15.63	10.68	15.59	1186	1920	1651	2339	1539	2709	2391	3414	12.30	16.13	11.11	15.74	10.77	15.63	10.67	15.59	1169	1911	1648	2337	1532	2707	2391	3414	7095	10054	7064	10045
77	5	45	80	83	11.21	15.79	10.79	15.64	10.67	15.59	10.63	15.58	56	486	854	882	79	704	1247	1293	12.77	16.26	11.25	15.77	10.82	15.64	10.69	15.60	64	506	866	887	81	710	1251	1295	2277	3323	2323	3337
78	17	68	115	108	13.81	16.64	11.56	15.88	10.92	15.67	10.73	15.61	235	786	1256	1137	283	1080	1622	1655	13.52	16.52	11.47	15.85	10.90	15.66	10.72	15.61	230	780	1254	1136	281	1078	1801	1655	3414	4819	3400	4814
79	2	60	93	93	11.39	15.84	10.84	15.65	10.69	15.60	10.64	15.58	23	650	994	990	32	939	1451	1449	11.55	15.89	11.88	15.66	10.70	15.60	10.64	15.58	23	653	995	990	32	940	1451	1449	2657	3870	2661	3871
81	82	119	199	181	11.90	16.04	10.99	15.71	10.74	15.62	10.66	15.59	976	1308	2137	1929	1315	1869	3108	2822	12.02	16.07	11.02	15.72	10.75	15.62	10.66	15.59	986	1311	2139	1929	1318	1871	3108					

**Worksheet 1b: Local Air Quality - Plan Level Summary Table (Preferred Scheme)**

<b>PM<sub>10</sub> SUMMARY OF ROUTES – Preferred Scheme</b>	0-50m (i)	50-100m (ii)	100-500m (iii)	150-200m (iv)	0-200m (v=i+ii+iii+iv)
Total properties across all routes (min)	1396	2732	3793	4771	12692
Total Properties across all routes (some)	1396	2732	3793	4771	12692
Do-minimum PM <sub>10</sub> assessment across all routes	22418	42974	59265	74390	199047
Do-something PM <sub>10</sub> assessment across all routes	22369	42957	59263	74387	198975
<b>NET TOTAL ASSESSMENT FOR PM<sub>10</sub>, ALL ROUTES</b>	-71*				
Number of properties with an improvement	4040				
Number of properties with no change	0				
Number of properties with deterioration	4451				

\* Based on unrounded values

Reference Sources: DfT (2004) Transport Analysis Guidance (WebTAG) Unit 3.3.3 Local Air Quality Sub-objective; Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, Volume 11.3.1, Advice note HA 207/07 (2007); Air Quality Archive website for background concentrations:-[www.airquality.co.uk](http://www.airquality.co.uk)

**Quantitative measures:** 4451 properties experiencing worse air quality  
4040 experiencing improved air quality

**Assessment scores:** PM<sub>10</sub> score is -71, **overall improvement in air quality** with Preferred Scheme

**Qualitative comments:** Improvements due to reduction in congestion.

<b>NO<sub>2</sub> SUMMARY OF ROUTES - Preferred Scheme</b>	0-50m (i)	50-100m (ii)	100-500m (iii)	150-200m (iv)	0-200m (v=i+ii+iii+iv)
Total properties across all routes (min)	1396	2732	3793	4771	12692
Total Properties across all routes (some)	1396	2732	3793	4771	12692
Do-minimum NO <sub>2</sub> assessment across all routes	16835	30296	40878	50932	138941
Do-something NO <sub>2</sub> assessment across all routes	16728	30281	40878	50930	138817
<b>NET TOTAL ASSESSMENT FOR NO<sub>2</sub>, ALL ROUTES</b>	-124				
Number of properties with an improvement	3964				
Number of properties with no change	0				
Number of properties with deterioration	4527				

Reference Sources: DfT (2004) Transport Analysis I Guidance (WebTAG) Unit 3.3.3 Local Air Quality Sub-objective; Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, Volume 11.3.1, Advice note HA 207/07 (2007); Air Quality Archive website for background concentrations:-[www.airquality.co.uk](http://www.airquality.co.uk)

**Quantitative measures:** 4527 properties experiencing worse air quality  
3964 experiencing improved air quality

**Assessment scores:** NO<sub>2</sub> score is -124, **overall improvement in air quality** with Preferred Scheme

**Qualitative comments:** Improvements due to reduction in congestion.

## Worksheet 1: Regional Air Quality - Strategy and Plan Level – Preferred Scheme

### Nitrogen Oxides

Option Name: <u>    </u> A (PS) <u>                    </u> Present Year: <u>2007</u> Future Year: <u>2016</u>					
Tonnes per year					
	Do-Minimum		Do-Something	Do-Something compared with	
	Present	Future	Future	Present Do-Min	Future Do-Min
NO <sub>x</sub>	A	B	C	D=C-A	E=C-B
NO <sub>x</sub>	1509	795	786	-741	-26.2

Option Name: <u>    </u> A (PS) <u>                    </u> Present Year: <u>2007</u> Future Year: <u>2031</u>					
Tonnes per year					
	Do-Minimum		Do-Something	Do-Something compared with	
	Present	Future	Future	Present Do-Min	Future Do-Min
NO <sub>x</sub>	A	B	C	D=C-A	E=C-B
NO <sub>x</sub>	1509	797	774	-736	-23.5

Qualitative Comments: There would be a **3.3 % reduction in NO<sub>x</sub> emissions** with the Preferred Scheme in 2016 and a **2.9 % reduction in NO<sub>x</sub> emissions** with Preferred Scheme in 2031. (Calculated using unrounded figures)

Data Sources: DfT (2004) Transport Appraisal Guidance (WebTAG) Unit 3.3.4 Regional Air Quality Sub-objective.

