MERSEY GATEWAY
SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE ON ON-LINE OPTION
February 2005

1. INTRODUCTION

The Department for Transport have asked for clarification on a number of issues concerning the proposed Mersey Gateway Bridge Crossing. One of the issues identified by the DfT was concerned with the on-line route option. The DfT have requested more hard quantitative evidence of the potential impact on West Bank, Widnes and Runcorn Old Town of the on-line option such as impact on residential property, commercial property, regeneration and future development.

This note provides supplementary information on the impact of the on-line option (Route 1) with regards to regeneration issues, planning policy and the supporting analyses of Practicality and Public Acceptability and Distribution and Equity. A comparison of the on-line option with the preferred route is then made against the Scheme Objectives and Central Government Objectives which demonstrates why the on-line option is not considered to be a viable alternative.

2. ON-LINE ROUTE ALIGNMENT

The on-line option was developed in sufficient detail for a comparison of options and selection of a preferred route in 2003.

Since 2003 further topographical surveys have been carried out in the vicinity of the Silver Jubilee Bridge for the development of the preferred scheme, so the alignment of the on-line option has been revisited to include this information and also to ensure that the on-line route alignment is in accordance with the same design standards and principles being adopted for the preferred route. The developed alignment is shown in Drg B4027/3/H/101/300 and the alignment as presented in 2003 is shown with the developed alignment in Drg B4027/3/H/101/301 for comparison.

As can be seen, the alignment at the Runcorn junction has moved eastwards. This has been necessary to avoid any requirement to demolish part of the railway viaduct (which supports the West Coast Main Line Liverpool Branch) and to ensure that the minimum design standards for horizontal radii are met. This results in a greater impact on Runcorn Old Town than previously envisaged. The revised alignment also has a slightly greater impact on Widnes West Bank. It is estimated that the following buildings would need to be demolished:

Runcorn Old Town
140 Residential properties
1 College Annex Building
1 Surgery
1 Chapel
1 Public House
1 Hotel

Widnes West Bank
85 Residential Properties
1 Primary School
1 Public House
3 Industrial units

A further issue that has been raised since 2003 is that of tolling. If the scheme is to be funded by tolling, the feasibility of tolling alternatives needs to be considered in order to make a fair comparison of route options. An attempt has been made to include toll plazas at the north end of the on-line
option but this has proved very difficult. In order to make the on-line option feasible as a tolled scheme, it must be assumed at this stage that a fully electronic system requiring no toll plazas would be required.

3. REGENERATION

3.1 SRB Investment

The on-line option would have a significant detrimental impact on the Runcorn Old Town area SRB investment.

In overall terms, £12.7 million of SRB was directed into the Old Town Area between 1996 and 2003, which levered in further resources of £33 million.

Specifically to where the bridge hits land close to the Dukesfield area, as part of the SRB programme this was designated a Housing Renewal Area.

Financially, £3,712,000 of SRB was used to improve the Dukesfield area which was matched by £4,760,000 of Private Sector funds and £486,000 of Public Sector funds. This led to 25 private sector dwellings being improved, 62 new private sector dwellings built, 59 new Housing Association dwellings built and a further 73 improved - the viability of this area would be blighted by the long term increase in traffic and also by the severe disruption during construction.

3.2 Halton Waterside Development Strategy

The on-line option would have an adverse impact on the Halton Waterside Development Strategy. The vision for Halton’s waterfronts is:

*High quality, attractive and accessible waterfronts where people choose to come to live, work, invest and visit, and enjoy the environmental assets of the waterways*

Objectives/principles:
- to use waterways as a catalyst for regeneration
- to establish the perception of Halton’s waterfronts as a positive asset
- to promote and attract high quality developments that use the waterfront setting
- to deliver sustainability through the use of waterways and waterfronts
- to protect and enhance the waterways’ environmental assets
- to increase awareness and understanding of the heritage and environmental values of Halton’s waterways
to encourage healthy lifestyles and activities by providing leisure opportunities along the waterways.

