Scheme A		Option 1 (Proposed Scheme)	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Option Name *Please insert the name by which the option is known*		Proposed Design Scheme option.	Partial Signals.	Part time signal.	Maximise Existing Capacity.
Infrastructure Type *Please provide if different from the proposed scheme.*		Fully signalised junction with dumbbell arrangement including pedestrian and cycle facilities and linkages.	Partial Signals on selected arms, maintaining two roundabouts.	Part time signals.	Maximise capacity with normal roundabout control.
Variation from Proposed Scheme *What are the key differences (characteristics) between the proposed scheme and this option? How is it different?*		N/A	Only selected arms signalised.	Part time signals only.	No signalisation.
Technical Assessment & Appraisal *Please describe the level of technical appraisal or assessment undertaken – including previous studies and relevant data – to assess this option, including application of the Early Assessment and Sifting Tool.*		A Linsig model has been built in order to verify the proposed scheme can accommodate the forecast traffic growth. The close spacing of nodes and signalling on the M65 southbound on slip allows good pedestrian and cycle connectivity.	Appraisal using a Linsig model has shown that an arrangement of two roundabouts will not support the forecast traffic growth.	As per the proposed scheme.	The land requirements for this option are significant and it is considered the chance of providing a viable technical solution would be limited, based on engineering experience, so no further technical appraisal has been undertaken.
Consultation *Please explain the extent of any stakeholder or wider consultation on the option and summarise the key findings.*		Peer review on various design solutions and consultation on the need for improvement was undertaken as part of the Burnley / Pendle Growth Corridor Strategy development. Representatives of the County Council, Borough Councils, Highways England and relevant industry organisations were present throughout.			
Indicative Cost (£M) & Economic Appraisal *Please provide indicative costs if known or provide information on the likely affordability against the headings 'high' 'medium' or 'low.' Also explain any economic appraisal undertaken, including benefit/cost analysis*		£2.5m	£2.5m	£2.3m	Much greater than £2.5m
Impact against Strategic Objectives *Please describe how this option delivers against the strategic objectives set out in Section 1.3. Make reference to the outputs of the Early Assessment and Sifting Tool process.*	Improve the operation of the M65 motorway junctions and ensure journey time reliability on the M65 mainline is maintained;	This option would significantly improve the operation of the junction.	This option would not provide sufficient capacity to allow efficient operation of the junction with forecast traffic growth.	This option would not provide sufficient capacity to allow efficient operation of the junction with forecast traffic growth.	This option would not provide sufficient capacity to allow efficient operation of the junction with forecast traffic growth.
	Improve highway safety issues within the study area;	This option would significantly improve the safety of the junction.	Slight improvements to junction safety.	Slight improvements to junction safety.	The junction would continue to operate as current, without any notable improvements to safety.
	Reduce congestion on the local road network;	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Improve access to existing developments (including town centres) and proposed development sites;	Significantly improve access to development sites for highway traffic, pedestrians and cyclists.	This option will not provide sufficient capacity for the expected traffic growth.	Part time signals may limit the development potential due to capacity issues.	This option will not provide sufficient capacity for the expected traffic growth.
	Improve the effectiveness of public transport facilities within the study area; and	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Improve walking and cycling facilities within the study area.	Improved cycle and pedestrian connectivity.	Partial signals will provide improved cycle and pedestrian provision on selected arms only.	This option can not provide the additional cycle facilities that the proposed option offers.	No improvement to walking and cycling facilities.
Key Risks *Please identify the key technical, funding and delivery risks associated with this option.*		This option requires complex traffic control set up.	This option will not provide a solution for the expected traffic growth.	This option could limit development potential.	This is not considered a viable solution.
Rationale for Rejection *Please explain why this specific option has been rejected in favour of the proposed scheme.*		Preferred scheme.	This option will not provide an adequate solution for the forecast traffic growth.	This option will not provide an adequate solution for the forecast traffic growth and limits the potential for improvements to walking and cycling facilities.	This is not considered a viable solution due to the level of land take required and the chance of providing a viable technical solution.

Scheme B		Option 1 (Proposed Scheme)	Option 2	Option 3
Option Name *Please insert the name by which the option is known*		Proposed Design Scheme option.	Partial Signals.	Maximise Existing Capacity.
Infrastructure Type *Please provide if different from the proposed scheme.*		Fully signalised junction with pedestrian and cycle facilities and linkages	Partial Signals on selected arms.	Maximise capacity with normal roundabout control.
Variation from Proposed Scheme *What are the key differences (characteristics) between the proposed scheme and this option? How is it different?*		N/A	Only selected arms signalised.	No signalisation.
Technical Assessment & Appraisal *Please describe the level of technical appraisal or assessment undertaken – including previous studies and relevant data – to assess this option, including application of the Early Assessment and Sifting Tool.*		A Linsig model has been built in order to verify the proposed scheme can accommodate the forecast traffic growth. The close spacing of nodes and signalling on the M65 southbound on slip allows good pedestrian and cycle connectivity.	As per the proposed scheme.	The land requirements for this option are significant and it is considered the chance of providing a viable technical solution would be limited, based on engineering experience and an observed flow imbalance on approach arms, so no further technical appraisal has been undertaken.
Consultation *Please explain the extent of any stakeholder or wider consultation on the option and summarise the key findings.*		Peer review on various design solutions and consultation on the need for improvement was undertaken as part of the Burnley / Pendle Growth Corridor Strategy development. Representatives of the County Council, Borough Councils, Highways England and relevant industry organisations were present throughout.		
Indicative Cost (£M) & Economic Appraisal *Please provide indicative costs if known or provide information on the likely affordability against the headings 'high' 'medium' or 'low.' Also explain any economic appraisal undertaken, including benefit/cost analysis*		£1.0m	£1.0m	Much greater than £2.5m.
Impact against Strategic Objectives *Please describe how this option delivers against the strategic objectives set out in Section 1.3. Make reference to the outputs of the Early Assessment and Sifting Tool process.*	Improve the operation of the M65 motorway junctions and ensure journey time reliability on the M65 mainline is maintained;	This option would significantly improve the operation of the junction.	This option would not provide sufficient capacity to allow efficient operation of the junction with forecast traffic growth.	This option would not provide sufficient capacity to allow efficient operation of the junction with forecast traffic growth.
	Improve highway safety issues within the study area;	This option would significantly improve the safety of the junction.	Slight improvements to junction safety.	Slight improvements to junction safety.
	Reduce congestion on the local road network;	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Improve access to existing developments (including town centres) and proposed development sites;	Significantly improved access to development sites for highway traffic, pedestrians and cyclists, in particular to Lomeshaye Industrial Estate.	This option will not provide sufficient capacity for the expected traffic growth.	This option will not provide sufficient capacity for the expected traffic growth.
	Improve the effectiveness of public transport facilities within the study area; and	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Improve walking and cycling facilities within the study area.	Improved cycle and pedestrian connectivity.	Partial signals will provide improved cycle and pedestrian provision on selected arms only.	No improvement to walking and cycling facilities.
Key Risks *Please identify the key technical, funding and delivery risks associated with this option.*		This option requires complex traffic control set up.	This option will not provide a solution for the expected traffic growth.	not a viable solution
Rationale for Rejection *Please explain why this specific option has been rejected in favour of the proposed scheme.*		Preferred scheme.	This option will not provide an adequate solution for the forecast traffic growth.	not a viable solution

