

Bath and North East Somerset Flood Risk Management Strategy - Appendix F
Strategic Option Assessment

Low = 1 Neutral = 3 High = 5

| | | | Weighting | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Percentile | |
|-----------------|------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|-------|
| | | | 5 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 82 | |
| | | | Technical Feasibility | | | Benefit / Cost | | Sustainability Test | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Score |
| Favoured Option | Option No. | Option | Flood Defence Standard of Service | Residual Flood Risk - Properties Not Protected by Option | Risk of Flooding Merely being Displaced | Annual Average Damage Avoided (AAD) | Likely Range of Construction Costs | Reduce Vulnerability to Flooding (SA Objective 19) | Promote Waste Management accordance with the waster hierarchy (Reduce, Re-use & Recycle) (SA Objective 21) | Townscape/ Landscape | Supports the Regeneration Delivery Plan (RDP) | Enables Previously Developed Land to be Re-used | Improves Accessibility to Community Facilities & Local Services (SA Objective 1) | Meet identified need for sufficient and high Quality Housing (SA Objective 3) | Ensure Residents have access to a range of Employment Opportunities (SA Objective 8) | Ensure Everyone has access to high quality and affordable Public Transport and promote Cycling and Walking (SA Objective 12) | Promote stronger and more vibrant city, town local and village centres (SA Objective 10) | Encourage bio-diversity, protecting and enhancing important and rare habitats and species (SA Objective 15) | Protect and enhance cultural and historical assets (SA Objective 16) | Encourage Sustainable Construction and use of renewable energy (SA Objective 18) | | |
| - | 0.1 | Bath & Keynsham Do Minimum | 1 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 64 | |
| - | 0.2 | Midsomer Norton & Radstock Do Minimum | 1 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 65 | |
| 1 | 1 | Upstream Storage (u/s of the A4 Bath Road upstream storage) | 1 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 75 | |
| 2 | 7 | Upstream Storage at Kensington Meadows Mill & Ride and the proposed Mill Lane Park & Ride | 4 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 85 | |
| 3 | 3 | Walls & Embankments - including compensatory storage downstream | 5 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 80 | |
| 4 | 4 | Cumulative development site site-specific flood storage areas | 4 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 82 | |
| 4 | 6 | Twerton Sluice Improvements & compensatory storage downstream (£3M) | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 68 | |

| Viability Test | | | Deliverability Test | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Test 1 RFMS Scheme Costs in Relation to Development Costs | Test 2 Potential Case for Gap Funding | Viability Summary - Option likely to be viable or have reasonable prospect of the funding gap being plugged | Test 1 Suitability & Use | Test 2 Delivery Vehicle | Test 3 Need for Land Assembly | Test 4 Timing and Phasing | Delivery Summary - Option has a realistic prospect of being delivered |
| Y | N | Y | Y | Y | 0 | Y | Y |
| Y | N | Y | Y | Y | 0 | Y | Y |
| Y | Y | Y | Y | N | 10 | Y | Y |
| Y | Y | Y | Y | N | 0 | Y | Y |
| Y | Y | Y | N | Y | 10 | Y | Y |
| Y | Y | Y | N | Y | 0 | Y | Y |
| Y | Y | Y | Y | N | 10 | Y | Y |

[illegible]

| Percentile |
|------------|
| 92 |

[illegible]

Bath and North East Somerset Flood Risk Management Strategy - Appendix F
Site Specific Option Assessment

