

DART+ WEST - MCA Stage 1							
Clonsilla 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.	Pedestrian Cycle Bridge only at Level Crossing / Station (delivered contingent on road bridge crossing at Barberstown)
1	Economy	1.1	Construction and Land Cost	Assessment of cost of construction of option, land costs and temporary works	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options
					The proposed signaling system will need augmentation to accommodate the level crossing left in place	Cost of removing crossing is nominal in comparison to provision of road crossing.	The provisions here include low key works to close the level crossing and the construction of a new pedestrian / cycle bridge
		1.2	Long Term Maintenance costs	Ongoing annual maintenance costs associated with varied options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options
					The do-nothing scenario would maintain the existing maintenance costs of the level crossing	The closure of the level crossing would remove the maintenance requirement of the level crossing	Maintenance costs low - 15k ex VAT per year for bridge structure
		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.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options
					Reduced capacity as train frequencies increase; increase in journey times for local residents.	Displacement of traffic onto alternative routes; increase in journey times for local residents.	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%,
		2.1	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	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	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.	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.	Severance of access to train station car parking from south of the railway. Would require significant re-routing of proposed L52 bus route (BusConnects). Removal of local accessibility to the Royal Canal Cycle Route

DART+ WEST - MCA Stage 1							
Clonsilla Level Crossing Assessment							
	Parameter		Criteria	Sub-Criteria (Quantitative/ Qualitative)	Do Nothing	Do Minimum	Option 1
2	Integration	2.2	Land Use Integration	Impact on land use strategies and local plans. Assessment of support for land use factors local land use and planning. Inclusion of project in relevant local planning documents.	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options
					The do-nothing option would not support for DART Expansion however it does not impact on local planning policy/objectives hence rated as an advantage over other options.	The Do – Minimum Option does not impact any Fingal DP map-based Zoning Objectives and Specific Objectives. Closure of the level crossing with no alternative access would prevent land use and planning integration at this location and access to Clonsilla Station from either side of the tracks/ Canal and restricting access to the Royal Canal greenway.	The option is located in lands zoned “High Amenity” and “Open Space”. The construction of a pedestrian and cycle bridge would impact negatively on this land use objective which crosses over the Royal Canal. It would prevent continued vehicular access at this location. However, when compared with other options it is more discrete and impacts less HA and OS zoned lands when compared with other Do-Something options and for this reason would have some advantages over other options. The Draft Kellystown LAP 2020 is currently being developed and would need to be taken account of this as part of the movement strategy. Further consultation would be required with FCC if this is chosen as the preferred option.
		2.3	Geographical Integration	Alternative level crossing options are mostly neutral in respect of Geographical Integration due to localised nature of the level crossings. As a consequence all options are rated comparable to one another.	Comparable to other options	Comparable to other options	Comparable to other options
					No impact on Geographical Integration	No impact on Geographical Integration	No impact on Geographical Integration
		2.4	Other Government Policy Integration	Integration with the other Government policy such as the NPF and RSES.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options
					This option would not support the delivery of the higher level national and regional planning policies regarding the DART Expansion programme (NPF- (NS04), RSES & GDA Transport Strategy).	This option would support the delivery of the higher level national and regional planning policies regarding the DART Expansion programme (NPF- (NS04), RSES & GDA Transport Strategy). However there would be impact to Smarter travel policy.	This option would support the delivery of the higher level national and regional planning policies regarding the DART Expansion programme (NPF- (NS04), RSES & GDA Transport Strategy).
		3.1	Noise and Vibration	Estimated number of sensitive properties within 100m of the works. Options closer to more sensitive locations will have an increased risk of generating a noise impact. However, qualitative criteria are also used where necessary to differentiate between the options.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options
					Retains vehicular traffic which will impact the low number of sensitive receptors in proximity.	Removes vehicular traffic and minimal construction phase.	Pedestrian crossing only will have no operational noise impact. 27 properties within 100m.
		3.2	Air Quality and Climate	Estimated number of number of receptors within 50m reviewed as part of appraisal. Options closer to more sensitive locations will have an increased risk of changes in air quality during construction or operational phases. However, qualitative criteria are also used where necessary to differentiate between the options.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options
					Retains vehicular traffic which will impact the low number of sensitive receptors in proximity.	Removes vehicular traffic and minimal construction phase	Pedestrian crossing only will have no operational impact locally. Traffic redistribution not considered. 8 properties within 50m. Potential for construction phase dust impact is not significant when mitigation measures are put in place.

DART+ WEST - MCA Stage 1							
Clonsilla Level Crossing Assessment							
	Parameter		Criteria	Sub-Criteria (Quantitative/ Qualitative)	Do Nothing	Do Minimum	Option 1
3	Environment	3.3	Landscape and Visual (including light)	Key landscape characteristics affected; Impact on landscape character; Impacts on landscape features, protected landscapes. Key visual characteristics affected; Impacts on properties, amenities, protected views, key views.	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options
					No impact on existing landscape or visual characteristics	Loss of local connectivity. Minimal impact on existing landscape or visual characteristics - no likely significant landscape or visual impacts.	Proposed structure will impact some trees at entrance to Beech Park. 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	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options
					No likely impacts.	No likely impacts.	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	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options
					No likely impacts.	No likely impacts.	Potential Indirect impacts on Callaghan Bridge (RPS No. 706), the Royal Canal (RPS No. 944a) and Clonsilla Overbridge and Signal Box (RPS No. 707).
		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	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options
					Maintains the status quo with potential negative impact on surface water quality /Canal due to vehicular traffic borne pollutants associated with traffic. No construction impacts. Has some comparative advantages over other options.	Removes vehicular traffic borne pollutants and minimal construction phase. The Do Minimum Option has significant comparative advantages over other options.	Potential Positive impact on surface water quality during operation by removing vehicular traffic borne pollutants. Potential negative impact on surface water quality during construction phase. Option has some comparative advantages over other options.

