IDOM

Iarnród Éireann Irish Rail

DART+ Maynooth Line - MCA Stage 1

Ashtown Level Crossing Assessment

	Parameter		Criteria	Sub-Criteria (Quantitative/ Qualitative)	Do Nothing	Do Minimum
1	Economy	1.1	Construction and Land Cost	Assessment of cost of construction of option, land costs, acquisition costs and temporary works	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** The level crossing is currently manned. The ongoing cost associated with this control mechanism on the railway is significant.	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** Cost of removing crossing is low in comparison to provision of road crossing.
		1.2	Long Term Maintenance costs	Steel options vs concrete options for structures and maintaining level crossings versus removing them	**Some comparative advantage over other options** The do-nothing scenario would maintain the existing maintenance costs of the level crossing.	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** The closure of the level crossing would remove the maintenance requirement of the level crossing.
		1.3	Traffic Functionality /economic benefit	Benefits to vehicular traffic through reduction in journey time lengths and delays through removal of level crossings. Consideration of potentially longer routes for traffic.	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** Reduced capacity as train frequencies increase; increase in journey times for local residents.	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** Displacement of traffic onto alternative routes; increase in journey times for local residents.
2	Integration	2.1	Transport Integration	Impact on scope for and ease of interchange between modes. Impact on the operation of other transport services both during construction and in operation. New interchange nodes and facilities; Reduced walking and wait times associated with interchanges. Modal shift figures during construction and operations. Changes to journey times to transport nodes.	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** GDA Cycle Network Plan cannot be realised with such poor connectivity. Increased delays on bus routes. Reduced access to train station and car park.	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** Inconsistent with GDA Cycle Network Plan - which shows a secondary route on Ashtown Road; Disruption to bus routes; Slight reduction in accessibility of train station.
		2.2	Land Use Integration	Impact on land use strategies and regional and local plans. Assessment of support for land use factors local land use and planning. Inclusion of project in relevant local and regional planning documents.	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** Retaining the level crossing goes against national and regional planning policy and sustainable mobility (NSO4 of the NPF) and Dublin MASP with regards to the DART Maynooth: Expansion Programme and also FDP and DCC local policies regarding the DART Exp. The retention of the level crossing in it's current form would not support the delivery of a sustainable public transport system for a growing population.	**Some comparative advantage over other options** At local planning policy level, this option does not impact on either the Fingal DP or DCC planning policies/objectives. However, closure of the level crossing with no pedestrian, cycle or vehicular access would influence future planning & transport development - yet to be determined. For example, future development that will be located in the Navan Road Parkway LAP and the Ashtown – Pellestown LAP 2014. (subject to details of these plans and traffic studies).
		2.3	Geographical Integration	Impact on improvement of external links. Desire to link various geographical – mostly neutral due to localised nature of the level	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** Original Distance roundabout to roundabout 500m retained.	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** Shortest diversion route is 4.3km (8.6x diversion route).
		2.4	Other Government Policy	Integration with Government Policy, Smarter Travel, Investment Programmes, rail safety, electrification etc	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** Maintaining the crossing does not meet government policy.	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** Closing the crossing with no other alternative meets government policy but not ideal.
3	Environment	3.1	Noise and Vibration	Estimated number of people likely to be affected by transport related noise with the scheme within 50m.	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** Retains vehicular traffic which will impact a low number of sensitive receptors in proximity.	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** Removes vehicular traffic and minimal construction phase.
		3.2	Air Quality and Climate	Local air quality effects. Number of receptors within 50m.	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** Retains vehicular traffic with which will impact a low number of sensitive receptors in proximity.	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** Removes vehicular traffic and minimal construction phase.
		3.3	Landscape and Visual (including light)	Key landscape characteristics affected; Effects on listed/ key views; Impact on landscape character.	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** No impact on existing landscape or visual characteristics.	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** No impact on existing landscape or visual characteristics.
		3.4	Biodiversity (flora and fauna)	Potential compliance/conflict with biodiversity objectives; Indirect impacts on protected species, designated sites; Overall effect on nature conservation	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** No direct impacts.	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** No direct impacts.
		3.5	Cultural, Archaeological and Architectural Heritage	Overall effect on cultural, archaeological and architecture heritage resource. Likely effects on RPS, National Monuments, SMRs, Conservation areas, etc. Number of designated sites/structures (by level of	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** No direct impacts.	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** No direct impacts.
		3.6	Water Resources	Overall potential significant effects on water resource attributes likely to be affected during construction and operation.	**Some comparative advantage over other options** Has some comparative advantage over other options.	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** Removes vehicular traffic born pollutants and minimal construction phase. The Do Minimum Option is advantageous across all sub-criteria and has a significant comparative advantage compared to other options overall.
		3.7	Agriculture and Non-Agricultural	Overall impact on land take & property. Number of properties to be impacted/acquired. Likely temporary or permanent severance effects, etc.	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** No direct impacts.	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** No direct impacts.
		3.8	Geology and Soils (including Waste)	Soils and Geology and likely impact on geological resources based on preliminary/likely construction details. Soil resources to be developed/removed. Existing information relating	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** No geological heritage impacts at Ashtown (nearest is Phoenix Park). Main impacts will be in fill requirements and availability of resources.	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** No direct impacts
		3.9	Radiation and Stray Current	Overall likely impact on existing sources of electromagnetic radiation.	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** No changes from an EMI perspective therefore advantage over other options.	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** No changes from an EMI perspective therefore advantage over other options.
4	Accessibility & Social inclusion	4.1	Impact on Vulnerable Groups	Safety for Rail users – removal of LC positive in this respect	**Some comparative advantage over other options** Original Distance roundabout to roundabout 500m retained. Due to level crossing closed longer difficulty in maintaining connectivity.	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** Shortest diversion route is 4.3km (8.6x diversion route).
		4.2	Stations Accessibility	Quality of Access for these road users, lengths of diversions, removal of interface with rail and other modes of transport	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** Original Distance roundabout to roundabout 500m retained	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** Shortest diversion route is 4.3km (8.6x diversion route).
		4.3	Social Inclusion	Quality of Access for these road users. removal of interfaces	**Some comparative advantage over other options** Original Distance roundabout to roundabout 500m retained. Due to level crossing closed longer difficulty in maintaining connectivity.	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** Shortest diversion route is 4.3km (8.6x diversion route).
5	Safety	5.1	Rail Safety	Safety for Rail users – removal of LC positive in this respect	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** Maintaining the crossing would have a significant disadvantage to rail safety for people still crossing the rail.	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** Option removes the rail - road interface
		5.2	Vehicular Traffic Safety	Quality of Access for these road users, lengths of diversions, removal of interface with rail and other modes of transport	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** Maintaining the crossing would have a significant disadvantage to rail safety for vehicles crossing the rail.	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** Closing the crossing with no alternative would have a slight disadvantage as it would divert traffic onto longer routes.
		5.3	Pedestrian, Cyclist and Vulnerable Road user Safety	Quality of Access for these road users. removal of interfaces	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** Maintaining the crossing would have a significant disadvantage to rail safety for pedestrians, cyclists and vulnerable road users crossing the rail.	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** Shortest diversion route is 4.3km (8.6x diversion route).
6	Physical Activity	6.1	Connectivity to adjoining cycling facilities	Analysis of the extent that the scheme connects with cycle tracks.	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** No cycle tracks currently present on the immediately surrounding road network, but increased closures of the level crossing would reduce access to the Royal Canal Greenway. See also Transport Integration above.	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** No cycle tracks on the immediately surrounding road network, but the closure of the level crossing would reduce access to the Royal Canal Greenway. See also Transport Integration above.
		6.2	Permeability and local connectivity opportunity	Journey Time and lengths of diversions for active modes and numbers affected. Analysis of the connectivity between level crossing and	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** Reduced connectivity across railway as closures become more frequent with increased train frequencies.	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** Severely curtailed cycle permeability; severance of pedestrian connectivity except through train station, with significant consequent diversions of over 2km in each direction.

	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
1.1	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** This option is considered to be impracticable due to the direct impacts on the community immediately in the vicinity of the level crossing. The multistorey complex to the north incorporates a streetscape and extensive underground carpark. The impact on these properties of a bridge over or under the streetscapp would be inordinately impactful. This option is set aside.	**Some comparative advantage over other options** Construction cost impacts are high due to direct impacts on canal and existing rail and more difficult construction. Land costs lower than option to east into zoned lands.	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** Option will have direct impacts on existing apartment building including impacts on basements and access and subsequent devaluation of property and impacts
1.2	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** This option is set aside - see 1.1 above	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** Higher amounts of maintenance and inspections are anticipated with the introduction of an underbridge.	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** An overbridge would increase the maintenance requirements over a level crossing, though it would not be significantly more so than other options.
1.3	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** This option is set aside - see 1.1 above	**Some comparative advantage over other options** Improvement in journey times; potential for induced trips; potential to increase congestion at Ashtown Roundabout as a result of induced traffic.	**Some comparative advantage over other options** Improvement in journey times; potential for induced trips; potential to increase congestion at Ashtown Roundabout as a result of induced traffic.
2.1	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** This option is set aside - see 1.1 above	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** Improved interchange between modes, subject to satisfactory access to train station platforms. General reduction in journey times. The route is largely on the desire line of transport customers	**Some comparative advantage over other options** Improved interchange between modes, subject to satisfactory access to train station platforms. General reduction in journey times. There may be severance to existing connectivity on the northern side of the canal and railway as a result of the construction of the required approach ramps.
2.2	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** This option is set aside - see 1.1 above	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** Underbridge on mill lane: At local planning policy level, a small section of this option is located on DCC (DP) lands close to Ashtown Station, zoned Z11 and also contains the conservation area of the Royal Canal. The remainder of this option road is located in FDP area: relevant zoning includes 'High Technology' (to the south of the Canal) and travel north of the canal into the start of a large area of land zoned 'High Amenity' (north of the canal). This option is within close proximity to the future Navan Road Parkway LAP (map based objective: LAP 13.B) and is likely to support overall land use and transport planning integration.	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** Overbridge on Mill Lane: At local planning policy level, Option 3 is similar to Option 2, however its entire extent is located within the FDP area only: relevant zoning includes 'High Technology' (to the south of the Canal). This route travels along the eastern boundary of a large area of land zoned 'High Amenity' (north of the canal). The introduction of a new overbridge in a High Amenity area would not work towards 'Objective NH51 (FCDP) "*Protect High Amenity areas from inappropriate development and reinforce their character, distinctiveness and sense of place*". However, for the most part this option follows existing road networks and while impacting on the high amenity lands comparatively it would not be as bad as Option 4. The option travels east of the future Navan Road Parkway LAP (map based objective: LAP 13.B) which would be linked by vehicular, pedestrian and cycle access. This option is likely to work towards overall land use and transport planning integration in this local area. Subject to traffic data.
2.3	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** This option is set aside - see 1.1 above	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** Diverted distance route is 572m (1.1x diversion route).	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** Diverted distance route is 565m (1.1x diversion route).
2.4	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** This option is set aside - see 1.1 above	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** Providing vehicular and pedestrian access is ideal.	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** Providing vehicular and pedestrian access is ideal.
3.1	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** This option is set aside - see 1.1 above	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** 85 dwellings within 100m. Moves traffic to rear of apt block from current road layout.	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** 88 dwellings within 100m. Moves traffic to rear of apt block from current road layout.
3.2	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** This option is set aside - see 1.1 above	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** Moves traffic to rear of apt block from current road layout. 39 dwellings within 50m plus apt blocks where traffic has been moved from front to back. Embodied carbon for new bridge.	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** Pedestrian crossing will have impacts during construction. 15 dwellings plus apt blocks within 50m of both vehicular route and pedestrian crossing.
3.3	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** This option is set aside - see 1.1 above	**Some comparative advantage over other options** Online overbridge option is likely to have very significant impact on visual setting and public realm of Rathborne Village Centre. Significant visual impact for setting of 10th Lock on Royal Canal and hence for on Objective CH43 of Fingal Development Plan Significant impact due to removal of roadside tree-lined hedgerows leading to railway - significant visual impact for properties in Martin Savage Park and for Ashtown Stables. [Note: As alignment has to bridge over the railway, I do not see why the existing canal (Longford) bridge would have to be removed/demolished as suggested. However, it is accept that it may be desirable to remove for other reasons. Was an online underbridging of the railway/canal considered? Insufficient design detail provided for full assessment of likely impact - especially north of canal].	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** Option will have a very significant impact on boundary trees/woodlands, entrance gates and lodge at Ashton (Ashtown) House, a protected structure (No. 690). Lands of Ashton House and the corridor of the Royal Canal west of Longford Bridge are zoned High Amenity and identified as a Nature Development Area in the Fingal Development Plan. Very significant visual impact for setting of 10th Lock on Royal Canal. Significant impact due to removal of roadside tree-lined hedgerows leading to railway - significant impact for Ashtown Stables. NOTE: Insufficient design detail provided for full assessment of likely impact.
3.4	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** This option is set aside - see 1.1 above	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** Hydrologically connected to South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA. No risk of LSE. Potential impacts to Royal Canal pNHA. Demolition of old Mill lane buildings may impact bats	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** Hydrologically connected to South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA. No risk of LSE. Potential impacts to Royal Canal pNHA. Demolition of old Mill lane buildings may impact bats. Loss of woodland.
3.5	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** This option is set aside - see 1.1 above	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** Direct impacts on gate lodge, entrance and demesne associated with Ashtown House (RPS 0690). Indirect impacts on mill and outbuildings (RPS) and Pelletstown House (structure of architectural merit). Potential direct impacts on archaeological deposits that may survive in greenfield areas and path of former road way	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** Direct impacts on gate lodge, entrance and demesne associated with Ashtown House (RPS 0690). Indirect impacts on mill and outbuildings (RPS) and Pelletstown House (structure of architectural merit). Potential direct impacts on archaeological deposits that may survive in greenfield areas and path of former road way.
3.6	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** This option is set aside - see 1.1 above	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** Underpass excavations pose potential risk to Groundwater quality. Has some comparative disadvantage over other options.	**Some comparative advantage over other options** Has some comparative advantage over other options.
3.7	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** This option is set aside - see 1.1 above	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** The non-agricultural impact will involve the acquisition of one residential property and a commercial property. The agricultural impact will have a profound impact on an equine holding (Ashtown Riding Stables).	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** The non-agricultural impact will involve the acquisition of one residential property and a commercial property. The agricultural impact will have a profound impact on an equine holding (Ashtown Riding Stables).
3.8	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** This option is set aside - see 1.1 above	**Some comparative advantage over other options** Underbridge option means that some materials may arise, which could possibly be suitable for reuse elsewhere on the project (Minor positive). This is balanced by an associated impact of interfering in the canal and existing railway, which may require specific materials be imported. Involves other geotechnical risks to design and construction.	**Some comparative advantage over other options** Overbridge options require increased fill import to the site (Minor negative).
3.9	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** This option is set aside - see 1.1 above	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** It is assumed that the routing of the cabling, the location of existing substations, hubs etc. along the line will be changed or impacted by the selection of any of the options over the entire project. All Do-Something options are comparable from an EMI perspective at this stage in the assessment.	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** It is assumed that the routing of the cabling, the location of existing substations, hubs etc. along the line will be changed or impacted by the selection of any of the options over the entire project. All Do-Something options are comparable from an EMI perspective at this stage in the assessment.
4.1	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** This option is set aside - see 1.1 above	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** Diverted distance route is 572m (1.1x diversion route).	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** Diverted distance route is 565m (1.1x diversion route) steep gradients on north side of option will be a disadvantage to vulnerable road users.
4.2	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** This option is set aside - see 1.1 above	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** Providing a segregated crossing would have a significant advantage as vehicular traffic is not crossing the live rail.	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** Diverted distance route is 565m (1.1x diversion route).
4.3	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** This option is set aside - see 1.1 above	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** Diverted distance route is 572m (1.1x diversion route).	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** Diverted distance route is 565m (1.1x diversion route).
5.1	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** This option is set aside - see 1.1 above	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** Option removes the rail - road interface	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** Option removes the rail - road interface
5.2	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** This option is set aside - see 1.1 above	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** Providing a segregated crossing would have a significant advantage as vehicular traffic is not crossing the live rail	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** Providing a segregated crossing would have a significant advantage as vehicular traffic is not crossing the live rail
5.3	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** This option is set aside - see 1.1 above	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** Diverted distance route is 572m (1.1x diversion route).	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** Diverted distance route is 565m (1.1x diversion route) steep gradients on north side of option will be a disadvantage to vulnerable road users.
6.1	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** This option is set aside - see 1.1 above	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** The scheme should include cycle tracks on the approaches to realise the objective of the Cycle Network Plan.	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** The scheme should include cycle tracks on the approaches to realise the objective of the Cycle Network Plan.
6.2	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** This option is set aside - see 1.1 above	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** Existing connectivity will be enhanced by the removal of the obstacle posed by the existing level crossing.	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** Existing connectivity will be enhanced by the removal of the obstacle posed by the existing level crossing.

