

Area around KYLEMORE ROAD				
CAF Parameters	Sub-Criteria	Basis for Comparative Analysis	Option 9 Assessment	Option 10 Assessment
1. Economy - The impacts of a transport investment on economic growth and competitiveness.	Capital Expenditure (CAPEX): construction, land acquisition, temporary works.	This sub-criteria considered cost of construction, land cost and temporary works cost of each option. A high-level cost estimate was prepared for each option (including potential land acquisitions (permanent and temporary, zoned or un-zoned land). The lowest cost option was preferable to higher cost options.	<p>Construction Costs - Comparable to the Other Option / Neutral</p> <p>Potential for Interference with Property Rights - Commentary</p> <p>The required increase in the no. of tracks can generally be accommodated within the existing rail corridor both north and south of the railway west of Kylemore Bridge. In both options the extent of permanent and temporary construction related works may extend into the 3m strip of land to the rear of properties along Kylemore Drive.</p> <p>There may also be temporary interference of other property rights during construction of the permanent works along the rail corridor and works around the bridge however these are comparable for both options, technical and construction related solutions will seek to minimise these impacts.</p>	<p>Construction Costs - Comparable to the Other Option / Neutral</p> <p>Potential for Interference with Property Rights - Commentary</p> <p>The required increase in the no. of tracks can generally be accommodated within the existing rail corridor both north and south of the railway west of Kylemore Bridge. In both options the extent of permanent and temporary construction related works may extend into the 3m strip of land to the rear of properties along Kylemore Drive.</p> <p>There may also be temporary interference of other property rights during construction of the permanent works along the rail corridor and works around the bridge however these are comparable for both options, technical and construction related solutions will seek to minimise these impacts.</p>
	OPEX: maintenance costs, operational costs (IE or other entities), Technology advancement and future proofing / obsolescence	This sub-criteria considered long term maintenance costs. The option with less risk for long term maintenance issues (and hence cost) was preferable options with greater risk of long-term maintenance issues.	<p>Comparable to the Other Option / Neutral</p> <p>Typical maintenance requirements.</p>	<p>Comparable to the Other Option / Neutral</p> <p>Typical maintenance requirements.</p>
	Train Operations Functionality/Economic Benefit	The option which resulted in a lower risk of interruption was preferable to options with a higher risk on operations.	<p>Comparable to the Other Option / Neutral</p>	<p>Comparable to the Other Option/ Neutral</p>
	Traffic functionality: Potential impacts for vehicular traffic and associated economic activities and opportunities.	The option with shorter traffic disruption/diversions was preferable to options with longer disruption/diversions.	<p>Comparable to the Other Option/ Neutral</p> <p>Traffic will be affected and will need diversion through to Le Fanu Road and Ballyfermot Road during bridge and road closure works adding additional journey time to commercial destinations.</p>	<p>Comparable to the Other Option/ Neutral</p> <p>Traffic will be affected and will need diversion through to Le Fanu Road and Ballyfermot Road during bridge and road closure works adding additional journey time to commercial destinations.</p>
	Urban regeneration	The option with greater potential to contribute to future urban regeneration was preferable.	<p>Comparable to the Other Option/ Neutral</p> <p>Both options support urban regeneration with the passive provision for a future station at Kylemore, which is proximate to lands south of the railway line (which have been identified as having significant regeneration potential and are part of the Naas-Ballymount-Cherry Orchard-Park West URDF Masterplan.</p>	<p>Comparable to the Other Option/ Neutral</p> <p>Both options support urban regeneration with the passive provision for a future station at Kylemore, which is proximate to lands south of the railway line (which have been identified as having significant regeneration potential and are part of the Naas-Ballymount-Cherry Orchard-Park West URDF Masterplan.</p>
	Summary Evaluation		<p>Comparable to the Other Option / Neutral</p>	<p>Comparable to the Other Option / Neutral</p>

Area around KYLEMORE ROAD					
CAF Parameters	Sub-Criteria	Basis for Comparative Analysis	Option 9 Assessment	Option 10 Assessment	