DART+ WEST - MCA Stage 1							
Clonsilla Level Crossing Assessment							
	Parameter		Criteria	Sub-Criteria (Quantitative/ Qualitative)	Do Nothing	Do Minimum	Option 1
		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	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options
					No likely impacts.	No likely impacts.	Options 1 will have a direct impact involving a small area of amenity lands in Beech Park.
		3.8	Geology and Soils (including Waste)	Soils and Geology and likely impact on geological resources based on preliminary/likely construction details. Soil or topsoil resources to be developed/removed based on cut or fill requirements and potential for soft ground which may also need replaced. 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	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options
					No likely impacts.	No likely impacts.	Lower fill import requirements compared to other options.
		3.9	Radiation and Stray Current	Overall likely impact on existing sources of electromagnetic radiation.	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options
					No changes from an EMI perspective therefore advantage over other options.	No changes from an EMI perspective therefore advantage 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, mobility impaired, visually impaired and people with a disability.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options
					Original Distance roundabout to roundabout 500m retained. The long closure times associated with the level crossing will, however, restrict access	This option severs access locally across the railway	Road traffic diverted distance route is 5.5km (12 x diversion route) steep gradients on north side of option will be a disadvantage to vulnerable road users. Local ped/cycle access maintained along ramped access over proposed bridge - ~340m diversion
		4.2	Stations Accessibility	Quantification of increased service levels to the vulnerable groups.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options
					Station Accessibility is addressed for all level crossing options in proximity to a station This option will require that traffic seeking to access the station from the north will divert along the existing road network due to delays at the level crossing Shortest diversion route 5.5km.	Station Accessibility is addressed for all level crossing options in proximity to a station This option requires that all traffic accessing the station from the north must divert along the existing road network Shortest diversion route 5.5km.	Station Accessibility is addressed for all level crossing options in proximity to a station This option does not significantly affect access to the station

DART+ WEST - MCA Stage 1							
Clonsilla Level Crossing Assessment							
	Parameter		Criteria	Sub-Criteria (Quantitative/ Qualitative)	Do Nothing	Do Minimum	Option 1
		4.3	Social Inclusion	Service levels impacts including severance of community groups; Severance from community facilities consequent on an option.	<p>Significant comparative disadvantage over other options</p> <p>This option causes severance of the community through curtailment of local access over the railway without replacement with effective alternative access.</p> <p>Community facilities affected by reduced access include Shopping facilities, St Josephs Medical Centre, St Mary's Church, 2No.Montessori School - north of the railway andThe Coartyard Beechpark, Westmanstown Sports and Conference Centre, Dublin Falconry and Luttrellstown Castle Resort - south of the railway.</p>	<p>Significant comparative disadvantage over other options</p> <p>This option causes severance of the community through curtailment of local access over the railway without replacement with effective alternative access.</p> <p>Community facilities affected by reduced access include Shopping facilities, St Josephs Medical Centre, St Mary's Church, 2No.Montessori School - north of the railway andThe Coartyard Beechpark, Westmanstown Sports and Conference Centre, Dublin Falconry and Luttrellstown Castle Resort - south of the railway.</p>	<p>Some comparative disadvantage over other options</p> <p>Diverted distance for vehicular traffic 5.5km (12 x diversion route), proposed pedestrian / cycle bridge maintains local non vehicular access.</p> <p>Community facilities affected by reduced access include Shopping facilities, St Josephs Medical Centre, St Mary's Church, 2No.Montessori School - north of the railway andThe Coartyard Beechpark, Westmanstown Sports and Conference Centre, Dublin Falconry and Luttrellstown Castle Resort - south of the railway.</p>
5	Safety	5.1	Rail Safety	Safety for Rail users – removal of Level crossings is considered a significant safety enhancement	<p>Significant comparative disadvantage over other options</p> <p>This Option leaves the railway level crossing in place, a characteristic which is considered negative from the perspective of railway safety.</p> <p>This option will require construction activity associated with signalling along the live railway associated with the level crossing</p>	<p>Significant comparative advantage over other options</p> <p>This option removes the railway level crossing, a characteristic which is considered positive from the perspective of railway safety.</p> <p>There is no significant construction activity along the railway associated with the level crossing</p>	<p>Significant comparative advantage over other options</p> <p>This option removes the railway level crossing, a characteristic which is considered positive from the perspective of railway safety.</p> <p>There is no significant construction activity along the railway associated with the level crossing</p>
		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	<p>Significant comparative disadvantage over other options</p> <p>This option retains the level crossing - a significant hazard to transport users;</p> <p>This option will result in traffic diversions of up to 5.5km and increased congestion on the local road network.</p>	<p>Some comparative disadvantage over other options</p> <p>Closing the crossing with no alternative would result in diversion of road traffic onto longer routes but would avoid congestion at the level crossing.</p>	<p>Some comparative disadvantage over other options</p> <p>Closing the crossing with no alternative would result in diversion of road traffic onto longer routes but would avoid congestion at the level crossing.</p>
		5.3	Pedestrian, Cyclist and Vulnerable Road user Safety	Quality of Access for these road users. removal of interfaces	<p>Significant comparative disadvantage over other options</p> <p>The curtailed availability of access over the level crossing associated with this option will divert vulnerable road users onto the existing road network.</p> <p>Diverted road users will be required to negotiate up to 7No additional junctions including traffic light junctions and roundabouts, typically turning left travelling southbound, right if travelling northbound.</p> <p>This options does not provide for segregation over the full length of the diversion routes for vulnerable road users.</p>	<p>Significant comparative disadvantage over other options</p> <p>This option closes the level crossing - removes a significant hazard to transport users;</p> <p>This option will result in traffic diversions of up to 5.5km and increased congestion on the local road network.</p>	<p>Significant comparative advantage over other options</p> <p>This option closes the level crossing - removes a significant hazard to transport users;</p> <p>Pedestrians, Cyclists and vulnerable road users are, however, accommodated at the level crossing by the proposed bridge.</p>