	Option 4 & 4a	Option 4 & 4b	Option 5
1.1	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** Additional pedestrian / cycle structure required in Ashtown.	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** Additional pedestrian / cycle structure required in Ashtown.	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** construction costs lower than Option 2 but with impact on zoned lands and impact on sports facilities to the south.
1.2	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** Higher amounts of maintenance and inspections are anticipated with the introduction of an underbridge.	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** Higher amounts of maintenance and inspections are anticipated with the introduction of an underbridge	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** Higher amounts of maintenance and inspections are anticipated with the introduction of an underbridge.
1.3	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** Some improvement in journey time; potential for induced trips.	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** Some improvement in journey time; potential for induced trips.	**Some comparative advantage over other options** Improvement in journey times; potential for induced trips; potential to increase congestion at Ashtown Roundabout as a result of induced traffic.
2.1	**Some comparative advantage over other options** Improved interchange between modes, subject to satisfactory access to train station platforms. General reduction in journey times. Bus services may be impacted as a result of the proposed diversion along the narrow River Road.	**Some comparative advantage over other options** Improved interchange between modes, subject to satisfactory access to train station platforms. General reduction in journey times. Bus services may be impacted as a result of the proposed diversion along the narrow River Road.	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** Improved interchange between modes, subject to satisfactory access to train station platforms. General reduction in journey times. Bus services may be impacted as a result of headroom restrictions on the proposed route.
2.2	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** At local level, the majority Option 4 is located within lands zoned by Fingal DP as "High Amenity". The route travels close to the boundary of the existing Coolmine Rugby Club and could support Fingal DP local map-based Specific Objective 136 "Facilitate pedestrian access from Coolmine Rugby Club grounds over the Canal adjacent to the Phoenix Park Railway Station". However, the introduction of a new road infrastructure in 'High Amenity' zoned land would go against Objective NH51 (FCDP) "Protect High Amenity areas from inappropriate development and reinforce their character, distinctiveness and sense of place". However, in terms of future land use factors Option 4 could create a direct link into map based objective (LAP13.B - Navan Road Parkway Local Area Plan) and also linking into LAP13.C. Option 4a section would result in a direct pedestrian and cycle access from the station into the "The Village Centre" via a new tunnel structure. This has some comparative disadvantage due to the impact on zoned high amenity lands	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** At local level, the majority Option 4 is located within lands zoned by Fingal DP as "High Amenity". The route travels close to the boundary of the existing Coolmine Rugby Club and could support Fingal DP local map-based Specific Objective 136 "Facilitate pedestrian access from Coolmine Rugby Club grounds over the Canal adjacent to the Phoenix Park Railway Station" However, the introduction of a new road infrastructure in "High Amenity" zoned land would go against Objective NH51 (FCDP) "Protect High Amenity areas from inappropriate development and reinforce their character, distinctiveness and sense of place". However, in terms of future land use factors Option 4 could create a direct link into map based objective (LAP13.B - Navan Road Parkway Local Area Plan and also linking into LAP13.C. Option 4b section would result in a direct pedestrian and cycle access from the station into residential zoned lands associated with Ashtown – Pelletstown LAP 2014. This has some comparative disadvantage due to the impact on zoned high amenity lands.	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** Option 5 (is similar to 6 and 7), located entirely within the DCDP area. This option is located on lands zoned Z11 'canal, coastal and river amenities' associated with the royal canal and travels along the north edge of the (Z9 zoned) existing Martin Savage Park (GAA pitch). North of the Canal it travels through currently a greenfield site, zoned for residential use in the Pelletstown Action Area Plan 2014. This option goes against the LAP residential zoning however, subject to traffic and design studies it may support the overall future land use and transport planning integration. Option 5 is at some disadvantage due to the impact on the functionality of the GAA/ amenity lands however it still at a disadvantage due to the negative effects on zoned residential land. (even though it is less than options 6 and 7)
2.3	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** Diverted distance route is 2.2km (4.5x diversion route).	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** Diverted distance route 2.2km (4.5x diversion route)	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** Diverted distance route is 821m (1.6x diversion route).
2.4	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** Providing vehicular and pedestrian access is ideal.	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** Providing vehicular and pedestrian access is ideal.	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** Providing vehicular and pedestrian access is ideal.
3.1	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** operational traffic impacts only affects 1 dwelling. Pedestrian crossing will have impacts during construction. 47 dwellings within 100m of both vehicular route and pedestrian crossing. Only 1 property within 100m of the vehicular route.	**Some comparative advantage over other options** operational traffic impacts only affects 1 dwelling. Pedestrian crossing will have impacts during construction. 123 dwellings within 100m of both vehicular route and pedestrian crossing. Only 1 property within 100m of the vehicular route.	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** 83 dwellings within 100m. Moves traffic to rear of apt block from current road layout.
3.2	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** Pedestrian crossing will have impacts during construction. 14 dwellings plus apt blocks within 50m of pedestrian crossing. Only 1 property within 50m of the vehicular route of operational traffic. Two separate bridges will increase embodied carbon for this option.	**Some comparative advantage over other options** Pedestrian crossing will have impacts during construction. 3 dwellings plus apt blocks within 50m of pedestrian crossing. Only 1 property within 50m of the vehicular route of operational traffic. Underpass may decrease embodied carbon over overbridge option.	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** 16 dwellings plus apartment buildings within 50m. Moves traffic to rear of apt block from current road layout.
3.3	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** Alignment will have a very significant impact on the landscape character and structure, trees and woodlands of lands between Ashtown Lodge (and its associated lodge) and Coolmine Rugby Club. Alignment will impact existing landscape character of River Road and lands north to the Tolka River. The majority of the lands are laid out in mature parkland with trees, walks, sculptures (?) and boundary woodland - all of which will be impacted by the alignment. The lands and the corridor of the Royal Canal are zoned High Amenity and identified as a Nature Development Area in the Fingal Development Plan. Tree and Woodland preservation objectives in Fingal Development Plan apply to the lands. Tunnel will have a significant impact on boundary trees/woodlands, entrance gates and setting of lodge at Ashton (Ashtown) House, a protected structure (No. 690). Lands of Ashton House and the corridor of the Royal Canal west of Longford Bridge are zoned High Amenity and identified as a Nature Development Area in the Fingal Development Plan. Side slopes (if proposed) would have significant impact due to removal of roadside tree-lined hedgerows leading to railway - significant impact for Ashtown Stables	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** Alignment will a very significant impact on the landscape character and structure, trees and woodlands of lands between Ashtown Lodge (and its associated lodge) and Coolmine Rugby Club. Alignment will impact existing landscape character of River Road and lands north to the Tolka River. The majority of the lands are laid out in mature parkland with trees, walks, sculptures (?) and boundary woodland - all of which will be impacted by the alignment. The lands and the corridor of the Royal Canal are zoned High Amenity and identified as a Nature Development Area in the Fingal Development Plan. Tree and Woodland preservation objectives in Fingal Development Plan apply to the lands. Pedestrian/cycle bridge will have a significant impact on trees/hedgerows along the royal canal and on open space north of Martin Savage Park. The bridge overswings the canal in a visually incongruous manner. Royal canal corridor is a conservation area in the Dublin City Development Plan. Lands south of the canal are zoned open space (Z9) for the protection, provision and improvement of recreational amenity, open space and green networks. NOTE: I believe that the existing pedestrian footbridge at Longford Bridge could be retained if required.	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** Option cuts through a permitted residential development on north side of canal - with very significant implications for the permitted layout (DCC Ref. 3666/15, ABP ref. PL29N.246373). Option will have a significant impact on boundary trees/hedgerows along the railway / canal corridor (a conservation area in the Dublin City Development Plan). Option will have a significant impact on open space at Martin Savage Park, including on Oliver Plunkett's GAA pitches. Option will have very significant visual impact for properties at the north end of Martin Savage Park and for users of the Royal Canal. NOTE: Insufficient design detail provided for full assessment of likely impact. Note: Option cuts through a permitted residential development on north side of canal - with very significant implications for the permitted layout (DCC Ref. 3666/15, ABP ref. PL29N.246373 - Active planning application 2596/20)
3.4	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** Hydrologically connected to South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA. No risk of LSE. Potential impacts to Royal Canal pNHA and River Tolka. Loss of woodland, marsh, treeline and hedgerow habitat.	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** Hydrologically connected to South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA. No risk of LSE. Potential impacts to Royal Canal pNHA. Loss of woodland, marsh, treeline and hedgerow habitat.	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** Disturbance to Light-bellied Brent Goose (QI of SPAs) which are known to forage in significant numbers at Ashtown Playing Pitches. Project could screen in for AA. Potential impacts to Royal Canal pNHA. Habitat loss.
3.5	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** Direct impacts on River Tolka and former demesne landscapes associated with Ashbrook (RPS) & Ashtown Lodge. Potential direct impacts on archaeological deposits that may survive in greenfield areas.	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** Direct impacts on entrance and demesne associated with Ashtown House (RPS 0690). Indirect impacts on mill and outbuildings (RPS) and Pelletstown House (structure of architectural merit). Indirect impacts on canal and lock (RPS).	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** No direct impacts predicted upon sites/structures subject to statutory protection. Potential direct impacts on archaeological deposits that may survive within greenfield areas.
3.6	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** Crossing of Tolka is within floodplain creating potential increase in flood risk to neighbouring lands. Creates potential pathway for pollutants to Tolka River resulting on negative impacts to Water Quality. Underpass excavations also pose potential risk to Groundwater quality. Options 4a is disadvantageous across all sub-criteria and has a significant comparative disadvantage over other options	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** Crossing of Tolka is within floodplain creating potential increase in flood risk to neighbouring lands. Creates potential pathway for pollutants to Tolka River resulting on negative impacts to Water Quality. Options 4b has some comparative disadvantage over other options.	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** Underpass excavations pose potential risk to Groundwater quality. Has some comparative disadvantage over other options.
3.7	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** The non-agricultural impact will involve the acquisition of one residential property and a commercial property. The agricultural impact will have a profound impact on an equine holding (Ashtown Riding Stables).	**Some comparative advantage over other options** Will have some advantages over other options given the reduced impact of the pedestrian / cycling overbridge of the rail line and canal	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** Direct impact on landscaped embankments and green area between Ashtown railway station and Martin Savage Park. Land acquisition will be required.
3.8	**Some comparative advantage over other options** Chance of additional earthworks requirements on approach to river to the north (Minor negative) but has not been observed (walkover survey / investigation required) and is possibly unlikely based on available mapping. Option 4A footbridge has higher comparative earthworks needs.	**Some comparative advantage over other options** Chance of additional earthworks requirements on approach to river to the north (Minor negative) but has not been observed (walkover survey / investigation required).	**Some comparative advantage over other options** Overbridge options require increased fill import to the site (Minor negative).
3.9	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** It is assumed that the routing of the cabling, the location of existing substations, hubs etc. along the line will be changed or impacted by the selection of any of the options over the entire project. All Do-Something options are comparable from an EMI perspective at this stage in the assessment.	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** It is assumed that the routing of the cabling, the location of existing substations, hubs etc. along the line will be changed or impacted by the selection of any of the options over the entire project. All Do-Something options are comparable from an EMI perspective at this stage in the assessment.	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** It is assumed that the routing of the cabling, the location of existing substations, hubs etc. along the line will be changed or impacted by the selection of any of the options over the entire project. All Do-Something options are comparable from an EMI perspective at this stage in the assessment.
4.1	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** Diverted distance route is 798m (1.6x diversion route).	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** Diverted distance route is 798m (1.6x diversion route).	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** Diverted distance route is 821m (1.6x diversion route).
4.2	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** Providing a segregated crossing would have a significant advantage as vehicular traffic is not crossing the live rail.	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** Providing a segregated crossing would have a significant advantage as vehicular traffic is not crossing the live rail.	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** Diverted distance route is 821m (1.6x diversion route).
4.3	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** Diverted distance route 798m (1.6x diversion route) but existing vehicular route severed	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** Diverted distance route 798m (1.6x diversion route) but existing vehicular route severed	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** Diverted distance route is 821m (1.6x diversion route).
5.1	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** Option removes the rail - road interface	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** Option removes the rail - road interface	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** Option removes the rail - road interface. Limited clearance underbridge poses potential hazard to structure and in turn rail users if a bridge strike occurs.
5.2	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** Providing a segregated crossing would have a significant advantage as vehicular traffic is not crossing the live rail	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** Providing a segregated crossing would have a significant advantage as vehicular traffic is not crossing the live rail	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** Providing a segregated crossing would have a significant advantage as vehicular traffic is not crossing the live rail. Limited clearance underbridge poses potential hazard to high vehicles and and their occupants.
5.3	**Some comparative advantage over other options** Diverted distance route 798m (1.6x diversion route).	**Some comparative advantage over other options** Diverted distance route is 798m (1.6x diversion route).	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** Diverted distance route is 821m (1.6x diversion route).
6.1	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** The scheme should include cycle tracks on the approaches to realise the objective of the Cycle Network Plan.	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** The scheme should include cycle tracks on the approaches to realise the objective of the Cycle Network Plan.	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** The scheme should include cycle tracks on the approaches to realise the objective of the Cycle Network Plan.
6.2	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** Existing connectivity will be enhanced by the removal of the obstacle posed by the existing level crossing.	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** Existing connectivity will be enhanced by the removal of the obstacle posed by the existing level crossing.	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** Existing connectivity will be enhanced by the removal of the obstacle posed by the existing level crossing.

	Option 6	Option 7	Option 8	Option 9
1.1	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** Construction costs lowest for option but impact on zoned lands to the north and impact on sports facilities to the south would result in higher costs.	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** Construction costs higher than option 6 and greater impact on lands north and south would result in higher costs.	**Some comparative advantage over other options** Construction costs of this option will be comparative to other options as the provision of a pedestrian cycle bridge within the canal environs will require significant temporary and permanent works. The cost to acquire land will be lower than other options providing full access	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options.** The cost and disruption of a scheme of this nature would be unsustainable and unjustifiable in comparison to other options available. It is proposed to discard this option without further consideration.
1.2	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** An overbridge would increase the maintenance requirements over a level crossing, though it would not be significantly more so than other options	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** An overbridge would increase the maintenance requirements over a level crossing, though it would not be significantly more so than other options	**Some comparative advantage over other options** A pedestrian/cyclist overbridge would require minimal maintenance in short term with regular inspections and remedial works in the long term. The long term maintenance low compared to other options	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** This option is set aside - see 1.1 above
1.3	**Some comparative advantage over other options** Improvement in journey times; potential for induced trips; potential to increase congestion at Ashtown Roundabout as a result of induced traffic.	**Some comparative advantage over other options** Improvement in journey times; potential for induced trips; potential to increase congestion on Navan Road at proposed new junction.	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** Displacement of mobility impaired and cycle traffic onto ramped alternative routes; increase in journey times for local residents. Removal of vehicular access over the level crossing results in displaced flows - 867 vehicles AM peak hour and 705 vehicles PM peak hour. Additional traffic delay will result along adjacent access routes - 18% AM peak hour and 12% PM peak hour. Benchmark journey times will increase by up to 38%,	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** This option is set aside - see 1.1 above
2.1	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** Improved interchange between modes, subject to satisfactory access to train station platforms. General reduction in journey times. There may be severance to existing connectivity on the northern side of the canal and railway as a result of the construction of the required approach ramps.	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** Improved interchange between modes, subject to satisfactory access to train station platforms. General reduction in journey times. There may be severance to existing connectivity on the northern side of the canal and railway as a result of the construction of the required approach ramps.	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** This option reduces the scope for interaction between modes of transport I ncomparison to all other options	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** This option is set aside - see 1.1 above
2.2	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** Option 6 (is similar to 5 and 7) located entirely within the DCDP area. This option is located on lands zoned Z11 'canal, coastal and river amenities' associated with the royal canal and travels along the north edge of the existing Martin Savage Park (GAA pitch)(Z9 zoned). North of the Canal it travels through currently a greenfield site, zoned for residential use in the Pelletstown Action Area Plan 2014 . This option goes against the LAP residential zoning however, subject to traffic and design studies it may support the overall future land use and transport planning integration. Option 6 is at some disadvantage (over option 7) as it will have less of an impact on the functionality of the GAA/ amenity lands however it will also have a disadvantage due on future zoned residential land.	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** Option 7 (is similar to 5 and 6) and is located entirely within the DCDP area. This option is located on lands zoned Z11 'canal, coastal and river amenities' associated with the royal canal and travels through the existing Martin Savage Park (GAA pitch). North of the Canal it travels through currently a greenfield site, zoned for residential use in the Pelletstown Action Area Plan 2014 . This option goes against the LAP residential zoning however, subject to traffic and design studies it may support the overall future land use and transport planning integration. Option 7 is more disadvantageous than 5 and 6 due to impact on the profound impact on the functionality of the GAA/ amenity lands and larger area of zoned residential land impacted.	**Some comparative advantage over other options** Option 8 is located entirely within the DCDP area. Option 8 is located within lands zoned for Z9 'Amenity/Open Space/Green Network' and Z11 'canal, coastal and river amenities' associated with the royal canal. Option 8 is likely to have an impact on Z9 and Z11 zoning objectives, however the impact is likely to be lower as Option 8 only provides access to sustainable modes of travel when compared with other options. Option 8 only accommodates pedestrian and cycle access to residential zoned lands associated with Ashtown – Pelletstown LAP 2014, however without provision of alternative infrastructure for vehicular traffic. By maintaining pedestrian and cycle access, this route will still support the future development as part of the Ashtown - Pellestown LAP 2014 while also providing an opportunity for non-vehicular modes of travel in the area.	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** This option is set aside - see 1.1 above
2.3	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** Diverted distance route is 1.1km (2x diversion route).	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** Diverted distance route is 974m (1.9x diversion route).	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** There is significant development planned in the vicinity of Ashtown. This option does not address the Geographical Integrations needs of the location.	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** This option is set aside - see 1.1 above
2.4	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** Providing vehicular and pedestrian access is ideal.	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** Providing vehicular and pedestrian access is ideal.	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** The GDATS includes an objective to enhance linkages to planned developments. This option runs contrary to the objective.	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** This option is set aside - see 1.1 above
3.1	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** Moves traffic to new route away from current route and therefore impacts on properties. 114 dwellings within 100m.	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** Moves traffic to new route away from current route and therefore impacts on properties. 88 properties within 100m.	**Some comparative advantage over other options** Operational traffic impacts only affects 1 dwelling. Pedestrian crossing will have impacts during construction. 123 dwellings within 100m of both vehicular route and pedestrian crossing. Only 1 property within 100m of the vehicular route.	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** This option is set aside - see 1.1 above
3.2	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** Moves traffic to new route away from current route and therefore impacts on properties. 22 dwellings within 50m plus some a number of apt blocks. This option also brings additional traffic to proximity of a school (highly sensitive receptor). Additional road infrastructure would increase embodied carbon for this option.	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** Moves traffic to new route away from current route and therefore impacts on properties. 59 properties plus apartment blocks within 50m. Additional road infrastructure would increase embodied carbon for this option.	**Some comparative advantage over other options** Pedestrian crossing will have impacts during construction. 3 dwellings plus apt blocks within 50m of pedestrian crossing. Only 1 property within 50m of the vehicular route of operational traffic.	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** This option is set aside - see 1.1 above
3.3	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** Option will have a significant impact on boundary trees/hedgerows along the railway / canal corridor (a conservation area in the Dublin City Development Plan). Option will have a very significant impact on open space and Oliver Plunket's GAA club/pitches at Martin Savage Park. Options would have a very significant impact on mature tree-lined hedgerow and linear open space between the established residential developments of Kempton Green and Ashbrook. NOTE: Option cuts through a permitted residential development on north side of canal - with very significant implications for the permitted layout (DCC Ref. 3666/15, ABP ref. PL29N.246373 - Active planning application 2596/20) Option will have very significant visual impact for properties at Ashbrook, Kempton Green, and for users of Martin Savage Open Space and the Royal Canal.	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** Option will have a significant visual impact along the canal corridor and for users of the canal (a conservation area in the Dublin City Development Plan). Option will have a very significant impact on open space and sports pitches at Martin Savage Park. Option will have very significant visual impact for properties at the north end of Martin Savage Open Space. Note: Option cuts through a permitted residential development on north side of canal - with very significant implications for the permitted layout (DCC Ref. 3666/15, ABP ref. PL29N.246373 - Active planning application 2596/20).	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** The bridge overswings the canal in a visually incongruous manner. Royal canal corridor is a conservation area in the Dublin City Development Plan. Lands south of the canal are zoned open space (Z9) for the protection, provision and improvement of recreational amenity, open space and green networks. NOTE: I believe that the existing pedestrian footbridge at Longford Bridge could be retained if required.	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** This option is set aside - see 1.1 above
3.4	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** Permanent loss of habitat & disturbance to Light-bellied Brent Goose (QI of SPAs) which are known forage in significant numbers at Ashtown Playing Pitches. Project could screen in for AA. Potential impacts to Royal Canal pNHA. Habitat loss.	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** Permanent loss of habitat & disturbance to Light-bellied Brent Goose (QI of SPAs) which are known forage in significant numbers at Ashtown Playing Pitches. Project could screen in for AA. Potential impacts to Royal Canal pNHA. Habitat loss.	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** Hydrologically connected to South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA. No risk of LSE. Potential impacts to Royal Canal pNHA. Loss of woodland, marsh, treeline and hedgerow habitat	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** This option is set aside - see 1.1 above
3.5	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** No direct impacts predicted upon sites/structures subject to statutory protection. Potential direct impacts on archaeological deposits that may survive within greenfield areas.	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** No direct impacts predicted upon sites/structures subject to statutory protection. Potential direct impacts on archaeological deposits that may survive within greenfield areas.	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** Direct impacts on entrance and demesne associated with Ashtown House (RPS 0690). Indirect impacts on mill and outbuildings (RPS) and Pelletstown House (structure of architectural merit). Indirect impacts on canal and lock (RPS).	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** This option is set aside - see 1.1 above
3.6	**Some comparative advantage over other options** Has some comparative advantage over other options.	**Some comparative advantage over other options** Has some comparative advantage over other options.	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** Crossing of Tolka is within floodplain creating potential increase in flood risk to neighbouring lands. Creates potential pathway for pollutants to Tolka River resulting on negative impacts to Water Quality. Underpass excavations also pose potential risk to Groundwater quality.	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** This option is set aside - see 1.1 above
3.7	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** Option 6 will have a significant advantage over the other options due to the reduced impact on the sports club lands.	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** Option 7 will have some comparative disadvantages due to the significant to profound impact on the sports club lands.	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** This option has some impact on the football grounds to the south of the railway. It also requires demolition of the existing privately owned cable stayed footbridge over the canal	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** This option is set aside - see 1.1 above
3.8	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** Some made ground on-site (requires walkover survey / investigation). Overbridge options require increased fill import to the site (Minor negative).	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** Some made ground on-site (requires walkover survey / investigation). Overbridge options require increased fill import to the site (Minor negative). This option appears to have the highest earthworks needs.	**Some comparative advantage over other options** Chance of additional earthworks requirements on approach to river to the north (Minor negative) but has not been observed (walkover survey / investigation required).	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** This option is set aside - see 1.1 above
3.9	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** It is assumed that the routing of the cabling, the location of existing substations, hubs etc. along the line will be changed or impacted by the selection of any of the options over the entire project. All Do-Something options are comparable from an EMI perspective at this stage in the assessment.	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** It is assumed that the routing of the cabling, the location of existing substations, hubs etc. along the line will be changed or impacted by the selection of any of the options over the entire project. All Do-Something options are comparable from an EMI perspective at this stage in the assessment.	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** It is assumed that the routing of the cabling, the location of existing substations, hubs etc. along the line will be changed or impacted by the selection of any of the options over the entire project. All Do-Something options are comparable from an EMI perspective at this stage in the assessment.	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** This option is set aside - see 1.1 above
4.1	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** Diverted distance route is 1.1km (2x diversion route).	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** Diverted distance route is 974m (1.9x diversion route).	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** Diverted distance route is 798m (1.6x diversion route).	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** This option is set aside - see 1.1 above
4.2	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** Providing a segregated crossing would have a significant advantage as vehicular traffic is not crossing the live rail.	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** Diverted distance route is 974m (1.9x diversion route).	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** Providing a segregated crossing would have a significant advantage as vehicular traffic is not crossing the live rail.	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** This option is set aside - see 1.1 above
4.3	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** Diverted distance route is 1.1km (2x diversion route).	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** Diverted distance route is 974m (1.9x diversion route).	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** Diverted distance route 798m (1.6x diversion route) but existing vehicular route severed	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** This option is set aside - see 1.1 above
5.1	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** Option removes the rail - road interface	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** Option removes the rail - road interface	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** Option removes the rail - road interface	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** This option is set aside - see 1.1 above
5.2	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** Providing a segregated crossing would have a significant advantage as vehicular traffic is not crossing the live rail	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** Providing a segregated crossing would have a significant advantage as vehicular traffic is not crossing the live rail	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** Closing the crossing with no alternative would have a slight disadvantage as it would divert traffic onto longer routes.	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** This option is set aside - see 1.1 above
5.3	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** Diverted distance route is 1.1km (2x diversion route).	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** Diverted distance route is 974m (1.9x diversion route).	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** Providing a segregated crossing would have a significant advantage as vehicular traffic is not crossing the live rail	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** This option is set aside - see 1.1 above
6.1	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** The scheme should include cycle tracks on the approaches to realise the objective of the Cycle Network Plan.	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** Cycle tracks should be provided, however, the route will not be as direct as some of the others considered.	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** The scheme should include cycle tracks on the approaches to realise the objective of the Cycle Network Plan.	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** This option is set aside - see 1.1 above
6.2	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** Existing connectivity will be enhanced by the removal of the obstacle posed by the existing level crossing.	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options** Existing connectivity will be improved, however, the route will not be as direct as some of the others considered.	**Significant comparative advantage over other options** Existing connectivity will be enhanced by the removal of the obstacle posed by the existing level crossing.	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options** This option is set aside - see 1.1 above