Scheme C		Option 1 (Proposed Scheme)	Option 2
Option Name *Please insert the name by which the option is known*		Proposed Design Scheme option.	Maximise Existing Capacity.
Infrastructure Type *Please provide if different from the proposed scheme.*		Realignment of roundabout into a signlaised T junction with provision for improved pedestrian and cycle facilities.	Maximise capacity with normal roundabout control.
Variation from Proposed Scheme *What are the key differences (characteristics) between the proposed scheme and this option? How is it different?*		N/A	No signalisation.
Technical Assessment & Appraisal *Please describe the level of technical appraisal or assessment undertaken – including previous studies and relevant data – to assess this option, including application of the Early Assessment and Sifting Tool.*		Linsig modelling to evaluate proposed design with existing and future traffic levels tested.	The land requirements for this option are significant and it is considered the chance of providing a viable technical solution would be limited, based on engineering experience and an observed flow imbalance on approach arms, so no further technical appraisal has been undertaken.
Consultation *Please explain the extent of any stakeholder or wider consultation on the option and summarise the key findings.*		Peer review on various design solutions and consultation on the need for improvement was undertaken as part of the Burnley / Pendle Growth Corridor Strategy development. Representatives of the County Council, Borough Councils, Highways England and relevant industry organisations were present throughout.	
Indicative Cost (£M) & Economic Appraisal *Please provide indicative costs if known or provide information on the likely affordability against the headings 'high' 'medium' or 'low.' Also explain any economic appraisal undertaken, including benefit/cost analysis*		£150k	Much greater than £150k.
Impact against Strategic Objectives *Please describe how this option delivers against the strategic objectives set out in Section 1.3. Make reference to the outputs of the Early Assessment and Sifting Tool process.*	Improve the operation of the M65 motorway junctions and ensure journey time reliability on the M65 mainline is maintained;	Whilst not an actual motorway junction, the location of this junction and it close proximity to the M65 Junction 12 means improvements here would offer slight improvements to the operation of the motorway junction.	This option would not provide sufficient capacity to allow efficient operation of the junction with forecast traffic growth.
	Improve highway safety issues within the study area;	This option would significantly improve the safety of the junction.	The junction would continue to operate as current, without any notable improvements to safety.
	Reduce congestion on the local road network;	The proposed junction design would provide a significant reduction in congestion to the local road network.	Maximising the capacity of this junction in its current format would provide some reduction in congestion to the local road network.
	Improve access to existing developments (including town centres) and proposed development sites;	Significantly improved access to development sites for highway traffic, pedestrians and cyclists, in particular to Lomeshaye Industrial Estate.	This option will not provide sufficient capacity for the expected traffic growth.
	Improve the effectiveness of public transport facilities within the study area; and	N/A	N/A
	Improve walking and cycling facilities within the study area.	The proposed junction design will have improve cycle and pedestrian crossing facilities.	No improvement to walking and cycling facilities.
Key Risks *Please identify the key technical, funding and delivery risks associated with*		None identified at present.	This is not considered a viable solution.
Rationale for Rejection *Please explain why this specific option has been rejected in favour of the proposed scheme.*		Preferred scheme.	This is not considered a viable solution due to the level of land take required and the chance of providing a viable technical solution due to flow imbalance issues.

Scheme D		Option 1 (Proposed Scheme)
Option Name *Please insert the name by which the option is known*		Proposed Design Scheme option.
Infrastructure Type *Please provide if different from the proposed scheme.*		Minor alterations to existing roundabout alignment.
Variation from Proposed Scheme *What are the key differences (characteristics) between the proposed scheme and this option? How is it different?*		N/A
Technical Assessment & Appraisal *Please describe the level of technical appraisal or assessment undertaken – including previous studies and relevant data – to assess this option, including application of the Early Assessment and Sifting Tool.*		An Arcady has clarified the proposed design can accommodate future traffic growth and work alongside the propsoed layout for the M65 J12.
Consultation *Please explain the extent of any stakeholder or wider consultation on the option and summarise the key findings.*		Peer review on various design solutions and consultation on the need for improvement was undertaken as part of the Burnley / Pendle Growth Corridor Strategy development. Representatives of the County Council, Borough Councils, Highways England and relevant industry organisations were present throughout.
Indicative Cost (£M) & Economic Appraisal *Please provide indicative costs if known or provide information on the likely affordability against the headings 'high' 'medium' or 'low.' Also explain any economic appraisal undertaken, including benefit/cost analysis*		£50k
Impact against Strategic Objectives *Please describe how this option delivers against the strategic objectives set out in Section 1.3. Make reference to the outputs of the Early Assessment and Sifting Tool process.*	Improve the operation of the M65 motorway junctions and ensure journey time reliability on the M65 mainline is maintained;	Whilst not an actual motorway junction, the location of this junction and it close proximity to the M65 Junction 12 means improvements here would offer slight improvements to the operation of the motorway junction.
	Improve highway safety issues within the study area;	Slight improvements to junction safety.
	Reduce congestion on the local road network;	The proposed junction design would provide a significant reduction in congestion to the local road network.
	Improve access to existing developments (including town centres) and proposed development sites;	Significantly improved access to development sites for highway traffic, pedestrians and cyclists, in particular to Lomeshaye Industrial Estate.
	Improve the effectiveness of public transport facilities within the study area; and	N/A
	Improve walking and cycling facilities within the study area.	The proposed junction design will have improved cycle and pedestrian crossing facilities.
Key Risks *Please identify the key technical, funding and delivery risks associated with this option.*		None identified at present.
Rationale for Rejection *Please explain why this specific option has been rejected in favour of the proposed scheme.*		Preferred scheme.