DART+ WEST - MCA Stage 1							
Clonsilla Level Crossing Assessment							
	Parameter		Criteria	Sub-Criteria (Quantitative/ Qualitative)	Do Nothing	Do Minimum	Option 1
6	Physical Activity	6.1	Connectivity to adjoining cycling facilities	Analysis of the extent that the scheme connects with cycle tracks.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options
					<p>There are existing pedestrian and cycle facilities north of the railway. There are none south of the railway.</p> <p>Increased closures of the level crossing would reduce access to cycle facilities and to the proposed Royal Canal Greenway.</p> <p>Access to the train station for pedestrians and cyclists will be significantly inhibited by the level crossing, particularly with the planned level of service on the railway.</p>	<p>The removal access over the level crossing associated with this option will divert vulnerable road users onto the existing road network.</p> <p>Diverted road users will be required to negotiate up to 7No additional junctions including traffic light junctions and roundabouts, typically turning left travelling southbound, right if travelling northbound.</p> <p>This options does not provide for segregation on the diversion routes for vulnerable road users.</p>	<p>This option supports good linkage between existing and proposed cycle facilities</p> <p>The quality of access to the train station for pedestrians and cyclists is good in respect of this option.</p>
		6.2	Permeability and local access 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	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options
					<p>Cross Railway journey = nil as crossing remains in place; Inaccessible when crossing is closed.</p> <p>Diversion for cyclists when level crossing closed 5.5km</p> <p>The principal high amenity greenspaces in the vicinity of the existing train station include the Royal canal, the amenity zoned lands and golf courses south of the level crossing. Increased closures of the level crossing would reduce access to each of them.</p>	<p>Cross Railway journey = 5.5km as level crossing is removed.</p> <p>Diversion for cyclists when level crossing closed 5.5km</p> <p>The principal high amenity greenspaces in the vicinity of the existing train station include the Royal canal, the amenity zoned lands and golf courses south of the level crossing. Increased closures of the level crossing would reduce access to each of them.</p>	<p>Cross Railway journey = nil as the proposed option is along the plan alignment of the existing Clonsilla Road.</p> <p>Diversion for cyclists when level crossing closed is 0.35km.</p> <p>The principal high amenity greenspaces in the vicinity of the existing train station include the Royal canal, the amenity zoned lands and golf courses south of the level crossing. This option retains access to the amenities effectively</p>

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

DART+ WEST - MCA Stage 1							
Clonsilla Level Crossing Assessment							
	Parameter		Criteria	Sub-Criteria (Quantitative/ Qualitative)	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
					Overbridge with approach roadworks 200m to the east of crossing	Overbridge 370m to the west of crossing	Overbridge 210m to the west of crossing
1	Economy	1.1	Construction and Land Cost	Assessment of cost of construction of option, land costs and temporary works	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options
					This option includes the costs of urban roadworks across green fieldsto cross the railway and canal via raised embankment and single span bridge. Includes 2No. Junctions and the acquisition of 6No houses.	This option includes costs above Option 2 for additional at grade roadworks and a longer bridge structure and land acquisition associated with same. This option does not require the acquisition of any houses.	This option includes costs above Option 2 for additional at grade roadworks and a longer bridge structure and land acquisition associated with same. It also includes a premium for the cost of online construction which applies to the works North of the canal. This option does not require the acquisition of any houses.
		1.2	Long Term Maintenance costs	Ongoing annual maintenance costs associated with varied options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options
					The inspection and maintenance costs are associated with the roadworks and the bridge	The inspection and maintenance costs are associated with the roadworks and the bridge	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.	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options
					Some improvement in journey time compared to the Do Minimum and Option1; Some potential for induced trips; diversion required for local residents.	Some improvement in journey time compared to the Do Minimum and Option1; Some potential for induced trips; diversion required for local residents.	Some improvement in journey time compared to the Do Minimum and Option1; Some potential for induced trips; diversion required for local residents.
		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	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options
					Improved facilities for pedestrians and cyclists on new road link. Removal of direct local access to Royal Canal greenway, although alternative access provided via slightly circuitous route. Slightly more circuitous route for cyclists to access station from the south. Would require slight re-routing of proposed L52 bus route (BusConnects), and a looped route back to continue to directly serve Coolmine Station, as per existing plan.	Improved facilities for pedestrians and cyclists on new road link. Removal of direct local access to Royal Canal greenway, although alternative access provided via slightly circuitous route. Slightly more circuitous route for cyclists to access station from the south. Would require slight re-routing of proposed L52 bus route (BusConnects), although it would still directly serve Coolmine Station, as per existing plan, and may increase potential catchment by running closer to existing developments.	Improved facilities for pedestrians and cyclists on new road link, although less extensive than other options. Slightly more circuitous route for cyclists to access station from the south. Removal of direct local access to Royal Canal greenway, although alternative access provided via slightly circuitous route. Would require slight re-routing of proposed L52 bus route (BusConnects), although it would still directly serve Coolmine Station, as per existing plan

