| | DELIVERABILITY CRITERIA | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | feasibility - is the project technically | Delivery of project: Evidence of stakeholder support - is there evidence of support for the project from e.g. Members, the public, District Council, Parish Council | Added Road Safety Benefit: - the level of benefit that may be achieved with regard to reducing risk to highway users, particulary more vulnerable users such as pedestrians and cyclists and the location is a current accident cluster site. | Economic Case: Scale of impact - what is the scale of (a) economic, (b) environmental and (c) social impacts of the project in relation to development(s), e.g. how many people will it benefit, local/countywide/strategic area covered, noise, air quality, safety, accessibilty/severance | Economic Case: Value for money - what level of benefits will the project deliver assessed against cost; either in Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) or qualititative assessment | Financial Case: Match/Alternative funding - are there other funding sources available for the project, either in whole or in part | Financial Case: Affordability - the extent to which the level of expenditure and financial risk involved in a project can be taken on, given other requests for funding | | | | | |
| 3 | Can be delivered with no issues, potentially in coniunction with other works | Formal consultation carried out evidencing support | Existing accident cluster site and likely to deliver significant benefits | Major/cross-district positive impact | High or very high value for money or BCR over 2 | >50% | Entirely funded by third party or specific funding stream | | | | | |
| 2 | Feasible with added value | Supported multiple (eg public & members) | | Mid-large scale positive impact | Medium value for money or BCR between 1.5 and 2 | 25-50% | Can be delivered without impacting other projects, part funded as per +3 | | | | | |
| 1 | Feasible | Support indicated (eg public or members) | Some benefits and not an existing cluster site. | Small scale/localised positive impact | Low value for money or BCR between 1 and 1.5 | <25% | Can be delivered without impacting other projects, low risk of costs increasing | | | | | |
| 0 | Feasible but minor issues | No evidence | Not expected to benefit road safety | No impact or +/- balance | Very low value for money or BCR below 1 or No impact | None | Affordable | | | | | |
| -1 | Feasible but highway land not sufficient/multiple issues | Minor opposition indicated | | Small scale/localised negative impact | | | Affordable with impact, risk of costs increasing | | | | | |
| -2 | Feasible but more significant issues with land, services, etc. | Multiple opposition indicated | | Mid-large scale negative impact | | | Unaffordable without Third Party contribution | | | | | |
| -3 | Not possible without major additional works | Formal consultation shows large opposition | | Major/cross-district negative impact | | | Unaffordable without significant Third Party contribution | | | | | |

| OBJECTIVES CRITERIA - Local Transport Plan objectives | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Score | , | Reducing the length of the commute and the need to travel by private car | Making sustainable modes of transport a viable and attractive alternative to the private car | Future-proofing our maintenance strategy and new transport infrastructure to cope with the effects of climate change | | Addressing the main causes of road accidents in Cambridgeshire | Protecting and enhancing the natural environment by minimising the environmental impact of transport | Influencing national and local decisions on land-use and transport planning that impact on routes through Cambridgeshire | | | | |
| 3 | Significant improvement to the reliability of journey times | Significant reduction | Significant positive impact | Significant positive impact | | Significant impact on addressing the main causes | Significant impact on protecting and enhancing the natural environment | Significant positive impact | | | | |
| 2 | Some improvement to the reliability of journey times | Some reduction | Some positive impact | Some positive impact | Some positive impact | Some impact to address the main causes | Some impact on protecting and enhancing the natural environment | Some positive impact | | | | |
| 1 | Minor improvement to the reliability of journey times | Minor reduction | Minor positive impact | Minor positive impact | ININOT DOSITIVE IMPACT | Minor impact to address the main causes | Minor positive impact on protecting and enhancing the natural environment | Minor positive impact | | | | |
| 0 | No Change | No Change | No Change | No Change | No Change | No Change | No Change | No Change | | | | |
| -1 | Minor negative impact on the reliability of journey times | Minor increase | Minor negative impact | Minor negative impact | | Minor negative impact on addressing the main causes | Minor negative impact in terms of protecting and enhancing the natural environment | Minor negative impact | | | | |
| -2 | Some negative impact on the reliability of journey times | Some increase | Some negative impact | Some negative impact | | Some negative impact on addressing the main causes | Some negative impact in terms of protecting and enhancing the natural environment | Some negative impact | | | | |
| -3 | Significant negative impact on the reliability of journey times | Significant increase | Significant negative impact | Significant negative | | Signifcant negative impact on addressing the main causes | Significant negative impact in terms of protecting and enhancing the natural environment | Significant negative | | | | |