Scheme E		Option 1 (Proposed Scheme)	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Option Name *Please insert the name by which the option is known*		Proposed Design Scheme option.	As per proposed design scheme but with controlled crossings.	Signalised T junction.	Fully Signalised roundabout.
Infrastructure Type *Please provide if different from the proposed scheme.*		Maintain existing roundabout but improved pedestrian and cycle (uncontrolled) facilities	As per proposed design scheme but with controlled crossings.	Modify junction layout to a fully signalised T junction with full pedestrian and cycle facilities.	All approach arms signalised.
Variation from Proposed Scheme *What are the key differences (characteristics) between the proposed scheme and this option? How is it different?*		N/A	Controlled pedestrian and cycle crossing facilities.	Change layout to T junction signals with full pedestrian and cycle facilities	As per proposed design scheme with all approach arms signalised.
Technical Assessment & Appraisal *Please describe the level of technical appraisal or assessment undertaken – including previous studies and relevant data – to assess this option, including application of the Early Assessment and Sifting Tool.*		An Arcady model proved that no further capacity changes were required in order to accommodate the expected future growth.	An Arcady model proved that no further capacity changes were required in order to accommodate the expected future growth.	No technical assessment undertaken as the Arcady modelling of the existing junction layout proves no further capacity increases are required.	No technical assessment undertaken as the Arcady modelling of the existing junction layout proves no further capacity increases are required.
Consultation *Please explain the extent of any stakeholder or wider consultation on the option and summarise the key findings.*		Peer review on various design solutions and consultation on the need for improvement was undertaken as part of the Burnley / Pendle Growth Corridor Strategy development. Representatives of the County Council, Borough Councils, Highways England and relevant industry organisations were present throughout.			
Indicative Cost (£M) & Economic Appraisal *Please provide indicative costs if known or provide information on the likely affordability against the headings 'high' 'medium' or 'low.' Also explain any economic appraisal undertaken, including benefit/cost analysis*		£100k	£250k	£700k	£700k
Impact against Strategic Objectives *Please describe how this option delivers against the strategic objectives set out in Section 1.3. Make reference to the outputs of the Early Assessment and Sifting Tool process.*	Improve the operation of the M65 motorway junctions and ensure journey time reliability on the M65 mainline is maintained;	Whilst not an actual motorway junction, the location of this junction and it close proximity to the M65 Junction 12 means improvements here would offer slight improvements to the operation of the motorway junction.	Whilst not an actual motorway junction, the location of this junction and it close proximity to the M65 Junction 12 means improvements here would offer slight improvements to the operation of the motorway junction.	Whilst not an actual motorway junction, the location of this junction and it close proximity to the M65 Junction 12 means improvements here would offer slight improvements to the operation of the motorway junction.	Whilst not an actual motorway junction, the location of this junction and it close proximity to the M65 Junction 12 means improvements here would offer slight improvements to the operation of the motorway junction.
	Improve highway safety issues within the study area;	Slight improvements to junction safety with improved revision for cyclists and pedestrians.	Slight improvements to junction safety with improved revision for cyclists and pedestrians.	Slight improvements to junction safety with improved revision for cyclists and pedestrians.	Slight improvements to junction safety with improved revision for cyclists and pedestrians.
	Reduce congestion on the local road network;	The proposed junction design would provide a significant reduction in congestion to the local road network.	The proposed junction design would provide a significant reduction in congestion to the local road network.	The proposed junction design would provide a significant reduction in congestion to the local road network.	The proposed junction design would provide a significant reduction in congestion to the local road network.
	Improve access to existing developments (including town centres) and proposed development sites;	Significantly improved access to development sites for highway traffic, pedestrians and cyclists, in particular to Lomeshaye Industrial Estate.	Significantly improved access to development sites for highway traffic, pedestrians and cyclists, in particular to Lomeshaye Industrial Estate.	Significantly improved access to development sites for highway traffic, pedestrians and cyclists, in particular to Lomeshaye Industrial Estate.	Significantly improved access to development sites for highway traffic, pedestrians and cyclists, in particular to Lomeshaye Industrial Estate.
	Improve the effectiveness of public transport facilities within the study area; and	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Improve walking and cycling facilities within the study area.	The proposed junction design will have improve cycle and pedestrian crossing facilities.	The proposed junction design will have improve cycle and pedestrian crossing facilities.	The proposed junction design will have improve cycle and pedestrian crossing facilities.	The proposed junction design will have improve cycle and pedestrian crossing facilities.
Key Risks *Please identify the key technical, funding and delivery risks associated with this option.*		None identified at present.	None identified at present.	None identified at present.	None identified at present.
Rationale for Rejection *Please explain why this specific option has been rejected in favour of the proposed scheme.*		Preferred scheme.	The data shows that the number of pedestrian and cycle users crossing at this point does not warrant a controlled crossing and the existing arrangement already has a good safety record. There is also a higher cost associated with this scheme.	Only a small benefit to highway users through installation of traffic control, however there is a significant expense associated with this. There is also a significantly higher cost associated with this scheme.	Only a small benefit to highway users through installation of traffic control, however there is a significant expense associated with this. There is also a significantly higher cost associated with this scheme.

Scheme F		Option 1 (Proposed Scheme)
Option Name *Please insert the name by which the option is known*		Proposed Design Scheme option.
Infrastructure Type *Please provide if different from the proposed scheme.*		Pedestrian facilities on all arms and signal technology upgrade to MOVA.
Variation from Proposed Scheme *What are the key differences (characteristics) between the proposed scheme and this option? How is it different?*		N/A
Technical Assessment & Appraisal *Please describe the level of technical appraisal or assessment undertaken – including previous studies and relevant data – to assess this option, including application of the Early Assessment and Sifting Tool.*		A Linsig model has been developed based on the existing VA control, however benefits are expected based on an upgrade to MOVA. The urban nature of the sites warrants pedestrian crossing facilities on all arms.
Consultation *Please explain the extent of any stakeholder or wider consultation on the option and summarise the key findings.*		Peer review on various design solutions and consultation on the need for improvement was undertaken as part of the Burnley / Pendle Growth Corridor Strategy development. Representatives of the County Council, Borough Councils, Highways England and relevant industry organisations were present throughout.
Indicative Cost (£M) & Economic Appraisal *Please provide indicative costs if known or provide information on the likely affordability against the headings 'high' 'medium' or 'low.' Also explain any economic appraisal undertaken, including benefit/cost analysis*		£100k
Impact against Strategic Objectives *Please describe how this option delivers against the strategic objectives set out in Section 1.3. Make reference to the outputs of the Early Assessment and Sifting Tool process.*	Improve the operation of the M65 motorway junctions and ensure journey time reliability on the M65 mainline is maintained;	N/A
	Improve highway safety issues within the study area;	Significant improvements to junctions safety.
	Reduce congestion on the local road network;	The proposed junction design would provide a significant reduction in congestion to the local road network.
	Improve access to existing developments (including town centres) and proposed development sites;	Improvements to this junction will reduce congestion for vehicles travelling between Burnley and Nelson via the A682 and for those accessing a number of the development sites along the A682 parallel route.
	Improve the effectiveness of public transport facilities within the study area; and	N/A
	Improve walking and cycling facilities within the study area.	The proposed junction design will have improved cycle and pedestrian crossing facilities.
Key Risks *Please identify the key technical, funding and delivery risks associated with this option.*		None identified at present.
Rationale for Rejection *Please explain why this specific option has been rejected in favour of the proposed scheme.*		Preferred scheme.