	Criteria	Do Nothing	Do Minimum	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4 & 4a	Option 4 & 4b	Option 5	Option 6	Option 7	Option 8	Option 9
1	Economy	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options
2	Integration	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options
3	Environment	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options
4	Accessibility and social inclusion	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options
5	Safety	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options
6	Physical Activity	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options
	Progress To Stage 2	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No

IDOM RDD C3 Projects

Iarnród Éireann Irish Rail

DART+ Maynooth Line - MCA Stage 1

Coolmine Level Crossing Assessment

	Parameter		Criteria	Sub-Criteria (Quantitative/ Qualitative)	Do Nothing	Do Minimum	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6	Option 7	Option 8
1	Economy	1.1	Construction and Land Cost	Assessment of cost of construction of option, land costs and temporary works	Some comparative advantage over other options The level crossing is currently manned. The ongoing cost associated with this control mechanism on the railway is significant.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Cost of removing crossing is low in comparison to provision of road crossing.	Some comparative advantage over other options The capital cost of this option is expected to be higher than Option 7, to be equivalent to Option 6 and to be lower than all other options.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options The capital cost of options 2, 4 and 5 are expected to be significantly higher than Option 7, and to be higher than all other options.	Some comparative advantage over other options The capital cost of this option is expected to be higher than Options 1 and 7, to be equivalent to Option 6 and to be lower than all other options.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options The capital cost of options 2, 4 and 5 are expected to be significantly higher than Option 7, and to be higher than all other options.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options The capital cost of options 2, 4 and 5 are expected to be significantly higher than Option 7, and to be higher than all other options.	Some comparative advantage over other options The capital cost of this option is expected to be higher than Option 7, to be equivalent to Option 1 and to be lower than all other options.	Significant comparative advantage over other options The capital cost of this option is expected to be lower than Options 1 and 6 and to be significantly lower than all other options.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options. The cost and disruption of a scheme of this nature would be unsustainable and unjustifiable in comparison to other options available. It is proposed to discard this option without further consideration.
		1.2	Long Term Maintenance costs	Steel options vs concrete options for structures and maintaining level crossings versus removing them	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options The do-nothing scenario would maintain the existing maintenance costs of the level crossing.	Significant comparative advantage over other options The closure of the level crossing would remove the maintenance requirement of the level crossing.	Some comparative advantage over other options An overbridge would reduce maintenance requirements over a level crossing. Bridge option would determine overall maintenance costs.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options An opening overbridge would significantly increase the maintenance requirements.	Some comparative advantage over other options An overbridge would reduce maintenance requirements over a level crossing. Bridge option would determine overall maintenance costs .	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options An opening overbridge would significantly increase the maintenance requirements.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Higher amounts of maintenance and inspections are anticipated with the introduction of an underbridge and reconfiguration of canal with ongoing operational costs for canal.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options An overbridge likely to be Steel bridge to reduce deck thickness to allow for approach gradients .	Some comparative advantage over other options An overbridge would reduce maintenance requirements over a level crossing. Bridge option would determine overall maintenance costs .	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options This option is set aside - see 1.1 above
		1.3	Traffic Functionality /economic benefit	Benefits to vehicular traffic through reduction in journey time lengths and delays through removal of level crossings. Consideration of potentially longer routes for traffic.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Reduced capacity as train frequencies increase; increase in journey times for local residents.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Displacement of traffic onto alternative routes; increase in journey times for local residents.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Improvement in journey times; potential for induced trips; potential to increase congestion on surrounding road network as a result of induced traffic.	Some comparative advantage over other options Improvement in journey times; potential for induced trips; potential to increase congestion on surrounding road network as a result of induced traffic.	Some comparative advantage over other options Improvement in journey times; potential for induced trips; potential to increase congestion on surrounding road network as a result of induced traffic.	Some comparative advantage over other options Improvement in journey times; potential for induced trips; potential to increase congestion on surrounding road network as a result of induced traffic.	Some comparative advantage over other options Improvement in journey times; potential for induced trips; potential to increase congestion on surrounding road network as a result of induced traffic.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Improvement in journey times; potential for induced trips; potential to increase congestion on surrounding road network as a result of induced traffic.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Displacement of mobility impaired and cycle traffic onto ramped alternative routes; increase in journey times for local residents. Removal of vehicular access over the level crossing results in displaced flows - 1023 vehicles AM peak hour and 1068 vehicles PM peak hour. Additional traffic delay will result along adjacent access routes - 12% AM peak hour and 10% PM peak hour. Benchmark journey times will increase by up to 27%,	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options This option is set aside - see 1.1 above
2	Integration	2.1	Transport Integration	Impact on scope for and ease of interchange between modes. Impact on the operation of other transport services both during construction and in operation. New interchange nodes and facilities; Reduced walking and wait times associated with interchanges. Modal shift figures during construction and operations. Changes to journey times to transport nodes.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options GDA Cycle Network Plan cannot be realised with such poor connectivity. Increased delays on bus routes. Reduced access to train station and car park.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Inconsistent with GDA Cycle Network Plan - which shows a primary route on Coolmine Road; Disruption to bus routes; Slight reduction in accessibility of train station; Significant reduction in accessibility of train station car park.	Some comparative advantage over other options Improved interchange between modes, subject to satisfactory access to train station platforms. General reduction in journey times. There may be severance to existing connectivity on the approaches to the bridge over the canal and railway as a result of the construction of the required approach ramps. Access to the train station car park will be difficult.	Some comparative advantage over other options Improved interchange between modes, subject to satisfactory access to train station platforms. General reduction in journey times. There may be severance to existing connectivity on the approaches to the bridge over the canal and railway as a result of the construction of the required approach ramps. Access to the train station car park will be difficult.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Rerouted access to train station car park. General improvement in connectivity and journey times.	Some comparative advantage over other options Rerouted access to train station car park. General improvement in connectivity and journey times.	Some comparative advantage over other options Rerouted access to train station car park. General improvement in connectivity and journey times.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Improved interchange between modes, subject to satisfactory access to train station platforms. General reduction in journey times. There may be severance to existing connectivity on the approaches to the bridge over the canal and railway as a result of the construction of the required approach ramps. Access to the train station car park will be difficult and it is likely that the capacity of the existing car park will be significantly reduced.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options This option reduces the scope for interaction between modes of transport I ncomparison to all other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options This option is set aside - see 1.1 above
		2.2	Land Use Integration	Impact on land use strategies and regional and local plans. Assessment of support for land use factors local land use and planning. Inclusion of project in relevant local and regional planning documents.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options This option would not support higher level national and regional planning policy regarding the Maynooth DART Expansion program. Retaining the level crossing would support FCDP Specific Objective 142: *"Preserve the existing pedestrian and vehicular right of way at the Coolmine Level Crossing".* In terms of land use factors: The area is a low-density suburban, well established residential area - planning policy does not suggest that there would be significant future development likely to occur in this area.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options This option would support national and regional planning policy regarding the DART Expansion. Majority of the Options 1,2,3,4,5,6, do not support Objective 142: "Preserve the existing pedestrian and vehicular right of way at the Coolmine Level Crossing" and therefore this factor does not become a differentiator in terms of the comparative assessment as they are all the same. However, it is recognised as a moderate negative in terms of the local policy context. In terms of land use factors, the area is a well established residential area with no significant future development planned for the area. However, closure of the level crossing will change transportation patterns and restrict access to sustainable modes of travel to and from the station for some users. (It would result in a community severance (considered under social inclusion 0 not considered as part of planning policy).	Some comparative advantage over other options Online Overbridge: This option would support higher level national and regional planning policy regarding the Maynooth DART: Expansion program. Options 1,2,3,4,5,6, do not support Objective 142: *"Preserve the existing pedestrian and vehicular right of way at the Coolmine Level Crossing"* and therefore this factor does not become a significant differentiator in the comparative assessment. However, it is recognised as a moderate negative in terms of the local policy context. An alternative pedestrian footpath is included which would create a new right of way. No cycle infrastructure is provided, therefore it only partly meets the 'indicative/cycle/ walking' network at this location (FDP). In terms of land use factors, the area is a well established residential area with no significant future development planned for the area. The construction of Option 1 will change transportation patterns and restrict access to sustainable modes of travel to and from the station for some users. (It would result in a community severance (considered under social inclusion 0 not considered as part of planning policy).	Some comparative advantage over other options Online underbridge under the canal: Similar to Option 1, This option is supported in principle by the national and regional planning policy context. Majority of the Options (1,2,3,4,5,6) do not support Objective 142: "Preserve the existing pedestrian and vehicular right of way at the Coolmine Level Crossing" and therefore this factor does not become a significant differentiator in the comparative assessment. However, it is recognised as a moderate negative in terms of the local policy context. An alternative pedestrian footpath is included which would create a new right of way. No cycle infrastructure is provided, therefore it only partly meets the 'indicative/cycle/ walking' network at this location (FDP). In terms of land use factors, the area is a well established residential area with no significant future development planned for the area. The construction of Option 2 will change transportation patterns and restrict access to sustainable modes of travel to and from the station for some users. (It would result in a community severance (considered under social inclusion 0 not considered as part of planning policy).	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options New Overbridge Connecting St. Mochta's Grove to Luttrellpark Road. This option is supported in principle by the national and regional planning policy context. Majority of the Options (1,2,3,4,5,6) do not support Objective 142: "Preserve the existing pedestrian and vehicular right of way at the Coolmine Level Crossing" and therefore this factor does not become a significant differentiator in the comparative assessment. However, it is recognised as a moderate negative in terms of the local policy context. This option includes an alternative pedestrian and also includes dedicated cycle lanes, which would create a new right of way as well as linking to the GDA cycle network. This option would result in the construction of a new road bridge over the Canal at the location defined by the FDP map based "Specific *Objective 141* Prohibit any road bridge at this location" . It would bring traffic through an established residential area connecting to existing road network associated with Riverwood Court, Station Court way and St. Mochas Groove - depending on traffic levels this could impact negatively on the residential amenity of these zoned areas. [TRAFFIC to report on change and effects]. Future land use factors development is not likely as it is a well established area.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options New Underbridge with Opening Canal Bridge Connecting St. Mochta's Grove to Luttrellpark Road This option is supported in principle by the national and regional planning policy context. Majority of the Options (1,2,3,4,5,6) do not support Objective 142: "Preserve the existing pedestrian and vehicular right of way at the Coolmine Level Crossing" and therefore this factor does not become a significant differentiator in the comparative assessment. However, it is recognised as a moderate negative in terms of the local policy context. This option includes an alternative pedestrian and also includes dedicated cycle lanes, which would create a new right of way as well as linking to the GDA cycle network. This option would result in the construction of a new road bridge over the Canal at the location defined by the FDP map based "Specific Objective 141 Prohibit any road bridge at this location" . It would bring traffic through an established residential area connecting to existing road network associated with Riverwood Court, Station Court way and St. Mochas Groove - depending on traffic levels this could impact negatively on the residential amenity of these zoned areas. [TRAFFIC to report on change and effects]. Future land use factors development is not likely as it is a well established area.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options New Underbridge Connecting St. Mochta's Grove to Luttrellpark Road with Diversion of Canal Over Proposed Road This option is supported in principle by the national and regional planning policy context. Majority of the Options (1,2,3,4,5,6) do not support Objective 142: "Preserve the existing pedestrian and vehicular right of way at the Coolmine Level Crossing" and therefore this factor does not become a significant differentiator in the comparative assessment. However, it is recognised as a moderate negative in terms of the local policy context. This option includes an alternative pedestrian and also includes dedicated cycle lanes, which would create a new right of way as well as linking to the GDA cycle network. This option would result in the construction of a new road bridge over the Canal at the location defined by the FDP map based "Specific Objective 141 Prohibit any road bridge at this location" . It would bring traffic through an established residential area connecting to existing road network associated with Riverwood Court, Station Court way and St. Mochas Groove - depending on traffic levels this could impact negatively on the residential amenity of these zoned areas. [TRAFFIC to report on change and effects]. Future land use factors development is not likely as it is a well established area.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Overbridge to East of Coolmine Road. This option is supported in principle by the national and regional planning policy context. Majority of the Options (1,2,3,4,5,6) do not support Objective 142: "Preserve the existing pedestrian and vehicular right of way at the Coolmine Level Crossing" and therefore this factor does not become a significant differentiator in the comparative assessment. However, it is recognised as a moderate negative in terms of the local policy context. An alternative pedestrian footpath is included which would create a new right of way and also cycle infrastructure is provided, which would meet the 'indicative/cycle/ walking' network at this approximate location (FDP). Option 6 travels through the existing Coolmine Train Station Carpark that has a "*Specific Objective 143 Car parking provision associated with the train station shall be two storeys or less".* This option directly impacts this objective while also reducing the current viability of the carpark that would be required for the likely increase of train passengers. This option would not have major negative impacts from a land use planning and transportation integration perspective.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options New Overbridge Connecting St. Mochta's Grove to Luttrellpark Road. This option is supported in principle by the national and regional planning policy context. Majority of the Options (1,2,3,4,5,6) do not support Objective 142: "Preserve the existing pedestrian and vehicular right of way at the Coolmine Level Crossing" and therefore this factor does not become a significant differentiator in the comparative assessment. However, it is recognised as a moderate negative in terms of the local policy context. This option includes an alternative pedestrian access and also includes dedicated cycle lanes, which would create a new right of way as well as linking to the GDA cycle network. This option would result in the construction of a new road bridge over the Canal at the location defined by the FDP map based "Specific *Objective 141* Prohibit any road bridge at this location" . It would bring traffic through an established residential area connecting to existing road network associated with Riverwood Court, Station Court way and St. Mochas Groove - depending on traffic levels this could impact negatively on the residential amenity of these zoned areas. [TRAFFIC to report on change and effects]. Additionally, the footbridge considered as part of Option 3 travels through the existing Coolmine Train Station Carpark that has a "Specific Objective 143 Car parking provision associated with the train station shall be two storeys or less". This option directly impacts this objective while also reducing the current viability of the carpark that would be required for the likely increase of train passengers, however to a lesser extend than Option 6. This option would not have major negative impacts from a land use planning and transportation integration perspective. Future land use factors development is not likely as it is a well established area.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options This option is set aside - see 1.1 above
		2.3	Geographical Integration	Impact on improvement of external links. Desire to link various geographical – mostly neutral due to localised nature of the level crossings. Overall electrification scheme would be highly positive.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Original Distance roundabout to Rockfield Drive crossroads 450m retained.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Shortest diversion route 3.1km (6.8x diversion route).	Significant comparative advantage over other options Original Distance roundabout to roundabout 500m retained.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Original Distance roundabout to roundabout 500m retained.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Diverted distance route 1.5km (3.3x diversion route).	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Diverted distance route 1.5km (3.3x diversion route).	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Diverted distance route 1.5km (3.3x diversion route).	Significant comparative advantage over other options Diverted distance route 821m (1.2x diversion route).	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options There is significant development planned in the vicinity of Ashtown. This option does not address the Geographical Integrations needs of the location.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options This option is set aside - see 1.1 above
		2.4	Other Government Policy	Integration with Government Policy, Smarter Travel, Investment Programmes, rail safety, electrification etc	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Maintaining the crossing does not meet government policy.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Closing the crossing with no other alternative meets government policy but not ideal.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Providing vehicular and pedestrian is ideal.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Providing vehicular and pedestrian is ideal.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Providing vehicular and pedestrian is ideal.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Providing vehicular and pedestrian is ideal.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Providing vehicular and pedestrian is ideal.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Providing vehicular and pedestrian is ideal.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options The GDATS includes an objective to enhance linkages to planned developments. This option runs contrary to the objective.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options This option is set aside - see 1.1 above
3	Environment	3.1	Noise and Vibration	Estimated number of people likely to be affected by transport related noise with the scheme within 50m.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Retains vehicular traffic which will impact a low number of sensitive receptors in proximity.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Removes vehicular traffic and the construction phase is minimal.	Some comparative advantage over other options Online option will have no additional impacts to the current situation. 246 dwellings within 100m.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Moves traffic to new location and will impact different properties to the current crossing. 248 dwellings within 100m.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Moves traffic to new location and will impact different properties to the current crossing. 277 dwellings within 100m.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Moves traffic to new location and will impact different properties to the current crossing. 252 dwellings within 100m.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Moves traffic to new location and will impact different properties to the current crossing. 257 dwellings within 100m.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Moves traffic to new location and will impact different properties to the current crossing. 101 dwellings within 100m.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options 203 dwellings within 50m. Impact during the construction stage on properties in vicinity of the pedestrian bridge. No impact during the operational phase.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options This option is set aside - see 1.1 above
		3.2	Air Quality and Climate	Local air quality effects. No of number of receptors within 50m.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Retains vehicular traffic which will impact a low number of sensitive receptors in proximity.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Removes vehicular traffic and the construction phase is minimal.	Some comparative advantage over other options On line option. 160 dwellings within 50m.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options On line option. 160 dwellings within 50m.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Moves traffic to new location and will impact different properties to the current crossing. 203 dwellings within 50m.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Moves traffic to new location and will impact different properties to the current crossing. 174 dwellings within 50m. Potentially less embodied carbon than option 3 due to underbridge rather than over bridge in construction phase.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options 190 dwellings within 50m.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Moves traffic to new location and will impact different properties to the current crossing. 67 dwellings within 50m.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options 203 dwellings within 50m.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options This option is set aside - see 1.1 above