DART+ WEST - MCA Stage 1							
Clonsilla Level Crossing Assessment							
	Parameter		Criteria	Sub-Criteria (Quantitative/ Qualitative)	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
2	Integration	2.2	Land Use Integration	Impact on land use strategies and local plans. Assessment of support for land use factors local land use and planning. Inclusion of project in relevant local planning documents.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options
					<p>This Option would impact lands zoned LAP13.C 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. The Draft Kellystown LAP 2020 (south of the railway) indicates that this Option would be located in an area identified for openwith residential either side of the proposed online road option. Further consultation would be required with FCC if this is chosen as the preferred option.</p>	<p>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". This option 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". In terms of land use factors, it would connect to the Hansfield SDZ. This option would not correspond with the movement strategy or land use zoning objectives of this SDZ.</p>	<p>Options 4 impacts zoned 'High Amenity' and 'Open Space' and would include vehicular, pedestrian and cycle access. It is a more discrete solution than Option 3 and some of the other Do-Something options and therefore would have minor advantages over other Do-Something options.</p>
		2.3	Geographical Integration	Alternative level crossing options are mostly neutral in respect of Geographical Integration due to localised nature of the level crossings. As a consequence all options are rated comparable to one another.	Comparable to other options	Comparable to other options	Comparable to other options
					No impact on Geographical Integration	No impact on Geographical Integration	No impact on Geographical Integration
		2.4	Other Government Policy Integration	Integration with the other Government policy such as the NPF and RSES.	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options
					<p>This option would support the delivery of the higher level national and regional planning policies regarding the DART Expansion programme (NPF- (NS04), RSES & GDA Transport Strategy).</p>	<p>This option would support the delivery of the higher level national and regional planning policies regarding the DART Expansion programme (NPF- (NS04), RSES & GDA Transport Strategy).</p>	<p>This option would support the delivery of the higher level national and regional planning policies regarding the DART Expansion programme (NPF- (NS04), RSES & GDA Transport Strategy).</p>
		3.1	Noise and Vibration	Estimated number of sensitive properties within 100m of the works. Options closer to more sensitive locations will have an increased risk of generating a noise impact. However, qualitative criteria are also used where necessary to differentiate between the options.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options
					<p>This option constructs a new crossing point and therefore moves vehicular traffic closer to dwellings not currently exposed to vehicular traffic. 86 dwellings within 100m.</p>	<p>This option constructs a new crossing point and therefore moves vehicular traffic closer to dwellings not currently exposed to vehicular traffic. 51 dwellings within 100m.</p>	<p>38 dwellings within 100m. Slightly less impacts options 2, 3, 5 and 6 due to lower number of properties within 100m</p>
		3.2	Air Quality and Climate	Estimated number of number of receptors within 50m reviewed as part of appraisal. Options closer to more sensitive locations will have an increased risk of changes in air quality during construction or operational phases. However, qualitative criteria are also used where necessary to differentiate between the options.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options
					<p>25 dwellings within 50m. Due to longer length and overbridge, there would be a higher volume of embodied carbon in this option. Potential for construction phase dust impact is not significant when mitigation measures are put in place. Potential for construction phase dust impact is not significant when mitigation measures are put in place.</p>	<p>13 dwellings within 50m. Due to longer length and overbridge, there would be a higher volume of embodied carbon in this option. Potential for construction phase dust impact is not significant when mitigation measures are put in place.</p>	<p>5 dwellings within 50m. Slightly less impacts over options 2, 3 and 6 due to lower number of properties within 50m and lower construction materials (embodied carbon). Potential for construction phase dust impact is not significant when mitigation measures are put in place.</p>

