

Appendix E: MCA Table - Kilmore Road Junction to Killester Avenue

Assessment Criteria	Assessment Sub-Criteria		PRO Proposal	Option 1	Option 2
			Total - €0.4M	Total - €0.3M	Total - €0.3M
			Cost per KM - €2.7M	Cost per KM - €2.0M	Cost per KM - €2.0M
Economy (Cost Assessment and Transport Economic Indicators)			Indicative Scheme	Indicative Scheme	Indicative Scheme
	Ca	pital Cost	Infrastructure Works Cost - €0.32 M	Infrastructure Works Cost - €0.27M	Infrastructure Works Cost - €0.27M
			Private Land Costs - €0.08M	Private Land Costs - €0.03M	Private Land Costs - €0.03M
	Rank				
	Rank		Continuous southbound bus	Continuous Northbound bus	Continuous southbound bus
			and orthbound bus lanes Cycle	lanes.Cycle lanes provided in	lanes.Cycle lanes provided in
			lanes provided in both directions.	both directions.	both directions.
	Journey-time reliability and Consistency			Signal Controlled Priority for	Signal Controlled Priority for
				Southbound buses that would be located at Danieli Road	northbound buses that would be located at ilmore Road. would
				would control all inbound traffic.	control all inbound traffic. This
				This would significantly increase the delay to all inbound traffic	could potentially increase the delay to outbound traffic and
				including traffic from Kilmore	traffic from Kilmore Road.
				Road.	
	Rank				
			Options considered equal under	Options considered equal under	Options considered equal unde
	Land Use Integration		this criterion	this criterion	this criterion
	Rank			÷ 11	
	Total residential and employment		Options considered equal under this criterion	Options considered equal under this criterion	Options considered equal under this criterion
	Rank	10 Mins)	. 5 55.10.1	. 5 55.10.1	
				Significantl the delay to Bus	Potentially increased delay to
	Public Tra	nsport Integration	this criterion	traffic including Bus traffic from Kilmore Road.	outbound Bus traffic and Bus traffic from Kilmore Road.
Integration	<u>L</u>	<u> </u>			
	Rank				
	Traffic Network Integration		No traffic diversions as part of this option	Significantl the delay to all inbound traffic including traffic	Potentially increased delay to outbound traffic and traffic from
			tilis option	from Kilmore Road.	Kilmore Road.
	Rank				
	Cyclists and pedestrian Integration		Cycle lanes provided in both directions for whole length	Cyclists in both directions diverted around	Northbound cycle lane provided southbound cyclists share the
			uncelloris for whole length		bus lane or divert via Hegarty
				the bus lanes	Road , 2 crossing movements.
	High Volume Trip Attractors		Options considered equal under	Options considered equal under	Options considered equal under
	(======================================		this criterion	this criterion	this criterion
Accessibility & Social Inclusion	Rank		Options considered equal under	Ontions associdated agual under	
,	Deprived Geographic Areas				Options considered equal under
	Deprived (Geographic Areas	this criterion	this criterion	Options considered equal under this criterion
	Deprived (Geographic Areas	this criterion	this criterion	this criterion
Safahu	Rank	Geographic Areas	this criterion	· ·	this criterion
Safety	Rank		this criterion Options considered equal under	this criterion Options considered equal under	this criterion Options considered equal under
Safety	Rank Ro		this criterion Options considered equal under	this criterion Options considered equal under	this criterion Options considered equal under
Safety	Rank Ro	ad Safety Zone of Archaeological	this criterion Options considered equal under this criterion	this criterion Options considered equal under this criterion	this criterion Options considered equal under this criterion
Safety	Rank Ro	Zone of Archaeological Potential (ZAP)	this criterion Options considered equal under this criterion	this criterion Options considered equal under this criterion	this criterion Options considered equal under this criterion
Safety	Rank Ro Rank Archaeology,	Zone of Archaeological Potential (ZAP) Record of Monument	Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP	Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP	this criterion Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP
Safety	Rank Ro Rank Archaeology, Architectural	Zone of Archaeological Potential (ZAP)	Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area	Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area	this criterion Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area
Safety	Rank Ro Rank Archaeology,	Zone of Archaeological Potential (ZAP) Record of Monument and Places (RMP) Archaeological	Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP	Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP	this criterion Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP
Safety	Rank Ronk Archaeology, Architectural and Cultural	Zone of Archaeological Potential (ZAP) Record of Monument and Places (RMP)	Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area	Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area	this criterion Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area
Safety	Rank Ronk Archaeology, Architectural and Cultural	Zone of Archaeological Potential (ZAP) Record of Monument and Places (RMP) Archaeological Conservation Areas	Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area Not a rchaeological Conservation Area.	Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area Not a rchaeological Conservation Area.	this criterion Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area Not a rchaeological Conservation Area.