		3.3	Landscape and Visual (including light)	Key landscape characteristics affected; Effects on listed/ key views; Impact on landscape character.	Significant comparative advantage over other options No likely impacts.	Significant comparative advantage over other options No impact on existing landscape or visual characteristics.	Some comparative advantage over other options Online overbridge option is likely to have significant impact on visual setting of adjoining residential properties at Kirkpatrick Drive, Sheepmoor Lane, Delwood Grove and Riverwood Hall. Significant visual impact for setting of Kirkpatrick Bridge - a protected structure and hence for Objective CH43 of Fingal Development Plan. Likely significant impact due to removal of roadside tree-lined hedgerows leading to railway / canal. Further information required regarding junction proposal/arrangement for Sheepmoor Lane and Kirkpatrick Drive.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Online underbridge is likely to have significant impact on visual setting of adjoining residential properties at Kirkpatrick Drive, Sheepmoor Lane, Delwood Grove and Riverwood Hall. Significant impact in removal of Kirkpatrick Bridge - a protected structure and hence for Objective CH43 of Fingal Development Plan. Likely significant impact due to removal of roadside tree-lined hedgerows leading to railway / canal. Further information required regarding junction proposal/arrangement for Sheepmoor Lane and Kirkpatrick Drive.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Online overbridge option will have very significant landscape and visual impact on open space zoned lands between St. Mochta's/Rockfield, Stationcourt Way/Kirkpatrick and through Riverwood. Very significant visual impact for residential properties at St. Mochta's, Rockfield, Stationcourt Way/Hall, Kirkpatrick and Riverwood. Demolition of residential property at Sheepmoor Lane. Tree and vegetation loss and significant visual impact in crossing the Royal Canal and hence for Objective CH43 of Fingal Development Plan.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Online underbridge option will have very significant landscape and significant visual impact on open space zoned lands between St. Mochta's/Rockfield, Stationcourt Way/Kirkpatrick and through Riverwood. Significant visual impact for residential properties at St. Mochta's, Rockfield, Stationcourt Way/Hall, Kirkpatrick and Riverwood. Demolition of residential property at Sheepmoor Lane. Tree and vegetation loss and significant visual impact in crossing the Royal Canal and hence for Objective CH43 of Fingal Development Plan.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Underbridge option will have very significant visual impact on residential properties at Delwood, Cherry Drive and Rosehaven. Very significant landscape and visual impact on corridor of Royal Canal, setting of Kirkpatrick Bridge and hence for Objective CH43 of Fingal Development Plan. Demolition of residential properties at Delwood Grove.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Overbridge option will have very significant visual impact on residential properties at Delwood, Cherry Drive and Rosehaven. Very significant landscape and visual impact on corridor of Royal Canal, setting of Kirkpatrick Bridge and hence for Objective CH43 of Fingal Development Plan. Demolition of residential properties at Delwood Grove.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Will have very significant landscape and visual impact on open space zoned lands between St. Mochta's/Rockfield, Stationcourt Way/Kirkpatrick and through Riverwood. Very significant visual impact for residential properties at St. Mochta's, Rockfield, Stationcourt Way/Hall, Kirkpatrick and Riverwood. Demolition of residential property at Sheepmoor Lane. Tree and vegetation loss and significant visual impact in crossing the Royal Canal and hence for Objective CH43 of Fingal Development Plan.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options This option is set aside - see 1.1 above
		3.4	Biodiversity (flora and fauna)	Potential compliance/conflict with biodiversity objectives; Indirect impacts on protected species, designated sites; Overall effect on nature conservation resource.	Significant comparative advantage over other options No likely impacts.	Significant comparative advantage over other options No likely impacts.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Hydrologically connected to South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA. No risk of LSE. Potential impacts to Royal Canal pNHA. Minor habitat loss. Widening of Coolmine Road on north side could result in loss of mature ash trees on the west side of road next to canal. This could be avoided if road is widened at eastern side. Demolition of Kirkpatrick Bridge could cause disturbance to fauna impact water quality in the canal.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Similar to Option 1. Hydrologically connected to South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA. No risk of LSE. Potential impacts to Royal Canal pNHA. Minor habitat loss. Widening of Coolmine Road on north side could result in loss of mature ash trees on the west side of road next to canal. this could be avoided if road is widened at eastern side. Demolition of Kirkpatrick Bridge could cause disturbance to fauna impact water quality in the canal.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Hydrologically connected to South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA. No risk of LSE. Potential impacts to Royal Canal pNHA. Loss of woodland, scrub, amenity grassland, scattered trees and parkland.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Hydrologically connected to South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA. No risk of LSE. Potential impacts to Royal Canal pNHA. Loss of woodland, scrub, amenity grassland, scattered trees and parkland.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Hydrologically connected to South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA. No risk of LSE. Diversion of the canal could cause significant impact to the Royal Canal pNHA. Loss of woodland, scrub, amenity grassland, scattered trees and parkland.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Hydrologically connected to South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA. No risk of LSE. Potential impacts to Royal Canal pNHA. Loss of woodland and scrub habitat. Less impact on habitats than some other options.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Hydrologically connected to South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA. No risk of LSE. Potential impacts to Royal Canal pNHA. Loss of woodland, scrub, ammenity grassland, scattered trees and parkland.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options This option is set aside - see 1.1 above
		3.5	Cultural, Archaeological and Architectural Heritage	Overall effect on cultural, archaeological and architecture heritage resource. Likely effects on RPS, National Monuments, SMRs, Conservation areas, etc. Number of designated sites/structures (by level of designation) directly impacted by scheme (landtake)	Significant comparative advantage over other options No likely impacts.	Significant comparative advantage over other options No likely impacts.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Potential direct impact on RPS 0697 bridge over canal	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Potential direct impact on RPS 0697 Kirkpatrick bridge. Source: Fingal Development Plan 2017- 2023	Significant comparative advantage over other options No direct impacts predicted upon sites/structures subject to statutory protection. Potential indirect impact canal (RPS).	Significant comparative advantage over other options No direct impacts predicted upon sites/structures subject to statutory protection. Potential indirect impact canal (RPS).	Significant comparative advantage over other options No direct impacts predicted upon sites/structures subject to statutory protection.	Significant comparative advantage over other options No direct impacts predicted upon sites/structures subject to statutory protection. Potential indirect impact canal (RPS)	Significant comparative advantage over other options No direct impacts predicted upon sites/structures subject to statutory protection. Potential indirect impact canal (RPS).	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options This option is set aside - see 1.1 above
		3.6	Water Resources	Overall potential significant effects on water resource attributes likely to be affected during construction and operation.	Some comparative advantage over other options Potential negative impact on surface water quality during operational phase. Requires minimal construction. Has some comparative advantages over other options.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Removes vehicular traffic borne pollutants and minimal construction phase. The Do Minimum Option is advantageous across all sub-criteria and has a significant comparative advantage compared to other options overall.	Some comparative advantage over other options Has some comparative advantage over other options.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Underpass excavations pose potential risk to Groundwater quality. Has some comparative disadvantage over other options.	Some comparative advantage over other options Has some comparative advantage over other options.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Underpass excavations pose potential risk to Groundwater quality. Has some comparative disadvantage over other options.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options The in-stream works required constitute a flood hazard and is significantly disadvantageous compared to the other options. The construction works within the Royal Canal proposed as part of Option 5 is likely to have a significant negative impact on Surface water quality. Underpass excavations also pose potential risk to Groundwater quality. Option is disadvantageous across all sub-criteria and has a significant comparative disadvantage	Some comparative advantage over other options Has some comparative advantage over other options.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Potential minor negative impact on flood risk during construction as works may alter the existing drainage regime and increase risk of spot pluvial flooding. Will likely have a neutral/ negligible impact on flood risk during operation. May have a negative impact on water quality during construction phase as runoff borne pollutants may enter the receiving waterbodies. During operational phase there will likely be a minor positive impact to the water quality of the royal canal as the surface water drainage network is formalised reducing the current levels of vehicular derived pollutants. GSI Groundwater vulnerability mapping indicates that all proposed options are within	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options This option is set aside - see 1.1 above
		3.7	Agriculture and Non-Agricultural	Overall impact on land take & property. Number of properties to be impacted/acquired. Likely temporary or permanent severance effects, etc.	Significant comparative advantage over other options No likely impacts.	Significant comparative advantage over other options No likely impacts.	Significant comparative advantage over other options No direct impacts	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Potential direct impact on RPS 0697 Kirkpatrick bridge which will have to be demolished. Source: Fingal Development Plan 2017-2023	Some comparative disadvantage over other options The non-agricultural impact will involve the acquisition of one residential property under Option 3	Some comparative disadvantage over other options The non-agricultural impact will involve the acquisition of one residential property under Options 4	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Land acquisition and demolition of one property on the North side of the canal will be required.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Four residential properties on Option 6. Option 6 will have a significant impact on the Coolmine Station car park.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options The non-agricultural impact will involve the acquisition of one residential property under Option 7	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options This option is set aside - see 1.1 above
		3.8	Geology and Soils (including Waste)	Soils and Geology and likely impact on geological resources based on preliminary/likely construction details. Soil resources to be developed/removed. Existing information relating to potential to encounter contaminated land. High-level assessment based on the likely structures/ works required and the potential for ground contamination due to historic landfills, pits and quarries.	Significant comparative advantage over other options No likely impacts.	Significant comparative advantage over other options No likely impacts.	Some comparative advantage over other options Overbridge options require increased fill import to the site (Minor negative).	Some comparative advantage over other options Underbridge option means that some materials may arise, which could possibly be suitable for reuse elsewhere on the project. This is balanced by an associated impact of interfering in the canal and existing railway, which would require specific materials be imported. Involves other geotechnical risks to design and construction. (Minor negative)	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Overbridge options require increased fill import to the site (Minor negative).	Some comparative advantage over other options Comparatively lower fill import requirements due to the lower alignment (Minor negative/negligible)	Some comparative advantage over other options Underbridge option means that some materials may arise, which could possibly be suitable for reuse elsewhere on the project. This is balanced by an associated impact of interfering in the canal and existing railway, which would require specific materials be imported. Involves other geotechnical risks to design and construction. (Minor negative)	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Some made ground on-site (requires walkover survey / investigation). Overbridge options require increased fill import to the site (Minor negative).	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Overbridge options require increased fill import to the site (Minor negative).	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options This option is set aside - see 1.1 above
		3.9	Radiation and Stray Current	Overall likely impact on existing sources of electromagnetic radiation.	Significant comparative advantage over other options No changes from an EMI perspective therefore advantage over other options.	Significant comparative advantage over other options No changes from an EMI perspective therefore advantage over other options.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options It is assumed that the routing of the cabling, the location of existing substations, hubs etc. along the line will be changed or impacted by the selection of any of the options over the entire project. All Do-Something options are comparable from an EMI perspective at this stage in the assessment.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options It is assumed that the routing of the cabling, the location of existing substations, hubs etc. along the line will be changed or impacted by the selection of any of the options over the entire project. All Do-Something options are comparable from an EMI perspective at this stage in the assessment.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options It is assumed that the routing of the cabling, the location of existing substations, hubs etc. along the line will be changed or impacted by the selection of any of the options over the entire project. All Do-Something options are comparable from an EMI perspective at this stage in the assessment.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options It is assumed that the routing of the cabling, the location of existing substations, hubs etc. along the line will be changed or impacted by the selection of any of the options over the entire project. All Do-Something options are comparable from an EMI perspective at this stage in the assessment.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options It is assumed that the routing of the cabling, the location of existing substations, hubs etc. along the line will be changed or impacted by the selection of any of the options over the entire project. All Do-Something options are comparable from an EMI perspective at this stage in the assessment.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options It is assumed that the routing of the cabling, the location of existing substations, hubs etc. along the line will be changed or impacted by the selection of any of the options over the entire project. All Do-Something options are comparable from an EMI perspective at this stage in the assessment.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options It is assumed that the routing of the cabling, the location of existing substations, hubs etc. along the line will be changed or impacted by the selection of any of the options over the entire project. All Do-Something options are comparable from an EMI perspective at this stage in the assessment.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options This option is set aside - see 1.1 above
4	Accessibility & Social inclusion	4.1	Impact on Vulnerable Groups		Some comparative advantage over other options Original Distance roundabout to Rockfield Drive crossroads 450m retained.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Shortest diversion route 3.1km (6.8x diversion route).	Significant comparative advantage over other options Original Distance roundabout to roundabout 500m retained.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Original Distance roundabout to roundabout 500m retained.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Diverted distance route 1.5km (3.3x diversion route)	Significant comparative advantage over other options Diverted distance route 1.5km (3.3x diversion route)	Significant comparative advantage over other options Diverted distance route 1.5km (3.3x diversion route)	Some comparative advantage over other options Diverted distance route 821m (1.2x diversion route)	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Diverted distance route 1.5km (3.3x diversion route)	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options This option is set aside - see 1.1 above
		4.2	Stations Accessibility	Quantification of increased service levels to the vulnerable groups.	Some comparative advantage over other options Original Distance roundabout to Rockfield Drive crossroads 450m retained. Due to level crossing closed longer difficulty in maintaining connectivity.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Shortest diversion route 3.1km (6.8x diversion route).	Significant comparative advantage over other options Original Distance roundabout to roundabout 500m retained	Significant comparative advantage over other options Original Distance roundabout to roundabout 500m retained	Significant comparative advantage over other options Diverted distance route 1.5km (3.3x diversion route)	Significant comparative advantage over other options Diverted distance route 1.5km (3.3x diversion route)	Significant comparative advantage over other options Diverted distance route 1.5km (3.3x diversion route)	Significant comparative advantage over other options Diverted distance route 821m (1.2x diversion route)	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Providing a segregated crossing would have a significant advantage as vehicular traffic is not crossing the live rail.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options This option is set aside - see 1.1 above
		4.3	Social Inclusion	Quantification of service levels impacts including severance to all groups (Severance of local communities through removal of level crossings without connection would fair worst under this heading).	Significant comparative advantage over other options Original Distance roundabout to Rockfield Drive crossroads 450m retained.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Shortest diversion route 3.1km (6.8x diversion route).	Significant comparative advantage over other options Original Distance roundabout to roundabout 500m retained	Significant comparative advantage over other options Original Distance roundabout to roundabout 500m retained	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Diverted distance route 1.5km (3.3x diversion route)	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Diverted distance route 1.5km (3.3x diversion route)	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Diverted distance route 1.5km (3.3x diversion route).	Significant comparative advantage over other options Diverted distance route 821m (1.2x diversion route).	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Diverted distance route 798m (1.6x diversion route) but exisiting vehicular route severed	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options This option is set aside - see 1.1 above
5	Safety	5.1	Rail Safety	Safety for Rail users – removal of LC positive in this respect	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Maintaining the crossing would have a significant disadvantage to rail safety for people still crossing the rail.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Closing the crossing will remove the interface between rail and other traffic.	Comparable to other options All Options remove rail - road interface	Comparable to other options All Options remove rail - road interface	Comparable to other options All Options remove rail - road interface	Comparable to other options All Options remove rail - road interface	Comparable to other options All Options remove rail - road interface	Comparable to other options All Options remove rail - road interface	Comparable to other options Option removes the rail - road interface	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options This option is set aside - see 1.1 above
		5.2	Vehicular Traffic Safety	Quality of Access for these road users, lengths of diversions, removal of interface with rail and other modes of transport	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Maintaining the crossing would have a significant disadvantage to rail safety for vehicles crossing the rail.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Closing the crossing with no alternative would have a slight disadvantage as it would divert traffic onto longer routes.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Providing a segregated crossing would have a significant advantage as vehicular traffic is not crossing the live rail.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Providing a segregated crossing would have a significant advantage as vehicular traffic is not crossing the live rail.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Providing a segregated crossing would have a significant advantage as vehicular traffic is not crossing the live rail	Significant comparative advantage over other options Providing a segregated crossing would have a significant advantage as vehicular traffic is not crossing the live rail	Significant comparative advantage over other options Providing a segregated crossing would have a significant advantage as vehicular traffic is not crossing the live rail	Significant comparative advantage over other options Providing a segregated crossing would have a significant advantage as vehicular traffic is not crossing the live rail.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Closing the crossing with no alternative would have a slight disadvantage as it would divert traffic onto longer routes.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options This option is set aside - see 1.1 above
		5.3	Pedestrian, Cyclist and Vulnerable Road user Safety	Quality of Access for these road users. removal of interfaces	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Original Distance roundabout to Rockfield Drive crossroads 450m retained.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Shortest diversion route 3.1km (6.8x diversion route).	Significant comparative advantage over other options Original Distance roundabout to roundabout 500m retained	Significant comparative advantage over other options Original Distance roundabout to roundabout 500m retained	Some comparative advantage over other options Pedestrian / Cycle Bridge curtails diversion	Some comparative advantage over other options Pedestrian / Cycle Bridge curtails diversion	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Diverted distance route 1.5km (3.3x diversion route).	Some comparative advantage over other options Diverted distance route 821m (1.2x diversion route) steeped access, issue for cyclists and pedestrians.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Providing a segregated crossing would have a significant advantage as vehicular traffic is not crossing the live rail	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options This option is set aside - see 1.1 above
6	Physical Activity	6.1	Connectivity to adjoining cycling facilities	Analysis of the extent that the scheme connects with cycle tracks.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options No cycle tracks currently present on the immediately surrounding road network, but increased closures of the level crossing would reduce access to the Royal Canal Greenway. See also Transport Integration above.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options No cycle tracks on the immediately surrounding road network, but the closure of the level crossing would reduce access to the Royal Canal Greenway. See also Transport Integration above.	Some comparative advantage over other options The scheme should include cycle tracks on the approaches to realise the objective of the Cycle Network Plan.	Some comparative advantage over other options The scheme should include cycle tracks on the approaches to realise the objective of the Cycle Network Plan.	Some comparative advantage over other options The scheme should include cycle tracks on the approaches to realise the objective of the Cycle Network Plan.	Some comparative advantage over other options The scheme should include cycle tracks on the approaches to realise the objective of the Cycle Network Plan.	Some comparative advantage over other options The scheme should include cycle tracks on the approaches to realise the objective of the Cycle Network Plan.	Some comparative advantage over other options The scheme should include cycle tracks on the approaches to realise the objective of the Cycle Network Plan.	Significant comparative advantage over other options The scheme should include cycle tracks on the approaches to realise the objective of the Cycle Network Plan.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options This option is set aside - see 1.1 above
		6.2	Permeability and local connectivity opportunity	Journey Time and lengths of diversions for active modes and numbers affected. Analysis of the connectivity between level crossing and green areas/key attractions related to active mode	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Reduced connectivity across railway as closures become more frequent with increased train frequencies.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Severely curtailed cycle permeability; severance of pedestrian connectivity except through train station, with significant consequent diversions of over 2km in each	Some comparative advantage over other options Existing connectivity will be enhanced by the removal of the obstacle posed by the existing level crossing.	Some comparative advantage over other options Existing connectivity will be enhanced by the removal of the obstacle posed by the existing level crossing.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Pedestrian access to the existing train station from the north will be more circuitous.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Pedestrian access to the existing train station from the north will be more circuitous.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Pedestrian access to the existing train station from the north will be more circuitous.	Some comparative advantage over other options Existing connectivity will be enhanced by the removal of the obstacle posed by the existing level crossing.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Existing connectivity will be enhanced by the removal of the obstacle posed by the existing level crossing.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options This option is set aside - see 1.1 above