DART+ WEST - MCA Stage 1							
Clonsilla Level Crossing Assessment							
	Parameter		Criteria	Sub-Criteria (Quantitative/ Qualitative)	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
3	Environment	3.3	Landscape and Visual (including light)	Key landscape characteristics affected; Impact on landscape character; Impacts on landscape features, protected landscapes. Key visual characteristics affected; Impacts on properties, amenities, protected views, key views.	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. Note also impacts for Option 1.	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 / Westmanstown's 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. Very significant visual impact on residential properties at Porter's Gate, and 2 canal side properties at bridge location.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Impact on trees north of the canal - which are subject to Tree Preservation Objectives. Passes 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	Biodiversity (flora and fauna)	Potential compliance/conflict with biodiversity objectives; Indirect impacts on protected species, designated sites; Overall effect on nature conservation resource.	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. Significant loss of woodland, treeline, hedgerow amenity grassland and wet grassland habitats compared to other options.	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	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)	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Direct impacts on demesne landscapes associated with Greenmount and Kellystown. Potential indirect impact on the Royal Canal (RPS No. 944a). Potential to encounter archaeological deposits that may survive within undeveloped areas.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Direct impacts on demesne associated with the Courtyard, Beech Park House (RPS No. 709) and Clonsilla Lodge. Potential indirect impacts on Beech Park House (RPS No. 710), the Royal Canal (RPS No. 944a) and Luttrellstown ACA. Potential to encounter archaeological deposits that may survive within greenfield areas.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Direct impact on demesne landscape associated with Courtyard, Beech Park House (RPS No. 709). Potential indirect impact on the Royal Canal (RPS No. 944a). Potential to encounter archaeological deposits that may survive within 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. Potential negative impact on surface and groundwater quality during construction phase. Has some comparative disadvantage over other options.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Proposed route indicated to have increased flood risk compared to other options. Potential surface water impacts during operational phase. Potential negative impact on surface and groundwater quality during construction phase. Has some comparative disadvantage over other options.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options Proposed route indicated to have increased flood risk compared to other options. Potential negative impacts to surface water quality during operational phase. Potential negative impact on surface and groundwater quality during construction phase. Has some comparative disadvantage over other options.

DART+ WEST - MCA Stage 1							
Clonsilla Level Crossing Assessment							
	Parameter		Criteria	Sub-Criteria (Quantitative/ Qualitative)	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
		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 disadvantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options
					Under Options 2, the non-agricultural impact will involve the acquisition of five residential properties. The agricultural impact will result in landtake and land severance on a livestock farm holding.	Option 3 will result in significant land severance of Beech Park amenity lands and landtake of St. Josephs Centre lands. There is a direct impact on lands used for community allotments.	Option 4 will have direct impact on amenity lands in Beech Park.
		3.8	Geology and Soils (including Waste)	Soils and Geology and likely impact on geological resources based on preliminary/likely construction details. Soil or topsoil resources to be developed/removed based on cut or fill requirements and potential for soft ground which may also need replaced. 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.	Some comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options
					Lower fill import requirements compared to other options.	Longest route with overbridge require fill import to the site (Minor negative). This option appears to have the highest earthworks needs.	Lower fill import requirements compared to other options.
		3.9	Radiation and Stray Current	Overall likely impact on existing sources of electromagnetic radiation.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage 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.	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.	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, mobility impaired, visually impaired and people with a disability.	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options
					Local ped/cycle access maintained along ramped access over proposed bridge. Road traffic diverted distance route is 572m (1.1x diversion route).	Local ped/cycle access maintained along ramped access over proposed bridge Shortest diversion route 1.7km (3.6x diversion route)	Local ped/cycle access maintained along ramped access over proposed bridge. Road traffic diverted distance route 894m (2.0x diversion route)
		4.2	Stations Accessibility	Quantification of increased service levels to the vulnerable groups.	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options
					Station Accessibility is addressed for all level crossing options in proximity to a station This option does not significantly affect access to the station	Station Accessibility is addressed for all level crossing options in proximity to a station Shortest diversion route 1.7km (3.6x diversion route)	Station Accessibility is addressed for all level crossing options in proximity to a station Shortest diversion route 894m (2.0x diversion route)

DART+ WEST - MCA Stage 1							
Clonsilla Level Crossing Assessment							
	Parameter		Criteria	Sub-Criteria (Quantitative/ Qualitative)	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
		4.3	Social Inclusion	Service levels impacts including severance of community groups; Severance from community facilities consequent on an option.	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options
					This option does not cause community severance. This option does not curtail access to community amenities Diverted distance route is 572m (1.1x diversion route).	This option does not cause community severance. This option does not curtail access to community amenities Shortest diversion route 1.7km (3.6x diversion route)	This option does not cause community severance. This option does not curtail access to community amenities Diverted distance route 894m (2.0x diversion route)
5	Safety	5.1	Rail Safety	Safety for Rail users – removal of Level crossings is considered a significant safety enhancement	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options
					This option removes the railway level crossing, a characteristic which is considered positive from the perspective of railway safety. There is no significant construction activity along the railway associated with the level crossing	This option removes the railway level crossing, a characteristic which is considered positive from the perspective of railway safety. There is no significant construction activity along the railway associated with the level crossing	This option removes the railway level crossing, a characteristic which is considered positive from the perspective of railway safety. There is no significant construction activity along the railway associated with the level crossing
		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 advantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options
					Providing a segregated crossing would have a significant advantage as vehicular traffic is not crossing the live rail.	Providing a segregated crossing would have a significant advantage as vehicular traffic is not crossing the live rail.	Providing a segregated crossing would have a significant advantage as vehicular traffic is not crossing the live rail.
		5.3	Pedestrian, Cyclist and Vulnerable Road user Safety	Quality of Access for these road users. removal of interfaces	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options
					This option replaces access for pedestrians, cyclists and vulnerable road users via the proposed bridge but at more remote location than Option 1. Diverted distance route 758m (1.6x diversion route).	This option replaces access for pedestrians, cyclists and vulnerable road users via the proposed bridge but at more remote location than Option 1. Shortest diversion route 1.7km (3.6x diversion route).	This option replaces access for pedestrians, cyclists and vulnerable road users via the proposed bridge but at more remote location than Option 1. Diverted distance route 894m (2.0x diversion route).