The on-line option would have an adverse impact on the visual setting of Halton’s waterfront and in particular on the setting of the existing listed bridges. The on-line option would take up land within prime waterfront development areas in both Runcorn Old Town and Widnes West Bank (see 3.3, and 3.4). This could jeopardise the Waterside Development Strategy in the long term. In the short term the disruption due to construction would blight the waterfront area.

3.3 West Bank Development Framework

Specific objectives have been developed as part of the West Bank Development Framework with the aim of revitalising this waterfront area of Widnes. West Bank is located adjacent to the River Mersey and the Sankey (or St Helens) canal. The aims of the development framework are to:

- Develop a sustainable mixed use neighbourhood
- Improve links with Widnes town centre
- Maximize the potential of the waterfront for attracting development and enhancing the quality of the environment
- Support and expand leisure uses on the Sankey Canal waterfront
- Improve links between West Bank and Spike Island
- Improve the environmental quality
- Support local jobs and appropriate businesses in the area

The on-line option would not allow the maximisation of the waterfront potential in West Bank and would result in deterioration in environmental quality in this area. Businesses in the area would be severely affected during construction and jobs would be lost in the long term due to the demolition of community facilities.

3.4 Runcorn Historic Canal Town Masterplan/Development Brief

Runcorn Old Town is situated on three waterways; the Bridgewater Canal, the Manchester Ship Canal and the River Mersey. A Masterplan has been developed for the Old Town area with the aim of regenerating it as a historic canal town. The aims of the Masterplan are to:

- Re-integrate Runcorn Historic Canal Town centre with the waterfronts of Bridgewater Canal and Manchester Ship Canal/ River Mersey
- Improve the environmental quality of Runcorn Historic Canal Town through improvements to the waterfront areas.
- Bring additional economic activity into Runcorn Historic Canal Town by creating a more attractive and vibrant area.
- Develop derelict and underused sites into active and high quality uses
- Develop the ‘Runcorn Historic Canal Town’ image and brand that are unique in the area.
- Give each waterfront a different but active function and identity to avoid competition both between the waterfronts and between the waterfronts and the core of the town centre
  - Bridgewater Canal: leisure, retail and commercial focus with secondary residential
  - Manchester Ship Canal: residential focus with some ancillary retail and commercial

---
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The on-line option would have a devastating effect on the Runcorn Canal Basin with 5 separate
structures crossing this area. This in turn would clearly have a significant impact on plans to develop
the Runcorn Historic Canal Town. As with West Bank, the on-line option would result in deterioration
in environmental quality in this area. Businesses in the area would be severely affected during
construction and jobs would be lost in the long term due to the demolition of community facilities.

The impact of the on-line option on planning issues associated with regeneration is discussed below.

4. EXISTING AND FUTURE PLANNING POLICY

The on-line route for the new bridge would impact directly on the communities of West Bank, Widnes
and Runcorn Old Town, both of which are the subject of policies and proposals in the Halton Unitary
Development Plan which aim to protect the amenity of both these vulnerable old neighbourhoods and
Runcorn Old Town Centre and to enhance their prospects for regeneration. It is expected that the
UDP will be adopted in April 2005.

Runcorn Old Town is also covered by policies in the Runcorn Old Town Centre Strategy, adopted by
the Council in 1997. This has the status of supplementary planning guidance.

Part 1 of the UDP includes aims and objectives relevant to these areas. They are:-

  c) to make residential neighbourhoods more self-sufficient and sustainable.
  d) to protect residential amenity.
  e) to protect and enhance greenspace within residential neighbourhoods.
  f) to provide an appropriate level of infrastructure and community facilities to support the
     revitalisation of local communities and attract new investment.

Environmental and Cultural Assets

a) to protect and enhance the natural (land, air and water) environment and man-mades heritage.

Environmental Quality

a) to create a safe and healthy environment.

Town Centres and Shopping

a) to increase the vitality and viability of Halton's Town Centres.

Regeneration

a) to regenerate and revitalise Halton's older industrial areas and encourage development for
   the benefit of the community.
   b) to regenerate run-down housing through new development.
  c) to regenerate and revitalise the waterside environment of Halton.