Safety	Rank Ronk Archaeology, Architectural and Cultural	Zone of Archaeological Potential (ZAP) Record of Monument and Places (RMP) Archaeological	Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area Not a rchaeological Conservation Area.	Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area	this criterion Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area Not a rchaeological Conservation Area.
Safety	Rank Ronk Archaeology, Architectural and Cultural	Zone of Archaeological Potential (ZAP) Record of Monument and Places (RMP) Archaeological Conservation Areas	Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area Not a rchaeological Conservation Area. Options considered equal under	this criterion Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area Not a rchaeological Conservation Area. Options considered equal under	Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area Not a rchaeological Conservation Area. Options considered equal under
Safety	Rank Ro Rank Archaeology, Architectural and Cultural Heritage	Zone of Archaeological Potential (ZAP) Record of Monument and Places (RMP) Archaeological Conservation Areas	this criterion Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area Not a rchaeological Conservation Area. Options considered equal under this criterion There are no European or	this criterion Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area Not a rchaeological Conservation Area. Options considered equal under this criterion There are no European or	this criterion Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area Not a rchaeological Conservation Area. Options considered equal under this criterion There are no European or
Safety	Rank Ro Rank Archaeology, Architectural and Cultural Heritage	Zone of Archaeological Potential (ZAP) Record of Monument and Places (RMP) Archaeological Conservation Areas Summary	Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area Not a rchaeological Conservation Area. Options considered equal under this criterion	this criterion Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area Not a rchaeological Conservation Area. Options considered equal under this criterion	this criterion Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area Not a rchaeological Conservation Area. Options considered equal under this criterion
Safety	Rank Ro Rank Archaeology, Architectural and Cultural Heritage	Zone of Archaeological Potential (ZAP) Record of Monument and Places (RMP) Archaeological Conservation Areas	this criterion Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area Not a rchaeological Conservation Area. Options considered equal under this criterion There are no European or Nationally designated Sites of Conservation of Importance downstream of this route option	this criterion Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area Not a rchaeological Conservation Area. Options considered equal under this criterion There are no European or Nationally designated Sites of Conservation of Importance downstream of this route option	this criterion Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area Not a rchaeological Conservation Area. Options considered equal under this criterion There are no European or Nationally designated Sites of Conservation of Importance downstream of this route option
Safety	Rank Ro Rank Archaeology, Architectural and Cultural Heritage	Zone of Archaeological Potential (ZAP) Record of Monument and Places (RMP) Archaeological Conservation Areas Summary	Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area Not a rchaeological Conservation Area. Options considered equal under this criterion	Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area Not a rchaeological Conservation Area. Options considered equal under this criterion	this criterion Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area Not a rchaeological Conservation Area. Options considered equal under this criterion There are no European or Nationally designated Sites of Conservation of Importance
Safety	Rank Ro Rank Archaeology, Architectural and Cultural Heritage	Zone of Archaeological Potential (ZAP) Record of Monument and Places (RMP) Archaeological Conservation Areas Summary	this criterion Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area Not a rchaeological Conservation Area. Options considered equal under this criterion There are no European or Nationally designated Sites of Conservation of Importance downstream of this route option in Dublin Bay. Land take will be greatest along	this criterion Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area Not a rchaeological Conservation Area. Options considered equal under this criterion There are no European or Nationally designated Sites of Conservation of Importance downstream of this route option in Dublin Bay. Land-take will result in the loss	this criterion Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area Not a rchaeological Conservation Area. Options considered equal under this criterion There are no European or Nationally designated Sites of Conservation of Importance downstream of this route option in Dublin Bay. Land-take will result in the loss
Safety	Rank Ro Rank Archaeology, Architectural and Cultural Heritage	Zone of Archaeological Potential (ZAP) Record of Monument and Places (RMP) Archaeological Conservation Areas Summary	Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area Not a rchaeological Conservation Area. Options considered equal under this criterion There are no European or Nationally designated Sites of Conservation of Importance downstream of this route option in Dublin Bay.	this criterion Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area Not a rchaeological Conservation Area. Options considered equal under this criterion There are no European or Nationally designated Sites of Conservation of Importance downstream of this route option in Dublin Bay.	this criterion Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area Not a rchaeological Conservation Area. Options considered equal under this criterion There are no European or Nationally designated Sites of Conservation of Importance downstream of this route option in Dublin Bay.
