

Table 6.1.3.1 - Evaluation of Options in Ballymun Sub-Section 3A - Phibsborough Road

Assessment	Assessment Sub-Criterion	Option A	Option B
Criterion		2 Bus Lanes and Quiet Street Cycle Route	1 Bus Lane + 2 Cycle Tracks
	Capital Cost	Infrastructure Works No appreciable difference	Infrastructure Works No appreciable difference.
Economy		Land Acquisition n/a	Land Acquisition n/a
Loonomy	Rank		
	Journey Time Reliability (Bus)	Bus lanes for >95% of length	Bus lanes for 50% of length
	Rank		
	Economy		
	Policy Integration	No appreciable difference	No appreciable difference
	Rank		
	Residential Population and Employment Catchments	No appreciable difference	No appreciable difference
	Rank		
Integration	Public Transport Network	2 bus lanes	1 bus lane
3	Rank		
	Cycling Integration	Alternative Route for through trips, but not through Phibsborough Village	Continuously segregated through Phibsborough Village
	Rank		
	Traffic Network Integration	No appreciable difference	No appreciable difference
	Rank		
	Integration		
	Key Trip Attractors (Education / Health / Commercial / Employment)	No appreciable difference	No appreciable difference

Accessibility	Rank		
and Social	Deprived Geographic Areas	No appreciable difference	No appreciable difference
Inclusion	Rank		
Acc	cessibility & Social Inclusion		
Safety	Road Safety	No appreciable difference	No appreciable difference
Salety	Rank		
<u>, </u>	Safety		
	Archaeology & Cultural Heritage	No appreciable difference	No appreciable difference
	Rank		
	Flora & Fauna / Biodiversity	No appreciable difference	No appreciable difference
	Rank		
	Soils & Geology	No appreciable difference	No appreciable difference
	Rank		
Environment	Hydrology	No appreciable difference	No appreciable difference
Environment	Rank		
	Landscape & Visual	No appreciable difference	No appreciable difference
	Rank		
	Air & Noise	No appreciable difference	No appreciable difference
	Rank		
	Land Use and the Built Environment	No appreciable difference	No appreciable difference
	Rank		
<u>, </u>	Environment		
Preference Rank		1	2

Table 6.1.3.3 – Evaluation of Options in Ballymun Sub-Section 3A – Cross Guns Bridge

Assessment	Assessment Sub-Criterion	Option A	Option B
Criterion		2 Bus Lanes	1 Bus Lane + Wider Footpaths
	Capital Cost	Infrastructure Works	Infrastructure Works
		No appreciable difference	No appreciable difference.
		Land Acquisition	Land Acquisition
Economy		n/a	n/a
	Rank		
	Journey Time Reliability (Bus)	Continuous bus lanes	Short gaps in southbound bus lane with signal-controlled priority
	Rank		
	Economy		
	Policy Integration	No appreciable difference	No appreciable difference
	Rank		
	Residential Population and Employment	No appreciable difference	No appreciable difference
	Catchments		
	Rank		
Integration	Public Transport Network	No appreciable difference	No appreciable difference
	Rank		
	Cycling Integration	No appreciable difference	No appreciable difference
	Rank		
	Traffic Network Integration	No appreciable difference	No appreciable difference
	Rank		
	Integration		
	Key Trip Attractors (Education / Health / Commercial / Employment)	No appreciable difference	No appreciable difference

Accessibility	Rank		
and Social	Deprived Geographic Areas	No appreciable difference	No appreciable difference
Inclusion	Rank		
Acc	essibility & Social Inclusion		
Safety	Road Safety	Adequate footpaths	Wide footpaths
Salety	Rank		
	Safety		
	Archaeology & Cultural Heritage	No appreciable difference	No appreciable difference
	Rank		
	Flora & Fauna / Biodiversity	No appreciable difference	No appreciable difference
	Rank		
	Soils & Geology	No appreciable difference	No appreciable difference
	Rank		
Environment _	Hydrology	No appreciable difference	No appreciable difference
Liviloiiiicii	Rank		
	Landscape & Visual	No appreciable difference	No appreciable difference
	Rank		
	Air & Noise	No appreciable difference	No appreciable difference
	Rank		
	Land Use and the Built Environment	No appreciable difference	No appreciable difference
	Rank		
	Environment		
Preference Rank		1	2

