

Appendix A

Detailed MCA table

| Comparison Criteria Legend | |
|---|--|
| Significant comparative advantage over other | |
| Some comparative advantage over other options | |
| Comparable to other options / neutral | |
| Some comparative disadvantage over other | |
| Significant comparative disadvantage over other | |

| | | | | Economy | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|---------------|--|--|---|---|---|--|-----------|--|-----------|
| Works Description | Summary of requirements | Option Number | Description of Option | Capital Expenditure (CAPEX): Construction, land acquisition, temporary works | | OPEX: Operational costs (if or other entities), Technology advancements and future proofing / obsolescence | | Train operations functionality/Economic benefit | | Traffic functionality and associated economic activities and opportunities | |
| | | | | Qualitative appraisal of potential infrastructure costs of proposed options | Rationale | Qualitative appraisal of potential ongoing infrastructure maintenance costs of proposed options | Rationale | Qualitative appraisal of potential ongoing operational costs of proposed options | Rationale | Qualitative appraisal of potential wider benefits of proposed options | Rationale |
| | | | | Estimate high level cost of construction of option Extent and type of 3rd party lands required permanently Extent and type of 3rd party land required temporarily for temporary works during construction | Cost to maintain the infrastructure over the whole life. Effects of infrastructure maintenance to services. Provision of ways of undertaking routine inspections and maintenance activities while minimising the effect on service to customers. | Potential improvement or deterioration of the operation conditions of the line (reduction or increase of the risk of interruption of service) Increased DART service improving connectivity and economy (leading to increased competition in economy, increased output of firms, increased tax revenue). | Potential benefit to vehicular traffic flows in the vicinity of the works during construction and associated economic activities and opportunities in the vicinity Consideration of duration of traffic disruption and length of diversions To minimise the impacts on traffic and transportation during the construction and operational stages | | | | |
| Works around Clongriffin Station | Provide turnback infrastructure at Clongriffin which will meet the Train Service Specification. | 3a | New low speed platform 0 with new crossover | Comparative advantage over Options 5 & 6 regarding good construction access with minimal negative impact to third parties. Minor impact to railway during construction, although possessions are needed for S&C work. Regarding track, this option requires a single crossover with loop connections provided by moderate speed standard switches which is comparable with Option 4 and has some comparative advantage over Options 5 and 6. This option will impact on the existing OHLE structures in the Up track up to approximately 250-300 m from both end of the platforms. Some of them are two track cantilevers so this will impact also on the Down track. Additionally, the existing OHLE structures on the Down Line at the south side of the platforms will also be affected by the new crossover proposed in this option. New OHLE structures will be required for the new siding track and new OHLE wires for this track and for the crossover (850 m). Comparative advantage over Options 5 & 6. Comparable to Option 4. Regarding signalling, Option 3a and 4 have a comparative advantage over Options 5 and 6 as the turnouts to access Platform 3 shall not be modified. Option 3 does not have the double crossover and therefore requires less turnout modification than Option 4. This option does not require any significant bridge or civil structures works, giving it a significant comparative advantage over Options 5 and 6 from a structural perspective. From the perspective of stations, this option has a significant comparative advantage over Options 5 and 6 as no changes are required to Platform 3. | All options are comparable from the perspective of track maintenance costs as they all require 4 new point ends. However, similar to Options 4 and 6, this option does not require additional bridge structures so has lower structural maintenance costs compared to Option 5. All options would require the same level of staffing and rolling stock provision so are comparable from this perspective. | In this option, most but not all services can terminate using conflict free moves (although there is a potential variation that could be made at the expense of flexibility to achieve conflict free moves). This option enables a high speed passing move in the southbound direction, but the northbound direction would require a low speed passing move via Platform 3. The current TSS (and likely future timetables) must have the opportunity to pass trains at this location, as non-stop services will need to take an empty path of a terminating service north of Clongriffin. | Extent of disruption to traffic & transportation will depend upon proposed construction access (TBC) but in any case will be relatively slight: local residential roads, not main highways. | | | | |
| | | 4 | New low speed platform 0 with new double crossover | Comparative advantage over Options 5 & 6 regarding good construction access with minimal negative impact to third parties. Minor impact to railway during construction, although possessions are needed for S&C work. Regarding track, this option requires a double crossover with loop connections provided by moderate speed standard switches which is comparable with Option 3a and has some comparative advantage over Options 5 and 6. Regarding OHLE, this option is comparable to Option 3a. Although there is additional impact on the Down Line at the south side of the station because of the double crossover. This is not considered to be of significant comparable difference. Regarding signalling, Option 3a and 4 have better results compared to other options as turnouts to access Platform 3 shall not be modified. Option 4 has a comparative disadvantage over Option 3a as it includes the double crossover, requiring more turnout modification. This