### Particulate Matter

Option Name: <u>    </u> A (PS) <u>                    </u> Present Year: <u>2007</u> Future Year: <u>2016</u>					
Tonnes per year					
	Do-Minimum		Do-Something	Do-Something compared with	
	Present	Future	Future	Present Do-Min	Future Do-Min
PM <sub>10</sub>	A	B	C	D=C-A	E=C-B
PM <sub>10</sub>	43.2	19.6	19.0	-24.4	-0.6

Option Name: <u>    </u> A (PS) <u>                    </u> Present Year: <u>2007</u> Future Year: <u>2031</u>					
Tonnes per year					
	Do-Minimum		Do-Something	Do-Something compared with	
	Present	Future	Future	Present Do-Min	Future Do-Min
PM <sub>10</sub>	A	B	C	D=C-A	E=C-B
PM <sub>10</sub>	43.2	20.3	19.7	-23.5	-0.6

Qualitative Comments: There would be a **3.1 % reduction in PM<sub>10</sub> emissions** with Preferred Scheme in 2016 and a **2.6 % reduction in PM<sub>10</sub> emissions** with Preferred Scheme in 2031. (Calculated using unrounded figures)

Data Sources: DfT (2004) Transport Appraisal Guidance (WebTAG) Unit 3.3.4 Regional Air Quality Sub-objective.

**Greenhouse Gases Worksheet 1 – Preferred Scheme**

**APPRAISAL- Greenhouse Gases**

**Proposal Name:** Option A (PS)

**Current Year of Appraisal:** 2007

**Proposal Opening year:** 2016

**Project (Road/Rail or Road and Rail):** Road

**Overall Assessment Score:**

**Net Present Value of Carbon Emissions of Proposal (£):** 4,140

(60 Year Period)

\*positive value reflects a **net benefit** (i.e. carbon emissions reduction)

**Quantitative Assessment:**

**Change in Carbon Emissions over 60 year appraisal period (tonnes):** -135

(between with scheme and without scheme scenarios)

**Change in Carbon Emissions in Opening year (tonnes):** -3

(between with scheme and without scheme scenarios)

**Qualitative Comments:**

Reduction in emissions due to reduction in delays and congestion

**Sensitivity**

**Analysis:**

Upper bound Net Present Value of Carbon Emissions of Proposal (£): 6,873

Lower bound Net Present Value of Carbon Emissions of Proposal (£): 2,773

**Data Sources:**

DfT (October, 2006) Transport Analysis Guidance (WebTAG) Unit 3.3.5 The Greenhouse Gases Sub-objective

Highways Agency Design Manual for Roads and Bridges; Volume 11.3.1, Advice note HA 207/07 (2007), spreadsheet version 1.03c

**Landscape and Townscape Worksheet (Plan Level) – Option A: Preferred Option**

<b>Features</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Scale it matters</b>	<b>Rarity</b>	<b>Importance</b>	<b>Substitutability</b>	<b>Impact</b>	<b>Additional Mitigation</b>
Pattern	A mixture of urban form types predominantly large scale retail characterised by large buildings and extensive car parking. Some residential and mixed use areas. Airfield forms a distinctive urban fringe with open extensive area linked to levels beyond	Urban area local in significance with airfield more regional in significance	Urban form typical and not rare. Airfield rare	Locally important and regionally important	Loss of land to highway not substitutable	Changes in character are small scale within urban area but medium scale on airfield.	Design should allow for integration with adjacent buildings and with improvements to frontages. Larger scale mitigation will be required for airfield
Tranquillity	All locations are busy with moving vehicles and are relatively noisy	Local level	A sense of tranquillity is rare in this noisy and busy environment	Important at local level and regionally important	A small reduction in tranquillity is not substitutable. There would be large loss in the more tranquil airfield area which is not substitutable.	Small loss of tranquillity due to increase in traffic. Slight adverse in urban area. Moderate adverse in airfield landscape with loss of tranquillity due to introduction of traffic especially on runway area. Moderate adverse	No mitigation

Features	Description	Scale it matters	Rarity	Importance	Substitutability	Impact	Additional Mitigation
Cultural	Located within the urban area or close to the urban fringe. Airfield is located on the urban fringe and on the edge of the Somerset levels landscape. It is also closer to nearby smaller settlements. Former airfield a distinct feature.	Located near to retail and commercial property and some residential. Local significance. Airfield has some historical landscape value	A common local landscape /townscape pattern within the urban area. Airfield regionally rare	Important at local level and regionally important	Small losses of landscape elements are substitutable in the urban area. Loss of airfield elements not substitutable.	Limited adverse impact due to small scale nature of proposals. Neutral. Moderate impact due to introduction of traffic into tranquil area. Moderate adverse	No mitigation
Landcover	Urban area, predominantly retail and commercial with some residential, with highway land including verges and embankments. Some small areas of private land. Industrial area with remnant aprons and runway. Open arable fields around the runway	Local scale	Locally common. Airfield rare	Important at local level and regionally important	Contained within existing highway land with urban area. Extends into arable fields at airfield	Loss of existing boundary planting and other landscape elements. Slight adverse. Loss of open landscape moderate adverse	Scope for enhancing frontages and higher quality public realm along with replacement planting.