Table 6.1.3.5 – Evaluation of Options for the crossing of Royal Canal Bank at North Circular Road

Assessment	Assessment Sub-Criterion	Option A	Option B
Criterion		Traffic Signal	Bridge
	Capital Cost	Infrastructure Works	Infrastructure Works
		Lower cost.	Significantly higher cost
		Land Acquisition	Land Acquisition
Economy		n/a	n/a
	Rank		
	Journey Time Reliability (Bus)	No appreciable difference	No appreciable difference
	Rank		
	Economy		
	Policy Integration	No appreciable difference	No appreciable difference
	Rank		
	Residential Population and Employment Catchments	No appreciable difference	No appreciable difference
	Rank		
Integration	Public Transport Network	No appreciable difference	No appreciable difference
	Rank		
	Cycling Integration	Major traffic route crossing	Segregated Crossing
	Rank		
	Traffic Network Integration	No appreciable difference	No appreciable difference
	Rank		
	Integration		
Accessibility and Social	Key Trip Attractors (Education / Health / Commercial / Employment)	No appreciable difference	No appreciable difference
Inclusion	Rank		

	Deprived Geographic Areas	No appreciable difference	No appreciable difference
	Rank		
Accessibility & Social Inclusion			
Safety	Road Safety	Traffic Crossing for pedestrians and cyclists	Segregated Crossing
Jaiety	Rank		
	Safety		
	Archaeology & Cultural Heritage	No change	Reinstatement of a bridge on Royal Canal Bank
	Rank		
	Flora & Fauna / Biodiversity	No appreciable difference	No appreciable difference
	Rank		
	Soils & Geology	No appreciable difference	No appreciable difference
	Rank		
	Hydrology	No appreciable difference	No appreciable difference
Environment	Rank		
	Landscape & Visual	Visual severance retained, but no loss of existing landscaping.	Connection along Royal Canal Bank, but loss of existing landscaping and replacement.
	Rank		
	Air & Noise	No appreciable difference	No appreciable difference
	Rank		
	Land Use and the Built Environment	Severance of Community	Connectivity of Community
	Rank		
	Environment		
Preference Rank		2	1

Table 6.1.3.7 – Evaluation of Options for Cyclists from Western Way to Ormond Quay

Assessment	Assessment Sub-Criterion	Option A	Option B
Criterion		Cycle Route along Church Street	Additional Two-Way Cycle Route through Markets Area
	Capital Cost	Infrastructure Works No appreciable difference	Infrastructure Works No appreciable difference
Economy		Land Acquisition n/a	Land Acquisition n/a
	Rank		
	Journey Time Reliability (Bus)	No appreciable difference	No appreciable difference
	Rank		
	Economy		
	Policy Integration	No appreciable difference	No appreciable difference
	Rank		
	Residential Population and Employment Catchments	No appreciable difference	No appreciable difference
	Rank		
Integration	Public Transport Network	No appreciable difference	No appreciable difference
	Rank		
	Cycling Integration	Single Route	Additional route
	Rank		
	Traffic Network Integration	No appreciable difference	No appreciable difference
	Rank		
	Integration		
	Key Trip Attractors (Education / Health / Commercial / Employment)	No appreciable difference	No appreciable difference

Accessibility	Rank		
and Social	Deprived Geographic Areas	No appreciable difference	No appreciable difference
Inclusion	Rank		
Acce	ssibility & Social Inclusion		
Cofety	Road Safety	No appreciable difference	No appreciable difference
Safety	Rank		
	Safety		
	Archaeology & Cultural Heritage	No appreciable difference	No appreciable difference
	Rank		
	Flora & Fauna / Biodiversity	No appreciable difference	No appreciable difference
	Rank		
	Soils & Geology	No appreciable difference	No appreciable difference
	Rank		
Environment	Hydrology	No appreciable difference	No appreciable difference
Liiviioiiiieiit	Rank		
	Landscape & Visual	No appreciable difference	No appreciable difference
	Rank		
	Air & Noise	No appreciable difference	No appreciable difference
	Rank		
	Land Use and the Built Environment	No change from existing	Enhancement for Markets Area
	Rank		
,	Environment		
Preference Rank		2	1