option does not require any significant bridge or civil structures works, giving it a significant comparable advantage over Options 5 and 6 from a structural perspective. From the perspective of stations, this option has a comparative advantage over Options 5 and 6 as no changes are required to Platform 3. | All options are comparable from the perspective of track maintenance costs as they all require 4 new point ends. However, similar to Options 3a and 6, this option does not require additional bridge structures so has lower structural maintenance costs compared to Option 5. All options would require the same level of staffing and rolling stock provision so are comparable from this perspective. | This Option requires that all terminating services will require conflicting moves. This will impact on reliability and the ability of operations to recover in perturbed conditions. This option enables a high speed passing move in both directions, which supports the TSS and the likely structure of any future timetable. The current TSS (and likely future timetables) must have the opportunity to pass trains at this location, as non-stop services will need to take an empty path of a terminating service north of Clongriffin. | Extent of disruption to traffic & transportation will depend upon proposed construction (TBC) but in any case will be relatively slight - local residential roads, not main highways | | | | |
| | | 5 | New higher speed platform 0 and 3 | A new bridge structure is required adjacent to the existing underbridge UBB19 and modifications are needed to an existing retaining structure to the south of the station. The scope of works is significantly more extensive than for Options 3a and 4, including more interfaces with the public. Monitoring of the newly constructed earthworks will need to be undertaken to ensure no localised settlement occurs, which could introduce a potential twist fault into the track. There is comparable disadvantage over Options 3a and 4 as this option will have more impact on the existing OHLE in both ends of the station for all existing tracks as far as the turnouts of the existing siding track are displaced and new siding track is longer than in Options 3a and 4. Proposed crossovers will also require additional changes to the existing OHLE on the south end of the platforms. Regarding signalling, Options 5 and 6 have a comparable disadvantage over Options 3a and 4 because they modify the existing turnouts in Platform 3 to convert it to a high speed platform. This option requires a new culvert adjacent to the existing UBB18C culvert and a new bridge crossing over the Mayne River adjacent to the existing UBB19. This represents a significant comparative disadvantage for structural works compared to Options 3a and 4. From the perspective of stations this option has a comparative disadvantage over Options 3a and 4 as changes are required to Platform 3 to accommodate the higher speeds, entailing new track. These changes may include track slewing, requiring changes to the platform edge geometry, and changes to signal sighting lines requiring existing platform furniture to be moved. | All options are comparable from the perspective of track maintenance costs as they all require 4 new point ends. However, it does require an additional bridge adjacent to the existing UBB19 and new culvert adjacent to the existing UBB18C and so has higher structural maintenance costs compared to options 3a, 4 and 6. Therefore this option has some comparable disadvantage overall. All options would require the same level of staffing and rolling stock provision so are comparable from this perspective. | This option is the ideal layout in terms of operations, as it allows for all terminating services to be operated with conflict-free moves, and allows for critical high speed passing moves in both directions. | Extent of disruption to traffic & transportation will depend upon proposed construction access (TBC), especially west side where there are third party buildings alongside. Due to the new culvert and bridge structures adjacent to existing structures UBB18B and UBB19, the extent of disruption is likely to be greater than for the other options. | | | | |
| | | 6 | New higher speed platform 3 | Similar to Option 5 with the exception of widening of existing UBB19 instead of a completely new bridge. Monitoring of the newly constructed earthworks will be undertaken to ensure no localised settlement occurs, thus introducing a potential twist fault into the rail. This option has the same new siding track and crossover as proposed in option 3a, however it changes the existing siding track similarly to option 5. Regarding signalling, Options 5 and 6 have a comparable disadvantage over Options 3a and 4 because they modify the existing turnouts in platform 3 to convert it into a high speed platform. Option 6 has advantage over Option 5 as it retains the existing crossover. The revised track work for this option continues across the existing Mayne River bridge crossing (UBB19). An assessment on the existing structure may be required, with the potential for some modifications although bridge widening is not anticipated. From the perspective of stations this option has a comparative disadvantage over Options 3a and 4 as changes are required to Platform 3 to accommodate the higher speeds and new track. These may include track slewing requiring changes to the platform edge geometry, and changes to signal sighting lines requiring existing platform furniture to be moved. | All options are comparable from the perspective of track maintenance costs as they all require 4 new point ends. However, similar to Options 3a and 4, this option does not require additional bridge structures so has lower structural maintenance costs compared to Option 5. All options would require the same level of staffing and rolling stock provision and so are comparable from this perspective. | This option allows for most but not all services to terminate using conflict free moves. It also allows for critical high speed passing move in both directions. | Extent of disruption to traffic & transportation will depend upon proposed construction access (TBC), especially west side where there are third party buildings alongside. | | | | |