An on-line bridge crossing would require the demolition of dwellings and the destruction of urban
greenspace. The additional noise and pollution from road traffic would have a severe effect on
residential amenity, leading to a lower quality of life for residents. This in turn would be contrary to the
aim of making these residential neighbourhoods more self-sufficient and sustainable.

The on-line bridge crossing would, through its impact on visual amenity, air quality and noise, be
contrary to the environmental aims of the UDP and would hinder and prejudice the regeneration aims
set out above by deterring new investment that would reinvigorate residential areas and the vitality and viability of Runcorn Old Town.

The on-line crossing could also be contrary to specific policies of the UDP. These are as follows:

**Environmental Quality**

**BE1 General Requirements for Development**

This states that a development:

(2c) Must avoid material loss of amenity to occupiers or users of adjacent land or buildings, by virtue of noise disturbance, noxious fumes and dust or traffic generation. Adjacent residential uses should not suffer any loss of amenity through overlooking, overshadowing or overbearing appearance.

(2d) Must not cause unacceptable levels of pollution or noise.

**Air Quality**

An initial study of air quality in Halton has identified “hot spots” where pollutants may not meet Air Quality Objectives. The problem occurs around West Bank, and Runcorn Old Town due to proximity of industry and the congested Silver Jubilee Bridge.

A new on-line bridge crossing adjacent to the existing Silver Jubilee is likely therefore to add significantly to these existing problems.

If so, then such a proposal would be contrary to the following policies of the UDP:-

**PR1 Air Quality**

Development will not be permitted where it is likely to have an unacceptable effect on air quality. The phrase “unacceptable effect” includes consideration of the following:-

a) Emissions which are likely to have a significantly unacceptable effect on the amenity of the local environment.

b) Where there is the significant possibility that public health may be affected.

c) Where there is a significant possibility that any proposed development will affect air quality standards.

d) Where there is a significant possibility that investment confidence in respect of surrounding land uses may be affected.

e) An air quality assessment may be required before determining applications with a potential to pollute.

**TP18 Air Quality**

In areas where air quality is shown to be poor due to pollution from transport sources, new development that generates traffic which will create additional pollution or intensify the pollution problem will not be permitted.
It is also likely that an on-line crossing that would pass through and adjacent to residential areas at West Bank, Widnes and Runcorn Old Town would generate significant additional noise, particularly during the construction phase. This would be contrary to:-

**PR2 Noise Nuisance**

Development will not be permitted which contains any new noise source likely to cause significant increase in ambient noise levels for both day and night time conditions and where it is likely to affect land allocated on the proposals map for residential or any other existing noise sensitive land uses.

**Primarily Residential Areas – Protecting Amenity**

Both West Bank in Widnes and the area around Runcorn Old Town Centre are protected as “primarily residential areas” in the Halton UDP in Policy H10. These are areas where housing is, and will continue to be, the predominant land use in the area. The overriding concern of the designation is to apply policies to protect the amenity and public safety of existing residents and conserve the character and environmental quality of these areas.

It is clear that a new bridge crossing through and adjacent to these areas will be contrary to these policies.

**Shopping and Town Centres**

Runcorn Old Town Centre lies adjacent to the existing Silver Jubilee Bridge and provides an essential service for the community that it serves. In order to meet the UDP aim of increasing the vitality and viability of centres, the Council is committed to ensuring that it develops and prospers. Policy S17 Retail Development directs all major retail developments to Town Centres to meet this aim.

Areas identified in the UDP for new retail development in the centre of Runcorn Old Town are currently being developed in accordance with UDP Policies S17 (Retail Development) and TC1 ( Provision for Retail Development). Within walking distance of the centre of Runcorn Old Town are three more sites identified for Town Centre uses in Policy TC1. These are as follows:-

**Camden Gardens**

This has now been developed as a new theatre and arts centre known as “The Brindley”.

**Ex Crossville Bus Depot Site and Land rear of 59-69 High Street**

These sites are allocated for a mix of Town Centre uses and residential. They are currently the subject of a developer competition brief comprising the Runcorn Old Town Centre “Canal Quarter”. The competition was launched on 20th January and will be concluded in June 2005.