	Criteria		Do Nothing	Do Minimum	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6	Option 7	Option 8
1	Economy		Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options
2	Integration		Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options
3	Environment		Some comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options
4	Accessibility and social inclusion		Some comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options
5	Safety		Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options
6	Physical Activity		Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options
	Progress To Stage 2		No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No

DART+ Maynooth Line - MCA Stage 1

Porterstown Level Crossing Assessment

	Parameter		Criteria	Sub-Criteria (Quantitative/ Qualitative)	Do Nothing	Do Minimum	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
1	Economy	1.1	Construction and Land Cost	Assessment of cost of construction of option, land costs, acquisition costs and temporary works	Significant comparative advantage over other options The level crossing is currently manned. The ongoing cost associated with this control mechanism on the railway is significant.	Some comparative advantage over other options Cost of removing crossing is low in comparison to provision of road crossing.	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options
		1.2	Long Term Maintenance costs	Steel options vs concrete options for structures and maintaining level crossings versus removing them	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options The do-nothing scenario would maintain the existing maintenance costs of the level crossing.	Significant comparative advantage over other options The closure of the level crossing would remove the maintenance requirement of the level crossing.	Some comparative advantage over other options An overbridge would increase the maintenance requirements over a level crossing, though it would not be significantly more so than other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options An overbridge would increase the maintenance requirements over a level crossing, though it would not be significantly more so than other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options An overbridge would increase the maintenance requirements over a level crossing, though it would not be significantly more so than other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options An overbridge would increase the maintenance requirements over a level crossing, though it would not be significantly more so than other options
		1.3	Traffic Functionality /economic benefit	Benefits to vehicular traffic through reduction in journey time lengths and delays through removal of level crossings. Consideration of potentially longer routes for traffic.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Existing connectivity maintained, albeit with increased disruption from increased train frequencies. Economic disbenefit to rail.	Some comparative advantage over other options Displacement of traffic onto alternative routes; increase in journey times for local residents, New Link road already serves for commuter traffic.	Some comparative advantage over other options Displacement of traffic onto alternative routes; increase in journey times for local residents, New Link road already serves for commuter traffic.	Some comparative advantage over other options Displacement of traffic onto alternative routes; increase in journey times for local residents, New Link road already serves for commuter traffic.	Some comparative advantage over other options Displacement of traffic onto alternative routes; increase in journey times for local residents, New Link road already serves for commuter traffic.	Some comparative advantage over other options Displacement of traffic onto alternative routes; increase in journey times for local residents, New Link road already serves for commuter traffic.
2	Integration	2.1	Transport Integration	Impact on scope for and ease of interchange between modes. Impact on the operation of other transport services both during construction and in operation. New interchange nodes and facilities; Reduced walking and wait times associated with interchanges. Modal shift figures during construction and operations. Changes to journey times to transport nodes.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Existing connectivity maintained, albeit with increased disruption from increased train frequencies. There is no cycle route proposed on Porterstown Road in the GDA Cycle Network Plan.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Reduction in local permeability. The provision of the Porterstown Viaduct has reduced the utility of Porterstown Road for anything more than local traffic.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Some indirect access provided for pedestrians and cyclists, but less preferable than other options. No access provided for other transport modes.	Some comparative advantage over other options Reasonable access provided for pedestrians and cyclists. No access provided for other transport modes.	Some comparative advantage over other options Reasonable access provided for pedestrians and cyclists. No access provided for other transport modes.	Some comparative advantage over other options Reasonable access provided for pedestrians and cyclists. No access provided for other transport modes.
		2.2	Land Use Integration	Impact on land use strategies and regional and local plans. Assessment of support for land use factors local land use and planning. Inclusion of project in relevant local and regional planning documents.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options The do-nothing option is contrary to national and regional planning policy objectives as it does not support the DART Expansion programme. However, supports local planning policy map based "O*bjective 137: Preserve the existing pedestrian and vehicular right of way at the level crossing at Porterstown*". There is also north south Specific Objective on Porterstown Road "Indicative Cycle/Pedestrian Route" that would be impacted. However, it is considered that there would be modifications required to the current insufficient road widths and narrow bridge over the canal this objectives cannot be safely implemented in it's current form.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options This option is supported in principle by the national and regional planning policy context. At local level, The Do - Minimum Option goes against two Fingal DP map-based Specific Objectives; Specific Objective 137 "Preserve the existing pedestrian and vehicular right of way at the level crossing at Porterstown" and the Specific Objective of "Indicative Cycle/Pedestrian Route". The closure of the level crossing with no alternative would sever vehicular and pedestrian/cycle access to lands to the south zoned for "Residential Area", subject of the future Kellystown LAP (map based objective LAP13.C).	Some comparative advantage over other options This option is supported in principle by the national and regional planning policy context. At local level, Option 1 does not support Fingal DP map-based Specific Objective 137; "Preserve the existing pedestrian and vehicular right of way at the level crossing at Porterstown". Option 1 supports pedestrian access to Dr Tory Bridge (Porterstown Viaduct) which would provide a pedestrian link to proposed 'light rail corridor' and a light rail stop at Porterstown (travelling north south along the R121). The surrounding area is zoned for 'Residential Area" will be subject to Kellystown LAP (at Issues paper stage June 2019). This option would support pedestrian access at this location and connect to other public transport services.	Some comparative advantage over other options This option is supported in principle by the national and regional planning policy context. At local level, Option 2 goes against Fingal DP map-based Specific Objective 137; "Preserve the existing pedestrian and vehicular right of way at the level crossing at Porterstown" by closing the existing level crossing. However, an alternative right of way for pedestrians is being provided as part of this option at the existing level crossing location. Option 2 supports the future development of lands zoned for "Residential Area" as part of the future Kellystown LAP by maintaining pedestrian and cycle access at this location.	Some comparative advantage over other options This option is supported in principle by the national and regional planning policy context. At local level, Option 3 goes against Fingal DP map-based Specific Objective 137; "Preserve the existing pedestrian and vehicular right of way at the level crossing at Porterstown" by closing the existing level crossing. However, an alternative right of way for pedestrians and also the development of cycling infrastructure is provided therefore support that 'indicative-Cycle/Pedestrian access' at the existing level crossing location (gradients & length not taken into consideration). Option 3 supports the future development of lands zoned for "Residential Area" as part of the future Kellystown LAP by maintaining pedestrian and cycle access at this location.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options This option is supported in principle by the national and regional planning policy context. At local level, Option 4 goes against Fingal DP map-based Specific Objective 137; "Preserve the existing pedestrian and vehicular right of way at the level crossing at Porterstown" by closing the existing level crossing. However, an alternative right of way for pedestrians is being provided as part of this option at the existing level crossing location. Option 4 supports the future development of lands zoned for "Residential Area" as part of the future Kellystown LAP by maintaining pedestrian and cycle access at this location.
		2.3	Geographical Integration	Impact on improvement of external links. Desire to link various geographical – mostly neutral due to localised nature of the level crossings. Overall electrification scheme would be highly positive.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Original Distance from The village junction to Porterstown Road junction 600m retained.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Shortest diversion route 1.2km (2x diversion route).	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Shortest diversion route 1.2km (2x diversion route)	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Shortest diversion route 1.2km (2x diversion route)	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Shortest diversion route 1.2km (2x diversion route)	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Shortest diversion route 1.2km (2x diversion route)
		2.4	Other Government Policy	Integration with Government Policy, Smarter Travel, Investment Programmes, rail safety, electrification etc	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Maintaining the crossing does not meet government policy.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Closing the crossing with no other alternative meets government policy but not ideal.	Some comparative advantage over other options Closing the crossing with no other alternative meets government policy but not ideal.	Some comparative advantage over other options Closing the crossing with no other alternative meets government policy but not ideal.	Some comparative advantage over other options Closing the crossing with no other alternative meets government policy but not ideal.	Some comparative advantage over other options Closing the crossing with no other alternative meets government policy but not ideal.
3	Environment	3.1	Noise and Vibration	Estimated number of people likely to be affected by transport related noise with the scheme within 50m.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Retains vehicular traffic which will impact the low number of sensitive receptors in proximity.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Removes vehicular traffic and minimal construction phase.	Some comparative advantage over other options 3 dwelling within 100m. Note that only construction stage impacts expected as this is a pedestrian crossing.	Some comparative advantage over other options 3 dwelling within 100m. Note that only construction stage impacts expected as this is a pedestrian crossing.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options 22 dwelling within 100m. Note that only construction stage impacts expected as this is a pedestrian crossing.	Some comparative advantage over other options 3 dwelling within 100m. Note that only construction stage impacts expected as this is a pedestrian crossing.
		3.2	Air Quality and Climate	Local air quality effects. No of number of receptors within 50m.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Retains vehicular traffic which will impact the low number of sensitive receptors in proximity.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Removes vehicular traffic and minimal construction phase.	Some comparative advantage over other options 3 dwelling within 50m. Note that only construction stage impacts expected as this is a pedestrian crossing. All three options will result in the same additional operational phase vehicle emission increase due to rerouting traffic. No bridge so lower construction impacts.	Some comparative advantage over other options 3 dwelling within 50m. Note that only construction stage impacts expected as this is a pedestrian crossing. All three options will result in the same additional operational phase vehicle emission increase due to rerouting traffic.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options 10 dwelling within 50m. Note that only construction stage impacts expected as this is a pedestrian crossing. Potentially more embodied carbon due to additional construction material required.	Some comparative advantage over other options 3 dwelling within 50m. Note that only construction stage impacts expected as this is a pedestrian crossing. All three options will result in the same additional operational phase vehicle emission increase due to rerouting traffic.
		3.3	Landscape and Visual (including light)	Key landscape characteristics affected; Effects on listed/ key views; Impact on landscape character.	Significant comparative advantage over other options No impact on existing landscape or visual characteristics	Significant comparative advantage over other options No impact on existing landscape or visual characteristics	Some comparative advantage over other options Significant impact on trees to north of canal - which provide screening for residential property.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Significant impact on trees to north of canal - which provide screening for residential property. Significant visual impact for old cottages at level crossing. Visual impact on setting of Keenan bridge, with proposed bridge elevated directly over.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Significant impact on roadside trees and hedgerows. Significant visual impact for old cottages at level crossing and for properties on Porterstown Road, north of the canal. Visual impact on setting of Keenan bridge, with proposed bridge elevated directly over.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Significant impact on trees to north of canal - which provide screening for residential property. Significant visual impact for old cottages at level crossing. Visual impact on setting of Keenan bridge, with proposed bridge elevated directly over.
		3.4	Biodiversity (flora and fauna)	Potential compliance/conflict with biodiversity objectives; Indirect impacts on protected species, designated sites; Overall effect on nature conservation resource.	Significant comparative advantage over other options No likely significant impacts.	Significant comparative advantage over other options No likely significant impacts.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Hydrologically connected to South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA. No risk of LSE. Potential impacts to Royal Canal pNHA. Potential impact to woodland habitat adjacent to canal. Potential impacts to bats foraging and roosting in existing bridge, buildings and trees nearby. Given that that this option will follow existing pedestrian bridge there is less impact to canal corridor than option 2 and 3.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Hydrologically connected to South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA. No risk of LSE. Potential impacts to Royal Canal pNHA. Potential impacts to bats foraging and roosting in existing bridge, buildings and trees nearby. Loss of trees and vegetation at new bridge crossing and adjacent to canal and railway. Given that this option involves work over and adjacent to canal there is potential for greater impact to canal than all other options.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Hydrologically connected to South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA. No risk of LSE. Potential impacts to Royal Canal pNHA. Potential impacts to bats foraging and roosting in existing bridge, buildings and trees nearby. Loss of trees at new bridge crossing. Greater potential to impact canal from than Option 1.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Hydrologically connected to South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA. No risk of LSE. Potential impacts to Royal Canal pNHA. Potential impacts to bats foraging and roosting in existing bridge, buildings and trees nearby. Loss of trees and vegetation at new bridge crossing and adjacent to canal and railway. Given that this option involves work over and adjacent to canal there is potential for greater impact to canal than all other options.
		3.5	Cultural, Archaeological and Architectural Heritage	Overall effect on cultural, archaeological and architecture heritage resource. Likely effects on RPS, National Monuments, SMRs, Conservation areas, etc. Number of designated sites/structures (by level of designation) directly impacted by scheme (landtake)	Significant comparative advantage over other options No direct impacts.	Significant comparative advantage over other options No direct impacts.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Indirect impacts on Crossing cottage and school house (RPS). Potential direct impacts on archaeological deposits that may survive in greenfield areas.	Some comparative advantage over other options Indirect impacts on Crossing cottage, school house, canal bridge and canal.	Some comparative advantage over other options Indirect impacts on Crossing cottage, school house, canal bridge and canal.	Some comparative advantage over other options Indirect impacts on Crossing cottage, school house, canal bridge and canal.
		3.6	Water Resources	Overall potential significant effects on water resource attributes likely to be affected during construction and operation.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Potential negative impact on surface water quality during operational phase. Has some comparative disadvantage over other options.	Some comparative advantage over other options Removes vehicular traffic borne pollutants and minimal construction phase. The Do Minimum Option has some comparative advantages over other options.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Potential negative impact on groundwater quality during construction phase. Has some comparative disadvantage over other options.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Potential negative impact on groundwater quality during construction phase. Has some comparative disadvantage over other options.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Potential negative impact on groundwater quality during construction phase. Has some comparative disadvantage over other options.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Potential negative impact on groundwater quality during construction phase. Has some comparative disadvantage over other options.
		3.7	Agriculture and Non-Agricultural	Overall impact on land take & property. Number of properties to be impacted/acquired. Likely temporary or permanent severance effects, etc.	Significant comparative advantage over other options No direct impacts.	Significant comparative advantage over other options No direct impacts.	Some comparative advantage over other options The non-agricultural impacts associated with Options 1 will have significant impacts on lands (car park) used by St. Mochta's GAA club	Some comparative advantage over other options The non-agricultural impacts associated with Option 2 will have significant impacts on lands (car park) used by St. Mochta's GAA club	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Option 3 will impact on lands used by St. Mochta's GAA club, St. Mochta's FC and St. Mochta's National School	Some comparative advantage over other options The non-agricultural impacts associated with Option 2 will have significant impacts on lands (car park) used by St. Mochta's GAA club
		3.8	Geology and Soils (including Waste)	Soils and Geology and likely impact on geological resources based on preliminary/likely construction details. Soil resources to be developed/removed. Existing information relating to potential to encounter contaminated land. High-level assessment based on the likely structures/ works required and the potential for ground contamination due to historic landfills, pits and quarries.	Significant comparative advantage over other options No significant direct impacts.	Significant comparative advantage over other options No significant direct impacts.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options No significant direct impacts.	Some comparative advantage over other options No significant direct impacts.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options No significant direct impacts.	Some comparative advantage over other options No significant direct impacts.
		3.9	Radiation and Stray Current	Overall likely impact on existing sources of electromagnetic radiation.	Significant comparative advantage over other options No changes from an EMI perspective therefore advantage over other options.	Significant comparative advantage over other options No changes from an EMI perspective therefore advantage over other options.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options It is assumed that the routing of the cabling, the location of existing substations, hubs etc. along the line will be changed or impacted by the selection of any of the options over the entire project. All Do-Something options are comparable from an EMI perspective at this stage in the assessment.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options It is assumed that the routing of the cabling, the location of existing substations, hubs etc. along the line will be changed or impacted by the selection of any of the options over the entire project. All Do-Something options are comparable from an EMI perspective at this stage in the assessment.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options It is assumed that the routing of the cabling, the location of existing substations, hubs etc. along the line will be changed or impacted by the selection of any of the options over the entire project. All Do-Something options are comparable from an EMI perspective at this stage in the assessment.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options It is assumed that the routing of the cabling, the location of existing substations, hubs etc. along the line will be changed or impacted by the selection of any of the options over the entire project. All Do-Something options are comparable from an EMI perspective at this stage in the assessment.
4	Accessibility & Social inclusion	4.1	Impact on Vulnerable Groups		Some comparative advantage over other options Original Distance from The village junction to Porterstown Road junction 600m retained.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Shortest diversion route 1.2km (2x diversion route).	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Diverted distance route 1.1km (1.8x diversion route).	Some comparative advantage over other options Original Distance from The village junction to Porterstown Road junction 600m retained.	Some comparative advantage over other options Original Distance from The village junction to Porterstown Road junction 600m retained.	Some comparative advantage over other options Original Distance from The village junction to Porterstown Road junction 600m retained.
		4.2	Stations Accessibility	Quantification of increased service levels to the vulnerable groups.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Original Distance from The village junction to Porterstown Road junction 600m retained.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Shortest diversion route 1.2km (2x diversion route).	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Shortest diversion route 1.2km (2x diversion route)	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Shortest diversion route 1.2km (2x diversion route)	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Shortest diversion route 1.2km (2x diversion route)	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Shortest diversion route 1.2km (2x diversion route)
		4.3	Social Inclusion	Quantification of service levels impacts including severance to all groups (Severance of local communities through removal of level crossings without connection would fair worst under this heading).	Significant comparative advantage over other options Original Distance from The village junction to Porterstown Road junction 600m retained	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Shortest diversion route 1.2km (2x diversion route)	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Diverted distance route 1.1km (1.8x diversion route).	Significant comparative advantage over other options Original Distance from The village junction to Porterstown Road junction 600m retained.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Original Distance from The village junction to Porterstown Road junction 600m retained.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Original Distance from The village junction to Porterstown Road junction 600m retained.
5	Safety	5.1	Rail Safety	Safety for Rail users – removal of LC positive in this respect	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Maintaining the crossing would have a significant disadvantage to rail safety for people still crossing the rail.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Closing the crossing will remove the interface between rail and other traffic.	Significant comparative advantage over other options All overbridges have a significant advantage as they are a great crossing alternative	Significant comparative advantage over other options All overbridges have a significant advantage as they are a great crossing alternative	Significant comparative advantage over other options All overbridges have a significant advantage as they are a great crossing alternative	Significant comparative advantage over other options All overbridges have a significant advantage as they are a great crossing alternative
		5.2	Vehicular Traffic Safety	Quality of Access for these road users, lengths of diversions, removal of interface with rail and other modes of transport	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Maintaining the crossing would have a significant disadvantage to rail safety for vehicles crossing the rail.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Closing the crossing with no alternative would have a slight disadvantage as it would divert traffic onto longer routes.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Closing the crossing with no alternative would have a slight disadvantage as it would divert traffic onto longer routes.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Closing the crossing with no alternative would have a slight disadvantage as it would divert traffic onto longer routes.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Closing the crossing with no alternative would have a slight disadvantage as it would divert traffic onto longer routes.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Closing the crossing with no alternative would have a slight disadvantage as it would divert traffic onto longer routes.
		5.3	Pedestrian, Cyclist and Vulnerable Road user Safety	Quality of Access for these road users. removal of interfaces	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Original Distance from The village junction to Porterstown Road junction 600m retained.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Shortest diversion route 1.2km (2x diversion route).	Some comparative advantage over other options Diverted distance route 1.1km (1.8x diversion route).	Significant comparative advantage over other options Original Distance from The village junction to Porterstown Road junction 600m retained.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Original Distance from The village junction to Porterstown Road junction 600m retained.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Original Distance from The village junction to Porterstown Road junction 600m retained.
6	Physical Activity	6.1	Connectivity to adjoining cycling facilities	Analysis of the extent that the scheme connects with cycle tracks.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options No cycle tracks currently present on the immediately surrounding road network, but increased closures of the level crossing would reduce access to the Royal Canal Greenway. See also Transport Integration above.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options No cycle tracks on the immediately surrounding road network, but the closure of the level crossing would reduce access to the Royal Canal Greenway. See also Transport Integration above.	Some comparative advantage over other options Local severance on Porterstown Road mitigated to a degree by access to Porterstown Viaduct	Significant comparative advantage over other options Severance overcome by provision of direct replacement.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Severance overcome by provision of direct replacement.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Severance overcome by provision of direct replacement.
		6.2	Permeability and local connectivity opportunity	Journey Time and lengths of diversions for active modes and numbers affected. Analysis of the connectivity between level crossing and green areas/key attractions related to active mode	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Reduced connectivity across railway as closures become more frequent with increased train frequencies.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Severance of existing connectivity	Some comparative advantage over other options Local severance on Porterstown Road mitigated to a degree by access to Porterstown Viaduct	Significant comparative advantage over other options Severance overcome by provision of direct replacement.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Severance overcome by provision of direct replacement.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Severance overcome by provision of direct replacement.

	Criteria	Do Nothing	Do Minimum	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
1	Economy	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Comparable to other options	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options
2	Integration	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options
3	Environment	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options
4	Accessibility and social inclusion	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options
5	Safety	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options
6	Physical Activity	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options
	Progress To Stage 2	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Comment						