| Comparison Criteria Legend |
|---|
| Significant comparative advantage over other |
| Some comparative advantage over other options |
| Comparable to other options / neutral |
| Some comparative disadvantage over other |
| Significant comparative disadvantage over other |

| Safety | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|---------------|--|---|---|---|---|
| Works Description | Summary of requirements | Option Number | Description of Option | Employer's safety (for final score) | | Public safety (for final score) | |
| | | | | Qualitative appraisal on the safety impacts on IÉ or railway staff | Rationale | Qualitative appraisal on the safety impacts on the public (road/rail/cycle/pedestrian) | Rationale |
| | | | | To reduce safety risks associated with construction, maintenance and operations. To reduce the potential for incidents or near-misses for IÉ/construction staff. | | To reduce safety risks associated with passengers at platforms, public adjacent to the railway and road, pedestrian and cycle users at level crossings. To reduce the potential for accidents for members of the public/passengers on railway infrastructure. To reduce the potential for conflict between rail and road users. | |
| Works around Clongriffin Station | Provide turnback infrastructure at Clongriffin which will meet the Train Service Specification. | 3a | New low speed platform 0 with new crossover | | Drivers are provided refuge via the existing platform for any changing or end switching in all options. Therefore driver safety is comparable across all options. | | Having only one crossover reduces the risk of train derailment on entering the station but this is not considered material enough to differentiate it from other options. |
| | | 4 | New low speed platform 0 with new double crossover | | Drivers are provided refuge via the existing platform for any changing or end switching in all options. Therefore driver safety is comparable across all options. | | Comparable to other options |
| | | 5 | New higher speed platform 0 and 3 | | Drivers are provided refuge via the existing platform for any changing or end switching in all options. Therefore driver safety is comparable across all options. | | Comparable to other options |
| | | 6 | New higher speed platform 3 | | Drivers are provided refuge via the existing platform for any changing or end switching in all options. Therefore driver safety is comparable across all options. | | Comparable to other options |

| Comparison Criteria Legend | |
|---|--|
| Significant comparative advantage over other | |
| Some comparative advantage over other options | |
| Comparable to other options / neutral | |
| Some comparative disadvantage over other | |
| Significant comparative disadvantage over other | |