It is feared that a proposal to build an on-line bridge crossing may blight developer confidence in this area and retard the regeneration of this area that aims to capitalise on the success of the adjoining Brindley Arts Centre.

5. **EMERGENCY PLANNING**

The whole length of the on-line option is well within the Public Information Zone (PIZ) around the Tessenderlo UK Ltd site in Widnes, which is subject to the top-tier COMAH regulations. The closest point from the site to the road is less than 500 metres. The PIZ is set by the HSE on the basis that outside it people are not at significant risk from major accidents.
In the event of a major emergency at the Tesseradoro site, and particularly if the wind was blowing a toxic gas cloud in the direction of the bridge/road, management of the incident would include consideration of whether to keep the bridge open or not. This would also apply to the existing bridge. There would be no other option for traffic to cross the river other than at Warrington or Liverpool. Various incidents, not just major emergencies, have in the past caused severe disruption and holdups on the existing bridge and adjoining roads. Assuming that more traffic would be using both bridges than use the existing one now, this could place more people in a congested area when a major emergency occurred.

The immediate advice to the public in the event of the site major emergency siren sounding is to follow 'shelter advice', i.e. close all doors, windows, ventilation systems, etc. and tune into a local radio station for further advice. (Are all vehicles able to close ventilation systems?) There may be a delay before vehicle drivers not familiar with this response to the siren take the shelter action (they would need to be already tuned in or pick up the frequency from the existing signs on the approach roads).

Three top-tier COMAH sites, INEOS Chlor, INEOS Fluor and European Vinyls Corporation, are located in Runcorn. The edge of the PIz for all these sites is close to the south end of the on-line option. The Weston Point Expressway, one of the main road links from the M56 to the online option, runs very close to these sites (well within the PIz).

6. PRACTICALITY

The construction of the on-line option will have a significant impact on Runcorn Old Town and Widnes West Bank and will impact on the existing road network. The construction period is estimated to be a minimum of 3 years and a possible construction sequence has been determined as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Phase</th>
<th>Traffic Diversion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Construct Main Span of Bridge from Northbound chainage 500 to 1400 and Southbound chainage 550 to 1600</td>
<td>No Diversion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Construct Weston Point to New Mersey Crossing and New Mersey Crossing to Weston Point links except sections at existing Queensway structures</td>
<td>Close Weston Point to Daresbury expressways East and West bound.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Construct Daresbury to New Mersey Crossing Link including section over existing Queensway link road</td>
<td>Close of Queensway link during construction of bridge above. No Southbound Access to Daresbury.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Construct Southbound link from Dilton to New Mersey Crossing and Widnes Bypass to New Mersey Crossing</td>
<td>Close existing Widnes bypass to New Mersey Crossing southbound link. Contra-flow diversion for Dilton to New Mersey Crossing Traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Demolish existing Southbound-Daresbury Queensway link and Construct new Southbound-Daresbury link road</td>
<td>South Bound traffic from Dilton and Widnes Bypass to use new bridge, to cross over to North bound side and use new Daresbury to New Mersey Crossing Link. No Southbound Access to Weston Point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Demolish Existing Queensway structure over expressways; construct remainder of Weston Point to New Mersey Crossing Links. Construct Local Access bridge over Expressways (Runcorn side)</td>
<td>All south bound traffic to use new bridge via finished link, Daresbury to north bound traffic to use new bridge and contra-flow on Widnes side of bridge to Dilton. North Bound link to Widnes Bypass closed. Weston Point to New Mersey Crossing Northbound to use existing link. No Southbound Access to Weston Point. No Local to existing bridge access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Construct Northbound to Dilton and Widnes Bypass links and local access road. Construct Weston Point to Daresbury Link roads.</td>
<td>Southbound traffic to use new bridge. Northbound traffic to use new bridge and contra-flow on Widnes side of bridge to Dilton. Northbound link to Widnes Bypass closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Project Complete.</td>
<td>Local traffic to use Silver Jubilee bridge. Through traffic to use New Mersey Crossing, Weston Point to Daresbury link roads open.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. PUBLIC ACCEPTABILITY

A number of public consultation exercises have been conducted. The first stage was carried out in the autumn of 2002 and was aimed at determining perceptions of the problems associated with the use of the SJJB and expectations from a new crossing. Possible routes were also discussed. A questionnaire was sent to the Halton 2000 panel and 95% of respondents agreed that a new crossing is required.