Features	Description	Scale it matters	Rarity	Importance	Substitutability	Impact	Additional Mitigation
Summary of character	Typical urban areas, mostly large scale retail and commercial in form, with large buildings and surrounding car parks. Airfield poor in appearance due to industrial land uses with poor quality buildings, open storage area and parking.	Local changes to landscape and townscape. More significant changes at airfield	Locally common and regionally rare	Locally important and regionally important	Typical highway and associated verges, footpaths and planting can be replaced. Loss of open landscape at airfield can not be replaced	Small scale changes with neutral impact in urban area. More significant changes across airfield. Moderate adverse.	Adequate highway and public realm design with planting to replace that lost. More significant mitigation required at airfield.

**Reference Source(s):** Guidance for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, DMRB Volume 11

**Summary assessment score:** Moderate adverse in the short term. Neutral in the medium term, but with potential to bring benefits with good integration of new highway with existing building frontages within the urban area. Changes to landscape at airfield moderate adverse and difficult to mitigate

**Qualitative comments:** Small scale improvements can be contained within existing highway. Higher quality public realm and replacement planting to provide possible enhancements and benefits in the urban area for the medium term. Some potential to improve industrial area on airfield, but also loss of historic remnants of airfield.

**Worksheet for Environment: Heritage of Historic Resources - Plan Level**  
**(Source: WebTAG Worksheet Heritage of Historic Resources, TAG Unit 3.3.9)**

**Option A: Preferred Scheme**

Part 1		Part 2			Part 3
Feature	Description	Scale it matters	Significance	Rarity	Impact
Form	Drove Roundabout – no known buried archaeological resource	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	No direct impact on known archaeology and therefore <i>Neutral</i> . If unknown archaeology is present, it is thought highly likely this could be preserved by record through standard archaeological mitigation measures. The same is true for the remaining features
	Town Gateway – no known buried archaeological resource	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	No direct impact on known archaeology and therefore <i>Neutral</i> .
	Cross Railway Bridge Link – some known archaeological monuments within this option	Archaeological remains: post-medieval and modern date all of local interest	Archaeological remains: Defence of Britain (DoB) sites are of increasing significance given their increasing disappearance owing to modern development. Railway infrastructure of similar importance. Overall score: Low to medium significance	Archaeological remains: Unique to railway infrastructure and DoB sites specific to RAF Locking	Impacts to these sites hard to determine at present but mitigation likely to be applied leading to a <i>Neutral effect</i>

Part 1		Part 2			Part 3
Feature	Description	Scale it matters	Significance	Rarity	Impact
	Cross Airfield Link Road – Defence of Britain archaeological monuments would be affected such as the runway, a blast shelter and industrial complex. Two post-medieval agricultural features may also be affected.	Local – Regional significance. DoB sites increasingly valued and buildings and features within Weston Airfield are significant features worthy of archaeological or building recording (as per advice received from the local authority). Agricultural features of unknown significance	Low – Medium – DoB features of varying importance, but some of the monuments may already no longer exist e.g. gun emplacements. Agricultural features of likely low significance	Medium – diminishing resource of DoB features	Once mitigation measures are implemented, the impacts on the cultural heritage resource can be reduced to a <i>Neutral</i> effect.  Potential for unknown buried archaeology. Thought likely that this could be mitigated through preservation by record, therefore a <i>Neutral</i> effect
	Elmham Way Bus Priority – no known buried archaeological resource.	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	No direct impact on known archaeology and therefore <i>Neutral</i>
	Worle Station Improvements – no known buried archaeological resource.	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	No direct impact on known archaeology and therefore <i>Neutral</i> .  It is likely that unknown archaeology could be mitigated through implementation of standard archaeological measures, producing a <i>Neutral</i> effect
	Queen’s Way Bus Priority – no known buried archaeological resource	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	No direct impact on known archaeology and therefore <i>Neutral</i>
	Junction 21, M5 – no known buried archaeological resource.	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	No direct impact on known archaeology and therefore <i>Neutral</i>

Part 1		Part 2			Part 3
Feature	Description	Scale it matters	Significance	Rarity	Impact
Survival	For all sites aside from the Cross Airfield Link Road – survival of unknown buried archaeology is not quantifiable, though possible in all of the scheme elements. Even with the Cross Airfield Link Road, most of the monuments survival is unknown, with the exception of the runway	Local to Regional value	Low -Medium	Medium.	<i>Neutral</i>
Condition	Condition of unknown buried archaeology generally unknown, although some extant features around the Airfield Link Road scheme on RAF Locking may be in good condition.	Local - Regional	Medium significance	Low-medium rarity	<i>Neutral</i>
Complexity	Defence of Britain sites at RAF Locking complex, but known monuments on line of proposed Cross Airfield Link Road scheme represent just a select few elements of the overall context.	Local – Regional	Low significance	Low	<i>Neutral</i>

Part 1		Part 2			Part 3
Feature	Description	Scale it matters	Significance	Rarity	Impact
Context	Context is mostly similar with all the scheme components, but Airfield Link Road scheme differs in that it is not within a major built-up area, being situated within a designed military base. The road will chiefly follow existing hard-standing routes, so the context of the former Airfield will not be radically altered	Local	Low significance	Low	<i>Neutral</i>
Period	Known archaeology from the post-medieval and modern periods are likely to be affected	Local	Low significance	Low	<i>Neutral</i>

