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

Low = 1 Neutral = 3 High = 5

 Weighting
 Fercentile

 5
 2
 4
 3
 4
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 1
 82

	Technical Feasibility			ibility	Benefi	it / Cost						S	ustainability T	Test							Viab	oility Test			Deliv	verability Tes	it		
Favoured Option	Option No.	Option	Flood Defence Standard of Service	Residual Flood Risk - Properties Not Protected by Option	_	Annual Average Damage Avoided (AAD)		to Flooding	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	Accessibility to Community Facilities & Local Services	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)	affordable Public Transport and	Promote stronger and more vibrant city, town local and village centres (SA Objective 10)	Encourage biodiversity, 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)	Score	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	Γest 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
-	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	Y	N	Y	Υ	Y	0	Y	Y
-	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	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	0	Y	Y
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	Y	Y	Y	Υ	N	10	Y	Y
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	Y	Υ	Y	Y	N	0	Y	Y
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	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	10	Y	Y
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	Υ	Y	Y	N	Y	0	Υ	Υ
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	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	N	10	Υ	Υ

Bath and North East Somerset Flood Risk Management Strategy - Appendix F Site Specific 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	92

			Tec	hnical Feasi	hility	Bene	efit / Cost	Sustainability Test													
Option No	Site Ref.	Option	Flood Defence Standard of Service Anticipated	Residual Flood Risk - Properties Not	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)	Developed Land to be Re-used	Community	Meet identified need for sufficient and high Quality Housing (SA	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	Promote stronger and more vibrant city, town local and village	Encourage biodiversity, protecting and enhancing important and rare habitats and species (SA Objective 15)	Protect and enhance cultural and historical assets (SA Objective	Encourage Sustainable Construction and use of renewable energy (SA Objective 18)	Score
101		Cornmarket to Podium	3	3	5	3	2	5	5	3	5	5	4	4	5	3	5	3	3	3	85
102 103	B2c B2c	Empire Undercroft Grand Parade	3 4	3	5	4	5	5	5	4	5	5	4	3 3	3	4	4	3	3	3	88 99
104	ВЗа	The Rec & Sports Centre Flood Storage	3	3	5	3	1	5	5	3	1	5	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	73
105	B3b	Cricket Ground Flood Storage	4	3	5	4	3	5	5	3	1	5	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	85
106	B4a	Manvers Street Option B - SUDs/ Landscape & hard defences	4	3	5	4	3	5	5	3	5	5	3	3	5	4	5	3	3	3	94
107	B5	Former Menzies Hotel	4	3	5	4	4	5	5	3	1	5	3	4	5	3	3	3	2	3	92
108	В6а	Avon Street Coach & Car Park - SUDS & Integrated Building Defences/Off-line storage-wetlands	3	3	5	4	3	5	5	3	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	3	3	3	93
109	B6b	City of Bath College - Integrated Building Defences & SUDS	3	3	5	3	4	5	5	3	5	5	3	3	3	3	5	3	3	3	88
110		Green Park House Topland - Integrated Building Defences & SUDs	3	3	5	3	4	5	5	3	5	5	3	3	5	3	5	3	3	3	90
111		Green Park House Other - Integrated Building Defences & SUDs	3	3	5	3	4	5	5	3	5	5	3	3	5	3	5	3	3	3	90
112	B6di	Kingsmead House	3	3	5	3	4	5	5	3	5	5	3	3	5	3	4	3	3	3	89
113	B6diii	Rosewell Court	3	3	5	3	5	5	5	3	5	5	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	91
114	B6e	1-3 James St West	3	3	5	3	4	5	5	3	5	5	3	3	4	3	4	3	3	3	88
115	B6f	4 James St West	3	3	5	3	5	5	5	3	5	5	3	3	5	3	4	3	3	3	92
116	B6g	The Forum	3	3	5	3	4	5	5	3	5	5	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	88
117	D/	Option B - Green Park Station SUDS terrace	4	3	5	4	4	5	5	3	5	5	5	4	5	3	5	4	4	3	100
118	B8	Option C - BWR East IBD- SUDS	4	3	5	4	3	5	5	4	5	5	5	4	5	4	5	2	3	3	96
	В9а	South Quay	3	3	5	3	3	5	5	3	5	5	4	3	5	5	4	3	3	3	88
120	B9b B12	RBP to Travis Perkins Bath Press	3	3	5	3	3	5	5	3	5	5	3	3	5	4	4	3	4	3	89 87
	B13a	Lower Bristol Road	4	3	5	3	5	5	1	4	5	5	3	4	5	4	5	3	4	4	98
	B13b B13c	Lower Bristol Road Lower Bristol Road	3	3	5	3	5	5	1	4	5	5	3	3	5	4	5	3	4	4	90
122	B13d	Lower Bristol Road	3	3	5	3	5	5	1	4	5	5	3	3	5	4	5	3	4	4	93
	B13e	Lower Bristol Road - Access to Locksbrook Island Remodel Weir to Form overflow structure	4	3	1	3	5	5	1	4	5	5	3	3	5	3	5	3	4	4	84
123	B13f	Option B - Brassmill Lane Industrial Estate Wetland Storage	4	3	5	4	4	5	5	3	5	5	3	3	4	3	4	4	3	4	96
124	B14	Option A - Locksbrook FSA	4	3	5	4	3	5	5	4	5	5	3	3	4	3	4	3	3	4	93
125 126	B15	The Maltings Option A - BWR Phase One	3	3	5	3 4	3	5	5	3 4	5	5	3	3	4 5	3	4 5	3 4	3	3 4	88
		Wetland Option B - BWR Phase Three (2&3) IBD-SUDS	3	3	5	3	3	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	4	5	4	3	3	4	99
		(2007) 22 0020					-	-	-		-		9	4		-			•		
	B18	Westmark Comfortable Place/TA Centre	3	3	5	3	5 4	5	5	3	5	5	3	<u>4</u> <u>4</u>	3	3	3	2	3	3	92 87
130		Onega Centre	3	3	5	3	5	5	5	3	5	5	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	92
131		Option B - Hinton Garage IBD- SUDS		3	5	4	5	5	5	3	5	5	3	4	3	3	3	3	4	4	98
132		Somerdale/ Cadburys -	4	3	5	4	4	5	5	3	5	5	3	5	5	5	5	3	3	3	99
	KM3b	FDA/SUDS The Centre	3	3	4	3	4	5	5	2	5	5	3	3	5	4	5	3	3	3	87
134		Riverside Park Channel Widening	4	3	5	4	4	5	5	3	1	5	2	3	3	3	4	4	3	4	92
135	KM9	Keynsham Paper Mill - SUDS	3	3	5	3	4	5	5	3	5	5	3	3	5	3	3	3	3	3	88
					1						<u> </u>	1			<u> </u>	<u> </u>]	1			L