The second stage of consultation was carried out early in 2003 and concentrated on detailed discussions of route options. A questionnaire was also widely circulated together with a leaflet explaining the potential impacts of each route. 96% of respondents agreed that a new crossing is required and preferred route options are shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>% Votes for Route</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of Stage 2 Questionnaire

Initial analysis seems to indicate that Option 3 was selected over Option 3A due to concerns about congestion at Ditton Roundabout with Option 3A. However it is believed that this is due to the lack of detail in the map shown on the consultation leaflet and, in general, the findings from the focus groups and workshops support this belief. What is clear is that there is overwhelming support for a crossing connecting into the Central Expressway in Runcorn and very little support for a crossing adjacent to the Silver Jubilee Bridge.

8. STAKEHOLDER ACCEPTABILITY

In addition to being publicly acceptable it is important that key stakeholders have been consulted and their concerns addressed. The key stakeholders who have expressed concerns regarding the on-line option are summarised below.

8.1 Halton Borough Council

In view of the issues discussed above regarding the detrimental impact of the on-line option on regeneration and planning policies within Halton, Halton Borough Council could not support this option.

8.2 Halton PCT

The following statement has been received from the Director of Public Health for Halton:

"The existing social and environmental impact assessment performed to support the choice of route for the bridge describes the principle health and wellbeing issues associated with the routes. The key difference in this regard between the on-line option and the proposed route is that the on-line option would perpetuate social health and community wellbeing harm from the high density traffic flow and associated air pollution to local communities. The proposed longer route acknowledges the strategic nature of the crossing by removing it from the centres of population on either side of the river.

As Director of Public Health, my advice is that the longer proposed crossing will be more supportive of improved health and wellbeing and also supports the development of sustainable transport options which are more healthy."
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8.3 Emergency Services

As indicated above under Emergency Planning, the emergency services would prefer a route that is far enough away from the Silver Jubilee Bridge to allow it be an alternative route in the event of an incident at one of the COMAH sites resulting in the closure of the SJBR.

8.4 Network Rail

Network Rail has expressed concern over the impact of the on-line route on the existing railway viaduct, which carries the West Coast Main Line Liverpool Branch. The alignment has been developed to ensure that there would be minimal impact on Network Rail’s infrastructure.

8.5 Environmental Stakeholders

Ecology and Hydrodynamics

The construction of any piers within the Mersey Estuary for the on-line option would have a significant impact on the hydrodynamics of the estuary, including impacts on the SPA/RAMSAR site located downstream of the Silver Jubilee Bridge. The on-line option would therefore need to be constructed as a single span with no piers in the estuary.

Visual Impact and Heritage

The visual impact of the on-line option on landscape and townscape, and the impact on the existing Grade II and II* listed bridges are considered to be very significantly adverse. The on-line option would be contrary to policy BE11 in Halton’s UDP which states that “Development which would affect the setting of a listed building should aim to preserve both the character of that setting and its historic relationship to the listed building...”.

CABE and English Heritage are likely to have concerns over this route option.

9. DISTRIBUTION AND EQUITY

This Supporting Analysis is designed to show the distribution of the overall impacts summarised in a scheme appraisal, thereby enabling a judgement to be made about the fairness of the impacts across those affected by the scheme.

The benefits of the Mersey Gateway will be experienced by all transport users currently using the SJBR, and will also extend to some transport users who currently avoid the SJBR because of existing problems. This in turn means that the economic benefits are distributed over a wide area extending to Merseyside and North Wales. This would be the case for both the preferred scheme and the on-line option.