DART+ Maynooth Line - MCA Stage 1

Clonsilla Level Crossing Assessment

	Parameter		Criteria	Sub-Criteria (Quantitative/ Qualitative)	Do Nothing	Do Minimum	Option 1
1	Economy	1.1	Construction and Land Cost	Assessment of cost of construction of option, land costs, acquisition costs and temporary works	Significant comparative advantage over other options The level crossing is currently manned. The ongoing cost associated with this control mechanism on the railway is significant.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Cost of removing crossing is low in comparison to provision of road crossing.	Some comparative advantage over other options
		1.2	Long Term Maintenance costs	Steel options vs concrete options for structures and maintaining level crossings versus removing them	Some comparative advantage over other options The do-nothing scenario would maintain the existing maintenance costs of the level crossing	Significant comparative advantage over other options The closure of the level crossing would remove the maintenance requirement of the level crossing	Some comparative disadvantage over other options An overbridge would increase the maintenance requirements over a level crossing, though it would not be significantly more so than other options.
		1.3	Traffic Functionality /economic benefit	Benefits to vehicular traffic through reduction in journey time lengths and delays through removal of level crossings. Consideration of potentially longer routes for traffic.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Reduced capacity as train frequencies increase; increase in journey times for local residents.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Displacement of traffic onto alternative routes; increase in journey times for local residents.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Displacement of mobility impaired and cycle traffic onto ramped alternative routes; increase in journey times for local residents. Removal of vehicular access over the level crossing results in displaced flows - 680 vehicles AM peak hour and 704 vehicles PM peak hour. Additional traffic delay will result along adjacent access routes - 1% AM peak hour and 1% PM peak hour. Benchmark journey times will increase by up to 3%,
2	Integration	2.1	Transport Integration	Impact on scope for and ease of interchange between modes. Impact on the operation of other transport services both during construction and in operation. New interchange nodes and facilities; Reduced walking and wait times associated with interchanges. Modal shift figures during construction and operations. Changes to journey times to transport nodes.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Not shown on GDA Cycle Network Plan but there would be a reduction in local accessibility to the Royal Canal Cycle Route with increased closures of the railway. Reduced access to train station car parking from south of the railway.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Not shown on GDA Cycle Network Plan but there would be a removal of local accessibility to the Royal Canal Cycle Route. Severance of access to train station car parking from south of the railway.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Severance of access to train station car parking from south of the railway.
		2.2	Land Use Integration	Impact on land use strategies and regional and local plans. Assessment of support for land use factors local land use and planning. Inclusion of project in relevant local and regional planning documents.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options The do-nothing option is contrary to national and regional planning policy objectives as it does not support the DART Expansion programme.	Some comparative advantage over other options This option is supported in principle by the national and regional planning policy context. At local level, the Do – Minimum Option does not impact any Fingal DP map-based Zoning Objectives and Specific Objectives. LAP 13.C (associated with Kellystown LAP is to the south of Canal and level crossing. Closure of the level crossing would prevent access at this location and access to Clonsilla Station if it should be required.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options This option is supported in principle by national and regional planning policy context. At local level, however this option is located in Fingal DP for "High Amenity" and "Open Space" Zoned areas. Which would impact negatively on this land use objective. However, as it is a pedestrian bridge only the impacts would not be as significant as road bridge options. From a land use planning perspective if sensitively designed it could contribute to the sustainable mobility, planning and transport integration. Option 1 would support development of lands zoned for "Residential Area" as part of the future Kellystown LAP by maintaining pedestrian and cycle access at this location and links to public transport services.
		2.3	Geographical Integration	Impact on improvement of external links. Desire to link various geographical – mostly neutral due to localised nature of the level crossings. Overall electrification scheme would be highly positive.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Original Distance from Clonsilla Road junction to Porterstown road 450m retained.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Shortest diversion route 3.8km (8.4x diversion route).	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Shortest diversion route 3.8km (8.4x diversion route)
		2.4	Other Government Policy	Integration with Government Policy, Smarter Travel, Investment Programmes, rail safety, electrification etc	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Maintaining the crossing does not meet government policy.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Closing the crossing with no other alternative meets government policy but not ideal.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Closing the crossing with no other alternative meets government policy but not ideal
3	Environment	3.1	Noise and Vibration	Estimated number of people likely to be affected by transport related noise with the scheme within 50m.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Retains vehicular traffic which will impact the low number of sensitive receptors in proximity.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Removes vehicular traffic and minimal construction phase.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Pedestrian crossing only will have no operational noise impact.
		3.2	Air Quality and Climate	Local air quality effects. No of number of receptors within 50m.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Retains vehicular traffic which will impact the low number of sensitive receptors in proximity.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Removes vehicular traffic and minimal construction phase	Significant comparative advantage over other options Pedestrian crossing only will have no operational impact locally. This option will result in some additional operational phase vehicle km increase due to rerouting, extent of impact on traffic would determine if this was preferred or not.
		3.3	Landscape and Visual (including light)	Key landscape characteristics affected; Effects on listed/ key views; Impact on landscape character.	Significant comparative advantage over other options No impact on existing landscape or visual characteristics	Significant comparative advantage over other options No impact on existing landscape or visual characteristics. Assumes minimal physical intervention in environment.	Some comparative advantage over other options Proposed structure will impact some trees at entrance to Beech Park. Very significant impact on residential properties on Clonsilla Road/ Larch Grove and Weaver's Walk north of the canal, and along the east side of Clonsilla Road south of canal (including Greenmount House). Impact on tree-lined corridor on northern side canal where structure will oversail the canal.
		3.4	Biodiversity (flora and fauna)	Potential compliance/conflict with biodiversity objectives; Indirect impacts on protected species, designated sites; Overall effect on nature conservation resource.	Significant comparative advantage over other options No likely impacts.	Significant comparative advantage over other options No likely impacts.	Some comparative advantage over other options Hydrologically connected to South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA. No risk of LSE. Potential impacts to Royal Canal pNHA. Minor habitat loss in comparison to other options.
		3.5	Cultural, Archaeological and Architectural Heritage	Overall effect on cultural, archaeological and architecture heritage resource. Likely effects on RPS, National Monuments, SMRs, Conservation areas, etc. Number of designated sites/structures (by level of designation) directly impacted by scheme (landtake)	Significant comparative advantage over other options No likely impacts.	Significant comparative advantage over other options No likely impacts.	Some comparative advantage over other options Indirect impacts on canal bridge, canal and signal box (RPS)
		3.6	Water Resources	Overall potential significant effects on water resource attributes likely to be affected during construction and operation.	Some comparative advantage over other options Potential negative impact on surface water quality during operational phase. Requires minimal construction. Has some comparative advantages over other options.	Some comparative advantage over other options Removes vehicular traffic borne pollutants and minimal construction phase. The Do Minimum Option has some comparative advantages over other options.	Some comparative advantage over other options Potential Positive impact on surface water quality during operation. Potential negative impact on groundwater quality during construction phase. Option has some comparative advantages over other options.
		3.7	Agriculture and Non-Agricultural	Overall impact on land take & property. Number of properties to be impacted/acquired. Likely temporary or permanent severance effects, etc.	Significant comparative advantage over other options No likely impacts.	Significant comparative advantage over other options No likely impacts.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Options 1 and 4 were identified as having significant advantages over options due to the limited landtake and impact associated with Option 1 and the reduced direct impact associated with Option 4.
		3.8	Geology and Soils (including Waste)	Soils and Geology and likely impact on geological resources based on preliminary/likely construction details. Soil resources to be developed/removed. Existing information relating to potential to encounter contaminated land. High-level assessment based on the likely structures/ works required and the potential for ground contamination due to historic landfills, pits and quarries.	Significant comparative advantage over other options No likely impacts.	Significant comparative advantage over other options No likely impacts.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Lower fill import requirements compared to other options.
		3.9	Radiation and Stray Current	Overall likely impact on existing sources of electromagnetic radiation.	Significant comparative advantage over other options No changes from an EMI perspective therefore advantage over other options.	Significant comparative advantage over other options No changes from an EMI perspective therefore advantage over other options.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options It is assumed that the routing of the cabling, the location of existing substations, hubs etc. along the line will be changed or impacted by the selection of any of the options over the entire project. All Do-Something options are comparable from an EMI perspective at this stage in the assessment.
4	Accessibility & Social inclusion	4.1	Impact on Vulnerable Groups	Impacts on low income groups, non-car owners, people with a disability. Quantification of increased service levels to these groups ; Quantification of infrastructure and rolling stock improvements aimed at these groups; distribution of consumers surplus	Some comparative advantage over other options Original Distance from Consilla Road junction to Porterstown road 450m retained.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Shortest diversion route 3.8km (8.4x diversion route).	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Original Distance from Consilla Road junction to Porterstown road 450m retained.
		4.2	Stations Accessibility	Quantification of increased service levels to the vulnerable groups.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Original Distance from Clonsilla Road junction to Porterstown road 450m retained	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Shortest diversion route 3.8km (8.4x diversion route)	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Original Distance from Clonsilla Road junction to Porterstown road 450m retained.
		4.3	Social Inclusion	Quantification of service levels impacts including severance to all groups (Severance of local communities through removal of level crossings without connection would fair worst under this heading).	Significant comparative advantage over other options Original Distance from Clonsilla Road junction to Porterstown road 450m retained	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Shortest diversion route 3.8km (8.4x diversion route)	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Shortest diversion route 3.8km (8.4x diversion route)
5	Safety	5.1	Rail Safety	Safety for Rail users – removal of LC positive in this respect	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Maintaining the crossing would have a significant disadvantage to rail safety for people still crossing the rail.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Closing the crossing will remove the interface between rail and other traffic.	Some comparative advantage over other options Closing the crossing would have a slight disadvantage to rail users as they would have to use alternative routes.
		5.2	Vehicular Traffic Safety	Quality of Access for these road users, lengths of diversions, removal of interface with rail and other modes of transport	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Maintaining the crossing would have a significant disadvantage to rail safety for vehicles crossing the rail.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Closing the crossing with no alternative would have a slight disadvantage as it would divert traffic onto longer routes.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Closing the crossing with no alternative would have a slight disadvantage as it would divert traffic onto longer routes.
		5.3	Pedestrian, Cyclist and Vulnerable Road user Safety	Quality of Access for these road users. removal of interfaces	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Original Distance from Clonsilla Road junction to Porterstown road 450m retained.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Shortest diversion route 3.8km (8.4x diversion route).	Significant comparative advantage over other options Original Distance from Clonsilla Road junction to Porterstown road 450m retained.
6	Physical Activity	6.1	Connectivity to adjoining cycling facilities	Analysis of the extent that the scheme connects with cycle tracks.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options No cycle tracks currently present on the immediately surrounding road network, but increased closures of the level crossing would reduce access to the Royal Canal Greenway. See also Transport Integration above.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options No cycle tracks on the immediately surrounding road network, but the closure of the level crossing would reduce access to the Royal Canal Greenway. See also Transport Integration above.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Severance overcome by provision of direct replacement.
		6.2	Permeability and local connectivity opportunity	Journey Time and lengths of diversions for active modes and numbers affected. Analysis of the connectivity between level crossing and green areas/key attractions related to active mode	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Reduced connectivity across railway as closures become more frequent with increased train frequencies.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Severance of existing connectivity.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Severance overcome by provision of direct replacement.

Criteria	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
1.1	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options
1.2	Some comparative disadvantage over other options An overbridge would increase the maintenance requirements over a level crossing, though it would not be significantly more so than other options.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options An overbridge would increase the maintenance requirements over a level crossing, though it would not be significantly more so than other options.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options An overbridge would increase the maintenance requirements over a level crossing, though it would not be significantly more so than other options.
1.3	Some comparative advantage over other options Some improvement in journey time; potential for induced trips; diversion required for local residents.	Some comparative advantage over other options Some improvement in journey time; potential for induced trips; diversion required for local residents.	Some comparative advantage over other options Some improvement in journey time; potential for induced trips; diversion required for local residents.
2.1	Some comparative advantage over other options Some improvement in journey time; potential for induced trips; diversion required for local residents.	Some comparative advantage over other options Some improvement in journey time; potential for induced trips; diversion required for local residents.	Some comparative advantage over other options Some improvement in journey time; potential for induced trips; diversion required for local residents.
2.2	Some comparative disadvantage over other options This option is supported in principle by the national and regional planning policy context. Similar to Option 5 : This option is supported in principle by the national and regional planning policy context. At local level, Option 2 travels through LAP13.C future Kellystown LAP which is also zoned as a Strategic Development Zone (SDZ) Other relevant zonings that apply include Open Space, established residential, town centre and district. It is also within a wider 'urban Framework Plan' area as per the Fingal DP map-based Zoning Objectives. Without the development of the LAP it is not known how new road infrastructure at this location would impact on the future development of the area. It is likely it could support sustainable modes of travel. There is a FDP map based specific objective to develop a 'School' on Clonsilla Road which may be impacted by this option.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options This option is supported in principle by the national and regional planning policy context. At local level, Option 3 traverses through large area of land zoned for "Open Space" by Fingal DP which aims to "*Preserve and provide for open space and recreational amenities*" as well as lands zoned for "High Amenity" where the aim is to "*Protect and enhance high amenity areas*". Due to the large extents of land being severed by the proposed Options which involve the development of roads, it is considered that Option 3 goes against the aims of lands zoned for "Open Space" and "High Amenity". Additionally, Option 3 traverses lands with a Fingal map-based Specific Objective to "Protect & Preserve Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows". Option 3 is not in accordance with this Specific Objective. In terms of land use factors, it connects into the Hansfield SDZ. This option does not correspond with the movement strategy or land use zoning objectives of the SDZ.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Overbridge 210m to the west of existing crossing – This option is supported in principle by the national and regional planning policy context. At local level, Options 4 travels through zoned 'High Amenity' and 'Open Space' with vehicular traffic as opposed to options with only pedestrian and cyclist traffic therefore would have greater impact on the environment and HA and OS land use zoning objectives.
2.3	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Diverted distance route 758m (1.6x diversion route)	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Shortest diversion route 1.7km (3.6x diversion route)	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Diverted distance route 894m (2.0x diversion route)
2.4	Significant comparative advantage over other options Providing vehicular and pedestrian is ideal	Significant comparative advantage over other options Providing vehicular and pedestrian is ideal	Significant comparative advantage over other options Providing vehicular and pedestrian is ideal
3.1	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options 53 dwellings within 100m.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options 43 dwellings within 100m.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options 29 dwellings within 100m. Slightly preferred over options 2, 3 and 6 due to lower number of properties within 100m
3.2	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options 24 dwellings within 50m. Due to longer length and overbridge, there would be a higher volume of embodied carbon in this option.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options 16 dwellings within 50m. Due to longer length and overbridge, there would be a higher volume of embodied carbon in this option.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options 12 dwellings within 50m. Slightly preferred over options 2, 3 and 6 due to lower number of properties within 50m and lower construction materials (embodied carbon).
3.3	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Overbridge option will remove a number of residential properties at Larch Grove. Very significant impact on residential properties on Clonsilla Road/ Larch Grove and Weaver's Walk north of the canal, and along the east side of Clonsilla Road south of canal (including Greenmount House). Significant impact on tree-lined corridor of canal/railway. Junction with Porterstown Road may impact boundary of Luttrellstown Castle estate (an architectural conservation area, and a protected structure). Tree Preservation Objectives within Luttrellstown estate.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Very significant impact on trees north of the canal and through Beech Park - all of which are subject to Tree Preservation Objectives. Very Significant impact on GAA Pitch at Beech Park / Westmanstowns Gaels and on parkland generally, including allotments. Lands south of the railway are zoned High Amenity. Junction with Porterstown Road may impact boundary of Luttrellstown Castle estate (an architectural conservation area, and a protected structure). Tree Preservation Objectives within Luttrellstown estate. Significant impact on tree-lined corridor of canal/railway.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Impact on trees north of the canal - which are subject to Tree Preservation Objectives - and through Beech Park. Lands south of the railway are zoned High Amenity. Very significant impact on tree-lined corridor of canal and entrance to Porter's Gate. Visual impact on canal side properties at end of western ramp.
3.4	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Hydrologically connected to South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA. No risk of LSE. Potential impacts to Royal Canal pNHA. Loss of woodland, treeline, hedgerow amenity grassland and wet grassland habitats.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Hydrologically connected to South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA. No risk of LSE. Potential impacts to Royal Canal pNHA. Greater loss of woodland, treeline, hedgerow amenity grassland and wet grassland habitats than all other options. Dissects public park.	Some comparative advantage over other options Hydrologically connected to South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA. No risk of LSE. Potential impacts to Royal Canal pNHA. Loss of treeline and wet grassland habitat. Direct impacts to veteran beech tree in the field where option runs through.
3.5	Some comparative advantage over other options Direct impacts on demesne landscapes associated with Greenmount and Kellystown. Indirect impact on canal (RPS). Potential direct impacts on archaeological deposits that may survive within greenfield areas.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Direct impacts on demesne associated with Beech Park Ho (RPS) and Clonsilla Lodge. Indirect impacts on Beech Park Ho (RPS), canal (RPS) and Luttrellstown ACA. Potential direct impacts on archaeological deposits that may survive within greenfield areas.	Some comparative advantage over other options Direct impact on demesne landscape associated with Beech Park Ho. Indirect impact on canal (RPS). Potential direct impacts on archaeological deposits that may survive within greenfield areas.
3.6	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Potential negative impact on surface water quality during operational phase. Potential negative impact on groundwater quality during construction phase. Has some comparative disadvantage over other options.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Proposed route indicated to have increased flood risk compared to other options. Potential negative impact on surface water quality during operational phase. Has some comparative disadvantage over other options.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Proposed route indicated to have increased flood risk compared to other options. Potential negative impact on surface water quality during operational phase. Has some comparative disadvantage over other options.
3.7	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Under Options 2, the non-agricultural impact will involve the acquisition of five residential properties. The agricultural impact will result in land severance on a livestock farm holding	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Option 3 will result in significant land severance of Beech Park lands. There is a direct impact on lands used for community allotments.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Options 1 and 4 were identified as having significant advantages over options due to the limited landtake and impact associated with Option 1 and the reduced direct impact associated with Option 4.
3.8	Some comparative advantage over other options Lower fill import requirements compared to other options.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Longest route with overbridge require fill import to the site (Minor negative). This option appears to have the highest earthworks needs.	Some comparative advantage over other options Lower fill import requirements compared to other options.
3.9	Some comparative disadvantage over other options It is assumed that the routing of the cabling, the location of existing substations, hubs etc. along the line will be changed or impacted by the selection of any of the options over the entire project. All Do-Something options are comparable from an EMI perspective at this stage in the assessment.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options It is assumed that the routing of the cabling, the location of existing substations, hubs etc. along the line will be changed or impacted by the selection of any of the options over the entire project. All Do-Something options are comparable from an EMI perspective at this stage in the assessment.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options It is assumed that the routing of the cabling, the location of existing substations, hubs etc. along the line will be changed or impacted by the selection of any of the options over the entire project. All Do-Something options are comparable from an EMI perspective at this stage in the assessment.
4.1	Some comparative advantage over other options Diverted distance route 758m (1.6x diversion route).	Some comparative advantage over other options Shortest diversion route 1.7km (3.6x diversion route)	Some comparative advantage over other options Diverted distance route 894m (2.0x diversion route)
4.2	Some comparative advantage over other options Diverted distance route 758m (1.6x diversion route).	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Shortest diversion route 1.7km (3.6x diversion route)	Some comparative advantage over other options Diverted distance route 894m (2.0x diversion route)
4.3	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Diverted distance route 758m (1.6x diversion route)	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Shortest diversion route 1.7km (3.6x diversion route)	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Diverted distance route 894m (2.0x diversion route)
5.1	Some comparative advantage over other options All underbridges will have a slight advantage as they are good but notoriously unpleasant for rail users.	Some comparative advantage over other options All overbridges have a significant advantage as they are a great crossing alternative.	Some comparative advantage over other options All underbridges will have a slight advantage as they are good but notoriously unpleasant for rail users
5.2	Significant comparative advantage over other options Providing a segregated crossing would have a significant advantage as vehicular traffic is not crossing the live rail.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Providing a segregated crossing would have a significant advantage as vehicular traffic is not crossing the live rail.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Providing a segregated crossing would have a significant advantage as vehicular traffic is not crossing the live rail.
5.3	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Diverted distance route 758m (1.6x diversion route).	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Shortest diversion route 1.7km (3.6x diversion route).	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Diverted distance route 894m (2.0x diversion route).
6.1	Some comparative advantage over other options Local severance at Clonsilla Station mitigated to a degree by alternative access proposal	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Local severance at Clonsilla Station mitigated to a degree by alternative access proposal. More remote than other options considered with greater diversion for pedestrians and cyclists.	Some comparative advantage over other options Local severance at Clonsilla Station mitigated to a degree by alternative access proposal.
6.2	Some comparative advantage over other options Local severance at Clonsilla Station mitigated to a degree by alternative access proposal	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Local severance at Clonsilla Station mitigated to a degree by alternative access proposal. More remote than other options considered with greater diversion for pedestrians and cyclists.	Some comparative advantage over other options Local severance at Clonsilla Station mitigated to a degree by alternative access proposal