Key: DoB = Defence of Britain (military defensive structures or industrial sites)

**Reference Source(s):** Historic Environment Record and other data synthesised within an archaeological desk-based assessment

**Summary assessment score:** Neutral – although this would be conditional on the implementation of programmes of archaeological investigation and follow-up mitigation where necessary

**Qualitative comments:** most of the elements within the scheme will have little or no impact on the archaeological / cultural heritage resource. There is likely to be impacts to post-medieval agricultural features and modern Defence of Britain sites from the Cross Railway Bridge and Cross Airfield Links, but these can be mitigated through preservation by record. The scope of such mitigation work will be established by North Somerset Council. There is a high possibility for the presence of unknown buried archaeology/ palaeoenvironment which will probably only be a major issue on the Worle Station site. Appropriate programmes for investigating this resource would be established by North Somerset Council.

Worksheet for Environment: Biodiversity – Plan Level

(Source: WebTAG Biodiversity Worksheet, TAG Unit 3.3.10)

Preferred Option

Area	Description of feature / attribute	Scale (at which attribute matters)	Importance (of attribute)	Trend (in relation to target)	Biodiversity and earth heritage value	Magnitude of impact	Assessment Score
Severn Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), Special Protection Area (SPA) and Special Area of Conservation (SAC)  North Somerset and Mendips (part of) SAC	Important for intertidal mudflats and sandflats, sandbanks, Sabellaria reefs, saltmarsh, shingle and coastal grazing marsh. It is also important as a wintering ground for a range of migratory wildfowl.	International	Very High importance at the international scale	Not known	Very High	Negligible No direct or indirect impacts predicted.	Neutral
Regional Wildlife Sites: Borrow Pits at Bristol Road Bridge; Borrow Pits at Banwell Road Bridge; Uphill Great Rhyne; Ellenborough Park; Apple Farm Meadow; River Banwell (part of); Borrow Pit at Moor Lane Bridge; Grumplepill Rhyne (part of)	Primarily standing water habitats with associated marginal habitats, with Apple Farm Meadow being unimproved grassland and the River Banwell being running water habitat.	Regional	High importance at the regional scale.	Not known	High	Negligible Indirect impacts from dust and potential pollution incidences will be mitigated for.	Neutral
Coastal and Floodplain Grazing Marsh	A small area of habitat that is unmanaged with extensive and expanding areas of scrub and tall herb communities.	UP to National UK Priority Habitat	Medium - Limited potential for substitution	Losses in the whole UK have been significant in the last 60 years.  The habitat within Option A is currently degraded in character and existing trends indicate a further loss of its character in the short to medium term	Medium – but degraded due to lack of management	Minor negative Loss of habitat	Slight adverse
Species-rich neutral grassland	Road verge comprising species-rich areas, relatively small in extent. It is, however, species-rich and the habitat could be considered to fall within the lowland meadows UK BAP Priority Habitat. The desk study suggests the potential presence of some locally uncommon species of vascular plant including pyramidal orchid ( <i>Anacamptis pyramidalis</i> ) and fig-leaved goosefoot ( <i>Chenopodium ficifolium</i> ).	Local	Medium importance at the local scale	Lowland neutral grassland has suffered a sharp decline in extent over the last 50 years. An estimated 97% of unimproved neutral grasslands (including lowland meadows) had been lost by 1984 with further losses since then (UK BAP).  Some loss at site due to succession.	Lower	Minor negative Minor loss of habitat	Slight Adverse
Species-poor semi-improved and improved grassland	Low biodiversity but valued due to the extent of the habitat and potential for species such as breeding birds.	Local	Low importance at the local scale	Grassland possibly declining at site due to minimal management	Lower	Intermediate negative Loss of habitat	Slight Adverse
Tall herb communities	Dominated by rosebay willowherb ( <i>Chamerion angustifolium</i> ), bristly ox-tongue ( <i>Picris echioides</i> ) and creeping thistle ( <i>Cirsium arvense</i> ).	Local	Low importance at the local scale	Expanding range at site	Lower	Minor negative Loss of habitat	Slight adverse
Linear Features (hedgerows, rhynes and ditches)	The hedgerows are species-poor, being dominated by hawthorn ( <i>Crataegus monogyna</i> ). Rhynes very limited in extent and generally heavily shaded.	Up to Regional North Somerset BAP Habitat	Medium importance and the regional scale. Typical hedgerow species for North Somerset include: hawthorn, blackthorn, willows, ash, hazel, elder, field maple and oak.	Declining through loss and lack of, or inappropriate management.	Medium	Minor negative Some loss of and disruption to hedgerow habitat likely.	Slight adverse
Scrub	Low diversity scrub, dominated by hawthorn and blackthorn ( <i>Prunus spinosa</i> ).	Local	Low importance at the local scale	Expanding range	Lower	Intermediate negative Loss of habitat	Slight adverse
Secondary Woodland and Plantation	Relatively recent in origin with species-poor ground flora.	Local – Woodland is a North Somerset BAP Habitat but recent woodland of low diversity	Medium importance at the local scale	Currently approximately 1890ha of lowland mixed deciduous woodland in North Somerset. Trend within the region unknown.	Lower	Minor Negative	Slight Adverse
Urban Habitats	A small area of derelict, hard standing.	Local - Urban habitats are a North Somerset BAP Habitat, but area is minimal and hardstanding	Very low importance at the local scale	None	Negligible	Minor negative Loss of habitat	Neutral
Reptiles	Records for reptile species and suitable habitat within the schemes included in Option A.	National	High importance and rarity at the national scale.	All UK reptile species declining.	High	Minor negative Loss of habitat	Slight adverse

