

Summary evaluation of Northern Interceptor Transport Options

++ = Major Positive

- = Negative

+ = Positive

0 = Neutral (no significant positive or negative effects)

-- = Major Negative

Evaluation criteria	Summary comments									
	Baseline	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6	Option 7	Option 8	
1. Compatibility with Masterplan Vision (environmental quality)	--	+	++	+	--	++	--	+	-	Retaining Church St (Options 6 & 8) as existing severs Tresham from Town centre and traffic/bus conflicts will increase. A bridge would be unsightly and severance would remain (Option 8). Option 4 slices through Tresham site, undermining development potential. Options 2 and 5 provide potential for greatest environmental quality.
2. Impact on bus strategy	--	++	+	-	-	+	--	++	--	Keeping cars on Church Street (Option 8) prevents bus priority. Option 6 creates a number of car / bus conflict points and compromises bus priority on Sheep Street. Options 1 & 7 are best as they create no bus conflicts and allow full implementation of the bus priority strategy.
3. Impact on parking strategy	-	0	0	+	-	+	-	0	-	Option 4 cuts through Tresham and requires reconsideration of the car park location. Church St options (6 & 8), do nothing to intercept cars before entering one-way system. St John's St options (1,2 & 7) need careful design to prevent cars exiting onto Herriotts Lane / Church Street.
4. No. of resident parking spaces requiring removal (NR not required)	NR	34	15	NR	NR	NR	NR	105	NR	Removal of parking spaces only required on the St John's Street options.
5. Impact on walking and cycling strategy	--	+	+	+	+	+	--	+	-	Option 6 which severs Tresham and Market Square is very poor for pedestrian movement. A bridge (option 8) reduces activity and vitality at ground level and is inconvenient for pedestrians.

Evaluation criteria	Summary comments										
	Baseline	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6	Option 7	Option 8		
6. Impact on taxi strategy	-	+	+	0	0	+	-	+	-	Best options for taxis are those that avoid Church Street and hence avoid car / taxi conflict.	
7. Impact on servicing strategy	-	+	+	0	0	+	-	+	-	Best options are those that avoid Church Street and hence avoid conflict with cars.	
8. Modelling output (where applicable) in comparison with option 1	Baseline			0						Total vehicle hours	
	Baseline			0						Total vehicle kilometres	
	Baseline			0						Average network speed	
	Baseline			Increase AM Decrease PM							Journey time: bus route round town centre
	Baseline			Increase due to increased journey distance							Journey times: vehicular routes around town centre
	Baseline			0							Junction impacts

Evaluation criteria	Summary comments									
	Baseline	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6	Option 7	Option 8	
9. Number of properties required	3	3	3	8	3*	9	3	4	3	All options require a portion of no. 32 High Street in order to enable access to the proposed multi-storey car park Herriotts Lane / St John's St junction and possibly a portion of no. 32a St John's St and No. 10 Herriotts Lane (tbc) to allow northerly exit from car park. Option 5 would also require the demolition of West End DIY and public house at the Herriotts Lane / Church St junction whilst option 7 would affect no.1 Regent St. Options 3 and 5 also affect 1, 2, 2a, 3 & 4 Herriotts Lane which would be required to get sufficient radius and visibility around Queen Street / Herriotts Lane corner. *Option 4 also reduces the developable area of Tresham and would thereby have a major adverse impact on the deliverability of the site.
10. NCC support (Yes/No)	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Options 1 & 2 proposed by NCC in Growth Strategy, with option 2 favoured. NCC has indicated that it would support option 5 as it avoids bus conflict issues.
11. Deliverability (attractiveness to investors, funding likelihood etc) (High / Medium / Low)	L	L	H+	L	L	H	L	L	L	Option 2 is likely to score highest on development feasibility. With funding assistance for West End DIY / pub / Herriotts Lane properties, Option 5 would enable integrated Tresham / Market Square and release site value. Lack of support from NCC undermines deliverability of Options 6,7 & 8. Political support of Option 1 is questioned.
12. Cost (High / Medium / Low)	L	M	M	M	H	H	M	M	M	Retaining status quo is cheapest, but destroys the value / appeal of Tresham site. Costs of land acquisition can potentially be offset by higher site development value.