Scheme G		Option 1 (Proposed Scheme)
Option Name *Please insert the name by which the option is known*		Proposed Design Scheme option.
Infrastructure Type *Please provide if different from the proposed scheme.*		Minor junction geometry changes.
Variation from Proposed Scheme *What are the key differences (characteristics) between the proposed scheme and this option? How is it different?*		N/A
Technical Assessment & Appraisal *Please describe the level of technical appraisal or assessment undertaken – including previous studies and relevant data – to assess this option, including application of the Early Assessment and Sifting Tool.*		An Arcady model has verified that the design proposals should accommodate the future traffic growth. Current capacity issues are as a result of queuing back from Rose Grove junction.
Consultation *Please explain the extent of any stakeholder or wider consultation on the option and summarise the key findings.*		Peer review on various design solutions and consultation on the need for improvement was undertaken as part of the Burnley / Pendle Growth Corridor Strategy development. Representatives of the County Council, Borough Councils, Highways England and relevant industry organisations were present throughout.
Indicative Cost (£M) & Economic Appraisal *Please provide indicative costs if known or provide information on the likely affordability against the headings 'high' 'medium' or 'low.' Also explain any economic appraisal undertaken, including benefit/cost analysis*		£200k
Impact against Strategic Objectives *Please describe how this option delivers against the strategic objectives set out in Section 1.3. Make reference to the outputs of the Early Assessment and Sifting Tool process.*	Improve the operation of the M65 motorway junctions and ensure journey time reliability on the M65 mainline is maintained;	Whilst not an actual motorway junction, the location of this junction and it close proximity to the M65 Junction 9 means improvements here would offer slight improvements to the operation of the motorway junction.
	Improve highway safety issues within the study area;	N/A
	Reduce congestion on the local road network;	The proposed junction design would provide a significant reduction in congestion to the local road network.
	Improve access to existing developments (including town centres) and proposed development sites;	Improved access to the M65 from Burnley and Burnley Bridge development site is expected.
	Improve the effectiveness of public transport facilities within the study area; and	N/A
	Improve walking and cycling facilities within the study area.	N/A
Key Risks *Please identify the key technical, funding and delivery risks associated with this option.*		None identified at present.
Rationale for Rejection *Please explain why this specific option has been rejected in favour of the proposed scheme.*		Preferred scheme.

Scheme H		Option 1 (Proposed Scheme)	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Option Name *Please insert the name by which the option is known*		Proposed Design Scheme option.	Option A	Option B	Option C & D
Infrastructure Type *Please provide if different from the proposed scheme.*		Junction improvements incorporating interchange facilities at Rose Grove station by constructing a 48 space car park.	Junction improvements with interchange and P&R facilities	Junction improvements with interchange and P&R facilities	Junction improvements with interchange and P&R facilities
Variation from Proposed Scheme *What are the key differences (characteristics) between the proposed scheme and this option? How is it different?*		N/A	An additional lane to the proposed design option with an increase in the size of the car park.	Avoid expensive 3rd party land and less lanes than option A	A design iteration on Option 3 to minimise service diversion costs and land costs.
Technical Assessment & Appraisal *Please describe the level of technical appraisal or assessment undertaken – including previous studies and relevant data – to assess this option, including application of the Early Assessment and Sifting Tool.*		A Linsig model has clarified the proposed design will provide additional capacity to the existing layout.	No additional technical assessment from the proposed design option however the additions are expected to add significant expense and extend the programme due to the requirement of obtaining 3rd party land.	No additional technical assessment from the proposed design option however the additions are expected to add significant expense due to impacts on bridge structure and service diversion costs.	No additional technical assessment from the proposed design option however further design iteration in an attempt to limit costs of land and service diversion.
Consultation *Please explain the extent of any stakeholder or wider consultation on the option and summarise the key findings.*		Peer review on various design solutions and consultation on the need for improvement was undertaken as part of the Burnley / Pendle Growth Corridor Strategy development. Representatives of the County Council, Borough Councils, Highways England and relevant industry organisations were present throughout.			
Indicative Cost (£M) & Economic Appraisal *Please provide indicative costs if known or provide information on the likely affordability against the headings 'high' 'medium' or 'low.' Also explain any economic appraisal undertaken, including benefit/cost analysis*		£2.8m	£5.8m	£4.8 m	£3.8m
Impact against Strategic Objectives *Please describe how this option delivers against the strategic objectives set out in Section 1.3. Make reference to the outputs of the Early Assessment and Sifting Tool process.*	Improve the operation of the M65 motorway junctions and ensure journey time reliability on the M65 mainline is maintained;	Whilst not an actual motorway junction, the location of this junction and it close proximity to the M65 Junction 9 means improvements here would offer slight improvements to the operation of the motorway junction.	Whilst not an actual motorway junction, the location of this junction and it close proximity to the M65 Junction 9 means improvements here would offer slight improvements to the operation of the motorway junction.	Whilst not an actual motorway junction, the location of this junction and it close proximity to the M65 Junction 9 means improvements here would offer slight improvements to the operation of the motorway junction.	Whilst not an actual motorway junction, the location of this junction and it close proximity to the M65 Junction 9 means improvements here would offer slight improvements to the operation of the motorway junction.
	Improve highway safety issues within the study area;	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Reduce congestion on the local road network;	The proposed junction design would provide a significant reduction in congestion to the local road network.	The proposed junction design would provide a significant reduction in congestion to the local road network.	The proposed junction design would provide a significant reduction in congestion to the local road network.	The proposed junction design would provide a significant reduction in congestion to the local road network.
	Improve access to existing developments (including town centres) and proposed development sites;	Improved access to the M65 from Burnley and Burnley Bridge development site is expected.	Improved access to the M65 from Burnley and Burnley Bridge development site is expected.	Improved access to the M65 from Burnley and Burnley Bridge development site is expected.	Improved access to the M65 from Burnley and Burnley Bridge development site is expected.
	Improve the effectiveness of public transport facilities within the study area; and	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Improve walking and cycling facilities within the study area.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Key Risks *Please identify the key technical, funding and delivery risks associated with this option.*		None identified at present.	Significant risk of increase costs of service diversions and land acquisition.	Significant risk of increase costs of service diversions and land acquisition with the addition of risks to bridge structure modifications.	Significant risk of increase costs of service diversions and land acquisition.
Rationale for Rejection *Please explain why this specific option has been rejected in favour of the proposed scheme.*		Preferred scheme.	The requirement of 3rd party land deems this option not cost effective.	The associated risks and high cost deems this option not cost effective.	The requirement of 3rd party land deems this option not cost effective.