| | | | | Environment | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|---------------|--|---|---|--|---|---|--|---|--|--|--|---|--|---|---|--|-----------|
| Works Description | Summary of requirements | Option Number | Description of Option | Landscape and Visual Quality | | Biodiversity | | Noise and Vibration | | Water resources | | Archaeology, Architectural and Cultural Heritage | | Geology & Soils | | Agricultural and non-agricultural | | Air Quality & Climate Change | |
| | | | | Appraisal of landscape and visual impacts of options based on the sensitive viewpoints | Rationale | Qualitative appraisal on the impact on biodiversity | Rationale | Qualitative appraisal of the potential noise and vibration impact | Rationale | Qualitative appraisal on the potential impacts to surface ground or coastal waters | Rationale | Qualitative appraisal of the potential impacts of options on potential sub surface archaeology and impact on foundations and above ground elements of architectural heritage | Rationale | Qualitative appraisal of the potential of the proposed options on waste and material resources including the reuse of site won materials. | Rationale | Qualitative appraisal of impacts on valued resources either from a human or natural origin with value arising for economic or cultural reasons. These assets can be existing utilities or non-renewable resources | Rationale | Qualitative appraisal of air quality and climate impacts both on the operational and construction phases | Rationale |
| | | | | To provide opportunities to enhance the local amenity, heritage value of the area and the surrounding landscape To minimise any impacts of light pollution and the impact on dark skies | To ensure that the solution provided minimises the effects on biodiversity of the area and/or provides opportunities to enhance it. | | To provide a solution which ensures minimum levels of noise and vibration | | To minimise the impact or provide opportunities to enhance the quality of surface waters and associated floodplains, ground waters and coastal waters. | | To minimise the impact on cultural heritage such as on below ground archaeological remains, historic buildings (individual and areas), and historic landscapes and parks. | | To provide a solution which minimises total capital carbon. To minimise waste. | | To provide a solution which minimises total capital carbon. | | To provide a solution which comprises a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. To ensure that the chosen solution preserves or enhances the local air quality | | |
| Works around Clongriffin Station | Provide turnback infrastructure at Clongriffin which will meet the Train Service Specification. | 3a | New low speed platform 0 with new crossover | Works within or adjoining existing railway corridor. No change to existing landscape / visual character. Little or no loss of trees/ hedgerows. Therefore this option is comparable to Options 4 and 6 and has some comparable advantage over Option 5. | | This option does not involve works to the bridge (potential bat roost structure) nor at/near the River Mayne which is a short stream upstream of a SAC and SPA. | | Slower speeds adjacent to sensitive receptors mean less risk of noise/vibration impacts. | | Mayne river: Medium probability of flooding at parts of rail line. River has poor WFD status. Site directly upstream of Baldoyle Estuary SAC. Aquifer low vulnerability. Therefore this option is comparable to Options 4 and 6 and has some comparative advantage over Option 5. | There are no recorded monuments within the vicinity of the proposed works. Previous archaeological investigation of the area revealed three sites now excavated and recorded as an enclosure (DU015-064001 & License No 04E0342) and two burnt mounds (DU015-096/097 & License No 04E0367) to the west of the railway line at a distance of 180m to 225m. No features of architectural heritage interest identified from desk study to date, therefore there is no significant difference identified between the options (historic maps have been compared with Google Earth and street view). If brought forward, this will be further investigated including site visit. All options are comparable. | There is the potential for excavation of made ground/contaminated land associated with this option, as well as topsoil/growing soil, for the new track landtake. Earthworks volumes (and associated waste/re-use volumes) are yet to be determined. This option is therefore comparable to Options 3a & 6 and has some comparable advantage over Option 5. | | No agricultural land affected by each of the options. All options are comparable. | Construction works more removed from sensitive receptors. Comparable to Option 4 and marginal advantage over Options 5 and 6. | | | | |
| | | 4 | New low speed platform 0 with new double crossover | Works within or adjoining existing railway corridor. No change to existing landscape / visual character. Little or no loss of trees/ hedgerows. Therefore this option is comparable to Option 3a and 6 and has some comparable advantage over Option 5. | | This option does not involve works to the bridge (potential bat roost structure) nor at/near the River Mayne which is a short stream upstream of a SAC and SPA. | | Slower speeds adjacent to sensitive receptors mean less risk of noise/vibration impacts. | | Mayne river: Medium probability of flooding at parts of rail line. River has poor WFD status. Site directly upstream of Baldoyle Estuary SAC. Aquifer low vulnerability. Therefore this option is comparable to Options 3a and 6 and has some comparative advantage over Option 5. | There are no recorded monuments within the vicinity of the proposed works. Previous archaeological investigation of the area revealed three sites now excavated and recorded as an enclosure (DU015-064001 & License No 04E0342) and two burnt mounds (DU015-096/097 & License No 04E0367) to the west