## Heron Plaza S278 Highway Works - Options Appraisal Matrix

|  | Option 1  | Option 2  | Option 3  |
|--|---|---|---|
| 23. Brief description  | Entirely Asphalt  | Asphalt / Granite   | Entirely Granite  |
| 24. Scope and Exclusions (where different to section 3)            | N/A   |   |   |
| 25. Benefits and strategy for                                      | See Appendix 6  | See Appendix 6  | See Appendix 6  |
| achievement (where different to section 12)                        | Overall rating of 7   | Overall rating of 8   | Overall rating of 9   |
| 26. Programme (where different to section 13)                      | N/A   |   |   |
| 27. Constraints and assumptions (where different to section 14)    | N/A   |   |   |
| 28. Risk implications (where different to section 15)              | Very low risk of disruption to<br>carriageway. Asphalt is quicker to<br>lay and repair. | Low risk of disruption to carriageway. The<br>one way network of streets mean that only<br>vehicles accessing the adjacent buildings<br>have any reason to use this street. The<br>existence of a pipe subway containing all<br>the utilities equipment under Houndsditch<br>will significantly reduce any potential of<br>utilities companies needing to work on the<br>highway. | Low risk of disruption to carriageway. The<br>one way network of streets mean that only<br>vehicles accessing the adjacent buildings<br>have any reason to use this street. The<br>existence of a pipe subway containing all<br>the utilities equipment under Houndsditch<br>will significantly reduce any potential of<br>utilities companies needing to work on the<br>highway. |
| 29. Stakeholders and consultees (where different to section 16)    | N/A   |   |   |
| 30. Legal implications (where different to section 17)             | N/A   |   |   |
| 31. HR implications (where different to section 18)                | N/A   |   |   |
| 32. Benchmarks or comparative data (where different to section 19) | N/A   |   |   |

| Financial Implications  | Option 1 - asphalt   | Option 2 – asphalt / granite   | Option 3 - granite   |
|---|--|--|--|
| 33. Total Estimated Cost<br>(£)   | £660,718   | £720,327   | £810,103   |
| 34. Anticipated source(s)<br>of project funding<br>(where different to<br>section 20) | N/A  |  |  |
| 35. Anticipated phasing of capital expenditure  | 2012/13 - £73,204 $2013/14 - £8,775$ $2014/15 - £8,775$ $2015/16 - £207,312$ $2016/17 - £332,415$ $2017/18 - £9,835$ <b>Total - £640,316</b> | 2012/13 – £73,204<br>2013/14 – £9,171<br>2014/15 - £9,171<br>2015/16 – £220,896<br>2016/17 – £353,253<br>2017/18 – £10,230<br>Total – £675,925 | 2012/13 – £73,204<br>2013/14 – £9,685<br>2014/15 - £9,685<br>2015/16 – £238,549<br>2016/17 – £380,333<br>2017/18 – £10,745<br>Total – £722,201 |
| 36. Estimated capital value/return (£)  | N/A  |  |  |
| 37. Fund/budget to be<br>credited with capital<br>return                              | N/A  |  |  |
| 38. Estimated ongoing<br>revenue implications<br>(£)                                  | Tree maintenance – £20,402   | Tree maintenance –£20,402Granite maintenance –£24,000Total –£44,402  | Tree maintenance –£20,402Granite maintenance –£67,500Total –£87,902  |
| 39. Source of ongoing revenue funding   | The developer  | The developer  | The developer  |
| 40. Fund/budget to be<br>credited with<br>income/savings                              | n/a  |  |  |
| 41. Anticipated life  | 20+ years  | 20+ years  | 20+ years  |

| 42. Investment Appraisal   | N/A |  |
|--|-----|--|
| 43. Affordability (where different to section 21)                          | N/A |  |
| 44. Proposed<br>procurement approach<br>(where different to<br>section 22) | N/A |  |

| 45. <u>Recommendation</u> | Not recommended  | Not recommended  | Recommended  |
|---------------------------|--|--|--|
| 46. Reasons               | This option will not be as aesthetically pleasing as option 3. | This option will not be as aesthetically pleasing as option 3. | This option is the best overall when<br>assessed against the social/cultural,<br>environmental and financial sustainability<br>criteria. This provides the design that best<br>enhances the City's cultural/social aspect<br>by utilising the aesthetically pleasing<br>granite on the carriageway. The potential<br>environmental impacts are negated by<br>locally sourcing the granite. This option is<br>also preferred by the developer and is as<br>per the previously agreed design for Heron<br>Tower. |