DART+ WEST - MCA Stage 1							
Clonsilla Level Crossing Assessment							
	Parameter		Criteria	Sub-Criteria (Quantitative/ Qualitative)	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
6	Physical Activity	6.1	Connectivity to adjoining cycling facilities	Analysis of the extent that the scheme connects with cycle tracks.	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options
					This option provides replacement pedestrian and cycle access with associated linkage to existing and proposed facilities along a diverted route - diversion - 500m	This option provides replacement pedestrian and cycle access with associated linkage to existing and proposed facilities along a diverted route - diversion - 1.2km	This option provides replacement pedestrian and cycle access with associated linkage to existing and proposed facilities along a diverted route - diversion - 600m
		6.2	Permeability and local access 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 advantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options
					<p>This option provides replacement pedestrian and cycle access with associated linkage to existing and proposed facilities along a diverted route - diversion - 500m</p> <p>The principal high amenity greenspaces in the vicinity of the existing train station include the Royal canal, the amenity zoned lands and golf courses south of the level crossing. This option retains access to the amenities</p>	<p>This option provides replacement pedestrian and cycle access with associated linkage to existing and proposed facilities along a diverted route - diversion - 1.2km</p> <p>The principal high amenity greenspaces in the vicinity of the existing train station include the Royal canal, the amenity zoned lands and golf courses south of the level crossing. This option retains access to the amenities</p>	<p>This option provides replacement pedestrian and cycle access with associated linkage to existing and proposed facilities along a diverted route - diversion - 600m</p> <p>The principal high amenity greenspaces in the vicinity of the existing train station include the Royal canal, the amenity zoned lands and golf courses south of the level crossing. This option retains access to the amenities</p>

	Criteria		Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
1	Economy		Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options
2	Integration		Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options
3	Environment		Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options
4	Accessibility and social inclusion		Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options
5	Safety		Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options
6	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

DART+ WEST - MCA Stage 1							
Clonsilla Level Crossing Assessment							
	Parameter		Criteria	Sub-Criteria (Quantitative/ Qualitative)	Option 5	Option 6	Option 7
					Overbridge 200m to the east of crossing – Offline at Larchgrove	Overbridge 200m to the east of crossing – Online at Larchgrove	Overbridge 200m to the east of crossing – Online of Larchgrove with Retained Walls
1	Economy	1.1	Construction and Land Cost	Assessment of cost of construction of option, land costs and temporary works	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options
					This option includes the costs of urban roadworks across green fieldsto cross the railway and canal via raised embankment and single span bridge. Includes 2No. Junctions and the acquisition of 6No houses.	This option includes the costs of urban roadworks across green fieldsto cross the railway and canal via raised embankment and single span bridge. Includes 2No. Junctions and the acquisition of 8No houses.	This option includes the costs of urban roadworks across green fieldsto cross the railway and canal via raised embankment and single span bridge. Includes 2No. Junctions and the acquisition of 6No houses. Retaining Walls on Northern Approach to Railway to reduce land take
		1.2	Long Term Maintenance costs	Ongoing annual maintenance costs associated with varied options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over 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.	An overbridge would increase the maintenance requirements over a level crossing, though it would not be significantly more so than 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.	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options
					Some improvement in journey time compared to the Do Minimum and Option1; Some potential for induced trips; diversion required for local residents.	Some improvement in journey time compared to the Do Minimum and Option1; Some potential for induced trips; diversion required for local residents.	Some improvement in journey time compared to the Do Minimum and Option1; Some potential for induced trips; diversion required for local residents.
		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	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options
					Improved facilities for pedestrians and cyclists on new road link. Slightly more circuitous route for cyclists to access station from the south. Removal of direct local access to Royal Canal greenway, although alternative access provided via slightly circuitous route. Would require slight re-routing of proposed L52 bus route (BusConnects), and a looped route back to continue to directly serve Coolmine Station, as per existing plan.	Improved facilities for pedestrians and cyclists on new road link. Slightly more circuitous route for cyclists to access station from the south. Removal of direct local access to Royal Canal greenway, although alternative access provided via slightly circuitous route. Would require slight re-routing of proposed L52 bus route (BusConnects), and a looped route back to continue to directly serve Coolmine Station, as per existing plan.	Improved facilities for pedestrians and cyclists on new road link. Slightly more circuitous route for cyclists to access station from the south. Removal of direct local access to Royal Canal greenway, although alternative access provided via slightly circuitous route. Would require slight re-routing of proposed L52 bus route (BusConnects), and a looped route back to continue to directly serve Coolmine Station, as per existing plan.