Scheme I		Option 1 (Proposed Scheme)
Option Name *Please insert the name by which the option is known*		Proposed Design Scheme option.
Infrastructure Type *Please provide if different from the proposed scheme.*		Improve signal technology from VA to MOVA.
Variation from Proposed Scheme *What are the key differences (characteristics) between the proposed scheme and this option? How is it different?*		N/A
Technical Assessment & Appraisal *Please describe the level of technical appraisal or assessment undertaken – including previous studies and relevant data – to assess this option, including application of the Early Assessment and Sifting Tool.*		Junction operational performace and modelling report from a Linsig model has identified that relatively small scale changes will provide a sound technical solution.
Consultation *Please explain the extent of any stakeholder or wider consultation on the option and summarise the key findings.*		Peer review on various design solutions and consultation on the need for improvement was undertaken as part of the Burnley / Pendle Growth Corridor Strategy development. Representatives of the County Council, Borough Councils, Highways England and relevant industry organisations were present throughout.
Indicative Cost (£M) & Economic Appraisal *Please provide indicative costs if known or provide information on the likely affordability against the headings 'high' 'medium' or 'low.' Also explain any economic appraisal undertaken, including benefit/cost analysis*		£100k
Impact against Strategic Objectives *Please describe how this option delivers against the strategic objectives set out in Section 1.3. Make reference to the outputs of the Early Assessment and Sifting Tool process.*	Improve the operation of the M65 motorway junctions and ensure journey time reliability on the M65 mainline is maintained;	N/A
	Improve highway safety issues within the study area;	N/A
	Reduce congestion on the local road network;	The proposed junction design would provide a significant reduction in congestion to the local road network.
	Improve access to existing developments (including town centres) and proposed development sites;	Improvements to this junction will reduce congestion for vehicles travelling between Burnley and Nelson via the A682 and for those accessing a number of the development sites along the A682 parallel route.
	Improve the effectiveness of public transport facilities within the study area; and	N/A
	Improve walking and cycling facilities within the study area.	N/A
Key Risks *Please identify the key technical, funding and delivery risks associated with this option.*		None identified at present.
Rationale for Rejection *Please explain why this specific option has been rejected in favour of the proposed scheme.*		Preferred scheme.

Scheme J		Option 1 (Proposed Scheme)
Option Name *Please insert the name by which the option is known*		Proposed Design Scheme option.
Infrastructure Type *Please provide if different from the proposed scheme.*		Signalisation of existing roundabout.
Variation from Proposed Scheme *What are the key differences (characteristics) between the proposed scheme and this option? How is it different?*		N/A
Technical Assessment & Appraisal *Please describe the level of technical appraisal or assessment undertaken – including previous studies and relevant data – to assess this option, including application of the Early Assessment and Sifting Tool.*		A Linsig model has verified the proposed design scheme should cope with forecast traffic growth.
Consultation *Please explain the extent of any stakeholder or wider consultation on the option and summarise the key findings.*		Peer review on various design solutions and consultation on the need for improvement was undertaken as part of the Burnley / Pendle Growth Corridor Strategy development. Representatives of the County Council, Borough Councils, Highways England and relevant industry organisations were present throughout.
Indicative Cost (£M) & Economic Appraisal *Please provide indicative costs if known or provide information on the likely affordability against the headings 'high' 'medium' or 'low.' Also explain any economic appraisal undertaken, including benefit/cost analysis*		£800k
Impact against Strategic Objectives *Please describe how this option delivers against the strategic objectives set out in Section 1.3. Make reference to the outputs of the Early Assessment and Sifting Tool process.*	Improve the operation of the M65 motorway junctions and ensure journey time reliability on the M65 mainline is maintained;	N/A
	Improve highway safety issues within the study area;	Significant improvements to junctions safety.
	Reduce congestion on the local road network;	The proposed junction design would provide a significant reduction in congestion to the local road network.
	Improve access to existing developments (including town centres) and proposed development sites;	Improvements to this junction will reduce congestion for vehicles travelling between Burnley and Nelson via the A682 and for those accessing a number of the development sites along the A682 parallel route.
	Improve the effectiveness of public transport facilities within the study area; and	N/A
	Improve walking and cycling facilities within the study area.	The proposed junction design will have improved cycle and pedestrian crossing facilities.
Key Risks *Please identify the key technical, funding and delivery risks associated with this option.*		None identified at present.
Rationale for Rejection *Please explain why this specific option has been rejected in favour of the proposed scheme.*		Preferred scheme.

Scheme K		Option 1 (Proposed Scheme)
Option Name *Please insert the name by which the option is known*		Proposed Design Scheme option.
Infrastructure Type *Please provide if different from the proposed scheme.*		Improve signal technology from VA to MOVA.
Variation from Proposed Scheme *What are the key differences (characteristics) between the proposed scheme and this option? How is it different?*		N/A
Technical Assessment & Appraisal *Please describe the level of technical appraisal or assessment undertaken – including previous studies and relevant data – to assess this option, including application of the Early Assessment and Sifting Tool.*		Junction operational performace and modelling report from a Linsig model has identified that relatively small scale changes will provide a sound technical solution.
Consultation *Please explain the extent of any stakeholder or wider consultation on the option and summarise the key findings.*		Peer review on various design solutions and consultation on the need for improvement was undertaken as part of the Burnley / Pendle Growth Corridor Strategy development. Representatives of the County Council, Borough Councils, Highways England and relevant industry organisations were present throughout.
Indicative Cost (£M) & Economic Appraisal *Please provide indicative costs if known or provide information on the likely affordability against the headings 'high' 'medium' or 'low.' Also explain any economic appraisal undertaken, including benefit/cost analysis*		£100k
Impact against Strategic Objectives *Please describe how this option delivers against the strategic objectives set out in Section 1.3. Make reference to the outputs of the Early Assessment and Sifting Tool process.*	Improve the operation of the M65 motorway junctions and ensure journey time reliability on the M65 mainline is maintained;	N/A
	Improve highway safety issues within the study area;	N/A
	Reduce congestion on the local road network;	The proposed junction design would provide a significant reduction in congestion to the local road network.
	Improve access to existing developments (including town centres) and proposed development sites;	Improvements to this junction will reduce congestion for vehicles travelling between Burnley and Nelson via the A682 and for those accessing a number of the development sites along the A682 parallel route.
	Improve the effectiveness of public transport facilities within the study area; and	N/A
	Improve walking and cycling facilities within the study area.	N/A
Key Risks *Please identify the key technical, funding and delivery risks associated with this option.*		None identified at present.
Rationale for Rejection *Please explain why this specific option has been rejected in favour of the proposed scheme.*		Preferred scheme.

