

## **APPENDIX 1**

### **EVALUATION METHODOLOGY AND ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS**

### Methodology for Assessment

“At examination, LPA’s will need to show a clear trail of options generation, appraisal selection or rejection and the role that Sustainability Appraisal and community engagement have played in this process” The Planning Inspectorate, June 2007.

#### **Methodology**

A robust appraisal framework must be developed in order to establish those options most appropriate to be developed in more detail into a preferred options document. This appraisal needs to be both rigorous and consistent and applied to each option. This approach is supported in the guidance produced by PAS, ‘LDF, options generation and appraisal’ March 2008.

The filtering criteria developed for York Northwest include tests suggested in the PAS guidance, with sustainability appraisal, community engagement and reasonableness taken into account. Whilst the ‘sifting’ of options through the evaluation process allows for the rejection of some from further analysis, guidance emphasises that consultees may still debate these options at the preferred option stage, and a different approach may be taken.

#### **Criteria**

Ten criteria have been selected to assess the options. These all relate to the ‘tests of soundness’ outlined in PPS12 and the emerging tests outlined in the draft replacement PPS12.

##### Criteria 1

###### *Contribution to overall vision and key objectives*

This relates to the vision for the AAP which is within the framework of the overall vision for the city outlined in the core strategy. Test 6: strategies are coherent and consistent with DPD’s

##### Criteria 2

###### *Consistency with Community Strategy/Local Area Agreement*

This relates to the 5<sup>th</sup> test and the need to be in synergy with the direction of the overall strategy for the City.

##### Criteria 3

###### *Regional and National Guidance*

This relates to the 4<sup>th</sup> test and the need to be in accordance with the Regional Spatial Strategy and Planning Policy guidance and other relevant plans and strategies.

##### Criteria 4

###### *Consultation Response*

This relates to the 2<sup>nd</sup> test and the feedback from the consultation received on the Issues and Options Report.

##### Criteria 5

###### *Sustainability Appraisal*

This relates to the 3<sup>rd</sup> test. This includes appraisal in terms of the social, environmental and economic effects of each option.

##### Criteria 6

###### *Community benefits*

This relates to the 7<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> tests. It considers the opportunities each option brings for the delivery of community facilities and infrastructure.

#### Criteria 7

##### *Evidenced approach*

This relates to the 7<sup>th</sup> test and the background circumstances to the particular option. If evidence base documents have been produced, regard will be given to the outcomes of this.

#### Criteria 8

##### *Viability*

This relates to the 8<sup>th</sup> test and the need to ensure that the option could have a reasonable chance of being achieved in financial terms. Where financial costs of the options have been established this will be highlighted.

#### Criteria 9

##### *Deliverability*

This relates to the 8<sup>th</sup> test and an assessment of whether it is likely that the option could be implemented.

#### Criteria 10

##### *Flexibility*

This relates to the 9<sup>th</sup> test and deals with the possible alternatives to the option should circumstances change.

### **Evaluation**

Following assessment of the criteria an evaluation is made as to the implications of the issues raised and how this would affect the implementation of the option. The criteria are not scored but an overall assessment is made in the conclusion as to the merits of the option being considered.

**Example assessment of option**

**Option C5: Develop a new pedestrian and cycle bridge link across the river**  
**Criterion based Evaluation**

Criteria	Assessment
<b>Consistent</b>	
1) Contribution to AAP vision and strategic development objectives	<p>The option would provide an excellent sustainable form of achieving a high level of integration with the city centre.</p> <p>The option would link the development to the city centre facilitating vitality, and would promote walking and cycling, which have quality of life benefits as healthy modes of transport. A high quality and innovative design solution could be pursued.</p>
2) Consistency with community strategy/local area agreement/core strategy and other key strategies	<p>This option would contribute to the 'sustainable city' theme in the community strategy. By encouraging walking and cycling links to the city centre a integrated sustainable transport network is promoted which minimises environmental impacts.</p> <p>A second round of Core Strategy Issues and Options consultation was undertaken by the Council between September and October 2007, and the Preferred Options document is currently in the very early stages of development. Notwithstanding this, York Northwest is identified in the Spatial Vision diagram as a large brownfield development opportunity. Furthermore, all of the Core Strategies spatial strategy options prioritise Yorks main urban area as a principal focus for growth – something that was maintained in consultation responses, and which this option would support. In addition, the Issues and Options 2 paper sets out a variety of spatial priorities for improved tourism offer, of which creating better linkages between key attractions and sites was a favoured approach. The option would support the Core Strategy approach in this respect, through providing facilities linking the existing minster area and national rail museum</p>
3) Regional and national guidance	<p>PPS1 highlights the need for inclusive, accessible development in achieving sustainable communities. PPS6 recommends that extended town centres should be integrated with the existing centre both in terms of design and to allow easy access on foot. The good practice guide on tourism recommends that facilities are integrated with their surroundings in terms of design and layout, and that they are located to maximise synergies with other attractions.</p>

