

Annex 2 – Assessment of options by success criteria

Success Factor	Option 5(i) 2021: CAZ B GM-wide, CAZ D in IRR 2023: CAZ C GM-wide	Option 5(ii) 2021: CAZ B GM-wide, CAZ D & all diesel cars charged in IRR 2023: CAZ C GM-wide	Option 8 2021: CAZ B GM-wide, 2023: CAZ C GM-wide	Summary
Compliance in the shortest possible time Which option reduces to zero the number of locations predicted to be in exceedance of the legal limits of NO ₂ concentrations in the shortest time?	Yes	Yes	Yes	All Options deliver compliance in 2024, considered to be the shortest possible time for achieving compliance in GM.
Reduction in NO ₂ emissions Which option delivers... The greatest reduction in the number of locations in exceedance (presumed to represent human exposure) in each year?				All Options deliver significant reductions in the number of locations in exceedance of 70-80% in 2021, with Option 5(ii) predicted to marginally deliver the greatest reductions in each year prior to compliance being achieved.
The greatest reduction in NO ₂ concentrations at the roadside in each year prior to compliance being achieved?				All Options deliver reductions in mass emissions across GM of between 20-30% in 2021, with the greatest reductions forecast to be delivered by Option 5(ii).
Compliance without putting other sites closer to exceedance (defined as concentrations of 38-40µg/m ³) than without action?				All Options are forecast to deliver compliance without putting other sites closer to exceedance, risk that Option 5(ii) leads to more re-routing than forecast.
Feasibility Are the measures proposed within the legal powers of the Greater Manchester Local Authorities?				The measures proposed in all Options are within the legal powers of the authorities.
Can a governance route be developed to enable timely local government joint working as required for delivery?				GM has proposed a governance route that facilitates the local government co-operation required for delivery. The complex vehicle change requirements nature of Option 5(ii) is likely to make approvals more difficult.
What is the likelihood of the measures being effective?				Clean Air Zones are presumed to be effective, but there is considerable uncertainty about how drivers will respond within the local context and to a scheme on a region-wide scale. Option 5(ii) is more complex and thus more uncertain.
Is delivery of the option subject to significant risks that make achieving compliance in the shortest possible time less likely?				If the full CAP cannot be delivered or funded, compliance may be delayed e.g. if there is not sufficient time or funds to achieve a clean hackney cab or bus fleet. The Plan is subject to risks in terms of the need for multiple approvals from different bodies; the political sensitivity of the proposals; and the need to run activities in parallel. Option 8 involves one rather than two CAZ schemes so is subject to less risk.
Strategic fit with local strategies and plans Air quality and climate change				All Options deliver improvements in NO ₂ concentrations, and also reduce PM and greenhouse gas emissions.
Transport				All options act to promote sustainable travel and will deliver a cleaner, newer bus and taxi fleet for GM passengers.
Growth				Risk that the city centre CAZ schemes deter housing and employment development; which could impact on the delivery of the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework. Option 8 delivers clean air without this risk.
Economy				Risk that the city centre CAZ schemes affect economic performance. Option 8 delivers clean air without this risk In all Options, CAZs will impose costs on local businesses.
Value for money Estimated value for money of the option compared to the risk of inaction				It would be more cost effective to deliver the changes more slowly; however this is a public health emergency so action is vital. Option 8 delivers compliance at the lowest imposed cost.
Distributional impact Health benefits				All groups will experience health benefits. Those living in areas with the worst air quality and those most vulnerable to the effects of poor air quality will benefit the most.
Accessibility (in terms of journey time and connectivity to opportunities and services)				The scheme brings improved accessibility in terms of small reductions in journey times for road traffic. Option 8 does not impose costs on private cars.
Affordability (for users)				Options 5(i/ii) impose costs affecting low income car drivers, with more vehicles in scope for charges in Option

				5(ii). Option 8 delivers clean air without this risk but still imposes costs on small businesses and sole traders.
Impact on the local economy – considering low income workers, small businesses, town centres and key sectors				All Options impose costs on small businesses and low income professional drivers; proposals to support fleet upgrade mitigate this somewhat. Options 5(i/ii) risk impacts on the city centre economy avoided in Option 8.
Impact on the quality of life of local residents and on equalities				Options 5(i/ii) may affect the quality of life of low income car drivers. Option 8 delivers clean air without this risk. Low income professional drivers may be affected by all Options.
Deliverability The Affordability of the cost of implementation (for the public sector)				Option 8 is the lowest cost option and is thus the most affordable for the public sector.
The Supply-side capacity and capability to deliver the measures outlined in the option				There are concerns about supply side capacity e.g. the availability of specialist compliant vehicles such as hackney cabs, and retrofitting capacity and risks of delays.
The Achievability of delivering the option, considering issues such as difficulty with scale or obtaining resources to implement and operate a measure/option				The scale of the region-wide CAZ, supporting programme and associated cost, and the need for cross-district collaboration, creates delivery risk. This risk is even greater for a city centre CAZ D scheme.