Scheme L		Option 1 (Proposed Scheme)
Option Name *Please insert the name by which the option is known*		Proposed Design Scheme option.
Infrastructure Type *Please provide if different from the proposed scheme.*		Redesign roundabout to accommodate four way junction.
Variation from Proposed Scheme *What are the key differences (characteristics) between the proposed scheme and this option? How is it different?*		N/A
Technical Assessment & Appraisal *Please describe the level of technical appraisal or assessment undertaken – including previous studies and relevant data – to assess this option, including application of the Early Assessment and Sifting Tool.*		Linsig modelling undertaken to provide optimum solution for traffic delay reduction and improved pedestrian crossings
Consultation *Please explain the extent of any stakeholder or wider consultation on the option and summarise the key findings.*		Peer review on various design solutions and consultation on the need for improvement was undertaken as part of the Burnley / Pendle Growth Corridor Strategy development. Representatives of the County Council, Borough Councils, Highways England and relevant industry organisations were present throughout.
Indicative Cost (£M) & Economic Appraisal *Please provide indicative costs if known or provide information on the likely affordability against the headings 'high' 'medium' or 'low.' Also explain any economic appraisal undertaken, including benefit/cost analysis*		£750k
Impact against Strategic Objectives *Please describe how this option delivers against the strategic objectives set out in Section 1.3. Make reference to the outputs of the Early Assessment and Sifting Tool process.*	Improve the operation of the M65 motorway junctions and ensure journey time reliability on the M65 mainline is maintained;	N/A
	Improve highway safety issues within the study area;	Significant improvements to junctions safety.
	Reduce congestion on the local road network;	The proposed junction design would provide a significant reduction in congestion to the local road network.
	Improve access to existing developments (including town centres) and proposed development sites;	Improvements to this junction will reduce congestion for vehicles travelling between Burnley and Nelson via the A682 and for those accessing a number of the development sites along the A682 parallel route.
	Improve the effectiveness of public transport facilities within the study area; and	N/A
	Improve walking and cycling facilities within the study area.	The proposed junction design will have improved cycle and pedestrian crossing facilities.
Key Risks *Please identify the key technical, funding and delivery risks associated with this option.*		None identified at present.
Rationale for Rejection *Please explain why this specific option has been rejected in favour of the proposed scheme.*		Preferred scheme.

Scheme M		Option 1 (Proposed Scheme)	Option 2
Option Name *Please insert the name by which the option is known*		Proposed Design Scheme option.	Part time signals
Infrastructure Type *Please provide if different from the proposed scheme.*		Fully signalise roundabout with controlled pedestrian facilities.	Part time signalisation of the roundabout.
Variation from Proposed Scheme *What are the key differences (characteristics) between the proposed scheme and this option? How is it different?*		N/A	No provision for controlled pedestrian facilities.
Technical Assessment & Appraisal *Please describe the level of technical appraisal or assessment undertaken – including previous studies and relevant data – to assess this option, including application of the Early Assessment and Sifting Tool.*		Linsig modelling undertaken to provide optimum solution for traffic delay reduction and improved pedestrian crossings.	Modelling as per proposed design scheme however no provision for pedestrians.
Consultation *Please explain the extent of any stakeholder or wider consultation on the option and summarise the key findings.*		Peer review on various design solutions and consultation on the need for improvement was undertaken as part of the Burnley / Pendle Growth Corridor Strategy development. Representatives of the County Council, Borough Councils, Highways England and relevant industry organisations were present throughout.	
Indicative Cost (£M) & Economic Appraisal *Please provide indicative costs if known or provide information on the likely affordability against the headings 'high' 'medium' or 'low.' Also explain any economic appraisal undertaken, including benefit/cost analysis*		£410k	£380k
Impact against Strategic Objectives *Please describe how this option delivers against the strategic objectives set out in Section 1.3. Make reference to the outputs of the Early Assessment and Sifting Tool process.*	Improve the operation of the M65 motorway junctions and ensure journey time reliability on the M65 mainline is maintained;	This option would significantly improve the operation of the junction.	This option would significantly improve the operation of the junction.
	Improve highway safety issues within the study area;	This option would significantly improve the safety of the junction.	Slight improvements to junction safety.
	Reduce congestion on the local road network;	N/A	N/A
	Improve access to existing developments (including town centres) and proposed development sites;	Improved access to the M65 from Accrington as well as through traffic between the Ribble Valley and the A56/M66.	Improved access to the M65 from Accrington as well as through traffic between the Ribble Valley and the A56/M66.
	Improve the effectiveness of public transport facilities within the study area; and	N/A	N/A
	Improve walking and cycling facilities within the study area.	Improved pedestrian connectivity.	N/A
Key Risks *Please identify the key technical, funding and delivery risks associated with this option.*		None identified at present.	None identified at present.
Rationale for Rejection *Please explain why this specific option has been rejected in favour of the proposed scheme.*		Preferred scheme.	The exclusion of pedestrians facilities only marginally reduces congestion. At only a slightly reduced cost, the additional congestion reduction does not represent good value for money. This scheme also lacks any safety improvements for pedestrians, however vehicle safety improvements are expected.

Scheme N		Option 1 (Proposed Scheme)	Option 2
Option Name *Please insert the name by which the option is known*		Proposed Design Scheme option.	Part time signals
Infrastructure Type *Please provide if different from the proposed scheme.*		Fully signalise roundabout with controlled pedestrian facilities.	Part time signalisation of the roundabout.
Variation from Proposed Scheme *What are the key differences (characteristics) between the proposed scheme and this option? How is it different?*		N/A	No provision for controlled pedestrian facilities.
Technical Assessment & Appraisal *Please describe the level of technical appraisal or assessment undertaken – including previous studies and relevant data – to assess this option, including application of the Early Assessment and Sifting Tool.*		Linsig modelling undertaken to provide optimum solution for traffic delay reduction and improved pedestrian crossings.	Modelling as per proposed design scheme however no provision for pedestrians.
Consultation *Please explain the extent of any stakeholder or wider consultation on the option and summarise the key findings.*		Peer review on various design solutions and consultation on the need for improvement was undertaken as part of the Burnley / Pendle Growth Corridor Strategy development. Representatives of the County Council, Borough Councils, Highways England and relevant industry organisations were present throughout.	
Indicative Cost (£M) & Economic Appraisal *Please provide indicative costs if known or provide information on the likely affordability against the headings 'high' 'medium' or 'low.' Also explain any economic appraisal undertaken, including benefit/cost analysis*		£800k	£380k
Impact against Strategic Objectives *Please describe how this option delivers against the strategic objectives set out in Section 1.3. Make reference to the outputs of the Early Assessment and Sifting Tool process.*	Improve the operation of the M65 motorway junctions and ensure journey time reliability on the M65 mainline is maintained;	This option would significantly improve the operation of the junction.	This option would significantly improve the operation of the junction.
	Improve highway safety issues within the study area;	This option would significantly improve the safety of the junction.	Slight improvements to junction safety.
	Reduce congestion on the local road network;	N/A	N/A
	Improve access to existing developments (including town centres) and proposed development sites;	Improved access to the M65 from Accrington as well as through traffic between the Ribble Valley and the A56/M66.	Improved access to the M65 from Accrington as well as through traffic between the Ribble Valley and the A56/M66.
	Improve the effectiveness of public transport facilities within the study area; and	N/A	N/A
	Improve walking and cycling facilities within the study area.	Improved pedestrian connectivity.	N/A
Key Risks *Please identify the key technical, funding and delivery risks associated with this option.*		None identified at present.	None identified at present.
Rationale for Rejection *Please explain why this specific option has been rejected in favour of the proposed scheme.*		Preferred scheme.	The exclusion of pedestrians facilities only marginally reduces congestion. At only a slightly reduced cost, the additional congestion reduction does not represent good value for money. This scheme also lacks any safety improvements for pedestrians, however vehicle safety improvements are expected.