2. Integration - Integration considers the extent to which the options being evaluated promotes integration with other transportation networks and infrastructure and is compatible with Government policies, including national spatial and local planning policy	Transport integration	The option which maximises integration with other existing and proposed transportation networks, infrastructure and services was preferable to other options.	<p>Comparable to the Other Option/ Neutral</p> <p>This route is not designated as a Bus Connects route, even if Landen Road and Kylemore Road currently have bus routes through the junction and over the bridge.</p> <p>The intended works will not improve or take away from the permeant state, however during works, Landen Road buses from the city centre through the local area would need to be diverted to Ballyfermot Road</p>	<p>Comparable to the Other Option/ Neutral</p> <p>This route is not designated as a Bus Connects route, even if Landen Road and Kylemore Road currently have bus routes through the junction and over the bridge.</p> <p>The intended works will not improve or take away from the permeant state, however during works, Landen Road buses from the city centre through the local area would need to be diverted to Ballyfermot Road</p>	
	Land use integration	The option with greater consistency and compliance with planning policy was preferable to others.	<p>Comparable to the Other Option/ Neutral</p> <p>Both options are supported by the national and regional planning policy context.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NPF: National Strategic Outcome - NSO1, NSO4 and NSO8 EMRA RSES / MASP: Policy Objective RPO8.8 (Table 8.2); Sustainable Transport Objective RPO5.2 <p>At local level, the Dublin City Development Plan 2016 -2022 supports the development of the DART + Programme project under Objective MT4, MT3, MT6(i) and MTO5(i).</p> <p>The proposed LUAS lines to Lucan, Fingal and Poolbeg (indicative alignment) – aka Green Line are shown going over Kylemore Bridge.</p> <p>In the Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022 all the lands and residential properties are zoned Z1 “To protect, provide and improve residential amenities” i.e., dwellings at Kylemore Drive, Kylemore Road and Landen Road Lands to the south of the bridge zoned Z6 “To provide for the creation and protection of enterprise and facilitate opportunities for employment creation”. These lands are part of a large bank of land identified as having significant regeneration potential.</p>	<p>Comparable to the Other Option/ Neutral</p> <p>Both options are supported by the national and regional planning policy context.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NPF: National Strategic Outcome - NSO1, NSO4 and NSO8 EMRA RSES / MASP: Policy Objective RPO8.8 (Table 8.2); Sustainable Transport Objective RPO5.2 <p>At local level, the Dublin City Development Plan 2016 -2022 supports the development of the DART + Programme project under Objective MT4, MT3, MT6(i) and MTO5(i).</p> <p>The proposed LUAS lines to Lucan, Fingal and Poolbeg (indicative alignment) – aka Green Line are shown going over Kylemore Bridge.</p> <p>In the Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022 all the lands and residential properties are zoned Z1 “To protect, provide and improve residential amenities” i.e., dwellings at Kylemore Drive, Kylemore Road and Landen Road Lands to the south of the bridge zoned Z6 “To provide for the creation and protection of enterprise and facilitate opportunities for employment creation”. These lands are part of a large bank of land identified as having significant regeneration potential.</p>	
	Geographical Integration	The option which minimises disruption and accessibility during construction was preferable.	<p>Comparable to the Other Option/ Neutral</p> <p>Both options require full closure of the bridge and road for construction and require the replacement of Le Fanu bridge in advance of Kylemore Bridge to provide sufficient capacity as a diversion route. The impact being approx. 5 min additional vehicular journey time.</p> <p>In its final state there is no operational difference to the equivalent option 10.</p>	<p>Comparable to the Other Option/ Neutral</p> <p>Both options require full closure of the bridge and road for construction and require the replacement of Le Fanu bridge in advance of Kylemore Bridge to provide sufficient capacity as a diversion route. The impact being approx. 5 min additional vehicular journey time.</p> <p>In its final state there is no operational difference to the equivalent option 9.</p>	
	Other government policy	The option with greater consistency and compliance with other government policy was preferable to others.	<p>Comparable to the Other Option/ Neutral</p> <p>Both options meet a range of other government policies including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Transport Strategy for the Greater Dublin Area 2016-2035: Section 5.7 (Walking), Section 5.8.2 (Regional and Local Roads) and Section 5.8.3 (Principles of Road Development); and Section 5.3 (Luas to Lucan) - Greater Dublin Area Cycle Network - Orbital Route SO4. 	<p>Comparable to the Other Option/ Neutral</p> <p>Both options meet a range of other government policy including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Transport Strategy for the Greater Dublin Area 2016-2035: Section 5.7 (Walking), Section 5.8.2 (Regional and Local Roads) and Section 5.8.3 (Principles of Road Development); and Section 5.3 (Luas to Lucan) - Greater Dublin Area Cycle Network - Orbital Route SO4. 	