Area	Description of feature / attribute	Scale (at which attribute matters)	Importance (of attribute)	Trend (in relation to target)	Biodiversity and earth heritage value	Magnitude of impact	Assessment Score
			Reptiles receive a limited degree of protection in the UK under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).				
Breeding birds	Potential for Red and Amber list species (Gregory et al, 2002), such as house sparrow, song thrush, starling and linnet.	National to Local	Up to High importance at the national scale. Good potential breeding and/or foraging habitat	Red list species are those that are Globally Threatened; those whose population or range has declined rapidly in recent years; and those that have declined historically and not shown a substantial recent recovery.  Amber list species are those with an unfavourable conservation status in Europe; those whose population or range has declined moderately in recent years; those whose population has declined historically but made a substantial recent recovery; rare breeders; and those with internationally important or localised populations.	High	Minor negative Loss of nesting and foraging habitat	Slight Adverse
Barn owl	Previously recorded and the rough grassland and tall herb habitats provide potential foraging habitat	National	High importance at the national scale. Protected under Schedule 1 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).	Nationally the species is in decline	High	Minor negative Loss of potential foraging habitat and habitat fragmentation	Slight adverse
Bats	Bat species have been recorded within the area, including pipistrelle ( <i>Pipistrellus</i> sp.) and noctule ( <i>Nyctalus noctule</i> )	International	High importance at the international scale. Bats are protected under the Conservation Regulations (1994) as amended and Schedule 5 of Wildlife and Countryside Act.	Although it remains the most abundant and widespread bat species in the UK, the pipistrelle is thought to have undergone a significant decline in numbers this century.	Very High	Minor negative Loss of foraging habitat	Slight Adverse
Badger	There are records of badger setts in the vicinity. Badgers may utilise some areas for foraging	Local	Medium importance and rarity at the local scale. Badgers are protected under the Badgers Act 1992, which makes it an offence to kill or injure badgers, disturb badgers within their setts, or cause damage to a badger sett.	Although not rare in the UK, badgers receive a high level of legal protection due to concerns over their welfare and threats from persecution.	Lower	Minor negative Loss of foraging habitat	Slight adverse
Brown hare	Potential foraging opportunities.	National	High importance at the national scale. UK BAP Species Action Plan.	Formerly considered abundant, the brown hare appears to have undergone a substantial decline in numbers since the early 1960s, with population estimates now varying between 817,500 and 1,250,000.	High – however disturbance from recreational uses means the habitat suitability likely to be low	Minor negative Loss of potential habitat	Slight adverse
Hedgehog	Potential foraging opportunities	National	High importance at the national scale. UK BAP priority list species.	The species is in decline nationally	High	Minor negative Loss of potential foraging habitat	Slight adverse
Common Toad	Suitable terrestrial and aquatic habitats, within and adjacent to the site	National	High importance at the national scale. UK BAP priority list species.	Nationally the species is in decline	High - potential foraging habitat and potential breeding site nearby	Minor negative Loss of terrestrial habitat	Slight Adverse
Water Shrew	The species has been recorded in a rhyne close to the proposed Cross Airfield Link.	Regional	Medium importance at the regional scale. North Somerset BAP species. Under the Wildlife and Countryside Act, 1981 (Schedule 6) it is an offence to capture or kill shrews without a license; to disturb an animal while it is occupying any structure or place which it uses for shelter; and to damage, destroy or obstruct access to any structure or place used by the animal for shelter.	Widespread distribution throughout mainland Britain, but nowhere is it common. It is believed to be declining due to habitat loss and the effects of pollution, but its current population status is not clear as data is scarce.	Medium	Neutral  Recorded adjacent to Cross Airfield link route but potential impacts can be mitigated	Neutral

**Reference Source(s):** 'Magic' website [www.magic.gov.uk](http://www.magic.gov.uk); UK Biodiversity Action Plan; Action for Nature: North Somerset Biodiversity Action Plan 2005; Bristol Regional Environmental Records Centre; Weston Park Environmental Statement (May 2007)

**Summary assessment score:** Slight Adverse

**Qualitative comments:** There will be a minor loss of habitats that is generally restricted to improved or amenity grassland, but includes some areas of rough grassland and potentially some species-rich grassland (M5 Junction 21). Slight adverse impacts are recorded for most habitat types and species, but Neutral impacts are predicted on internationally, nationally and regionally designated sites.