	Via	ability Test			Deliverability Test								
				Viability Summary -					D. II				
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	Option likely to be viable or have reasonable prospect of the funding gap being plugged		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				
	Υ		Y	Y	Υ	Υ	0	Y	Y				
	N N		N N	N Y	Y N	Y Y	0	Y	Y				
	N		N	N	N	Υ	0	N	N				
	N		N	N	N	Y	0	Y	N				
	Y		N	Υ	N	Y	0	N	N				
	NI NI		NI	N.	N			V	N				
	N		N	N	N	Y	1	Y	N				
	N		Y	Y	Υ	Y	0	Y	Υ				
	N		N	Y	Υ	Υ	0	Y	Υ				
	Y		N	Y	Υ	Υ	0	Y	Y				
	Y		N	Y	Υ	Υ	0	Y	Υ				
	Υ		N	Y	Υ	Υ	0	Y	Y				
	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	0	Y	Y				
	Assume Y		N	Y	Y	Y	0	Y	Y				
	N		N	N	Y	Υ	0	Y	Y				
	Y		N	Y	Y	Υ	0	Y	Y				
	Y		Υ	Y	Υ	Υ	0	Y	Y				
	Y		Υ	Y	Y	Υ	0	Y	Y				
	Y		N	Y	Y	Υ	0	Y	Y				
	Y		Y N	Y	Y	Y Y	0	Y	Y				
	Y		Υ	Y	Y	Y	0	Y	Y				
	Y N		N N	Y N	Y	Y	0	Y	Y				
	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	0	Y	Y				
			N	Y	Y	Y	0	Y	Y				
	Assume Y		N	Y	Υ	N	5	Υ	N				
	Assume Y		N	Y	Y	Y	0	N	Y				
	Assume Y		N	Y	Y	Y	0	Y	Y				
	Υ		Υ	Y	Y	Υ	0	Y	Υ				
	Υ		Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	0	Υ	Υ				
	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	0	Y	Y				
	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	0	Y	Y				
	N Y		N N	N Y	Y	Y	0	Y	Y				
	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	0	Y	Y				
	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	0	Y	Y				
	N		N	N	N	N	0	Y	N				
	Υ		N	Y	Y	Y	0	Y	Y				
1	l '	1	I N	'	' '	I	1	"	'				