Criteria	Option 5	Option 6	Option 7
1.1	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options
1.2	Some comparative disadvantage over other options An overbridge would increase the maintenance requirements over a level crossing, though it would not be significantly more so than other options.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options An overbridge would increase the maintenance requirements over a level crossing, though it would not be significantly more so than other options.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options An overbridge would increase the maintenance requirements over a level crossing, though it would not be significantly more so than other options.
1.3	Some comparative advantage over other options Some improvement in journey time; potential for induced trips; diversion required for local residents.	Some comparative advantage over other options Some improvement in journey time; potential for induced trips; diversion required for local residents.	Some comparative advantage over other options Some improvement in journey time; potential for induced trips; diversion required for local residents.
2.1	Some comparative advantage over other options Some improvement in journey time; potential for induced trips; diversion required for local residents.	Some comparative advantage over other options Some improvement in journey time; potential for induced trips; diversion required for local residents.	Some comparative advantage over other options Some improvement in journey time; potential for induced trips; diversion required for local residents.
2.2	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Overbridge 200m to the east of existing crossing – Online at Larchgrove Similar to Option 5 : This option is supported in principle by the national and regional planning policy context. At local level, Option 5 travels through LAP13.C future Kellystown LAP which is also zoned as a Strategic Development Zone (SDZ) Other relevant zonings that apply include Open Space, established residential, town centre and district. It is also within a wider 'urban Framework Plan' area as per the Fingal DP map-based Zoning Objectives. Without the development of the LAP it is not known how new road infrastructure at this location would impact on the future development of the area. It is likely it could support sustainable modes of travel. There is a FCDP map based specific objective to develop a 'School' on Clonsilla Road which may be impacted by this option.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options This option is supported in principle by the national and regional planning policy context. At local level, Option 6 may impact the Fingal DP map-based Zoning Objectives for "Residential" lands by impacting the existing residential properties. Additionally, Option 6 is likely to impact a map-based Specific Objective for the development of a "School" at Clonsilla Road by traversing through the lands earmarked for this development. Option 6 is located within undeveloped lands zoned for "Residential Area" and "Open Space" by the Fingal DP, which are subject to development as part of the future Kellystown LAP. This option will result in reduced zoned lands being made available for development however it will improve the overall land use and transport planning integration.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options This option is supported in principle by the national and regional planning policy context. At local level, Option 7 may impact the Fingal DP map-based Zoning Objectives for "Residential" lands by impacting the existing residential properties. Additionally, Option 7 is likely to impact a map-based Specific Objective for the development of a "School" at Clonsilla Road by traversing through lands earmarked for this development. Option 7 is located within undeveloped lands zoned for "Residential Area" and "Open Space" by the Fingal DP, which are subject to development as part of the future Kellystown LAP. This option will result in reduced zoned lands being made available for development however it will improve the overall land use and transport planning integration.
2.3	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Diverted distance route 758m (1.6x diversion route)	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Diverted distance route 795m (1.8x diversion route)	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Diverted distance route 795m (1.8x diversion route)
2.4	Significant comparative advantage over other options Providing vehicular and pedestrian is ideal.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Providing vehicular and pedestrian is ideal.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Providing vehicular and pedestrian is ideal.
3.1	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options 44 dwellings within 100m.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options 64 dwellings within 100m.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options 64 dwellings within 100m.
3.2	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options 43 dwellings within 50m.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options 31 dwellings within 50m.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options 34 dwellings within 50m.
3.3	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Overbridge option will remove a number of residential properties at Larch Grove / Weaver's Walk. Very significant impact on residential properties on Clonsilla Road/ Larch Grove and Weaver's Walk north of the canal; along the east side of Clonsilla Road south of canal (including Greenmount House) and Dolland House. Significant impact on tree-lined corridor of canal/railway.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Unlikely that property demolition could be avoided. Very significant impact on residential properties on Clonsilla Road/ Larch Grove and Weaver's Walk north of the canal, and along the east side of Clonsilla Road south of canal (including Greenmount House). Significant impact on tree-lined corridor of canal/railway. Junction with Porterstown Road may impact boundary of Luttrellstown Castle estate (an architectural conservation area, and a protected structure). Tree Preservation Objectives within Luttrellstown estate.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Unlikely that property demolition could be avoided. Very significant impact on residential properties on Clonsilla Road/ Larch Grove and Weaver's Walk north of the canal, and along the east side of Clonsilla Road south of canal (including Greenmount House). Significant impact on tree-lined corridor of canal/railway. Junction with Porterstown Road may impact boundary of Luttrellstown Castle estate (an architectural conservation area, and a protected structure). Tree Preservation Objectives within Luttrellstown estate.
3.4	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Hydrologically connected to South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA. No risk of LSE. Potential impacts to Royal Canal pNHA. Loss of woodland, treeline, hedgerow amenity grassland and wet grassland habitats.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Hydrologically connected to South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA. No risk of LSE. Potential impacts to Royal Canal pNHA. Demolition. Loss of woodland, treeline, hedgerow amenity grassland and wet grassland habitats.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Hydrologically connected to South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA. No risk of LSE. Potential impacts to Royal Canal pNHA. Loss of woodland, treeline, hedgerow amenity grassland and wet grassland habitats.
3.5	Some comparative advantage over other options Direct impacts on demesne landscapes associated with Greenmount and Kellystown. Indirect impact on canal (RPS0698). Potential direct impacts on archaeological deposits that may survive within greenfield areas. Source: Fingal Development Plan 2017-2023	Some comparative advantage over other options Direct impacts on demesne landscapes associated with Greenmount and Kellystown. Indirect impact on canal (RPS). Potential direct impacts on archaeological deposits that may survive within greenfield areas.	Some comparative advantage over other options Direct impacts on demesne landscapes associated with Greenmount and Kellystown. Indirect impact on canal (RPS0698). Potential direct impacts on archaeological deposits that may survive within greenfield areas. Source: Fingal Development Plan 2017-2023
3.6	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Potential negative impact on surface water quality during operational phase. Potential negative impact on groundwater quality during construction phase. Has some comparative disadvantage over other options.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Potential negative impact on surface water quality during operational phase. Potential negative impact on groundwater quality during construction phase. Has some comparative disadvantage over other options.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Potential negative impact on surface water quality during operational phase. Potential negative impact on groundwater quality during construction phase. Has some comparative disadvantage over other options.
3.7	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options A number of property acquisitions will be required including agricultural land including the demolition of approximately 3 properties.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Option 6, the non-agricultural impact will include landtake of property curtilage on residential properties. the agricultural impact will result in land severance on a livestock farm holding	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Agricultural land impacted and land acquisition will be required.
3.8	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Long route with overbridge require fill import to the site (Minor negative).	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Long route with overbridge require fill import to the site (Minor negative).	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Long route with overbridge require fill import to the site (Minor negative).
3.9	Some comparative disadvantage over other options It is assumed that the routing of the cabling, the location of existing substations, hubs etc. along the line will be changed or impacted by the selection of any of the options over the entire project. All Do-Something options are comparable from an EMI perspective at this stage in the assessment.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options It is assumed that the routing of the cabling, the location of existing substations, hubs etc. along the line will be changed or impacted by the selection of any of the options over the entire project. All Do-Something options are comparable from an EMI perspective at this stage in the assessment.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options It is assumed that the routing of the cabling, the location of existing substations, hubs etc. along the line will be changed or impacted by the selection of any of the options over the entire project. All Do-Something options are comparable from an EMI perspective at this stage in the assessment.
4.1	Some comparative advantage over other options Diverted distance route 758m (1.6x diversion route)	Some comparative advantage over other options Diverted distance route 795m (1.8x diversion route)	Some comparative advantage over other options Diverted distance route 795m (1.8x diversion route)
4.2	Some comparative advantage over other options Diverted distance route 758m (1.6x diversion route)	Some comparative advantage over other options Diverted distance route 795m (1.8x diversion route)	Some comparative advantage over other options Diverted distance route 795m (1.8x diversion route)
4.3	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Diverted distance route 758m (1.6x diversion route)	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Diverted distance route 795m (1.8x diversion route)	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Diverted distance route 795m (1.8x diversion route)
5.1	Some comparative advantage over other options All overbridges have a significant advantage as they are a great crossing alternative	Some comparative advantage over other options All overbridges have a significant advantage as they are a great crossing alternative	Some comparative advantage over other options All overbridges have a significant advantage as they are a great crossing alternative
5.2	Significant comparative advantage over other options Providing a segregated crossing would have a significant advantage as vehicular traffic is not crossing the live rail.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Providing a segregated crossing would have a significant advantage as vehicular traffic is not crossing the live rail.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Providing a segregated crossing would have a significant advantage as vehicular traffic is not crossing the live rail.
5.3	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Diverted distance route 758m (1.6x diversion route)	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Diverted distance route 795m (1.8x diversion route)	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Diverted distance route 795m (1.8x diversion route)
6.1	Some comparative advantage over other options Local severance at Clonsilla Station mitigated to a degree by alternative access proposal.	Some comparative advantage over other options Local severance at Clonsilla Station mitigated to a degree by alternative access proposal.	Some comparative advantage over other options Local severance at Clonsilla Station mitigated to a degree by alternative access proposal.
6.2	Some comparative advantage over other options Local severance at Clonsilla Station mitigated to a degree by alternative access proposal.	Some comparative advantage over other options Local severance at Clonsilla Station mitigated to a degree by alternative access proposal.	Some comparative advantage over other options Local severance at Clonsilla Station mitigated to a degree by alternative access proposal.

	Criteria		Do Nothing	Do Minimum	Option 1
1	Economy		Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options
2	Integration		Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options
3	Environment		Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options
4	Accessibility and social inclusion		Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options
5	Safety		Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options
6	Physical Activity		Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options
	Progress To Stage 2		No	No	Yes
	Comment				

Criteria	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Economy	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options
Integration	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options
Environment	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options
Accessibility and social inclusion	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options
Safety	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options
Physical Activity	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options
Progress To Stage 2	Yes	No	Yes
Comment			

Criteria	Option 5	Option 6	Option 7
Economy	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options
Integration	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options
Environment	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options
Accessibility and social inclusion	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options
Safety	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options
Physical Activity	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options
Progress To Stage 2	No	No	No
Comment			

DART+ Maynooth Line - MCA Stage 1

Barberstown Level Crossing Assessment

	Parameter		Criteria	Sub-Criteria (Quantitative/ Qualitative)	Do Nothing	Do Minimum	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5
					Leave the current level crossings in place.	Closure of the existing crossings with no alternative provided. All traffic would be diverted to alternative routes around the crossing location.					Pedestrian Cycle Bridge Only at the Level Crossing
1	Economy	1.1	**Construction and Land Cost**	Assessment of cost of construction of option, land costs, acquisition costs and temporary works	Significant comparative advantage over other options The level crossing is currently manned. The ongoing cost associated with this control mechanism on the railway is significant.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Cost of removing crossing is low in comparison to provision of road crossing.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options Construction costs of this option will be comparative to other options as the provision of a pedestrian cycle bridge within the canal environs will require significant temporary and permanent works. The cost to acquire land will be lower than other options providing full access
		1.2	**Long Term Maintenance costs**	Steel options vs concrete options for structures and maintaining level crossings versus removing them	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options The do-nothing scenario would maintain the existing maintenance costs of the level crossing.	Significant comparative advantage over other options The closure of the level crossing would remove the maintenance requirement of the level crossing.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options An overbridge would increase the maintenance requirements over a level crossing, though it would not be significantly more so than other options.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options An overbridge would increase the maintenance requirements over a level crossing, though it would not be significantly more so than other options.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options An overbridge would increase the maintenance requirements over a level crossing, though it would not be significantly more so than other options.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options An overbridge would increase the maintenance requirements over a level crossing, though it would not be significantly more so than other options.	Some comparative advantage over other options A pedestrian/cyclist overbridge would require minimal maintenance in short term with regular inspections and remedial works in the long term. The long term maintenance low compared to other options.
		1.3	**Traffic Functionality /economic benefit**	Benefits to vehicular traffic through reduction in journey time lengths and delays through removal of level crossings. Consideration of potentially longer routes for traffic.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Reduced capacity as train frequencies increase; increase in journey times for local residents.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Displacement of traffic onto alternative routes; increase in journey times for local residents.	Some comparative advantage over other options Improvement in journey times; potential for induced trips; potential to increase congestion on local road network.	Some comparative advantage over other options Some improvement in journey time; potential for induced trips; diversion required for local residents.	Some comparative advantage over other options Some improvement in journey time; potential for induced trips; diversion required for local residents.	Some comparative advantage over other options Some improvement in journey time; potential for induced trips; diversion required for local residents.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Displacement of mobility impaired and cycle traffic onto ramped alternative routes; increase in journey times for local residents. Removal of vehicular access over the level crossing results in displaced flows - 1218 vehicles AM peak hour and 1110 vehicles PM peak hour. Additional traffic delay will result along adjacent access routes - 7% AM peak hour and 5% PM peak hour. Benchmark journey times will increase by up to 8%,
2	Integration	2.1	**Transport Integration**	Impact on scope for and ease of interchange between modes. Impact on the operation of other transport services both during construction and in operation. New interchange nodes and facilities; Reduced walking and wait times associated with interchanges. Modal shift figures during construction and operations. Changes to	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Not shown on GDA Cycle Network Plan but there would be a reduction in local accessibility to the Royal Canal Cycle Route with increased closures of the railway.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Not shown on GDA Cycle Network Plan but there would be a removal of local accessibility to the Royal Canal Cycle Route.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options General reduction in journey times. Maintaining access to the Royal Canal Cycleway will present challenges.	Some comparative advantage over other options Some improvement in journey time; potential for induced trips; diversion required for local residents.	Some comparative advantage over other options Some improvement in journey time; potential for induced trips; diversion required for local residents.	Some comparative advantage over other options Some improvement in journey time; potential for induced trips; diversion required for local residents.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Reduction in local permeability.
		2.2	**Land Use Integration**	Impact on land use strategies and regional and local plans. Assessment of support for land use factors local land use and planning. Inclusion of project in relevant local and regional planning documents.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options The do-nothing option is contrary to national and regional planning policy objectives as it does not support the DART Expansion programme.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options The Do - Minimum Option supports the national and regional policies and objectives in relation to the project. This Option would not support the Barnhill LAP 2019, movement and access strategy nor does it provide access across the rail line to lands zoned for future development, zoned "Residential Area" in FDP as part of the Barnhill LAP (2019).	Some comparative advantage over other options This option is on online overbridge, supported in principle by the national and regional planning policy context. However, it is noted that it would have direct impact on a RPS (Packenham bridge (RPS 0711) - not factored as part of the planning policy consideration - refer to separate architectural heritage assessment). At local planning policy level, Option 1 would support the future development of lands zoned "Residential Area" as part of the Barnhill LAP by providing access vehicular, pedestrian and cycle access to these lands.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options This option is supported by the national and regional planning policy context. At local level, Option 2 is located within a section of land zoned for "High Amenity" by the Fingal DP, the also travels across Open Space zoned land and the GDA Cycle Network (along the Royal Canal). It then travels north west into an areas designated (map based zoning objective LAP 13.A) for the Barnhill LAP 2019. The introduction of a new road infrastructure into a High Amenity area is considered to be a major negative impact and would be inconsistent with this landuse zoning. However, it travels on the edge of this zoning and in proximity to the existing road network and could provide a direct connection into the LAP lands. Subject to further studies this option could have the potential to facilitate land use and transport planning integration.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options This option crosses through the middle of a new housing estate so would be significantly worse than the other options. However, this option is supported in principle by the national and regional planning policy context. At local level, Option 3 travels through sensitive land use zonings including 'High Amenity', 'Open Space' associated with the Royal Canal, over the GDA cycle Network. It continues northwards into Hansfield SDZ 2006 (as amended) There is map-based Specific Objective of "Protect & Preserve Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows". Continuing northwards it travels through zoned "Residential Area" part of the Hansfield SDZ (2006). The construction of mixed-used development commenced at Hansfield. Construction of a road network through the SDZ lands at this location would be inconsistent with the policies and objectives of the SDZ as well as impact on existing properties/residential amenity. There is a significant disadvantage with a major negative impacts associated with this option.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options This option is supported in principle by the national and regional planning policy context. At local level, Option 4 is located within a section of land zoned for "High Amenity" by the Fingal DP. This option travel into the LAP 13.A Barnhill LAP through zoned open space lands as part of the Barnhill LAP however it could link to the Barnhill - Ongar road network and may support overall land use and transport planning integration over the long-term. Some disadvantage over other options.	Some comparative advantage over other options This option is supported in principle by the national and regional planning policy context. At local level, Option 5 is located within a small section of land zoned for "Open Space" by the Fingal DP. The introduction of a new infrastructure into a Open Space area is inconsistent with the 'Open Space' landuse zoning objective, however as this option only supports sustainable modes of travel, it is considered that the impact will be smaller when compared with Option 2 and 4 which support vehicular traffic. Subject to further studies, this option could have the potential to support sustainable transport planning integration.
		2.3	**Geographical Integration**	Impact on improvement of external links. Desire to link various geographical – mostly neutral due to localised nature of the level crossings. Overall electrification scheme would be highly positive.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Original Distance from R121 junction to Barberstown North Road junction 300m retained.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Shortest diversion route 4.8km (16x diversion route).	Significant comparative advantage over other options Original Distance from R121 junction to Barberstown North Road junction 300m retained.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Diverted distance route 587m (2.0x diversion route).	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Diverted distance route 789m (2.6x diversion route).	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Diverted distance route 948m (3.1x diversion route)	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Diverted distance route 4.3km
		2.4	**Other Government Policy**	Integration with Government Policy, Smarter Travel, Investment Programmes, rail safety, electrification etc	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Maintaining the crossing does not meet government policy.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Closing the crossing with no other alternative meets government policy but not ideal.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Providing vehicular and pedestrian is ideal.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Providing vehicular and pedestrian is ideal.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Providing vehicular and pedestrian is ideal	Significant comparative advantage over other options Providing vehicular and pedestrian is ideal	Some comparative disadvantage over other options The GDATS includes an objective to enhance linkages to planned developments. This option runs contrary to the objective.
3	Environment	3.1	**Noise and Vibration**	Estimated number of people likely to be affected by transport related noise with the scheme within 50m.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Retains vehicular traffic which will impact a low number of sensitive receptors in proximity.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Removes vehicular traffic and construction phase is minimal.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options 2 dwellings within 100m.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Only 1 dwelling within 100m.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options This option crosses through the middle of a new housing estate so would be significantly worse than the other options.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Only 1 dwelling within 100m	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Only 1 dwelling within 100m
		3.2	**Air Quality and Climate**	Local air quality effects. No of number of receptors within 50m.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Retains vehicular traffic which will impact the low number of sensitive receptors in proximity.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Removes vehicular traffic and construction phase is minimal.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options 2 dwellings within 50m.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Only 1 dwelling within 50m.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options This option crosses through the middle of a new housing estate so would be significantly worse than the other options.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Only 1 dwelling within 50m	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Removes vehicle traffic therefore requiring longer trips on alternative routes for some traffic, however removes localised traffic impacts. Some short-term construction impacts.
		3.3	**Landscape and Visual (including light)**	Key landscape characteristics affected; Effects on listed/ key views; Impact on landscape character.	Significant comparative advantage over other options No likely impacts.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Minimal changes likely - no likely significant impacts.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Based on high level assessment of information provided there is potential for significant landscape and visual impact for boundary to Luttrellstown Castle estate (the latter is an architectural conservation area, and a protected structure). Tree Preservation Objectives within Luttrellstown Estate. Very significant landscape and visual impact on Royal Canal corridor and Pakenham Bridge. Very significant landscape and visual impact for 3 residential properties to either side of existing road leading to crossing and for canal side cottage at bridge.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Based on high level assessment of information provided there is potential significant landscape and visual impact for boundary to Luttrellstown Castle estate (the latter is an architectural conservation area, and a protected structure). Tree Preservation Objectives within Luttrellstown Estate. Significant landscape and visual impact on Royal Canal corridor. Significant visual impact for residential properties, two to north/northwest of eastern roundabout, and one southwest of western roundabout.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Note: Northern end of proposed route cuts through partly developed / partly under-development residential areas at Hansfield SDZ. Based on information provided there is potential for very significant landscape and visual impact on Royal Canal corridor and lands south to Luttrellstown Castle estate (the latter is an architectural conservation area, and a protected structure). Tree Preservation Objectives north of Luttrellstown Road and within Luttrellstown Estate. Very significant visual impact for residential property on site of former Barberstown House. Potential visual impact for Beech Park House / Shackleton Gardens east of the road option.	Some comparative advantage over other options Potential significant landscape and visual impact for boundary to Luttrellstown Castle estate (the latter is an architectural conservation area, and a protected structure). Tree Preservation Objectives within Luttrellstown estate. Significant landscape and visual impact on Royal Canal corridor. Significant visual impact for residential properties, one to northwest of eastern roundabout, and one southwest of western roundabout.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Significant visual impact for one residential dwelling in close proximity .
		3.4	**Biodiversity (flora and fauna)**	Potential compliance/conflict with biodiversity objectives; Indirect impacts on protected species, designated sites; Overall effect on nature conservation resource.	Significant comparative advantage over other options No direct impacts	Significant comparative advantage over other options No direct impacts	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Hydrologically connected to South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA. No risk of LSE. Demolition of existing bridge could lead to significant impacts on the Royal Canal pNHA. Habitat loss will be minor given that the option is online.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Hydrologically connected to South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA. No risk of LSE. Potential impacts to Royal Canal pNHA. Loss of treeline, hedgerow and agricultural grassland habitats.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Hydrologically connected to South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA. No risk of LSE. Potential impacts to Royal Canal pNHA. Loss of treeline, hedgerow and agricultural grassland habitats.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Hydrologically connected to South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA. No risk of LSE. Potential impacts to Royal Canal pNHA. Significantly greater loss of treeline, hedgerow and agricultural grassland habitats.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Hydrologically connected to South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA. No risk of LSE. Potential impacts to Royal Canal pNHA. Loss of hedgerow and agricultural grassland habitats.
		3.5	**Cultural, Archaeological and Architectural Heritage**	Overall effect on cultural, archaeological and architecture heritage resource. Likely effects on RPS, National Monuments, SMRs, Conservation areas, etc. Number of designated sites/structures (by level of designation) directly impacted by scheme (landtake)	Significant comparative advantage over other options No likely impacts.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Minimal changes likely - no likely significant impacts.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Direct impact on Packenham bridge (RPS 0711). Source: Fingal Development Plan 2017-2023	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Indirect impacts on canal and canal bridge (RPS 0711) and Luttrellstown ACA. Potential direct impacts on archaeological deposits that may survive in greenfield areas.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Indirect impacts on canal (RPS 0711) and Luttrellstown ACA. Potential direct impacts on archaeological deposits that may survive in greenfield areas.	Some comparative advantage over other options Indirect impacts on canal (RPS 0711) and Luttrellstown ACA. Potential direct impacts on archaeological deposits that may survive in greenfield areas.	Some comparative advantage over other options Indirect impacts on canal (RPS 0711)
		3.6	**Water Resources**	Overall potential significant effects on water resource attributes likely to be affected during construction and operation.	Some comparative advantage over other options Potential negative impact on surface water quality during operational phase. Requires minimal construction. Has some comparative advantages over other options.	Some comparative advantage over other options Removes vehicular traffic born pollutants and minimal construction phase. The Do Minimum Option has some comparative advantages over other options.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Potential negative impact on surface water quality during operational phase. Potential negative impact on groundwater quality during construction phase. Has some comparative disadvantage over other options.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Proposed route indicated to have increased flood risk compared to other options. Potential negative impact on surface water quality during operational phase. Potential negative impact on groundwater quality during construction phase. Has some comparative disadvantage over other options.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Potential negative impact on surface water quality during operational phase. Potential negative impact on groundwater quality during construction phase. Has some comparative disadvantage over other options.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Proposed route indicated to have increased flood risk compared to other options. Potential negative impact on surface water quality during operational phase. Potential negative impact on groundwater quality during construction phase. Has some comparative disadvantage over other options.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Potential negative impact on groundwater quality during construction phase
		3.7	**Agriculture and Non-Agricultural**	Overall impact on land take & property. Number of properties to be impacted/acquired. Likely temporary or permanent severance effects, etc.	Significant comparative advantage over other options No likely impacts.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Minimal changes likely - no likely significant impacts.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Properties on either side of the road to the south-east of the railway would severely restrict the construction of an online route at this location without partial or complete property acquisitions.	Some comparative advantage over other options Under Options 2, there is an impact on an equine farm holding resulting in land severance of lands located west of the Barberstown local road from the farmyard and equine facilities.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Significant impacts on non-agricultural property. Additionally, Option 3 is identified as having a significant disadvantage over the other options due to the significant impact on the equine farm holding.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Under Option 4, there is an impact on an equine farm holding resulting in land severance of lands located west of the Barberstown local road from the farmyard and equine facilities. Will have a significant advantage over other options due to the reduced impact on agricultural property	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Significant impact on agricultural property with one landowner to be affected by landtake.
		3.8	**Geology and Soils (including Waste)**	Soils and Geology and likely impact on geological resources based on preliminary/likely construction details. Soil resources to be developed/removed	Significant comparative advantage over other options No direct impacts.	Significant comparative advantage over other options No direct impacts.	Some comparative advantage over other options Lower fill import requirements compared to other options.	Some comparative advantage over other options Lower fill import requirements compared to other options.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Long route with overbridge require fill import to the site (Minor negative).	Some comparative advantage over other options Lower fill import requirements compared to other options.	Some comparative advantage over other options Lower fill import requirements compared to other options.
		3.9	**Radiation and Stray Current**	Overall likely impact on existing sources of electromagnetic radiation.	Significant comparative advantage over other options No change from an EMI perspective therefore advantage over other options.	Significant comparative advantage over other options No change from an EMI perspective therefore advantage over other options.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options It is assumed that the routing of the cabling, the location of existing substations, hubs etc. along the line will be changed or impacted by the selection of any of the options over the entire project. All Do-Something options are comparable from an EMI perspective at this stage in the assessment.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options It is assumed that the routing of the cabling, the location of existing substations, hubs etc. along the line will be changed or impacted by the selection of any of the options over the entire project. All Do-Something options are comparable from an EMI perspective at this stage in the assessment.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options It is assumed that the routing of the cabling, the location of existing substations, hubs etc. along the line will be changed or impacted by the selection of any of the options over the entire project. All Do-Something options are comparable from an EMI perspective at this stage in the assessment.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options It is assumed that the routing of the cabling, the location of existing substations, hubs etc. along the line will be changed or impacted by the selection of any of the options over the entire project. All Do-Something options are comparable from an EMI perspective at this stage in the assessment.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options It is assumed that the routing of the cabling, the location of existing substations, hubs etc. along the line will be changed or impacted by the selection of any of the options over the entire project. All Do-Something options are comparable from an EMI perspective at this stage in the assessment.
4	Accessibility & Social inclusion	4.1	**Impact on Vulnerable Groups**	Impacts on low income groups, non-car owners, people with a disability. Quantification of increased service levels to these groups ; Quantification of infrastructure and rolling stock improvements aimed at these groups; distribution of consumers surplus	Some comparative advantage over other options Original Distance from R121 junction to Barberstown North Road junction 300m retained.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Shortest diversion route 4.8km (16x diversion route).	Significant comparative advantage over other options Original Distance from R121 junction to Barberstown North Road junction 300m retained.	Some comparative advantage over other options Diverted distance route 587m (2.0x diversion route).	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Diverted distance route 789m (2.6x diversion route).	Some comparative advantage over other options Diverted distance route 948m (3.1x diversion route).	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Shortest diversion route 4.8km (16x diversion route).
		4.2	**Stations Accessibility**	Quantification of increased service levels to the vulnerable groups.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Original Distance from R121 junction to Barberstown North Road junction 300m retained.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Shortest diversion route 4.8km (16x diversion route).	Significant comparative advantage over other options Original Distance from R121 junction to Barberstown North Road junction 300m retained.	Some comparative advantage over other options Diverted distance route 587m (2.0x diversion route).	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Diverted distance route 789m (2.6x diversion route).	Some comparative advantage over other options Diverted distance route 948m (3.1x diversion route).	Some comparative advantage over other options Shortest diversion route 4.8km (16x diversion route).
		4.3	**Social Inclusion**	Quantification of service levels impacts including severance to all groups (Severance of local communities through removal of level crossings without connection would fair worst under this heading)	Significant comparative advantage over other options Original Distance from R121 junction to Barberstown North Road junction 300m retained.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Shortest diversion route 4.8km (16x diversion route).	Significant comparative advantage over other options Original Distance from R121 junction to Barberstown North Road junction 300m retained.	Some comparative advantage over other options Diverted distance route 587m (2.0x diversion route).	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Diverted distance route 789m (2.6x diversion route)	Some comparative advantage over other options Diverted distance route 948m (3.1x diversion route)	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Pedestrian, and cyclist and non motorised road users catered for.
5	Safety	5.1	**Rail Safety**	Safety for Rail users – removal of LC positive in this respect	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Maintaining the crossing would have a significant disadvantage to rail safety for people still crossing the rail.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Closing the crossing will remove the interface between rail and other traffic.	Significant comparative advantage over other options All overbridges have a significant advantage as they are a great crossing alternative.	Significant comparative advantage over other options All overbridges have a significant advantage as they are a great crossing alternative.	Significant comparative advantage over other options All overbridges have a significant advantage as they are a great crossing alternative.	Significant comparative advantage over other options All overbridges have a significant advantage as they are a great crossing alternative.	Significant comparative advantage over other options All overbridges have a significant advantage as they are a great crossing alternative.
		5.2	**Vehicular Traffic Safety**	Quality of Access for these road users, lengths of diversions, removal of interface with rail and other modes of transport	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Maintaining the crossing would have a significant disadvantage to rail safety for vehicles crossing the rail.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Closing the crossing with no alternative would have a slight disadvantage as it would divert traffic onto longer routes.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Providing a segregated crossing would have a significant advantage as vehicular traffic is not crossing the live rail.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Providing a segregated crossing would have a significant advantage as vehicular traffic is not crossing the live rail.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Providing a segregated crossing would have a significant advantage as vehicular traffic is not crossing the live rail.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Providing a segregated crossing would have a significant advantage as vehicular traffic is not crossing the live rail.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Closing the crossing would have a disadvantage on vehicular traffic as traffic will have to be diverted
		5.3	**Pedestrian, Cyclist and Vulnerable Road user Safety**	Quality of Access for these road users. removal of interfaces	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Original Distance from R121 junction to Barberstown North Road junction 300m retained.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Shortest diversion route 4.8km (16x diversion route).	Some comparative advantage over other options Original Distance from R121 junction to Barberstown North Road junction 300m retained.	Some comparative advantage over other options Diverted distance route 587m (2.0x diversion route).	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Diverted distance route 789m (2.6x diversion route)	Some comparative advantage over other options Diverted distance route 948m (3.1x diversion route)	Significant comparative advantage over other options No diversionl for pedestrian and cyclists
6	Physical Activity	6.1	**Connectivity to adjoining cycling facilities**	Analysis of the extent that the scheme connects with cycle tracks.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options No cycle tracks currently present on the immediately surrounding road network, but increased closures of the level crossing would reduce access to the Royal Canal Greenway. See also Transport Integration above.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options No cycle tracks on the immediately surrounding road network, but the closure of the level crossing would reduce access to the Royal Canal Greenway. See also Transport Integration above.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Severance overcome by provision of direct replacement. Access will have to be provided to Royal Canal Greenway.	Some comparative advantage over other options Local severance mitigated to a degree by alternative access proposal.	Some comparative advantage over other options Local severance mitigated to a degree by alternative access proposal.	Some comparative advantage over other options Local severance mitigated to a degree by alternative access proposal.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Severance overcome by provision of direct replacement.
		6.2	**Permeability and local connectivity opportunity**	Journey Time and lengths of diversions for active modes and numbers affected. Analysis of the connectivity between level crossing and green areas/key attractions related to active mode	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Reduced connectivity across railway as closures become more frequent with increased train frequencies.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Severance of existing connectivity.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Severance overcome by provision of direct replacement. Access will have to be provided to Royal Canal Greenway.	Some comparative advantage over other options Local severance mitigated to a degree by alternative access proposal.	Some comparative advantage over other options Local severance mitigated to a degree by alternative access proposal.	Some comparative advantage over other options Local severance mitigated to a degree by alternative access proposal.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Severance overcome by provision of direct replacement.