of the railway line at a distance of 180m to 225m. No features of architectural heritage interest identified from desk study to date, therefore there is no significant difference identified between the options (historic maps have been compared with Google Earth and street view). If brought forward, this will be further investigated. All options are comparable. | There is the potential for excavation of made ground/contaminated land associated with this option, as well as topsoil/growing soil, for the new track landtake. Earthworks volumes (and associated waste/re-use volumes) are yet to be determined. This option is therefore comparable to Options 3a & 6 and has some comparable advantage over Option 5. | | No agricultural land affected by each of the options. All options are comparable. | Construction works more removed from sensitive receptors. Comparable to Option 4 and marginal advantage over Options 5 and 6. | | | | |
| | | 5 | New higher speed platform 0 and 3 | Works expand existing railway corridor to east. New bridge over River Mayne and new culvert adjacent to UB18C. Loss of c.300m of boundary trees, hedgerows. Therefore this option has some comparable disadvantage compared to Options 3a, 4 and 6. | | This option involves works to provide a new culvert and new bridge structure adjacent to the existing UB18C, which appear likely to interact with or affect the River Mayne which drains to Baldoyle Bay SAC (460m downstream) and Baldoyle Bay SPA (935m downstream). | | Higher speeds adjacent to sensitive receptors mean more risk of noise/vibration impacts. This option has the potential to affect sensitive receptors equally to the east and west of Clongriffin Station. | | Mayne river: Medium probability of flooding at parts of rail line. River has poor WFD status. Site directly upstream of Baldoyle Estuary SAC. Aquifer low vulnerability. New bridge has potential impact with regards to flooding and impact on d/s water dependant SAC; however information currently provided does not allow for full assessment. Therefore this option has some comparative disadvantage to Options 3a, 4 and 6. | There are no recorded monuments within the vicinity of the proposed works. Previous archaeological investigation of the area revealed three sites now excavated and recorded as an enclosure (DU015-064001 & License No 04E0342) and two burnt mounds (DU015-096/097 & License No 04E0367) to the west of the railway line at a distance of 180m to 225m. No features of architectural heritage interest identified from desk study to date, therefore there is no significant difference identified between the options (historic maps have been compared with Google Earth and street view). If brought forward, this will be further investigated. All options are comparable. | There is the potential for encountering soft ground associated with the River Mayne - New Bridge Construction Impacts. There is also the potential for Made Ground/contaminated land to require excavation, as well as land/topsoil/growing soil, associated with new track and track replacement. Earthworks volumes (and associated waste/re-use options and volumes) are yet to be determined. There is also a potential for slope stability issues associated with retaining wall modifications. This option therefore has some comparable disadvantage against Option 6 and significant comparable disadvantage against Options 3a and 4. | | No agricultural land affected by each of the options. All options are comparable. | Construction works slightly closer to sensitive receptors. B Comparable to Option 6 and marginal disadvantage with Options 3a and 4. | | | | |
| | | 6 | New higher speed platform 3 | Works within or adjoining existing railway corridor. Widening bridge over River Mayne. Little or no loss of trees, hedgerows. Therefore this option is comparable to Option 3a and 4 and has some comparable advantage over Option 5. | | This option involves works to the bridge (potential bat roost structure) however works are near the River Mayne which is a short stream upstream of an SAC and SPA. | | Higher speeds adjacent to sensitive receptors mean more risk of noise/vibration impacts. Option 6 will have a similar impact to Option 5, but with lower levels of noise and vibration to receptors to the west of Clongriffin Station, as Platform 3 is further away from these receptors. | | Mayne river: Medium probability of flooding at parts of rail line. River has poor WFD status. Site directly upstream of Baldoyle Estuary SAC. Aquifer low vulnerability. Therefore this option is comparable to Options 3a and 4 and has some comparative advantage over Option 5. | There are no recorded monuments within the vicinity of the proposed works. Previous archaeological investigation of the area revealed three sites now excavated and recorded as an enclosure (DU015-064001 & License No 04E0342) and two burnt mounds (DU015-096/097 & License No 04E0367) to the west of the railway line at a distance of 180m to 225m. No features of architectural heritage interest identified from desk study to date, therefore there is no significant difference identified between the options (historic maps have been compared with Google Earth and street view). If brought forward, this will be further investigated. All options are comparable. | There is the potential for Made Ground/contaminated land to require excavation, as well as land/topsoil/growing soil, associated with new platform and track replacement. Earthworks volumes (and associated waste/re-use options and volumes) are yet to be determined. There is also a potential for slope stability issues associated with retaining wall modifications. This option therefore has some comparable advantage over Option 5. | | No agricultural land affected by each of the options. All options are comparable. | Construction works slightly closer to sensitive receptors than other options. Marginal disadvantage with other options | | | | |