	RSS policy E2 promotes environmental enhancements and accessibility improvements to create a distinct attractive and vibrant sense of place for city centres. Policy YH7 requires that development maximises accessibility by cycling and walking.
<b>Justified</b>	
4) Consultation response	<p>Accessibility and integration with the city centre was seen to be of critical importance. The concept of a well-designed pedestrian/cycle bridge linking York Central to the city centre and the Ouse was strongly supported. The potential to use platform 4 at the station as part of a new route was suggested. The opportunities for a 'riverside corridor' and for river transport between YNW and the city centre were also noted.</p> <p>In the representations received this option was seen as highly desirable. Enhanced daytime and evening activity with improvements to Scarborough Bridge were also mentioned. The flooding risks and impact on flow rates were highlighted as issues to be addressed in any new structure. Quantitative feedback from workshops shows over 80% in support of this option.</p>
5) Sustainability appraisal	<p><u>Key Positive Effects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Option could provide a more attractive link between the NRM/Railway Station and Museum Gardens/City Centre</li> <li>• Will enhance York's pedestrian and cycle network which may encourage use</li> <li>• Will integrate York Central with the city centre</li> </ul> <p><u>Key Constraints and Uncertainties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May have impact on flooding and river flow rates depending on bridge design – would need to make sure that flood risk was not increased and that the existing flood storage area was not reduced and flood flow routes are not compromised</li> <li>• Erection of a bridge would potentially result in the loss of open space on the northern bank of the river</li> </ul> <p><u>Key Opportunities and Enhancements</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If well-designed bridge then could act as an attraction in itself</li> <li>• Could create an opportunity to create a new cultural trail</li> <li>• Opportunity should be considered to review lighting and pedestrian facilities along the riverside to enhance safety and increase riverside activity in the daytime and evening</li> </ul>

6) Community benefits	Increased accessibility between attractions would be of benefit to the community and the option would facilitate increase tourism activity in York, with benefits to the local economy and therefore local communities. The high cost of implementing this option may result in reduced levels of developer contribution toward other community facilities.
7) Evidenced approach	LTP2 identifies a pedestrian/cycling bridge across the Ouse adjacent to Scarborough bridge as a scheme which, if additional funding is available, would be progressed. It is identified as a longer term measure (2011 to 2021) in the actions for the plan. Recently this bridge has been included as an objective within the Cycling Demonstration town bid document 2008 and identified as one of the missing links on the Haxby to York Station north/south cycle route. Due to the timescales for the implementation of schemes and the dependency on developer contributions as part of the overall funding package it is unlikely that the monies approved will include funding for the bridge. However, it is possible that funding could be available for feasibility work to be progressed on this.
<b>Effective</b>	
8) Viability	<p>High level viability assessment work will be undertaken on production of composite development scenarios. These will be produced once the evidence base is complete, which will inform the scale and quantum of development in the composite scenarios to be tested.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, currently the option is considered to be likely to have a medium impact in terms of viability due to positive effects of attracting footfall, balanced against cost of provision.</p>
9) Deliverability	Identified developers and partners would deliver the option. Physical site access is a key barrier to delivery that must be overcome, other key barriers have been identified, though are felt, with mitigation and design, not to prejudice delivery of this option. Any possible impact on Museum Gardens, a historic park/ garden and scheduled ancient monument, would need careful consideration. Phasing would have to have regard integrating the development with the city centre at an early stage.
10) Flexibility	This option may not prejudice flexibility. The option is not prescriptive in terms of the location of any new link and alternative locations could be considered should circumstances change. The provision of a new link would allow for more flexibility in terms of the range of uses which could be considered due to the increased connectivity with the city centre.

<b>Evaluation</b>	<p>This option would result in significant improvements in accessibility between YNW and the city centre. As such it is fundamental to the vision for the area and its strategic objectives. It would also be in accordance with the community strategy and emerging core strategy and would conform with regional and national policy. Accessibility and integration with the city centre was seen to be of critical importance in the public consultation with strong support for this option. Positive sustainability effects are identified with this option although some issues relating to the river are identified. Community benefits would arise from this option although further viability analysis will be needed on production of composite development scenarios. Deliverability and flexibility are not felt to be prejudiced in taking this option forward at this stage. From this analysis this option would meet the majority of the criteria and is considered to be an appropriate approach to take forward in the Preferred Options for further analysis.</p>
-------------------	--