	Criteria	Do Nothing	Do Minimum	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5
1	**Economy**	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options
2	**Integration**	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options
3	**Environment**	Some comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options
4	**Accessibility and social inclusion**	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options
5	**Safety**	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options
6	**Physical Activity**	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options
	Progress To Stage 2	**No**	**No**	**No**	**Yes**	**No**	**Yes**	**No**
	Comment			Although good on Integration, Accessibility and Physical Activity poor on environmental grounds due to impacts and more expensive than Options 2 & 3 due to longer bridge and property impacts				

DART+ Maynooth Line - MCA Stage 1

Blakestown Level Crossing Assessment

	Parameter		Criteria	Sub-Criteria (Quantitative/ Qualitative)	Do Nothing	Do Minimum	Option 1
					Leave the current level crossings in place.	Closure of the existing crossings with no alternative provided. All traffic would be diverted to alternative routes around the crossing location.	
1	Economy	1.1	Construction and Land Cost	Assessment of cost of construction of option, land costs, acquisition costs and temporary works	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options
		1.2	Long Term Maintenance costs	Steel options vs concrete options for structures and maintaining level crossings versus removing them	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options The do-nothing scenario would maintain the existing maintenance costs of the level crossing.	Significant comparative advantage over other options The closure of the level crossing would remove the maintenance requirement of the level crossing.	Some comparative advantage over other options An overbridge would increase decrease maintenance requirements and operating costs over a level crossing.
		1.3	Traffic Functionality /economic benefit	Benefits to vehicular traffic through reduction in journey time lengths and delays through removal of level crossings. Consideration of potentially longer routes for traffic.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Existing connectivity maintained, albeit with increased disruption from increased train frequencies. Train capacity and speeds disadvantaged through this option delivering lower frequency and slower journey times.	Some comparative advantage over other options Displacement of traffic onto alternative routes; increase in journey times for local residents.	Some comparative advantage over other options Displacement of traffic onto alternative routes; increase in journey times for local residents.
2	Integration	2.1	Transport Integration	Impact on scope for and ease of interchange between modes. Impact on the operation of other transport services both during construction and in operation. New interchange nodes and facilities; Reduced walking and wait times associated with interchanges. Modal shift figures during construction and operations. Changes to journey times to transport nodes.	Some comparative advantage over other options Existing connectivity maintained, albeit with increased disruption from increased train frequencies. There is no cycle route proposed on Blakestown Road in the GDA Cycle Network Plan.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Reduction in local permeability. Reduced access to Royal Canal Cycle Route.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Reduction in local permeability.
		2.2	Land Use Integration	Impact on land use strategies and regional and local plans. Assessment of support for land use factors local land use and planning. Inclusion of project in relevant local and regional planning documents.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Does not meet the higher level national and regional policy and would also be inconsistent with the local level planning context (contained in the Leixlip LAP 2020-2023 – where it recognises the level crossings will be required to be removed)	Some comparative advantage over other options Supports, national, regional and local planning policy. The consideration of land use factors is undertaken at a strategic level, as the Collinstown Masterplan is not yet developed. The future Masterplan is required to include the associated transportation studies. Therefore, both options are considered to be supported by the planning policy context (in support of DART Exp), neither the closure of the level crossing or the provision of pedestrian access at the level crossing is likely to significantly influence this comparative assessment in terms of 'planning' integration factors at this stage in the assessment. Further analysis of traffic factors will be required. Therefore, both options are considered to be comparable NOTE: The transport integration criteria and the safety is not considered as part of the land use integration assessment.	Some comparative advantage over other options Supports, national, regional and local planning policy. The consideration of land use factors is undertaken at a strategic level, as the Collinstown Masterplan is not yet developed. The future Masterplan is required to include the associated transportation studies. Therefore, both options are considered to be supported by the planning policy context (in support of DART Exp), neither the closure of the level crossing or the provision of pedestrian access at the level crossing is likely to significantly influence this comparative assessment in terms of 'planning' integration factors at this stage in the assessment. Further analysis of traffic factors will be required. Therefore, both options are considered to be comparable NOTE: The transport integration criteria and the safety is not considered as part of the land use integration assessment.
		2.3	Geographical Integration	Impact on improvement of external links. Desire to link various geographical – mostly neutral due to localised nature of the level crossings. Overall electrification scheme would be highly positive.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Original Distance from access to farm to R148 junction 270m retained.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Shortest diversion route 3.2km (11x diversion route).	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Shortest diversion route 3.2km (11x diversion route).
		2.4	Other Government Policy	Integration with Government Policy, Smarter Travel, Investment Programmes, rail safety, electrification etc	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Maintaining the crossing does not meet government policy.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Closing the crossing with no other alternative meets government policy but not ideal.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Providing vehicular and pedestrian is ideal.
3	Environment	3.1	Noise and Vibration	Estimated number of people likely to be affected by transport related noise with the scheme within 50m.	Significant comparative advantage over other options No significant impacts predicted at this stage.	Significant comparative advantage over other options No significant impacts predicted at this stage.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Removes vehicle traffic emissions however will have some short term construction impacts.
		3.2	Air Quality and Climate	Local air quality effects. No of number of receptors within 50m.	Significant comparative advantage over other options No significant impacts predicted at this stage.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Removes vehicular traffic and minimal construction phase	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Removes vehicle traffic therefore requiring longer trips on alternative routes for some traffic, however removes localised traffic impacts. Some short-term construction impacts.
		3.3	Landscape and Visual (including light)	Key landscape characteristics affected; Effects on listed/ key views, Impact on landscape character.	Significant comparative advantage over other options No impact on existing landscape or visual characteristics.	Significant comparative advantage over other options No impact on existing landscape or visual characteristics.	Significant comparative advantage over other options This options assumes minimal physical intervention in existing environment. No likely significant impacts on existing landscape or visual characteristics.
		3.4	Biodiversity (flora and fauna)	Potential compliance/conflict with biodiversity objectives; Indirect impacts on protected species, designated sites; Overall effect on nature conservation resource.	Significant comparative advantage over other options No impact on existing landscape or visual characteristics	Significant comparative advantage over other options No impact on existing landscape or visual characteristics	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Hydrologically connected to South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA. No risk of LSE. Potential impacts to Royal Canal pNHA arising from the construction of new pedestrian bridge.
		3.5	Cultural, Archaeological and Architectural Heritage	Overall effect on cultural, archaeological and architecture heritage resource. Likely effects on RPS, National	Significant comparative advantage over other options No impact on existing landscape or visual characteristics	Significant comparative advantage over other options No impact on existing landscape or visual characteristics	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Indirect impacts on canal bridge (RPS). Potential direct impacts on archaeological deposits that may survive in greenfield areas.
		3.6	Water Resources	Overall potential significant effects on water resource attributes likely to be affected during construction and operation.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Potential negative impact on surface water quality during operational phase, not some comparative disadvantage over other options.	Some comparative advantage over other options Removes vehicular traffic borne pollutants. Minimal construction phase impacts are likely. Some comparative advantages over other options.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Potential negative impact on groundwater quality during construction phase.
		3.7	Agriculture and Non-Agricultural	Overall impact on land take & property. Number of properties to be impacted/acquired. Likely temporary or permanent severance effects, etc.	Significant comparative advantage over other options There is no impact on agricultural or non-agricultural property.	Significant comparative advantage over other options There is no impact on agricultural or non-agricultural property.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options There will be a limited direct impact on both agricultural and non-agricultural property. There is no impact on access to lands though there will be increased travel for vehicular journeys to / from R148. In the comparative analysis, Option 1 was identified as having some disadvantage over the Option 1 due to the limited direct impact on lands.
		3.8	Geology and Soils (including Waste)	Soils and Geology and likely impact on geological resources based on preliminary/likely construction details. Soil resources to be developed/removed. Existing information relating to potential to encounter contaminated land. High-level assessment based on the likely structures/ works required and the potential for ground contamination due to historic landfills, pits and quarries.			
		3.9	Radiation and Stray Current	Overall likely impact on existing sources of electromagnetic radiation.	Significant comparative advantage over other options No change from an EMI perspective therefore advantage over other options.	Significant comparative advantage over other options No change from an EMI perspective therefore advantage over other options.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options It is assumed that the routing of the cabling, the location of existing substations, tuks etc. along the line will be changed or impacted by the selection of any of the options over the entire project. All Do-Something options are comparable from an EMI perspective at this stage in the assessment.
4	Accessibility & Social inclusion	4.1	Impact on Vulnerable Groups		Some comparative advantage over other options Original Distance from R121 junction to Barberstown North Road junction 300m retained.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Original Distance from access to farm to R148 junction 270m retained.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Original Distance from access to farm to R148 junction 270m retained.
		4.2	Stations Accessibility	Quantification of increased service levels to the vulnerable groups.	Some comparative advantage over other options Original Distance from access to farm to R148 junction 270m retained.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Original Distance from access to farm to R148 junction 270m retained.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Original Distance from access to farm to R148 junction 270m retained.
		4.3	Social Inclusion	Quantification of service levels impacts including severance to all groups (Severance of local communities through removal of level crossings without connection would fair worst under this heading).	Significant comparative advantage over other options No change from an EMI perspective therefore advantage over other options.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Shortest diversion route 3.2km (11x diversion route).	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Shortest diversion route 3.2km (11x diversion route), pedestrian, and cyclist and non motorised road users catered for.
5	Safety	5.1	Rail Safety	Safety for Rail users – removal of LC positive in this respect	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Maintaining the crossing would have a significant disadvantage to rail safety for people still crossing the rail.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Closing the crossing will remove the interface between rail and other traffic.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Closing the crossing would have a slight disadvantage to rail users as they would have to use alternative routes.
		5.2	Vehicular Traffic Safety	Quality of Access for these road users, lengths of diversions, removal of interface with rail and other modes of transport	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Maintaining the crossing would have a significant disadvantage to rail safety for vehicles crossing the rail.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Closing the crossing with no alternative would have a slight disadvantage as it would divert traffic onto longer routes.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Closing the crossing would have a slight disadvantage to rail users as they would have to use alternative routes.
		5.3	Pedestrian, Cyclist and Vulnerable Road user Safety	Quality of Access for these road users. removal of interfaces	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Original Distance from R121 junction to Barberstown North Road junction 300m retained, however interface issues with train line.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options No cycle tracks on the immediately surrounding road network, but the closure of the level crossing would reduce access to the Royal Canal Greenway. See also Transport Integration above.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Original Distance from access to farm to R148 junction 270m retained.
6	Physical Activity	6.1	Connectivity to adjoining cycling facilities	Analysis of the extent that the scheme connects with cycle tracks.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options No cycle tracks currently present on the immediately surrounding road network, but increased closures of the level crossing would reduce access to the Royal Canal Greenway. See also Transport Integration above.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options No cycle tracks on the immediately surrounding road network, but the closure of the level crossing would reduce access to the Royal Canal Greenway. See also Transport Integration above.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Severance overcome by provision of direct replacement.
		6.2	Permeability and local connectivity opportunity	Journey Time and lengths of diversions for active modes and numbers affected. Analysis of the connectivity between level crossing and green areas/key attractions related to active mode	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Reduced connectivity across railway as closures become more frequent with increased train frequencies.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Severance of existing connectivity.	Significant comparative advantage over other options Severance overcome by provision of direct replacement.

	Criteria		Do Nothing	Do Minimum	Option 1
1	Economy		Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options
2	Integration		Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options
3	Environment		Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options
4	Accessibility and social inclusion		Some comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options
5	Safety		Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options
6	Physical Activity		Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options
	Progress To Stage 2		No	Yes	Yes
	Comment				