Safety	Rank Ro Rank Archaeology, Architectural and Cultural Heritage	Zone of Archaeological Potential (ZAP) Record of Monument and Places (RMP) Archaeological Conservation Areas Summary	Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area Not a rchaeological Conservation Area. Options considered equal under this criterion There are no European or Nationally designated Sites of Conservation of Importance downstream of this route option in Dublin Bay. Land take will be greatest along this scheme and will include loss of garden frontage including planted trees and	Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area Not a rchaeological Conservation Area. Options considered equal under this criterion There are no European or Nationally designated Sites of Conservation of Importance downstream of this route option in Dublin Bay. Land-take will result in the loss of garden frontage resulting in impacts on flora and fauna. Although, a lower number of	this criterion Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area Not a rchaeological Conservation Area. Options considered equal under this criterion There are no European or Nationally designated Sites of Conservation of Importance downstream of this route option in Dublin Bay. Land-take will result in the loss of garden frontage resulting in impacts on flora and fauna. Although, a lower number of
Safety	Rank Ro Rank Archaeology, Architectural and Cultural Heritage	Zone of Archaeological Potential (ZAP) Record of Monument and Places (RMP) Archaeological Conservation Areas Summary	Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area Not a rchaeological Conservation Area. Options considered equal under this criterion There are no European or Nationally designated Sites of Conservation of Importance downstream of this route option in Dublin Bay. Land take will be greatest along this scheme and will include loss of garden frontage	Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area Not a rchaeological Conservation Area. Options considered equal under this criterion There are no European or Nationally designated Sites of Conservation of Importance downstream of this route option in Dublin Bay. Land-take will result in the loss of garden frontage resulting in impacts on flora and fauna.	Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area Not a rchaeological Conservation Area. Options considered equal under this criterion There are no European or Nationally designated Sites of Conservation of Importance downstream of this route option in Dublin Bay. Land-take will result in the loss of garden frontage resulting in impacts on flora and fauna.
Safety	Rank Ro Rank Archaeology, Architectural and Cultural Heritage	Zone of Archaeological Potential (ZAP) Record of Monument and Places (RMP) Archaeological Conservation Areas Summary	Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area Not a rchaeological Conservation Area. Options considered equal under this criterion There are no European or Nationally designated Sites of Conservation of Importance downstream of this route option in Dublin Bay. Land take will be greatest along this scheme and will include loss of garden frontage including planted trees and other planted recreational features.	Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area Not a rchaeological Conservation Area. Options considered equal under this criterion There are no European or Nationally designated Sites of Conservation of Importance downstream of this route option in Dublin Bay. Land-take will result in the loss of garden frontage resulting in impacts on flora and fauna. Although, a lower number of private gardens would be impacted than PRO Proposal.	this criterion Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area Not a rchaeological Conservation Area. Options considered equal under this criterion There are no European or Nationally designated Sites of Conservation of Importance downstream of this route option in Dublin Bay. Land-take will result in the loss of garden frontage resulting in impacts on flora and fauna. Although, a lower number of private gardens would be impacted than PRO Proposal.