| Comparison Criteria Legend |
|---|
| Significant comparative advantage over other |
| Some comparative advantage over other options |
| Comparable to other options / neutral |
| Some comparative disadvantage over other |
| Significant comparative disadvantage over other |

| Accessibility & Social Inclusion | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|---------------|--|--|--|--|---|
| Works Description | Summary of requirements | Option Number | Description of Option | Accessibility | | Social Inclusion | |
| | | | | Qualitative appraisal of capacity of options to facilitate the movement of people (either within, on to or across the rail system) | Rationale | Qualitative appraisal of capacity of options to provide ease of access for the mobility and visually impaired | Rationale |
| | | | | Capacity of options to facilitate the movement of people (either within, on to or across the rail system) Impact on the wellbeing of the passenger and public. Positive impact on passenger and public experience. Improve accessibility to key facilities, such as employment, education, transport and healthcare to satisfy transport demand for all trip types. | | Positive impact towards vulnerable groups Positive impact to deprived geographic areas. Improvement of accessibility to public transport facilities, in particular from deprived geographic areas. | |
| Works around Clongriffin Station | Provide turnback infrastructure at Clongriffin which will meet the Train Service Specification. | 3a | New low speed platform 0 with new crossover | | Opportunity to make improvements to the station with the additional platform 0 as regards reducing crowding. Additional facilities may be provided on Platform 0 including information screens and commerce outlets. All options are comparable. | | Opportunity to make improvements to the station with the additional platform 0 with improved access on this platform. Opportunity to make improvements to platform 0 with regards platform accessibility with regards ramps, shelters and help points. All options are comparable |
| | | 4 | New low speed platform 0 with new double crossover | | Opportunity to make improvements to the station with the additional platform 0 as regards reducing crowding. Additional facilities may be provided on Platform 0 including information screens and commerce outlets. All options are comparable | | Opportunity to make improvements to the station with the additional platform 0 with improved access on this platform. Opportunity to make improvements to platform 0 with regards platform accessibility with regards ramps, shelters and help points. All options are comparable |
| | | 5 | New higher speed platform 0 and 3 | | With the changes to the track at Platform 3, this may afford an opportunity to make improvements to the platform with regards platform facilities, such as sign posting, commerce, public information. All options are comparable | | With the changes to the track at Platform 3, this may afford an opportunity to make improvements to the platform with regards platform accessibility with regards ramps, shelters and help points. All options are comparable |
| | | 6 | New higher speed platform 3 | | With the changes to the track at Platform 3, this may afford an opportunity to make improvements to the platform with regards platform facilities, such as sign posting, commerce, public information. All options are comparable | | With the changes to the track at Platform 3, this may afford an opportunity to make improvements to the platform with regards platform accessibility with regards ramps, shelters and help points. All options are comparable |

| Comparison Criteria Legend | |
|---|--|
| Significant comparative advantage over other | |
| Some comparative advantage over other options | |
| Comparable to other options / neutral | |
| Some comparative disadvantage over other | |
| Significant comparative disadvantage over other | |