Low = 1 Neutral = 3 High = 5

| Weighting | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|-----------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Option No | Site Ref. | Option | Technical Feasibility | | | Benefit / Cost | | Sustainability Test | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Flood Defence Standard of Service Anticipated | Residual Flood Risk - Properties Not Protected by Option | Risk of Flooding Merely being Displaced | Annual Average Damage Avoided (AAD) | Likely Range of Construction Costs | Reduce Vulnerability to Flooding (SA Objective 19) | Promote Waste Management accordance with the waster hierarchy (Reduce, Re-use & Recycle) (SA Objective 21) | Townscape/ Landscape | Supports the Regeneration Delivery Plan (RDP) | Enables Previously Developed Land to be Re-used | Improves Accessibility to Community Facilities & Local Services (SA Objective 1) | Meet identified need for sufficient and high Quality Housing (SA Objective 3) | Ensure Residents have access to a range of Employment Opportunities (SA Objective 8) | Ensure Everyone has access to high quality and affordable Public Transport and promote Cycling and Walking (SA Objective 12) | Promote stronger and more vibrant city, town local and village centres (SA Objective 10) | Encourage bio-diversity, protecting and enhancing important and rare habitats and species (SA Objective 15) | Protect and enhance cultural and historical assets (SA Objective 16) | Encourage Sustainable Construction and use of renewable energy (SA Objective 18) |
| 136 | KM11 | Broadmead Lane Waste Site (IBD-SUDS-FDAs) | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 137 | MN3 | Chesterfield House (IBD-SUDS-FDAs) | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 138 | MN4 | Streamside | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 139 | MN8 | Somer Centre | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 140 | MN9 | Option C - Deculverting | 3 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 141 | MN12 | High Street | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 142 | MN13 | Town Park | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 143 | MN14 | Town Housing | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 144 | MN17 | Old Mills Industrial Estate Extension Option A FDA, Channel Widening & Bunding | 4 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 145 | RK2 | Rymans | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 146 | RK3 | Charltons | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 147 | RK4 | Old Bakery | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 148 | RK5 | Post Office | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 149 | RK6 | Library/Youth Centre | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 150 | RK7 | Fortescue Road | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 151 | RK8 | RadCo FDA | 3 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 152 | RK9 | Combe End Rd FSA (Clandown) | 3 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 |

| Percentile |
|------------|
| 92 |

| Score |
|-------|
| 88 |
| 88 |
| 86 |
| 83 |
| 90 |
| 85 |
| 76 |
| 82 |
| 88 |
| 90 |
| 92 |
| 93 |
| 92 |
| 92 |
| 93 |
| 92 |

| Viability Test | | | | | Deliverability Test | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Test 1 RFMS Scheme Costs in Relation to Development Costs | Test 1 RFMS Scheme Costs in Relation to Development Costs | Test 2 Potential Case for Gap Funding | Test 2 Potential Case for Gap Funding | Viability Summary - Option likely to be viable or have reasonable prospect of the funding gap being plugged | Test 1 Suitability & Use | Test 2 Delivery Vehicle | Test 3 Need for Land Assembly | Test 4 Timing and Phasing | Delivery Summary - Option has a realistic prospect of being delivered |
| | N | | N | N | Y | Y | 0 | Y | Y |
| | N | | N | N | Y | Y | 0 | Y | Y |
| | Y | | Y | Y | Y | Y | 0 | Y | Y |
| | N | | N | N | Y | Y | 0 | Y | Y |
| | Y | | Y | Y | Y | Y | 0 | Y | Y |
| | Assume Y | | N | Y | Y | Y | 0 | Y | Y |
| | N | | N | N | Y | Y | 0 | Y | Y |
| | Y | | N | Y | Y | Y | 0 | Y | Y |
| | N | | N | N | N | Y | 0 | Y | Y |
| | N | | N | N | Y | Y | 0 | Y | Y |
| | N | | N | N | Y | Y | 0 | Y | Y |
| | N | | N | N | Y | Y | 0 | Y | Y |
| | Y | | N | Y | Y | Y | 0 | Y | Y |
| | Y | | N | Y | Y | Y | 0 | Y | Y |
| | Y | | Y | Y | N | Y | 0 | Y | Y |
| | N | | Y | N | Y | Y | 1 | Y | Y |