DART+ WEST - MCA Stage 1							
Clonsilla Level Crossing Assessment							
	Parameter		Criteria	Sub-Criteria (Quantitative/ Qualitative)	Option 5	Option 6	Option 7
2	Integration	2.2	Land Use Integration	Impact on land use strategies and local plans. Assessment of support for land use factors local land use and planning. Inclusion of project in relevant local planning documents.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options
					Overbridge 200m to the east of existing crossing – Online at Larchgrove Similar to Option 2, this option would impact lands zoned LAP13.C 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. The Draft Kellystown LAP 2020 (south of the railway) indicates that this Option would be located in an area identified for openwith residential either side of the proposed online road option. Further consultation would be required with FCC if this is chosen as the preferred option.	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.	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.
		2.3	Geographical Integration	Alternative level crossing options are mostly neutral in respect of Geographical Integration due to localised nature of the level crossings. As a consequence all options are rated comparable to one another.	Comparable to other options	Comparable to other options	Comparable to other options
					No impact on Geographical Integration	No impact on Geographical Integration	No impact on Geographical Integration
		2.4	Other Government Policy Integration	Integration with the other Government policy such as the NPF and RSES.	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options
					This option would support the delivery of the higher level national and regional planning policies regarding the DART Expansion programme (NPF- (NS04), RSES & GDA Transport Strategy).	This option would support the delivery of the higher level national and regional planning policies regarding the DART Expansion programme (NPF- (NS04), RSES & GDA Transport Strategy).	This option would support the delivery of the higher level national and regional planning policies regarding the DART Expansion programme (NPF- (NS04), RSES & GDA Transport Strategy).
		3.1	Noise and Vibration	Estimated number of sensitive properties within 100m of the works. Options closer to more sensitive locations will have an increased risk of generating a noise impact. However, qualitative criteria are also used where necessary to differentiate between the options.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options
					This option constructs a new crossing point and therefore moves vehicular traffic closer to dwellings not currently exposed to vehicular traffic. 121 dwellings within 100m.	This option constructs a new crossing point and therefore moves vehicular traffic closer to dwellings not currently exposed to vehicular traffic. 120 dwellings within 100m.	This option constructs a new crossing point and therefore moves vehicular traffic closer to dwellings not currently exposed to vehicular traffic. 120 dwellings within 100m.
		3.2	Air Quality and Climate	Estimated number of number of receptors within 50m reviewed as part of appraisal. Options closer to more sensitive locations will have an increased risk of changes in air quality during construction or operational phases. However, qualitative criteria are also used where necessary to differentiate between the options.	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options
					27 dwellings within 50m. This option constructs a new crossing point and therefore moves vehicular traffic closer to dwellings not currently exposed to vehicular traffic. Potential for construction phase dust impact is not significant when mitigation measures are put in place.	28 dwellings within 50m. This option constructs a new crossing point and therefore moves vehicular traffic closer to dwellings not currently exposed to vehicular traffic. Potential for construction phase dust impact is not significant when mitigation measures are put in place.	28 dwellings within 50m. This option constructs a new crossing point and therefore moves vehicular traffic closer to dwellings not currently exposed to vehicular traffic. Potential for construction phase dust impact is not significant when mitigation measures are put in place.

DART+ WEST - MCA Stage 1							
Clonsilla Level Crossing Assessment							
	Parameter		Criteria	Sub-Criteria (Quantitative/ Qualitative)	Option 5	Option 6	Option 7
3	Environment	3.3	Landscape and Visual (including light)	Key landscape characteristics affected; Impact on landscape character; Impacts on landscape features, protected landscapes. Key visual characteristics affected; Impacts on properties, amenities, protected views, key views.	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	Biodiversity (flora and fauna)	Potential compliance/conflict with biodiversity objectives; Indirect impacts on protected species, designated sites; Overall effect on nature conservation resource.	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 similar to Option 2 but reduced carriageway and therefore reduced 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. 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	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)	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Direct impacts on demesne landscapes associated with Greenmount and Kellystown. Potential indirect impact on the Royal Canal (RPS No. 944a). Potential to encounter archaeological deposits that may survive within greenfield areas.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Direct impacts on demesne landscapes associated with Greenmount and Kellystown. Potential indirect impact on the Royal Canal (RPS No. 944a). Potential to encounter archaeological deposits that may survive within greenfield areas. Source: Fingal Development Plan 2017-2023	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Direct impacts on demesne landscapes associated with Greenmount and Kellystown. Potential indirect impact on the Royal Canal (RPS No. 944a). Potential to encounter archaeological deposits that may survive within greenfield areas. Source: Fingal Development Plan 2017-2023
		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. Potential negative impact on surface and 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 surface and 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 surface and groundwater quality during construction phase. Has some comparative disadvantage over other options.