| Integration | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|---------------|--|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| Works Description | Summary of requirements | Option Number | Description of Option | Adaptability in the future | | Transport Integration | | Land use integration | | Geographical integration | | Government policy integration | |
| | | | | Qualitative appraisal of capacity of options to cater for future projects or aspirations | Rationale | Qualitative appraisal of the options and their impact on integration with other transport modes | Rationale | Qualitative appraisal of the options and their impact on integration with land use policies | Rationale | Qualitative appraisal of the options and their impact on integration with geographical policies | Rationale | Qualitative appraisal of the options and their impact on integration with geographical and government policies | Rationale |
| | | | | Ability to continue to function successfully despite future changes in circumstances | | Scope for and ease of interchange between modes New interchange nodes and facilities Reduce walking and wait times associated with interchanges Integration with the cycle networks Modal shifts figures during construction and operations Changes to journey times to transport nodes Impact on the operation of the other transport services both during construction and in operation stage | | Consistency with land use strategies, regional and local plans | | Potential to impact on external links during construction Potential to impact on external links during operations Consideration for any community severance impacts | | Integration with national and international plans and policies | |
| Works around Clongriffin Station | Provide turnback infrastructure at Clongriffin which will meet the Train Service Specification. | 3a | New low speed platform 0 with new crossover | | The operation and construction of this station layout option has no impact on future internal transport links. All options are comparable. | | Potential temporary impact on existing bus services, pedestrian walkways and park and ride access. All options are comparable | | The proposal complies with regional and local policies to improve public transport services including DART services, encouraging modal shift and allowing for increased density of development in certain areas. The development is contained within the existing "envelope" of the rail line. There is no impact on existing land uses. All options are comparable | | All international, national, regional and local policies encourage improvements in relation to the efficiency of public transport. All the proposed options will facilitate this. All options are comparable | | All international, national, regional and local policies encourage improvements in relation to the efficiency of public transport. All the proposed options will facilitate this. All options are comparable |
| | | 4 | New low speed platform 0 with new double crossover | | The operation and construction of this station layout option has no impact on future internal transport links. All options are comparable | | Potential temporary impact on existing bus services, pedestrian walkways and park and ride access. All options are comparable | | The proposal complies with regional and local policies to improve public transport services including DART services, encouraging modal shift and allowing for increased density of development in certain areas. The development is contained within the existing "envelope" of the rail line. There is no impact on existing land uses. All options are comparable | | All international, national, regional and local policies encourage improvements in relation to the efficiency of public transport. All the proposed options will facilitate this. All options are comparable | | All international, national, regional and local policies encourage improvements in relation to the efficiency of public transport. All the proposed options will facilitate this. All options are comparable |
| | | 5 | New higher speed platform 0 and 3 | | The operation and construction of this station layout option has no impact on future internal transport links. All options are comparable | | Potential temporary impact on existing bus services, pedestrian walkways and park and ride access, more construction activities expected compared to Option 3a and 4 but overall options are considered comparable. | | The proposal complies with regional and local policies to improve public transport services including DART services, encouraging modal shift and allowing for increased density of development in certain areas. The development is contained within the existing "envelope" of the rail line. There is no impact on existing land uses. All options are comparable | | All international, national, regional and local policies encourage improvements in relation to the efficiency of public transport. All the proposed options will facilitate this. All options are comparable | | All international, national, regional and local policies encourage improvements in relation to the efficiency of public transport. All the proposed options will facilitate this. All options are comparable |
| | | 6 | New higher speed platform 3 | | The operation and construction of this station layout option has no impact on future internal transport links. All options are comparable | | Potential temporary impact on existing bus services, pedestrian walkways and park and ride access, more construction activities expected compared to Option 3a and 4 but overall options are considered comparable. | | The proposal complies with regional and local policies to improve public transport services including DART services, encouraging modal shift and allowing for increased density of development in certain areas. The development is contained within the existing "envelope" of the rail line. There is no impact on existing land uses. All options are comparable | | All international, national, regional and local policies encourage improvements in relation to the efficiency of public transport. All the proposed options will facilitate this. All options are comparable | | All international, national, regional and local policies encourage improvements in relation to the efficiency of public transport. All the proposed options will facilitate this. All options are comparable |

| Comparison Criteria Legend |
|---|
| Significant comparative advantage over other |
| Some comparative advantage over other options |
| Comparable to other options / neutral |
| Some comparative disadvantage over other |
| Significant comparative disadvantage over other |

| Physical Activity | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|---------------|--|--|
| Works Description | Summary of requirements | Option Number | Description of Option | Walking / cycling opportunities |
| | | | | Rationale |
| Works around Clongriffin Station | Provide turnback infrastructure at Clongriffin which will meet the Train Service Specification. | 3a | New low speed platform 0 with new crossover | Potential temporary impact on existing pedestrian walkways Comparable to other options |
| | | 4 | New low speed platform 0 with new double crossover | Potential temporary impact on existing pedestrian walkways. Comparable to other options |
| | | 5 | New higher speed platform 0 and 3 | Potential temporary impact on existing pedestrian walkways, more construction activities expected compared to Option 3a and 4. Comparable to other options |
| | | 6 | New higher speed platform 3 | Potential temporary impact on existing pedestrian walkways, more construction activities expected compared to Option 3a and 4. Comparable to other options |