Bath and North East Somerset Flood Risk Management Strategy – Appendix F

| Appraisal Score Criteria | | | |
|----------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Test | Sub-Criteria | Weighting (1) | Scoring justification |
| Technical Feasibility Test | Flood Defence Standard of Service Anticipated | 4 | 1 = > 1% AEP 2 = Local FD to 1% AEP but option requires FD works/Displaces Floodwater to neighbouring properties 3 = 1% AEP to Local Area Only 4 = 1% AEP to Local Area & Extends Protection to other Properties 5 = Protects Entire envelope to 1% AEP/< 0.5% AEP |
| | Residual Flood Risk - Properties Not Protected by Option | 2 | 1 = Works Cause Direct Flooding to neighbouring properties 2 = Option requires works to protect neighbouring properties outside the development boundary 3 = Protects Local Site (1% AEP) 4 = Reduces Degree of Flooding to NeighbouringProperties/ Prop's Outside Option Works Area 5 = Entirely Removes Properties not included within works area from 100 year flood envelope |
| | Risk of Flooding Merely being Displaced | 2 | 1 = More Detailed Investigation Required 2 = Compensatory Works Required Downstream 3 = Defence Works likely, but can be included in the Bath Scheme 4 = Small scale mitigation required 5 = None |
| Benefit / Cost Test | Indicative No. Properties Protected (1% AEP) (or appraisal based on AADs) | 3 | 1 = <10 2 = 10 - 50 3 = 50 - 100 4 = 100 - 500 5 = Entire Flood Envelope / 500 - 1000+ a scoring range for AADs will be determined during Task 4 |
| | Likely Range of Construction Costs | 2 | 1 = >£11M 2= £7M - £11M 3 = £3.5M - £7M 4 = £1M - £3.5M 5 = <£1M |
| Sustainability Test | Reduce Vulnerability to Flooding (SA Objective 19) | 1 | 1 = No 5 = Yes |
| | Promote Waste Management accordance with the waster hierarchy (Reduce, Re-use & Recycle) (SA Objective 21) | 1 | 1 = No 5 = Yes |
| | Townscape/Landscape | 1 | 1 = Proposed flood infrastructure would have a major negative impact on landscape/townscape features 2 = Proposed flood infrastructure would have a minor negative impact on landscape/townscape features 3 = Proposed flood infrastructure would not impact on landscape/townscape features or provide additional benefits. 4 = Proposed flood infrastructure would have a minor beneficial impact on landscape/townscape features (improvements to quality, improved public access, new spaces) 5 = Proposed flood infrastructure would have a major beneficial impacts on landscape/townscape features (improvements to quality, improved public access, new spaces/features) |
| | Supports the Regional Delivery Plan (RDP) | 1 | 1 = No 5 = Yes |
| | Enables Previously Developed Land to be Re-used | 1 | 1 = No 5 = Yes |
| | Improves Accessibility to Community Facilities & Local Services (SA Objective 1) | 1 | 1. Removes a open space/community facility/service 2. Hinders access to or quality/enjoyment of a open space/community facility/service 3. No impact on open space/community facility/ service provision 4. Improves accessibility or quality of an existing open space/ community facility/service 5. Enables establishment of a new open space/community facility/service |
| | Meet identified need for sufficient and high Quality Housing (SA Objective 3) | 1 | 1. Major negative impact on housing potential (including restoring vacant homes or adding student bedspaces in Bath) >500 dwellings 2. Minor negative impact on housing potential (including restoring vacant homes or adding student bedspaces in Bath) 50-499 dwellings 3. Does not significantly increase or reduce housing supply (<50 dwellings) 4. Minor enabling role in addressing local housing needs (50-499 dwellings) 5. Major enabling role in addressing housing needs (500+ dwellings) |
| | Ensure Residents have access to a range of Employment Opportunities (SA Objective 8) | 1 | 1. Major reduction in employment floorspace >1000 sq.m 2. Minor reduction in employment floorspace 1-999 sq.m 3. No impact on employment floorspace or protection of existing 4. Enables minor additional employment floorspace to be brought forward <1000 sq.m 5. Enables major additional employemnt floorspace provision >1000 sq.m |