**Worksheet for Environment: Water Environment – Plan Level**

(Source: WebTAG Biodiversity Worksheet, TAG Unit 3.3.11)

**Option A: Preferred Option**

Description of study area / Summary of potential impacts	Feature	Attributes	Quality	Scale	Rarity	Substitutability	Importance	Magnitude	Significance
<p><b>Entire Scheme</b> Potential Impact: pollutants in surface water drainage resulting in a reduction of quality of receiving watercourse.</p> <p>Increased risk of accidental</p>	River Banwell,	Fisheries / biodiversity.  Water supply.  Value to economy.	Low	River Banwell: Regional;	Low	Low	Low	Negligible	Insignificant
<p><b>Entire Scheme</b> Potential Impact: pollutants in surface water drainage resulting in a reduction of quality of receiving watercourse.</p> <p>Increased risk of accidental</p>	Tributaries and local drainage system.	Water abstraction.  Drainage.	Low	Local drainage network: Local;	Low	Low	Low	Negligible	Insignificant
<p><b>Entire Scheme</b> Potential Impact: Impermeable surfaces leading to increased surface water runoff.</p>	Floodplain	Storage & conveyance of flood flows.  Biodiversity.	Low	Local	Low	Negligible	High	Negligible	Insignificant

Description of study area / Summary of potential impacts	Feature	Attributes	Quality	Scale	Rarity	Substitutability	Importance	Magnitude	Significance
<b>Entire Scheme</b> Potential Impact: Loss of floodplain storage.  Impedance of flood flows  Increased risk of flooding to site.	Floodplain	Storage & conveyance of flood flows.  Biodiversity.  Aesthetics.	Low	Local	Low	Moderate: It is assumed that the adverse impact of increased flood risk will be reduced / bettered by providing compensatory floodplain	High	Minor	Low Significance

**Summary assessment score:** Slight adverse

**Qualitative comments:** Principal risks of the schemes relate to an increase in surface water runoff from the new hard standing areas. This will potentially increase flows within receiving watercourses. However with appropriate attenuation measures and a restricted discharge rate the scheme should have a negligible impact in terms of flood risk. Associated with runoff is an increase in contaminants entering the road drainage network which is anticipated to have a negligible impact upon the water quality of the receiving watercourse providing appropriate pollution control measures such as SuDS and petrol interceptors are incorporated into the highway drainage system. The magnitude of this impact and type of pollution control required will be dependent upon traffic flows, existing water quality and the Q95 (low flow) of the receiving watercourse. The proposed schemes are mostly located within the 1 in 100 year floodplain and so is not only at risk of flooding itself but will increase the risk of flooding to others without adequate mitigation measures. Overall the scheme will result in impacts of slight adverse significance due to the permanent alteration in the hydrological regime of the floodplain, fluvial system and associated ecology.

**Worksheet 1 Environment: Physical Fitness – Preferred Scheme**

<b>Factor</b>	<b>Better</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Worse</b>
<b>Pedestrian access</b>	X		
<b>Cycling access</b>		X	

**Reference Source(s):** Weston Park Environmental Statement Persimmon Homes Ltd (May 2007), Scheme Drawings TN4\_1, CTR/ABN/001, CTRABM/050/G2, CTRABN/30/002, 005, 006, 008 and 012.

Summary assessment score: **Slight beneficial.**

**Qualitative comments:** It is assumed that no travel is over 30 minutes at each of the proposals within the Low Cost Option. Existing pedestrian access is relatively good and would be maintained or improved through the provision of signalised pedestrian crossings. The existing cycling provision is limited in places and would be improved through the provision of cycle lanes and cycle advance areas. Improved facilities would be used by children travelling to school and for commuting. The Cross Airfield Link would include provision for pedestrians and cyclists however, it would not increase walking or cycling journey times.

**Worksheet 1 Environment: Journey Ambience– Preferred Scheme**

Factor	Sub-factor	Better	Neutral	Worse
Traveller Care	Cleanliness	X		
	Facilities	X		
	Information	X		
	Environment		X	
Travellers' Views			X	
Traveller Stress	Frustration	X		
	Fear of potential accidents	X		
	Route uncertainty	X		

The Reference Sources are the Weston Park Environmental Statement Persimmon Homes Ltd (May 2007), Scheme Drawings TN4\_1, CTR/ABN/001, CTRABM/050/G2, CTRABN/30/002, 005, 006, 008 and 012.

Summary assessment score: **Moderate beneficial.**

Qualitative comments: No traffic data was available during the appraisal and it is assumed that over 500 vehicles and less than 10,000 vehicles currently use the existing schemes.

Many of the schemes are based on a similar alignment to that which currently exists. Junction improvements, signal improvements and directional signage would improve traffic flow and reduce frustration. Fear of potential accidents would be reduced through improved junctions and sightlines and provision of cycle lanes would reduce vehicle/cyclist interaction and reduce risk of associated accidents.

The new alignment of the Airfield Bridge Link across the open countryside would open new views of the countryside for travellers. This would be beneficial to the travellers for both public and private transport users. However, limited open views of the landscape would be available from the Cross Airfield Link as a result of the associated development.

Airfield Bridge Link and Cross Airfield Link would reduce congestion on Herluin Way from Weston–super–Mare town centre. Use of these new roads would result in reduced traveller stress and frustration. Shared pedestrian and cyclist paths are proposed as part of both the Airfield Bridge Link and Cross Airfield Link schemes. These paths would provide safe pedestrian and cyclist access from the south east of Weston–super–mare to the town centre. Signage would be provided which would reduce route uncertainty.

## Assessment of Security Sub-objective

### Preferred Scheme

**Table 1 (Element 1) Junction 21 Improvements**

Factor	Better	Neutral	Worse
Surveillance		X	
Pedestrian/cycle route security		X	
Public transport waiting facilities		X	
Crossing facilities		X	

Existing footways and crossing facilities would be maintained under the proposed scheme.

**Table 2 (Element 2) Cross Airfield Link**

Factor	Better	Neutral	Worse
Surveillance		X	
Pedestrian/cycle route security	X		
Public transport waiting facilities	X		
Crossing facilities		X	

New shared-use footway/cycleways would be provided on both sides of the proposed CAL offering good levels of security to pedestrians and cyclists. High quality bus stops would also be provided.