Scheme O		Option 1 (Proposed Scheme)
Option Name *Please insert the name by which the option is known*		Proposed Design Scheme option.
Infrastructure Type *Please provide if different from the proposed scheme.*		Improve signal technology from VA to MOVA and additional provision for pedestrians.
Variation from Proposed Scheme *What are the key differences (characteristics) between the proposed scheme and this option? How is it different?*		N/A
Technical Assessment & Appraisal *Please describe the level of technical appraisal or assessment undertaken – including previous studies and relevant data – to assess this option, including application of the Early Assessment and Sifting Tool.*		Junction operational performance and modelling report from a Linsig model has identified that relatively small scale changes will provide a sound technical solution.
Consultation *Please explain the extent of any stakeholder or wider consultation on the option and summarise the key findings.*		Peer review on various design solutions and consultation on the need for improvement was undertaken as part of the Burnley / Pendle Growth Corridor Strategy development. Representatives of the County Council, Borough Councils, Highways England and relevant industry organisations were present throughout.
Indicative Cost (£M) & Economic Appraisal *Please provide indicative costs if known or provide information on the likely affordability against the headings 'high' 'medium' or 'low.' Also explain any economic appraisal undertaken, including benefit/cost analysis*		£800k
Impact against Strategic Objectives *Please describe how this option delivers against the strategic objectives set out in Section 1.3. Make reference to the outputs of the Early Assessment and Sifting Tool process.*	Improve the operation of the M65 motorway junctions and ensure journey time reliability on the M65 mainline is maintained;	Whilst not an actual motorway junction, the location of this junction and it close proximity to the M65 Junction 7 means improvements here would offer slight improvements to the operation of the motorway junction.
	Improve highway safety issues within the study area;	Slight improvements to junction safety for pedestrians.
	Reduce congestion on the local road network;	The proposed junction design would provide a significant reduction in congestion to the local road network.
	Improve access to existing developments (including town centres) and proposed development sites;	Improvements to this junction will reduce congestion for vehicles travelling accessing Great Harwood and Clayton le Moors and for those accessing the Junction 7 Business Park.
	Improve the effectiveness of public transport facilities within the study area; and	N/A
	Improve walking and cycling facilities within the study area.	The proposed junction design will have improved cycle and pedestrian crossing facilities.
Key Risks *Please identify the key technical, funding and delivery risks associated with this option.*		None identified at present.
Rationale for Rejection *Please explain why this specific option has been rejected in favour of the proposed scheme.*		Preferred scheme.

Scheme P		Option 1 (Proposed Scheme)
Option Name *Please insert the name by which the option is known*		Proposed Design Scheme option.
Infrastructure Type *Please provide if different from the proposed scheme.*		Signalised T junction with pedestrian facilities and MOVA signalling technology.
Variation from Proposed Scheme *What are the key differences (characteristics) between the proposed scheme and this option? How is it different?*		N/A
Technical Assessment & Appraisal *Please describe the level of technical appraisal or assessment undertaken – including previous studies and relevant data – to assess this option, including application of the Early Assessment and Sifting Tool.*		Linsig modelling undertaken to identify the required changes and investigate various lane and staging arrangements.
Consultation *Please explain the extent of any stakeholder or wider consultation on the option and summarise the key findings.*		Peer review on various design solutions and consultation on the need for improvement was undertaken as part of the Burnley / Pendle Growth Corridor Strategy development. Representatives of the County Council, Borough Councils, Highways England and relevant industry organisations were present throughout.
Indicative Cost (£M) & Economic Appraisal *Please provide indicative costs if known or provide information on the likely affordability against the headings 'high' 'medium' or 'low.' Also explain any economic appraisal undertaken, including benefit/cost analysis*		£730k
Impact against Strategic Objectives *Please describe how this option delivers against the strategic objectives set out in Section 1.3. Make reference to the outputs of the Early Assessment and Sifting Tool process.*	Improve the operation of the M65 motorway junctions and ensure journey time reliability on the M65 mainline is maintained;	Whilst not an actual motorway junction, the location of this junction and it close proximity to the M65 Junction 7 means improvements here would offer slight improvements to the operation of the motorway junction.
	Improve highway safety issues within the study area;	Slight improvements to junction safety for pedestrians.
	Reduce congestion on the local road network;	The proposed junction design would provide a significant reduction in congestion to the local road network.
	Improve access to existing developments (including town centres) and proposed development sites;	Improvements to this junction will reduce congestion for vehicles travelling accessing Great Harwood and Clayton le Moors and for those accessing the Junction 7 Business Park.
	Improve the effectiveness of public transport facilities within the study area; and	N/A
	Improve walking and cycling facilities within the study area.	The proposed junction design will have improved cycle and pedestrian crossing facilities.
Key Risks *Please identify the key technical, funding and delivery risks associated with this option.*		None identified at present.
Rationale for Rejection *Please explain why this specific option has been rejected in favour of the proposed scheme.*		Preferred scheme.

Scheme Q		Option 1 (Proposed Scheme)
Option Name *Please insert the name by which the option is known*		Proposed Design Scheme option.
Infrastructure Type *Please provide if different from the proposed scheme.*		Upgrade signal technology from VA to MOVA.
Variation from Proposed Scheme *What are the key differences (characteristics) between the proposed scheme and this option? How is it different?*		N/A
Technical Assessment & Appraisal *Please describe the level of technical appraisal or assessment undertaken – including previous studies and relevant data – to assess this option, including application of the Early Assessment and Sifting Tool.*		Linsig modelling undertaken to identify the required changes and investigate various lane and staging arrangements.
Consultation *Please explain the extent of any stakeholder or wider consultation on the option and summarise the key findings.*		Peer review on various design solutions and consultation on the need for improvement was undertaken as part of the Burnley / Pendle Growth Corridor Strategy development. Representatives of the County Council, Borough Councils, Highways England and relevant industry organisations were present throughout.
Indicative Cost (£M) & Economic Appraisal *Please provide indicative costs if known or provide information on the likely affordability against the headings 'high' 'medium' or 'low.' Also explain any economic appraisal undertaken, including benefit/cost analysis*		£420k
Impact against Strategic Objectives *Please describe how this option delivers against the strategic objectives set out in Section 1.3. Make reference to the outputs of the Early Assessment and Sifting Tool process.*	Improve the operation of the M65 motorway junctions and ensure journey time reliability on the M65 mainline is maintained;	N/A
	Improve highway safety issues within the study area;	N/A
	Reduce congestion on the local road network;	The proposed junction design would provide a significant reduction in congestion to the local road network.
	Improve access to existing developments (including town centres) and proposed development sites;	Improvements to this junction will reduce congestion for vehicles travelling between Accrington and the M65 and for those accessing existing and proposed development sites in the area.
	Improve the effectiveness of public transport facilities within the study area; and	N/A
	Improve walking and cycling facilities within the study area.	N/A
Key Risks *Please identify the key technical, funding and delivery risks associated with this option.*		None identified at present.
Rationale for Rejection *Please explain why this specific option has been rejected in favour of the proposed scheme.*		Preferred scheme.