| | Ensure Everyone has access to high quality and affordable Public Transport and promote Cycling and Walking (SA Objective 12) | 1 | 1. Major reduction in local accessibility or connectivity (all modes) 2. Minor reduction in local accessibility or connectivity (all modes) 3. Neutral impact on local accessibility or connectivity (all modes) 4. Proposals would enable minor improvements to local accessibility or connectivity. 5. Proposals would enable major improvements to local accessibility or connectivity |
| | Promote stronger and more vibrant city, town local and village centres (SA Objective 10) | 1 | 1. Major negative impact on Retail/ Tourism/Employment Strategy objectives 2. Minor negative impact on Retail/ Tourism/Employment Strategy objectives 3. Neutral Impact on Retail/ Tourism/Employment Strategy objectives 4. Minor positive impact on Retail/ Tourism/Employment Strategy objectives 5. Major positive impact on Retail/ Tourism/Employment Strategy objectives |
| Sustainability Test | Encourage bio-diversity, protecting and enhancing important and rare habitats and species (SA Objective 15) | 1 | 1. Potential for loss of international, national or locally site of ecological importance 2. Potential for reduction in quality or area of international, national or locally important habitat 3. No enhancement/harm 4. Enhancement or creation of new habitat <0.5 ha 5. Enhancement or creation of new habitat >0.5 ha |
| | Protect and enhance cultural and historical assets (SA Objective 16) | 1 | 1. Detracts from WHSMP objectives, harms setting/integrity of Listed Building (PPG16), SAM or AONB (regional-national-international significance) 2. Harms CA character/setting of local listed bldg/structure (local significance) 3. No harm/benefit 4. Improves CA character/setting of local listed bldg/structure (local significance) 5. Contributes to WHSMP objectives, improves setting/integrity of Listed Building (PPG16), SAM or AONB (regional-national-international significance) |
| | Encourage Sustainable Construction and use of renewable energy (SA Objective 18) | 1 | 1. Removes or prevents exploitation of a renewable source 2. Built in temporary/energy-intensive method below current best practice 3. Likely to be built to minimum statutory requirements (Building Regulations etc) 4. Likely to score moderately on CEEQUAL/BREAM 5. Likely to score highly on CEEQUAL/BREAM and/or include/improve renewable resource |
| | Score (XX Baseline) | | The threshold for further assessment will be determined during the appraisal process. |
| Test | Output | Criteria | |
| Viability Test | Test 1 RFMS Scheme Costs in Relation to Development Costs | Yes/No | Is the cost of Strategic FRMS infrastructure disproportionate to the overall scale and mix of development identified for sites located within FRZ 2&3 (FRMS Infrastructure cost per sq.m of floorspace) |
| | Test 1 RFMS Scheme Costs in Relation to Development Costs | Yes/No | Is the cost of Strategic FRMS infrastructure disproportionate to the overall scale and mix of development identified for sites located within FRZ 2&3 (FRMS Infrastructure cost per sq.m of floorspace) |
| | Test 2 Potential Case for Gap Funding | Yes/No | FRMS option has potential to deliver significant flood protection benefits to existing communities in addition to proposed development sites |
| | Test 2 Potential Case for Gap Funding | Yes/No | FRMS option could enable beneficial use of vacant premises or previously developed land |
| | Viability Summary - Option likely to be viable or have reasonable prospect of the funding gap being plugged | Yes/No | |
| Deliverability Test | Test 1 Suitability & Use | Yes/No | Would the area required to accommodate on site FRM infrastructure, location of infrastructure or associated assess and safety requirements have potential to compromise the development potential of the site |
| | Test 2 Delivery Vehicle | Yes/No | Consideration of who would be responsible for delivering each option component (i.e developer/landowner, EA, Local authority, Regeneration Partnership) |
| | Test 3 Need for Land Assembly | Requirement for land assembly does/does not preclude option | Likely extent of land required (ha) |
| | Test 4 Timing and Phasing | Potential approach to infrastructure phasing is compatible/ incompatible with development trajectory | Extent and cost of forward provision of infrastructure required |
| | Delivery Summary - Option has a realistic prospect of beina delivered | Yes/No | |