**Table 3 (Element 3) Airfield Bridge Link**

Factor	Better	Neutral	Worse
Surveillance		X	
Pedestrian/cycle route security	X		
Public transport waiting facilities		X	
Crossing facilities	X		

New shared-use foot/cycleways would be provided on both sides of the proposed link bridge offering good levels of security to pedestrians and cyclists compared to the existing crossings over the railway. Two roundabout junctions would be replaced by signalised junctions with signalised Toucan crossings.

**Table 4 (Element 4a) Town Gateway**

Factor	Better	Neutral	Worse
Surveillance		X	
Pedestrian/cycle route security	X		
Public transport waiting facilities		X	
Crossing facilities	X		

Footways would be provided on both the northern and southern sides of Marchfields Way and on the southern side of Winterstoke Road, and new crossing facilities on Marchfields Way and at the junction of Marchfields Way and Winterstoke Road towards the town centre. These crossing facilities will significantly improve the security for school pupils walking or cycling to Wyvern Community School.

**Table 5 (Element 4b) Drove Roundabout**

Factor	Better	Neutral	Worse
Surveillance		X	
Pedestrian/cycle route security		X	
Public transport waiting facilities		X	
Crossing facilities		X	

Existing signalised pedestrian and cycle crossing facilities would be revised at three of the four spurs off Drove roundabout.

**Table 6 (Element 5a) Worle Station**

Factor	Better	Neutral	Worse
Surveillance	X		
Pedestrian/cycle route security		X	
Public transport waiting facilities	X		
Crossing facilities		X	
Car park security	X		

The station improvements would include improved waiting facilities for bus and rail passengers, and CCTV cameras for the new Worle Station southern car park.

**Table 7 (Element 5b) Queen's Way Bus Priority**

Factor	Better	Neutral	Worse
Surveillance		X	
Pedestrian/cycle route security		X	
Public transport waiting facilities		X	
Crossing facilities		X	

Security of pedestrian and cycle routes and bus waiting facilities would be maintained at the current level.

**Table 8 (Element 5c) Elmham Way Bus Priority**

Factor	Better	Neutral	Worse
Surveillance		X	
Pedestrian/cycle route security		X	
Public transport waiting facilities		X	
Crossing facilities	X		

New crossing facilities would be provided at the junction of Elmham Way, Bransby Way and Rowan Place, which is on the route to Herons Moor Community Primary School, and would improve the security of school pupils' journeys.

Assessment of Integration – Passenger Interchange Worksheet

Weston Package **Preferred Scheme**

Passenger Interchange Indicator	Without Weston Package	With Weston Package
Waiting environment	Poor	Moderate – waiting facilities on the station would be improved as well as improved waiting facilities at the bus interchange
Level of facilities	No facilities	No facilities
Level of information	Poor <sup>(1)</sup>	Moderate – improvements would be made to passenger information on the station as well as the provision of RTI at the bus interchange on both the north and south side of the station
Visible staff presence	Poor	Poor – although additional CCTV coverage would be provided at the bus interchange
Physical linkage for next stage of journey	Poor	High – bus interchange would be provided on both sides of the station as well as additional car, cycle and motorcycle parking on the southern side
Reliability of connection	Poor	Moderate – due to closer interchange and higher frequency buses. The council is keen to work with bus operators to better co-ordinate timetables

<sup>(1)</sup> Currently poor but due to be upgraded to moderate by First Great Western

Assessment Score: Moderate Beneficial

Qualitative comments: Provision of a bus interchange and improvements to Worle station will enhance the passenger waiting environment and improve connectivity between transport modes

## Integration – Land Use Policy Worksheet

### Weston Package Preferred Scheme

Level	Land use Policies or Proposals
Local	Positive contribution to policies relating to sustainable development, improved accessibility, developing a prosperous economy, better health and well-being, tackling congestion, safer travel, climate change, improved air quality and better quality of life. Adverse integration with policies relating to the environment (landscape and ecology) the extent of which would depend on the mitigation measures proposed.
Regional	Positive contribution to policies relating to improving transport networks, promoting sustainable transport, enhancing the economy, managing growth, creating sustainable communities, reducing congestion, climate change, social inclusion and the development of SSCTs. Adverse integration with policies relating to the environment (landscape and ecology) the extent of which would depend on the mitigation measures proposed.
National	Contributes to policies relating to tackling climate change, improving competitiveness and productivity, raising equality of opportunity, providing gains in health and safety and improvements to the overall quality of life. Adverse integration with policies relating to the environment (landscape and ecology) the extent of which would depend on the mitigation measures proposed.