Safety	Rank Ro Rank Archaeology, Architectural and Cultural Heritage	Zone of Archaeological Potential (ZAP) Record of Monument and Places (RMP) Archaeological Conservation Areas Summary	Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area Not a rchaeological Conservation Area. Options considered equal under this criterion There are no European or Nationally designated Sites of Conservation of Importance downstream of this route option in Dublin Bay. Land take will be greatest along this scheme and will include loss of garden frontage including planted trees and other planted recreational features. The route option would impinge	Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area Not a rchaeological Conservation Area. Options considered equal under this criterion There are no European or Nationally designated Sites of Conservation of Importance downstream of this route option in Dublin Bay. Land-take will result in the loss of garden frontage resulting in impacts on flora and fauna. Although, a lower number of private gardens would be impacted than PRO Proposal. The route option would impinge	this criterion Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area Not a rchaeological Conservation Area. Options considered equal under this criterion There are no European or Nationally designated Sites of Conservation of Importance downstream of this route option in Dublin Bay. Land-take will result in the loss of garden frontage resulting in impacts on flora and fauna. Although, a lower number of private gardens would be impacted than PRO Proposal. The route option would impinge
Safety	Rank Ro Rank Archaeology, Architectural and Cultural Heritage	Zone of Archaeological Potential (ZAP) Record of Monument and Places (RMP) Archaeological Conservation Areas Summary EU Sites Ecological Land Take	Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area Not a rchaeological Conservation Area. Options considered equal under this criterion There are no European or Nationally designated Sites of Conservation of Importance downstream of this route option in Dublin Bay. Land take will be greatest along this scheme and will include loss of garden frontage including planted trees and other planted recreational features. The route option would impinge on garden frontage which is of low ecological potential or	Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area Not a rchaeological Conservation Area. Options considered equal under this criterion There are no European or Nationally designated Sites of Conservation of Importance downstream of this route option in Dublin Bay. Land-take will result in the loss of garden frontage resulting in impacts on flora and fauna. Although, a lower number of private gardens would be impacted than PRO Proposal. The route option would impinge on garden frontage which is of low ecological potential or	Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area Not a rchaeological Conservation Area. Options considered equal under this criterion There are no European or Nationally designated Sites of Conservation of Importance downstream of this route option in Dublin Bay. Land-take will result in the loss of garden frontage resulting in impacts on flora and fauna. Although, a lower number of private gardens would be impacted than PRO Proposal. The route option would impinge on garden frontage which is of low ecological potential or
Safety	Rank Ro Rank Archaeology, Architectural and Cultural Heritage	Zone of Archaeological Potential (ZAP) Record of Monument and Places (RMP) Archaeological Conservation Areas Summary EU Sites Ecological Land Take	Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area Not a rchaeological Conservation Area. Options considered equal under this criterion There are no European or Nationally designated Sites of Conservation of Importance downstream of this route option in Dublin Bay. Land take will be greatest along this scheme and will include loss of garden frontage including planted trees and other planted recreational features. The route option would impinge on garden frontage which is of low ecological potential or connectivity for foraging and	Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area Not a rchaeological Conservation Area. Options considered equal under this criterion There are no European or Nationally designated Sites of Conservation of Importance downstream of this route option in Dublin Bay. Land-take will result in the loss of garden frontage resulting in impacts on flora and fauna. Although, a lower number of private gardens would be impacted than PRO Proposal. The route option would impinge on garden frontage which is of	Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area Not a rchaeological Conservation Area. Options considered equal under this criterion There are no European or Nationally designated Sites of Conservation of Importance downstream of this route option in Dublin Bay. Land-take will result in the loss of garden frontage resulting in impacts on flora and fauna. Although, a lower number of private gardens would be impacted than PRO Proposal. The route option would impinge on garden frontage which is of
Safety	Rank Ro Rank Archaeology, Architectural and Cultural Heritage	Zone of Archaeological Potential (ZAP) Record of Monument and Places (RMP) Archaeological Conservation Areas Summary EU Sites Ecological Land Take	Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area Not a rchaeological Conservation Area. Options considered equal under this criterion There are no European or Nationally designated Sites of Conservation of Importance downstream of this route option in Dublin Bay. Land take will be greatest along this scheme and will include loss of garden frontage including planted trees and other planted recreational features. The route option would impinge on garden frontage which is of low ecological potential or connectivity for foraging and breeding birds or foraging bats with low impacts to flora and	Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area Not a rchaeological Conservation Area. Options considered equal under this criterion There are no European or Nationally designated