Scheme R		Option 1 (Proposed Scheme)
Option Name *Please insert the name by which the option is known*		Proposed Design Scheme option.
Infrastructure Type *Please provide if different from the proposed scheme.*		Upgrade signal technology from VA to MOVA.
Variation from Proposed Scheme *What are the key differences (characteristics) between the proposed scheme and this option? How is it different?*		N/A
Technical Assessment & Appraisal *Please describe the level of technical appraisal or assessment undertaken – including previous studies and relevant data – to assess this option, including application of the Early Assessment and Sifting Tool.*		Linsig modelling undertaken to identify the required changes and investigate various lane and staging arrangements.
Consultation *Please explain the extent of any stakeholder or wider consultation on the option and summarise the key findings.*		Peer review on various design solutions and consultation on the need for improvement was undertaken as part of the Burnley / Pendle Growth Corridor Strategy development. Representatives of the County Council, Borough Councils, Highways England and relevant industry organisations were present throughout.
Indicative Cost (£M) & Economic Appraisal *Please provide indicative costs if known or provide information on the likely affordability against the headings 'high' 'medium' or 'low.' Also explain any economic appraisal undertaken, including benefit/cost analysis*		£60k
Impact against Strategic Objectives *Please describe how this option delivers against the strategic objectives set out in Section 1.3. Make reference to the outputs of the Early Assessment and Sifting Tool process.*	Improve the operation of the M65 motorway junctions and ensure journey time reliability on the M65 mainline is maintained;	N/A
	Improve highway safety issues within the study area;	N/A
	Reduce congestion on the local road network;	The proposed junction design would provide a significant reduction in congestion to the local road network.
	Improve access to existing developments (including town centres) and proposed development sites;	Improvements to this junction will reduce congestion for vehicles travelling between Accrington and the M65 and for those accessing existing and proposed development sites in the area.
	Improve the effectiveness of public transport facilities within the study area; and	N/A
	Improve walking and cycling facilities within the study area.	N/A
Key Risks *Please identify the key technical, funding and delivery risks associated with this option.*		None identified at present.
Rationale for Rejection *Please explain why this specific option has been rejected in favour of the proposed scheme.*		Preferred scheme.

Scheme T		Option 1 (Proposed Scheme)
Option Name *Please insert the name by which the option is known*		Proposed Design Scheme option.
Infrastructure Type *Please provide if different from the proposed scheme.*		Passenger facility improvements to bring the station into line with the Rail North Station Quality Standard (SQS).
Variation from Proposed Scheme *What are the key differences (characteristics) between the proposed scheme and this option? How is it different?*		N/A
Technical Assessment & Appraisal *Please describe the level of technical appraisal or assessment undertaken – including previous studies and relevant data – to assess this option, including application of the Early Assessment and Sifting Tool.*		Value for money assessment based on published guidance and previous studies. Methodology assessed the monetary savings per facility per passenger, increase in TOC revenue through GJT changes and savings in MEC's through reduced highway vehicle kilometres.
Consultation *Please explain the extent of any stakeholder or wider consultation on the option and summarise the key findings.*		Representatives from Network Rail, Northern Rail and Rail North have been present at workshops throughout the development of the Burnley / Pendle Growth Corridor Strategy.
Indicative Cost (£M) & Economic Appraisal *Please provide indicative costs if known or provide information on the likely affordability against the headings 'high' 'medium' or 'low.' Also explain any economic appraisal undertaken, including benefit/cost analysis*		£160k
Impact against Strategic Objectives *Please describe how this option delivers against the strategic objectives set out in Section 1.3. Make reference to the outputs of the Early Assessment and Sifting Tool process.*	Improve the operation of the M65 motorway junctions and ensure journey time reliability on the M65 mainline is maintained;	N/A
	Improve highway safety issues within the study area;	N/A
	Reduce congestion on the local road network;	N/A
	Improve access to existing developments (including town centres) and proposed development sites;	Improvements to this station will increase the attractiveness of using Rose Grove station for accessing Burnley and Colne, for business, commuting or leisure.
	Improve the effectiveness of public transport facilities within the study area; and	Significant improvement to public transport facilities.
	Improve walking and cycling facilities within the study area.	Station facility upgrades will include provision for walkers and cyclists.
Key Risks *Please identify the key technical, funding and delivery risks associated with this option.*		None identified at present.
Rationale for Rejection *Please explain why this specific option has been rejected in favour of the proposed scheme.*		Preferred scheme.

Scheme U		Option 1 (Proposed Scheme)
Option Name *Please insert the name by which the option is known*		Proposed Design Scheme option.
Infrastructure Type *Please provide if different from the proposed scheme.*		Additional 68 car parking spaces.
Variation from Proposed Scheme *What are the key differences (characteristics) between the proposed scheme and this option? How is it different?*		N/A
Technical Assessment & Appraisal *Please describe the level of technical appraisal or assessment undertaken – including previous studies and relevant data – to assess this option, including application of the Early Assessment and Sifting Tool.*		Value for money assessment based on published guidance and previous studies. Methodology assessed the monetary savings per facility per passenger, increase in TOC revenue through GJT changes and savings in MEC's through reduced highway vehicle kilometres.
Consultation *Please explain the extent of any stakeholder or wider consultation on the option and summarise the key findings.*		Representatives from Network Rail, Northern Rail and Rail North have been present at workshops throughout the development of the Burnley / Pendle Growth Corridor Strategy.
Indicative Cost (£M) & Economic Appraisal *Please provide indicative costs if known or provide information on the likely affordability against the headings 'high' 'medium' or 'low.' Also explain any economic appraisal undertaken, including benefit/cost analysis*		£750k
Impact against Strategic Objectives *Please describe how this option delivers against the strategic objectives set out in Section 1.3. Make reference to the outputs of the Early Assessment and Sifting Tool process.*	Improve the operation of the M65 motorway junctions and ensure journey time reliability on the M65 mainline is maintained;	N/A
	Improve highway safety issues within the study area;	N/A
	Reduce congestion on the local road network;	Attracting additional trips to the highway network, and reducing car parking on local roads will reduced congestion on local roads.
	Improve access to existing developments (including town centres) and proposed development sites;	Improvements to this station will increase the attractiveness of using Rose Grove station for accessing Burnley and Colne, for business, commuting or leisure.
	Improve the effectiveness of public transport facilities within the study area; and	Significant improvement to public transport facilities.
	Improve walking and cycling facilities within the study area.	N/A
Key Risks *Please identify the key technical, funding and delivery risks associated with this option.*		None identified at present.
Rationale for Rejection *Please explain why this specific option has been rejected in favour of the proposed scheme.*		Preferred scheme.