Bath and North East Somerset Flood Risk Management Strategy - Appendix F Site Specific 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	92
3	2	4	J	4	ı	ı	ı	ı	ı	ı	ı	ı	ı	ı	ı	1	ı	1

			Tecl	hnical Feasi	bility	Bene	fit / Cost							S	Sustainability Te	est				
Option No	n Site Ref.	Option	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	to Flooding (SA Objective	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)	sufficient and high Quality Housing (SA	Ensure Residents have access to a range of Employment Opportunities (SA Objective 8)	Transport and promote	Promote stronger and more vibrant city, town local	Important and	Protect and enhance cultural and historical assets (SA Objective	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	МИЗ	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
	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
	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
	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

	Via	bility Test				Deliv	erability Te	st	
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 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	Υ	Υ	0	Y	Υ
	N		N	N	Y	Y	0	Y	Y
	Y		Υ	Υ	Y	Υ	0	Y	Y
	N		N	N	Υ	Y	0	Y	Y
	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	0	Y	Υ
	Assume Y		N	Υ	Y	Υ	0	Υ	Y
	N		N	N	Υ	Y	0	Y	Y
	Υ		N	Υ	Y	Υ	0	Y	Y
	N		N	N	N	Υ	0	Υ	Υ
	N		N	N	Y	Υ	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	Υ
	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	0	Y	Y
	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	0	Y	Y
	Y		Υ	Υ	N	Υ	0	Y	Υ
	N		Y	N	Y	Y	1	Υ	Y