Sites of Conservation of Importance downstream of this route option in Dublin Bay. Land-take will result in the loss of garden frontage resulting in impacts on flora and fauna. Although, a lower number of private gardens would be impacted than PRO Proposal. The route option would impinge on garden frontage which is of low ecological potential or connectivity for foraging and breeding birds or foraging bats with low impacts to flora and	this criterion Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area Not a rchaeological Conservation Area. Options considered equal under this criterion There are no European or Nationally designated Sites of Conservation of Importance downstream of this route option in Dublin Bay. Land-take will result in the loss of garden frontage resulting in impacts on flora and fauna. Although, a lower number of private gardens would be impacted than PRO Proposal. The route option would impinge on garden frontage which is of low ecological potential or connectivity for foraging and breeding birds or foraging bats with low impacts to flora and
Safety	Rank Ro Rank Archaeology, Architectural and Cultural Heritage	Zone of Archaeological Potential (ZAP) Record of Monument and Places (RMP) Archaeological Conservation Areas Summary EU Sites Ecological Land Take	Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area Not a rchaeological Conservation Area. Options considered equal under this criterion There are no European or Nationally designated Sites of Conservation of Importance downstream of this route option in Dublin Bay. Land take will be greatest along this scheme and will include loss of garden frontage including planted trees and other planted recreational features. The route option would impinge on garden frontage which is of low ecological potential or connectivity for foraging and breeding birds or foraging bats with low impacts to flora and fauna.	Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area Not a rchaeological Conservation Area. Options considered equal under this criterion There are no European or Nationally designated Sites of Conservation of Importance downstream of this route option in Dublin Bay. Land-take will result in the loss of garden frontage resulting in impacts on flora and fauna. Although, a lower number of private gardens would be impacted than PRO Proposal. The route option would impinge on garden frontage which is of low ecological potential or connectivity for foraging and breeding birds or foraging bats with low impacts to flora and fauna.	this criterion Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area Not a rchaeological Conservation Area. Options considered equal under this criterion There are no European or Nationally designated Sites of Conservation of Importance downstream of this route option in Dublin Bay. Land-take will result in the loss of garden frontage resulting in impacts on flora and fauna. Although, a lower number of private gardens would be impacted than PRO Proposal. The route option would impinge on garden frontage which is of low ecological potential or connectivity for foraging and breeding birds or foraging bats with low impacts to flora and fauna.
Safety	Rank Ro Rank Archaeology, Architectural and Cultural Heritage Rank	Zone of Archaeological Potential (ZAP) Record of Monument and Places (RMP) Archaeological Conservation Areas Summary EU Sites Ecological Land Take	Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area Not a rchaeological Conservation Area. Options considered equal under this criterion There are no European or Nationally designated Sites of Conservation of Importance downstream of this route option in Dublin Bay. Land take will be greatest along this scheme and will include loss of garden frontage including planted trees and other planted recreational features. The route option would impinge on garden frontage which is of low ecological potential or connectivity for foraging and breeding birds or foraging bats with low impacts to flora and	Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area Not a rchaeological Conservation Area. Options considered equal under this criterion There are no European or Nationally designated Sites of Conservation of Importance downstream of this route option in Dublin Bay. Land-take will result in the loss of garden frontage resulting in impacts on flora and fauna. Although, a lower number of private gardens would be impacted than PRO Proposal. The route option would impinge on garden frontage which is of low ecological potential or connectivity for foraging and breeding birds or foraging bats with low impacts to flora and	this criterion Options considered equal under this criterion Does not transverse ZAP No RMP located in area Not a rchaeological Conservation Area. Options considered equal under this criterion There are no European or Nationally designated Sites of Conservation of Importance downstream of this route option in Dublin Bay. Land-take will result in the loss of garden frontage resulting in impacts on flora and fauna. Although, a lower number of private gardens would be impacted than PRO Proposal. The route option would impinge on garden frontage which is of low ecological potential or connectivity for foraging and breeding birds or foraging bats with low impacts to flora and

	1	in the second se	PRO Proposal	Option 1	Option 2
		Invasive Species	Records for a number of medium impact invasive alien species have been obtained from the National Biodiversity Database. Three-cornered Garlic, Buddleja and Traveller's Joy are noted to occur along this scheme.	scheme.	scheme.
		Protected Species	Records for a number of protected species have been obtained from the National Biodiversity	Records for a number of protected species have been obtained from the National Biodiversity	Records for a number of protected species have been obtained from the National Biodiversity
		Summary	Minor impacts to flora and fauna are expected along this scheme.	Minor impacts to flora and fauna are expected along this scheme, however Lower then PRO Proposal.	Minor impacts to flora and fauna are expected along this scheme however Lower then PRO Proposal.