Reference Source(s) : Planning Policy Statement 1, Planning Policy guidance 2 and 13, The South West Regional Economic Strategy (2006), Draft Regional Spatial Strategy for the South West (2008), North Somerset Local Plan,

Assessment score : Beneficial

Qualitative comments : Integration with land use policies is mainly beneficial with a slight adverse impact on environmental policies relating to landscape and ecology

Integration – Other Government Policies Worksheet  
Weston Package Preferred Scheme

Government Department	Policies Helped	Policies Hindered
Transport	Reducing congestion Reducing pollution Reducing carbon emission Increasing accessibility Improving quality of life Reducing social exclusion	No direct impact
Communities and Local Government (C and LG)	Positive impacts on protection and enhancement of the environment (in terms of noise, air quality and climate change) and sustainable economic development	Possible adverse impact on protection of the environment (with respect to landscape and biodiversity)
Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA)	Positive impact on policies relating to protection and enhancement of the environment (with respect to noise, air quality and climate change) and putting sustainable development into practice	Possible adverse impact on protection of the environment (with respect to landscape and biodiversity)
Health	Positive impact on policies relating to reduction in accidents. Potential for contribution to policies relating to increased physical activity through improved walking and cycling facilities	No direct impact
Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform (BERR)	Positive impact on policies relating to creation and growth of business and sustainable growth	No direct impact
Children, Schools and Families (DCSF)	Positive impact on policies relating to well-being through increased activity and improving access to services and leisure facilities	No direct impact

Reference source(s): C and LG website, DEFRA website, Department of Health website, BERR website and DCSF website

Assessment score: Beneficial

Qualitative comments: Integration with other government policies is mainly beneficial with a slight adverse impact on environmental policies relating to landscape and ecology

## Local Government Affordability and Financial Sustainability

## Costs £m outturn

TOTAL  
(undiscounted)

## Breakdown by organisation/budget

## Investment Costs

			Council capital	Land bank	Section 106
Year 2009/10	1.56		0.90		0.66
Year 2010/11	2.43		1.40		1.03
Year 2011/12	2.5		1.44		1.06
Year 2012/13	9.32			1.38	7.94
Year 2013/14	14.29				14.29
Year 2014/15	12.10				12.10
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>42.2</b>	(1)	<b>3.74</b>	<b>1.38</b>	<b>37.08</b>
Developer and Other Contributions	37.08	(2)			37.08
Reimbursement from Central Government of Preparation Costs	2.60	(3)			
Grant to Private Sector	0	(4)			
<b>Cost to Local Government net of contributions</b>	<b>2.52</b>	(5)=(1)+(4)-(2)-(3)			

## Public Sector Operations

## Breakdown by organisation/budget

## Year 1

			Council revenue		
Change in operator costs	0.132	(6)	0.07		
Change in operator revenue	0	(7)	0		
<b>NET IMPACT</b>	<b>0.132</b>	<b>(8)=(7)-(6)</b>	<b>0.07</b>		

## Year 5

Change in operator costs	0.148	(9)	0.08		
Change in operator revenue	0	(10)	0		
<b>NET IMPACT</b>	<b>0.148</b>	<b>(11)=(10)-(9)</b>	<b>0.08</b>		

## Year 10

Change in operator costs	0.172	(12)	0.09		
Change in operator revenue	0	(13)	0		
<b>NET IMPACT</b>	<b>0.172</b>	<b>(14)=(13)-(12)</b>	<b>0.09</b>		

**Central Government Affordability and Financial Sustainability**

**Costs £m outturn**

**TOTAL (undiscounted)**

**Breakdown by organisation/budget**

**Investment Costs**

			HA	SRA	Other	Other
Year 2009/10	0.00					
Year 2010/11	1.60					
Year 2011/12	1.00					
Year 2012/13	3.85					
Year 2013/14	6.86					
Year 2014/15	6.02					
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>19.33</b>	(15)				
Developer and Other Contributions	0	(16)				
<b>Grant to Local Government</b>	<b>0.00</b>	(17)				
<b>Grant to Private Sector</b>	<b>0.00</b>	(18)				
<b>Indirect Tax Revenues</b>	<b>0.19</b>	(19)				
<b>Cost to Central Government net of contributions</b>	<b>19.14</b>	(20)=(15)+(17)+(18)- (16)-(19)				

**Operations**

**Breakdown by organisation/budget**

			HA	SRA	Other 1	Other
<b>Year 1</b>						
Change in operator costs		(21)				
Change in operator revenue		(22)				
<b>NET IMPACT</b>		(23)=(21)-(20)				
<b>Year 5</b>						
Change in operator costs		(24)				
Change in operator revenue		(25)				
<b>NET IMPACT</b>		(26)=(24)-(23)				
<b>Year 10</b>						
Change in operator costs		(27)				
Change in operator revenue		(28)				
<b>NET IMPACT</b>		(29)=(28)-(27)				

**Private Sector Affordability and Financial Sustainability**

**Private Sector Investment Costs and Grants**

**TOTAL (undiscounted)**

**Investment Costs**

Year I	
Year ii	
Year iii	
Year iv	
Year v	

TOTAL (30)

Grants from Central and Local Government (31)

**Breakdown by organisation**

Rail route 1	Rail route 2	Bus corridor 1	Bus corridor 2	Rail freight	Other

**Private Sector Operators**

**TOTAL (undiscounted)**

**Year 1**

Change in operator costs	(32)
Change in operator revenue	(33)
NET IMPACT	(34)=(33)-(32)
Subsidy	(35)

**Year 5**

Change in operator costs	(36)
Change in operator revenue	(37)
NET IMPACT	(38)=(37)-(36)
Subsidy	(39)

**Year 10**

Change in operator costs	(40)
Change in operator revenue	(41)
NET IMPACT	(42)=(41)-(40)
Subsidy	(43)

**Breakdown by organisation**

Rail route 1	Rail route 2	Bus corridor 1	Bus corridor 2	Rail freight	Other

**Private Sector NET IMPACT**

Investment net of capital grant =(30)-(31)

Operations net of subsidy

Year 1 =(34)-(35)

Year 5 =(38)-(39)

Year 10 =(42)-(43)