In contrast, the disbenefits of the scheme are experienced only by the population of Halton and, in particular, those people living and working in the vicinity of the proposed Mersey Gateway route. For the on-line option there would be a disproportionate impact on the residents and businesses of Runcorn Old Town and Widnes West Bank.
10. ASSESSMENT OF ROUTE OPTIONS AGAINST SCHEME OBJECTIVES

The scheme objectives set by Halton Borough Council and the Mersey Crossing Group are as follows:

- To relieve the Silver Jubilee Bridge, thereby removing the constraint on local and regional development and better provide for local traffic needs. (The Crossing must provide a viable alternative route to the Silver Jubilee Bridge);
- To maximise development opportunities;
- To improve public transport links across the river; and
- To encourage the increased use of cycling and walking.

For the Mersey Gateway to be successful it should:

- Fulfil each of the above objectives;
- Fit its environment; and
- Be economically viable.

The table below summarises the performance of the on-line route and the preferred route against these scheme objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>On-Line Route</th>
<th>Preferred Route</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To relieve the Silver Jubilee Bridge, thereby removing the constraint on local and regional development and better provide for local traffic needs. (The Crossing must provide a viable alternative route to the Silver Jubilee Bridge);</td>
<td>The on-line route would provide sufficient relief to the SJB to allow the SJB to be reduced to 2 lanes and be used for local traffic only.</td>
<td>The preferred route would provide sufficient relief to the SJB to allow the SJB to be reduced to 2 lanes and be used for local traffic only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The on-line route would provide a viable alternative to the SJB except in the event of a major incident at one of the COMAH sites (see section 9).</td>
<td>The on-line route would provide a viable alternative to the SJB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To maximise development opportunities</td>
<td>Regional Development: Journey time savings for both the on-line route and the preferred route are very similar so the benefits of the routes on regional development will be the same.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Development: The on-line option does not provide an enhancement of accessibility to existing developments. The on-line option prejudices development opportunities in Runcorn Old Town and Widnes West Bank (both of which are in wards (Riverse and Mersey) which are in the top 4% nationally for the most deprived for the IMD indicators of health and employment) including the Bellway homes development at the north of the West Bank area for which a planning application has been submitted. The on-line option destroys the setting of the Bridgewater Canal Basin in the Old Town. The on-line options requires the demolition of a number of community facilities in Runcorn Old Town and Widnes West Bank which would compromise the regeneration in these areas. The on-line route would be severely disruptive to</td>
<td>Local Development: The preferred route enhances accessibility to existing local developments e.g Widnes Waterfront and Halton Lea which links in to the Council’s wider policies for economic regeneration and improving vitality of Town Centres. The preferred option links two of the most deprived wards in Halton (Riverse and Castlfield) and improves accessibility to a number of others in central Runcorn. The preferred option requires the demolition of a number of businesses in Widnes and Astmoor (Runcorn), but a number of these are currently considered to be a blight to the development of this area (e.g. scrapyards) so this option would facilitate a significant improvement to the desirability of this area for prospective tenants. There are opportunities to relocate all the displaced businesses within Halton if required. The preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>On-Line Route</td>
<td>Preferred Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the communities of Runcorn Old Town and Widnes West Bank.</td>
<td>option would allow more opportunities for regeneration in Runcorn Old Town and Widnes West Bank than exist at present by freeing up land currently occupied by the approach roads to the SJR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To improve public transport links across the river</td>
<td>Reliability of public transport would be improved as a result of the congestion relief but the on-line option would not present the opportunity to open up new public transport routes. The on-line option would not facilitate the potential extension of the Merseytram LRT network into Runcorn in the future unless specific provision is made by increasing the width of the new crossing to accommodate this - this would result in further detrimental impact to Runcorn Old Town and Widnes West Bank.</td>
<td>Reliability of public transport would be improved as a result of the congestion relief, and the preferred option would open up opportunities to provide new public transport routes. The preferred option would facilitate the potential extension of the Merseytram LRT network into Runcorn by incorporating the tram lines within the deck of the proposed structure. Minor modifications to the proposals would be required to facilitate access to and from the new crossing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To encourage the increased use of cycling and walking</td>
<td>The on-line option would allow for significantly improved pedestrian and cycling facilities on the main deck of the SJR. However, journey ambience will be negatively affected by the presence of the adjacent heavily trafficked new crossing.</td>
<td>The preferred option would allow for significantly improved pedestrian and cycling facilities on the main deck of the SJR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To fulfill each of the above objectives</td>
<td>The on-line option would fulfill 3 of the 4 above objectives. The on-line option does not maximise development opportunities.</td>
<td>The preferred option fulfills all of the above objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To fit its environment</td>
<td>The on-line option would be damaging to the environment in the context of visual impact, social impact and the impact on listed buildings. There would also be adverse consequences and disruption during construction.</td>
<td>The preferred option has some impact on the Upper Mersey Estuary, but it is considered that these impacts can be mitigated. Detailed proposals for the mitigation of impacts will be included in the Environmental Statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be economically viable</td>
<td>The detailed financial assessments carried out by KPMG have indicated the level of funding required from the DfT to make the preferred option viable. The costs of the on-line option are slightly less than the preferred option (although a tolled scheme has not been fully costed and no allowance has been made for widening this route to facilitate the inclusion of an LRT) so this option would also be viable for the same level of funding. A detailed appraisal of the cost of disruption during construction has not yet been made, but this is likely to be higher for the on-line option.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. ASSESSMENT AGAINST CENTRAL GOVERNMENT OBJECTIVES