	Rank	•			
		Groundwater Vulnerability	Options considered equal under this criterion	Options considered equal under this criterion	Options considered equal under this criterion
		Bedrock Geology	Options considered equal under this criterion Options considered equal under	Options considered equal under this criterion Options considered equal under	Options considered equal under this criterion Options considered equal under
		Bedrock Aquifer Geological Heritage	this criterion Options considered equal under	this criterion Options considered equal under	this criterion Options considered equal under
	Calla and	Site Industrial Emissions	this criterion Options considered equal under	this criterion Options considered equal under	this criterion Options considered equal under
	Soils and Geology	Directive (IED)/Integrated Pollution Control (IPC) facilities (potential	this criterion	this criterion	this criterion
		Soils	Options considered equal under this criterion	Options considered equal under this criterion	this criterion
		Landtake and geology	Options considered equal under this criterion Options considered equal under	Options considered equal under this criterion Options considered equal under	Options considered equal under this criterion Options considered equal under
	Rank	Summary	this criterion	this criterion	this criterion
	ram	Fluvial Areas of flood	Options considered equal under	Options considered equal under	Options considered equal unde
	Hydrology	risk (AEP 10%) Fluvial Areas of flood risk (AEP 1%)	this criterion Options considered equal under this criterion	this criterion Options considered equal under this criterion	this criterion Options considered equal unde this criterion
		Flood Management Plans	Options considered equal under this criterion	Options considered equal under this criterion	Options considered equal unde this criterion
		OPW National Flood Hazards Map	Options considered equal under this criterion	Options considered equal under this criterion	Options considered equal unde this criterion
			Options considered equal under this criterion	Options considered equal under this criterion	Options considered equal unde this criterion
		CFRAMS	Options considered equal under this criterion	Options considered equal under this criterion	this criterion
		Summary	Options considered equal under this criterion	Options considered equal under this criterion	Options considered equal unde this criterion
	Landscape and Visual		Too Destration/Description	Tree Protection/Preservation:	Tree Protection/Preservation:
			Tree Protection/Preservation: Low/Medium Impact: Removal of small trees/hedges from private land required. Removal of 2 large trees	Low Impact: Removal of small trees/hedges from private land required	Low Impact: Removal of small trees/hedges from private land required. Removal of 2 large trees
			Visual Impact on Properties: Potential Medium Impact - Impact to some properties on Malahide Road Impact on Streetscape/Townscape: Med Impact to Malahide Road	Visual Impact on Properties: Potential Low Impact - Minor impact to some properties on Malahide Road Impact on Streetscape/Townscape: Low Impact to Malahide Road	Visual Impact on Properties: Potential Low/Medium Impact - Minor impact to some propertie on Malahide Road Impact on Streetscape/Townscape: Low/Medium Impact to Malahid Road
	Rank		Thoro will be some instance.	There will be some instance.	Thoro will be some instance.
Environment		Qualitative noise assessment	There will be some instances where the proposed scheme will result in traffic being relocated closer to sensitive receptors due to road widening. Should traffic be moved closer to sensitive receptors (or traffic volumes increase), there may be an increase in noise.	There will be some instances where the proposed scheme will result in traffic being relocated closer to sensitive receptors due to road widening. Should traffic be moved closer to sensitive receptors (or traffic volumes increase), there may be an increase in noise.	There will be some instances where the proposed scheme wi result in traffic being relocated closer to sensitive receptors du to road widening on the eastern side, bus lanes on both sides of the roads would increase noise at sensitive receptors comparer to option 2. Should traffic be moved closer to sensitive receptors (or traffic volumes increase), there may be an increase in noise.

		Sub-Criteria	PRO Proposal	Option 1	Option 2
	Noise & Vibration	Geodriectory (Building types)	A review of An Post Geodirectory data indicated that Building use along the Malahide Road is predominately residential. There is some commercial building use at the northern end of the scheme between the junction of Copeland Avenue and Charlemont Road. The southern end of Malahide Road between the junction of Crescent Place and Marino Crescent is predominately commercial and with some both residential & commercial use. Building use along the section at Fairview Park is predominately commercial, while building use along Annesley Bridge Road is		A review of An Post Geodirectory data indicated tha Building use along the Malahid Road is predominately residential. There is some commercial building use at the northern end of the scheme between the junction of Copeland Avenue and Charlemont Road. The souther end of Malahide Road between the junction of Crescent Place and Marino Crescent is predominately commercial and with some both residential & commercial use. Building use along the section i Fairview Park is predominately commercial, while building use along Annesley Bridge Road is
		Sensitive Receptors	predominately residential. There is one Creche (25 Malahide Rd), 2 educational establishments (Mario College, St. Joseph's CBS Secondary School) and 1 place of worship (Fairview hall), and 1 area of high amenity (Fairview Park) along the scheme option that meets the EPA definition of a noise sensitive location.	There is one Creche (25 Malahide Rd), 2 educational establishments (Mario College, St. Joseph's CBS Secondary School) and 1 place of worship (Fairview hall), and 1 area of high amenity (Fairview Park) along the scheme option that meets the EPA definition of a noise sensitive location.	There is one Creche (25 Malahide Rd), 2 educational establishments (Mario College, St. Joseph's CBS Secondary School) and 1 place of worship (Fairview hall), and 1 area of high amenity (Fairview Park) along the scheme option that meets the EPA definition of a noise sensitive location.