Notes: 1) 50% weighting applied to Technical feasibility/Benefit/Cost and 50% to Sustainability Test

| Site Specific Score Criteria | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| D | Sub-Criteria | Weighting (1) | Scoring justification |
| Technical Feasibility Test | Flood Defence Standard of Service Anticipated | 4 | 1 = > 1% AEP 2 = Local FD to 1% AEP but option requires FD works/Displaces Floodwater to neighbouring properties 3 = 1% AEP to Local Area Only 4 = 1% AEP to Local Area & Extends Protection to other Properties 5 = Protects Entire envelope to 1% AEP/< 0.5% AEP |
| | Residual Flood Risk - Properties Not Protected by Option | 2 | 1 = Works Cause Direct Flooding to neighbouring properties 2 = Option requires works to protect neighbouring properties outside the development boundary 3 = Protects Local Site (1% AEP) 4 = Reduces Degree of Flooding to NeighbouringProperties/ Prop's Outside Option Works Area 5 = Entirely Removes Properties not included within works area from 100 year flood envelope |
| | Risk of Flooding Merely being Displaced | 2 | 1 = More Detailed Investigation Required 2 = Compensatory Works Required Downstream 3 = Defence Works likely, but can be included in the Works Contract 4 = Small scale mitigation may be required 5 = None |
| Benefit / Cost Test | Indicative No. Properties Protected (1% AEP) (or appraisal based on AADs) | 3 | 1 = <10 2 = 10 - 50 3 = 50 - 100 4 = 100 - 500 5 = Entire Flood Envelope / 500 - 1000+ a scoring range for AADs will be determined during Task 4 |
| | Likely Range of Construction Costs | 2 | 1 = >£2M 2= £1M - £2M 3 = £0.5M - £1M 4 = £0.25M - £0.5M 5 = <£0.25M |
| Sustainability Test | Reduce Vulnerability to Flooding (SA Objective 19) | 1 | 1 = No 5 = Yes |
| | Promote Waste Management accordance with the waster hierarchy (Reduce, Re-use & Recycle) (SA Objective 21) | 1 | 1 = No 5 = Yes |
| | Townscape/Landscape | 1 | 1 = Proposed flood infrastructure would have a major negative impact on landscape/townscape features 2 = Proposed flood infrastructure would have a minor negative impact on landscape/townscape features 3 = Proposed flood infrastructure would not impact on landscape/townscape features or provide additional benefits. 4 = Proposed flood infrastructure would have a minor beneficial impact on landscape/townscape features (improvements to quality, improved public access, new spaces) 5 = Proposed flood infrastructure would have a major beneficial impacts on landscape/townscape features (improvements to quality, improved public access, new spaces/features) |
| | Supports the Regional Delivery Plan (RDP) | 1 | 1 = No 5 = Yes |
| | Enables Previously Developed Land to be Re-used | 1 | 1 = No 5 = Yes |
| | Improves Accessibility to Community Facilities & Local Services (SA Objective 1) | 1 | 1. Removes a open space/community facility/service 2. Hinders access to or quality/enjoyment of a open space/community facility/service 3. No impact on open space/community facility/ service provision 4. Improves accessibility or quality of an existing open space/ community facility/service 5. Enables establishment of a new open space/community facility/service |
| | Meet identified need for sufficient and high Quality Housing (SA Objective 3) | 1 | 1. Major negative impact on housing potential (including restoring vacant homes or adding student bedspaces in Bath) >500 dwellings 2. Minor negative impact on housing potential (including restoring vacant homes or adding student bedspaces in Bath) 50-499 dwellings 3. Does not significantly increase or reduce housing supply (<50 dwellings) 4. Minor enabling role in addressing local housing needs (50-499 dwellings) 5. Major enabling role in addressing housing needs (500+ dwellings) |
| | Ensure Residents have access to a range of Employment Opportunities (SA Objective 8) | 1 | 1. Major reduction in employment floorspace >1000 sq.m 2. Minor reduction in employment floorspace 1-999 sq.m 3. No impact on employment floorspace or protection of existing 4. Enables minor additional employment floorspace to be brought forward <1000 sq.m 5. Enables major additional employemnt floorspace provision >1000 sq.m |
| Sustainability Test | Ensure Everyone has access to high quality and affordable Public Transport and promote Cycling and Walking (SA Objective 12) | 1 | 1. Major reduction in local accessibility or connectivity (all modes) 2. Minor reduction in local accessibility or connectivity (all modes) 3. Neutral impact on local accessibility or connectivity (all modes) 4. Proposals would enable minor improvements to local accessibility or connectivity. 5. Proposals would enable major improvements to local accessibility or connectivity |
| | Promote stronger and more vibrant city, town local and village centres (SA Objective 10) | 1 | 1. Major negative impact on Retail/ Tourism/Employment Strategy objectives 2. Minor negative impact on Retail/Tourism/Employment Strategy objectives 3. Neutral Impact on Retail/ Tourism/Employment Strategy objectives 4. Minor positive impact on Retail/ Tourism/Employment Strategy objectives 5. Major positive impact on Retail/ Tourism/Employment Strategy objectives |
| | Encourage bio-diversity, protecting and enhancing important and rare habitats and species (SA Objective 15) | 1 | 1. Potential for loss of international, national or locally site of ecological importance 2. Potential for reduction in quality or area of international, national or locally important habitat 3. No enhancement/harm 4. Enhancement or creation of new habitat <0.5 ha 5. Enhancement or creation of new habitat >0.5 ha |
| | Protect and enhance cultural and historical assets (SA Objective 16) | 1 | 1. Detracts from WHSMP objectives, harms setting/integrity of Listed Building (PPG16), SAM or AONB (regional-national-international significance) 2. Harms CA character/setting of local listed bldg/structure (local significance) 3. No harm/benefit 4. Improves CA character/setting of local listed bldg/structure (local significance) 5. Contributes to WHSMP objectives, improves setting/integrity of Listed Building (PPG16), SAM or AONB (regional-national-international significance) |
| | Encourage Sustainable Construction and use of renewable energy (SA Objective 18) | 1 | 1. Removes or prevents exploitation of a renewable source 2. Built in temporary/energy-intensive method below current best practice 3. Likely to be built to minimum statutory requirements (Building Regulations etc) 4. Likely to score moderately on CEEQUAL/BREEAM 5. Likely to score highly on CEEQUAL/BREEAM and/or include/improve renewable resource |
| | Score (XX Baseline) | | The threshold for further assessment will be determined during the appraisal process. |