DART+ WEST - MCA Stage 1							
Clonsilla Level Crossing Assessment							
	Parameter		Criteria	Sub-Criteria (Quantitative/ Qualitative)	Option 5	Option 6	Option 7
		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 disadvantage over other options Under Options 5, the non-agricultural impact will involve the acquisition of five residential properties. The agricultural impact will result in landtake and land severance on a livestock farm holding.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Under Option 6, the non-agricultural impact will include landtake of property curtilage on residential properties. The agricultural impact will result in landtake and land severance on a livestock farm holding.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options Under Option 7, the non-agricultural impact will include landtake of property curtilage on residential properties. The agricultural impact will result in landtake and land severance on a livestock farm holding.
		3.8	Geology and Soils (including Waste)	Soils and Geology and likely impact on geological resources based on preliminary/likely construction details. Soil or topsoil resources to be developed/removed based on cut or fill requirements and potential for soft ground which may also need replaced. 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.	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	Radiation and Stray Current	Overall likely impact on existing sources of electromagnetic radiation.	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	4.1	Impact on Vulnerable Groups	Impacts on low income groups, non-car owners, mobility impaired, visually impaired and people with a disability.	Some comparative advantage over other options Local ped/cycle access maintained along ramped access over proposed bridge. Road traffic diverted distance route 758m (1.6x diversion route)	Some comparative advantage over other options Local ped/cycle access maintained along ramped access over proposed bridge. Road traffic diverted distance route 795m (1.8x diversion route)	Some comparative advantage over other options Local ped/cycle access maintained along ramped access over proposed bridge. Road traffic diverted distance route 795m (1.8x diversion route)
		4.2	Stations Accessibility	Quantification of increased service levels to the vulnerable groups.	Some comparative advantage over other options Station Accessibility is addressed for all level crossing options in proximity to a station Shortest diversion route 758m (1.6x diversion route)	Some comparative advantage over other options Station Accessibility is addressed for all level crossing options in proximity to a station Diverted distance route 795m (1.8x diversion route)	Some comparative advantage over other options Station Accessibility is addressed for all level crossing options in proximity to a station Diverted distance route 795m (1.8x diversion route)
			Accessibility & Social inclusion				

DART+ WEST - MCA Stage 1							
Clonsilla Level Crossing Assessment							
	Parameter		Criteria	Sub-Criteria (Quantitative/ Qualitative)	Option 5	Option 6	Option 7
		4.3	Social Inclusion	Service levels impacts including severance of community groups; Severance from community facilities consequent on an option.	Some comparative disadvantage over other options This option does not cause community severance. This option does not curtail access to community amenities Diverted distance route 758m (1.6x diversion route)	Some comparative disadvantage over other options This option does not cause community severance. This option does not curtail access to community amenities Diverted distance route 795m (1.8x diversion route)	Some comparative disadvantage over other options This option does not cause community severance. This option does not curtail access to community amenities Diverted distance route 795m (1.8x diversion route)
5	Safety	5.1	Rail Safety	Safety for Rail users – removal of Level crossings is considered a significant safety enhancement	Significant comparative advantage over other options This option removes the railway level crossing, a characteristic which is considered positive from the perspective of railway safety. There is no significant construction activity along the railway associated with the level crossing	Significant comparative advantage over other options This option removes the railway level crossing, a characteristic which is considered positive from the perspective of railway safety. There is no significant construction activity along the railway associated with the level crossing	Significant comparative advantage over other options This option removes the railway level crossing, a characteristic which is considered positive from the perspective of railway safety. There is no significant construction activity along the railway associated with the level crossing
		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 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	Pedestrian, Cyclist and Vulnerable Road user Safety	Quality of Access for these road users. removal of interfaces	Some comparative disadvantage over other options This option replaces access for pedestrians, cyclists and vulnerable road users via the proposed bridge but at more remote location than Option 1. Diverted distance route 758m (1.6x diversion route)	Some comparative disadvantage over other options This option replaces access for pedestrians, cyclists and vulnerable road users via the proposed bridge but at more remote location than Option 1. Diverted distance route 795m (1.8x diversion route)	Some comparative disadvantage over other options This option replaces access for pedestrians, cyclists and vulnerable road users via the proposed bridge but at more remote location than Option 1. Diverted distance route 795m (1.8x diversion route)

DART+ WEST - MCA Stage 1							
Clonsilla Level Crossing Assessment							
	Parameter		Criteria	Sub-Criteria (Quantitative/ Qualitative)	Option 5	Option 6	Option 7
6	Physical Activity	6.1	Connectivity to adjoining cycling facilities	Analysis of the extent that the scheme connects with cycle tracks.	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options
					This option provides replacement pedestrian and cycle access with associated linkage to existing and proposed facilities along a diverted route - diversion - 500m	This option provides replacement pedestrian and cycle access with associated linkage to existing and proposed facilities along a diverted route - diversion - 500m	This option provides replacement pedestrian and cycle access with associated linkage to existing and proposed facilities along a diverted route - diversion - 500m
		6.2	Permeability and local access 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 advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options
					<p>This option provides replacement pedestrian and cycle access with associated linkage to existing and proposed facilities along a diverted route - diversion - 500m</p> <p>The principal high amenity greenspaces in the vicinity of the existing train station include the Royal canal, the amenity zoned lands and golf courses south of the level crossing. This option retains access to the amenities</p>	<p>This option provides replacement pedestrian and cycle access with associated linkage to existing and proposed facilities along a diverted route - diversion - 500m</p> <p>The principal high amenity greenspaces in the vicinity of the existing train station include the Royal canal, the amenity zoned lands and golf courses south of the level crossing. This option retains access to the amenities</p>	<p>This option provides replacement pedestrian and cycle access with associated linkage to existing and proposed facilities along a diverted route - diversion - 500m</p> <p>The principal high amenity greenspaces in the vicinity of the existing train station include the Royal canal, the amenity zoned lands and golf courses south of the level crossing. This option retains access to the amenities</p>

	Criteria		Option 5	Option 6	Option 7
1	Economy		Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options
2	Integration		Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options
3	Environment		Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options
4	Accessibility and social inclusion		Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options
5	Safety		Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options
6	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