		Land take	There will be some instances of private land acquisition along the Malahide Road. In addition, there will be some instances of public land acquisition along the Malahide Road and along the R105 at Fairview Park	There will be some instances of private land acquisition along the Malahide Road. In addition, there will be some instances of public land acquisition along the Malahide Road and along the R105 at Fairview Park	There will be some instances of private land acquisition along the Malahide Road. In addition, there will be some instances of public land acquisition along the Malahide Road and along the R105 at Fairview Park
		Summary	The route option has the potential for both positive and negative impacts to the existing noise environment. There are no major issues that have the potential to give rise to significant impacts.	The route option has the potential for both positive and negative impacts to the existing noise environment. There are no major issues that have the potential to give rise to significant impacts.	The route option has the potential for both positive and negative impacts to the existing noise environment. There are no major issues that have the potential to give rise to significant impacts.
	Rank				
	Air Quality	Qualitative noise assessment	There will be some instances where the proposed scheme will result in traffic being relocated closer to sensitive receptors due to road widening. Should traffic be moved closer to sensitive receptors (or traffic volumes increase), there may be an increase in pollutant concentrations.	result in traffic being relocated closer to sensitive receptors due to road widening however Lower then PRO Proposal. Should traffic be moved closer to sensitive receptors (or traffic volumes increase), there may be an increase in pollutant concentrations however Lower then PRO Proposal.	There will be some instances where the proposed scheme w result in traffic being relocated closer to sensitive receptors du to road widening. however Lower then PRO Proposal. Should traffic be moved closer to sensitive receptors (or traffic volumes increase), there may be an increase in pollutant concentrations however Lower then PRO Proposal.
		Geodriectory (Building types) Sensitive Receptors	Building use along the section of Malahide Road is predominately residential. Options considered equal under this criterion	this criterion	Building use along the section of Malahide Road is predominately residential. Options considered equal unde this criterion
		Land take	Lantake will be required from	There will be some instances of private land acquisition along the Malahide Road. In addition, there will be some instances of public land acquisition along the Malahide Road and along the R105 at Fairview Park	There will be some instances of private land acquisition along the Malahide Road. In addition there will be some instances or public land acquisition along the Malahide Road and along the R105 at Fairview Park
		Summary	The route option has the potential for both positive and negative impacts to air quality. There are no major issues that have the potential to give rise to significant impacts.	The route option has the potential for both positive and negative impacts to air quality. There are no major issues that have the potential to give rise to significant impacts.	The route option has the potential for bothpositive and negative impacts to air quality. There are no major issues that have the potential to give rise t significant impacts.

Assessment Criteria	Assessment Sub-Criteria	PRO Proposal	Option 1	Option 2
	Land Use and Built Environment	Land acquisition will be required from 8 Properties Private parking within front gardens may also be removed with no alternative on-street parking available along both	Land acquisition will be required from 7 Properties Private parking within front gardens may also be removed with no alternative on-street parking available along both sides of Malahide Road however the impact will be lower then the PRO Proposal. Positive impacts will include the provision of north and southbound cycle lanes. Overall changes to land-use including land-acquisition are expected along this scheme however the impact will be lower	Land acquisition will be required from 7 Properties Private parking within front gardens may also be removed with no alternative on-street parking available along both sides of Malahide Road howeve the impact will be lower then the PRO Proposal. Positive impacts will include the provision of north and southbound cycle lanes. Overall changes to land-use including land-acquisition are expected along this scheme
	Rank			



National Transport Authority Dún Scéine Harcourt Lane Dublin 2 D02 WT20