| Test | | Output | Criteria |
|---------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Viability Test | Test 1 RFMS Scheme Costs in Relation to Development Costs | Yes/No | Is the cost of Strategic FRMS infrastructure disproportionate to the overall scale and mix of development identified for sites located within FRZ 2&3 (FRMS Infrastructure cost per sq.m of floorspace) |
| | Test 1 RFMS Scheme Costs in Relation to Development Costs | Yes/No | Is the cost of Strategic FRMS infrastructure disproportionate to the overall scale and mix of development identified for sites located within FRZ 2&3 (FRMS Infrastructure cost per sq.m of floorspace) |
| | Test 2 Potential Case for Gap Funding | Yes/No | FRMS option has potential to deliver significant flood protection benefits to existing communities in addition to proposed development sites |
| | Test 2 Potential Case for Gap Funding | Yes/No | FRMS option could enable beneficial use of vacant premises or previously developed land |
| | Viability Summary - Option likely to be viable or have reasonable prospect of the funding gap being plugged | Yes/No | |
| Deliverability Test | Test 1 Suitability & Use | Yes/No | Would the area required to accommodate on site FRM infrastructure, location of infrastructure or associated assess and safety requirements have potential to compromise the development potential of the site |
| | Test 2 Delivery Vehicle | Yes/No | Consideration of who would be responsible for delivering each option component (i.e developer/landowner, EA, Local authority, Regeneration Partnership) |
| | Test 3 Need for Land Assembly | Requirement for land assembly does/does not preclude option | Likely extent of land required (ha) |
| | Test 4 Timing and Phasing | Potential approach to infrastructure phasing is compatible/ incompatible with development trajectory | Extent and cost of forward provision of infrastructure required |
| | Delivery Summary - Option has a realistic prospect of being delivered | Yes/No | |

Notes: 1) 50% weighting applied to Technical feasibility/Benefit/Cost and 50% to Sustainability Test