The appraisal of options against central government objectives is detailed in the Major Scheme Appraisal submission. A summary of these AST's comparing the on-line option and the preferred option is included overleaf.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Central Government Objectives</strong></th>
<th><strong>On-line Option (Route 1)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Preferred Option (Route 3A)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OBJECTIVE</strong></td>
<td><strong>SUB-OBJECTIVE</strong></td>
<td><strong>Impact Scores</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENVIRONMENT</strong></td>
<td>Notes:</td>
<td>Net population affected +10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Net population affected -50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Air Quality</td>
<td>NO&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt; 636.34 (2007)</td>
<td>NO&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt; 416.75 (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM&lt;sub&gt;10&lt;/sub&gt; 2.90 (2007)</td>
<td>PM&lt;sub&gt;10&lt;/sub&gt; 0.86 (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>Moderate Large Adverse</td>
<td>Slight Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townscape</td>
<td>Large Adverse</td>
<td>Neutral – Slight Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage of Historic Resources</td>
<td>Large Adverse</td>
<td>Slight Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity</td>
<td>Slight Adverse</td>
<td>Moderate Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Environment</td>
<td>Significant Impact (based on hydrodynamic modelling with 1 pier in the estuary – if no piers in the estuary the impact would be neutral)</td>
<td>Low Significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Fitness</td>
<td>Score +67</td>
<td>Score +97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journey Ambience</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Large Beneficial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SAFETY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accidents</td>
<td>Large Beneficial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>Large Beneficial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ECONOMY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Accounts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Users &amp; Providers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Users</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wider Economic Impacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACCESSIBILITY</strong></td>
<td>Option values</td>
<td>Large Beneficial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Large Beneficial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Slight Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access to the Transport System</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transport Interchange</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land-Use Policy</td>
<td>Beneficial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Government Policies</td>
<td>Moderate Beneficial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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12. SUMMARY

The on-line route does not meet the scheme objectives in relation to "Maximising Development Opportunities" and "Fitting its Environment".

The on-line route does not meet the Central Government objective "Environment - to protect the built and natural environment". In particular the adverse impacts on Landscape, Townscape and Heritage of Historic Resources are significant.

The on-line option is not likely to be acceptable to the public. Only 7.5% of people chose this as their preferred route during consultations.

The on-line route would result in significant disruption to local communities and businesses and to the road network during construction.

The on-line option would result in the demolition of a significant number of residential properties and some community facilities in two communities which are both within wards that are classed as deprived (IMD 2004).

The on-line option would result in a disproportionate negative impact on local communities, whilst the benefits would be realised by all users of the crossing.