Appraisal Score Criteria

Test	Sub-Criteria	Weighting (1)	Consider treatification								
	Sub-Uniterial lood Defence Standard of Service Anticipated	4	Scoring justification 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								
Technical Feasibility Test	esidual 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								
	isk of Flooding Merely being Displaced		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 (or	dicative 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								
	kely Range of Construction Costs educe Vulnerability to Flooding (SA Objective 19)	1	1 = >£11M 2= £7M - £11M 3 = £3.5M - £7M 4 = £1M - £3.5M 5 = <£1M 1 = No 5 = Yes								
Pr	romote Waste Management accordance with the waster erarchy (Reduce, Re-use & Recycle) (SA Objective 21)	1	1 = No 5 = Yes 1 = No 5 = Yes								
То	ownscape/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)								
	upports the Regional Delivery Plan (RDP)	1	1 = No 5 = Yes								
Sustainability Test Im	nables Previously Developed Land to be Re-used nproves Accessibility to Community Facilities & Local ervices (SA Objective 1)		1 = No 5 = Yes 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								
	teet identified need for sufficient and high Quality Housing A Objective 3)	1	5. Enables establishment of a new open space/community facility/service 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 (504-99 dwellings) 5. Major enabling role in addressing housing needs (504-99 dwellings)								
	nsure Residents have access to a range of Employment pportunities (SA Objective 8)	1	1. Major reduction in employment floorspace > 1000 sq.m 2. Minor reducation in employment floorspace 1-999 sq.m 3. No impact on employment floorspace 1-999 sq.m 4. Enables minor additional employment floorspace to be brought forward <1000 sq.m 5. Enables major additional employment floorspace to be brought forward <1000 sq.m 5. Enables minor additional employment floorspace provision > 1000 sq.m								
Pu	nsure Everyone has access to high quality and affordable ublic Transport and promote Cycling and Walking (SA bjective 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.								
Pr vill	romote stronger and more vibrant city, town local and llage centres (SA Objective 10)	1	1. Major negative impact on Retali/ Tourism/Employment Strategy objectives 2. Minor negative impact on Retali/Tourism/Employment Strategy objectives 3. Neutral Impact on Retali/ Tourism/Employment Strategy objectives 4. Minor positive impact on Retali/ Tourism/Employment Strategy objectives 5. Major positive impact on Retali/ Tourism/Employment Strategy objectives 5. Major positive impact on Retali/ Tourism/Employment Strategy objectives								
	ncourage bio-diversity, protecting and enhancing nportant 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								
	rotect and enhance cultural and historical assets (SA bjective 16)		Detracts from WHSMP objectives, harms setting/integrity of Listed Building (PPG16), SAM or AONB (regional-national-international significance) Harms CA character/setting of local listed bldg/structure (local significance) No harm/benefit Hinproves CA character/setting of local listed bldg/structure (local significance) Contributes to WHSMP objectives, improves setting/integrity of Listed Building (PPG16), SAM or AONB (regional-national-international significance)								
	ncourage Sustainable Construction and use of renewable nergy (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 CEEGQUAL/BREEAM and/or include/improve renewable resource								
	Score (XX Baseline)		5. Likely to score highly on CEEQUAL/BREEAM and/or include/improve renewable resource The threshold for further assessment will be determined during the appraisal process.								

	Test	Output	Criteria
	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 floorpsace)
	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 floorpsace)
Viability Test	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	
	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)
Delivershility Test	Test 3 Need for Land Assembly	Requirement for land assembly does/does not preclude option	Likely extent of land required (ha)
Deliverability Test	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

Sub-Criteria

Site Specific Score Criteria

Weighting (1)

Scoring justification

	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
Technical Feasibility Test	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)		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 Reduce Vulnerability to Flooding (SA Objective 19)	2	1 = >£2M = £1M - £2M = £0.5M - £1M = £0.25M - £0.5M = <£0.25M 1 = No = 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) Enables Previously Developed Land to be Re-used	1	1 = No 5 = Yes 1 = No 5 = Yes
Sustainability Test	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	Major reduction in employment floorspace >1000 sq.m Minor reducation in employment floorpsace 1-999 sq.m No impact on employment floorspace or protection of existing Enables minor additional employment floorspace to be brought forward <1000 sq.m 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	Major reduction in local accessibility or connectivity (all modes) Minor reduction in local accessibility or connectivity (all modes) Neutral impact on local accessibility or connectivity (all modes) Proposals would enable minor improvements to local accessibility or connectivity. 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. 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. 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	Detracts from WHSMP objectives, harms setting/integrity of Listed Building (PPG16), SAM or AONB (regional-national-international significance) Harms CA character/setting of local listed bldg/structure (local significance) No harm/benefit Improves CA character/setting of local listed bldg/structure (local significance) 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. 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
	Test 1 RFMS Scheme Costs in Relation to Development Costs Test 1 RFMS Scheme Costs in Relation to Development	Yes/No 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 floorpsace) Is the cost of Strategic FRMS infrastructure disproportionate to the overall scale and mix of development identified for
Viability Test	Costs Test 2 Potential Case for Gap Funding	Yes/No	sites located within FRZ 2&3 (FRMS Infrastructure cost per sq.m of floorpsace) FRMS option has potential to deliver significant flood protection benefits to existing communities in addition to proposed
	Test 2 Potential Case for Gap Funding		development sites 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	
	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)
Deliverability Test	Test 3 Need for Land Assembly	preclude option	Likely extent of land required (ha)
Deliverability Test	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/Re		A 1-1-190 T

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