	Adaptability in the future (robustness in the solution)	The option with greater adaptability for the future was preferable to others.	<p>Comparable to the Other Option/ Neutral</p> <p>Designed for a structural bearing capacity combination of LUAS trains with road transport.</p>	<p>Comparable to the Other Option/ Neutral</p> <p>Designed for a structural bearing capacity combination of LUAS trains with road transport.</p>	
	Summary Evaluation			Comparable to the Other Option / Neutral	Comparable to the Other Option / Neutral

Area around KYLEMORE ROAD				
CAF Parameters	Sub-Criteria	Basis for Comparative Analysis	Option 9 Assessment	Option 10 Assessment
3. Environment - considers impacts, such as emissions to air, noise, and ecological and architectural impacts.	Noise and vibration	The Option which minimises potential impact on the environmental factor under consideration was preferable to other options.	Comparable to the Other Option/ Neutral Similar number of dwellings likely to be significantly impacted by night works. Combination of track lowering and retaining walls may reduce noise levels during operation. No significant difference between options.	Comparable to the Other Option/ Neutral Similar number of dwellings likely to be significantly impacted by night works. Combination of track lowering and retaining walls may reduce noise levels during operation. No significant difference between options.
	Air quality and Climate		Comparable to the Other Option/ Neutral Construction and operation phase impacts are analogous for both options and the variation to track lowering and road raising will not result in any significant variation in impact. Similarly, the number of properties potentially impacted by the construction/operation are identical.	Comparable to the Other Option/ Neutral Construction and operation phase impacts are analogous for both options and the variation to track lowering and road raising will not result in any significant variation in impact. Similarly, the number of properties potentially impacted by the construction/operation are identical.
	Landscape and Visual		Comparable to the Other Option/ Neutral Construction and operation phase impacts are analogous for both options and the variation to track lowering and road raising will not result in any significant variation in impact. Similarly, the number of properties potentially impacted by the construction/operation are identical.	Comparable to the Other Option/ Neutral Construction and operation phase impacts are analogous for both options and the variation to track lowering and road raising will not result in any significant variation in impact. Similarly, the number of properties potentially impacted by the construction/operation are identical.
	Biodiversity (flora and fauna)		Comparable to the Other Option/ Neutral	Comparable to the Other Option/ Neutral
	Cultural, archaeological and architectural heritage		Comparable to the Other Option/ Neutral No impact on RMP sites. Excavation for track lowering - track area already highly disturbed, the archaeological potential is low to negligible. No designated architectural heritage.	Comparable to the Other Option / Neutral No impact on RMP sites. Excavation for track lowering - track area already highly disturbed, the archaeological potential is low to negligible. No designated architectural heritage.
	Water resources		Comparable to the Other Option/ Neutral Option will likely have a neutral/negligible impact on flood risk during operation. Water quality risk during construction phase as runoff pollutants may enter the receiving waterbodies. Works will alter the existing drainage regime and may increase risk of pluvial flooding to the site itself.	Comparable to the Other Option / Neutral Option will likely have a neutral/negligible impact on flood risk during operation. Water quality risk during construction phase as runoff pollutants may enter the receiving waterbodies. Works will alter the existing drainage regime and may increase risk of pluvial flooding to the site itself.
	Agricultural and non-agricultural		Comparable to the Other Option/ Neutral Similar impact on land requirements	Comparable to the Other Option/ Neutral Similar impact on land requirements
	Geology and soils (include waste)		Comparable to the Other Option/ Neutral Construction and operation phase impacts are similar for both schemes and the variation to track lowering and road raising will not result in any significant variation in impact. Similarly, the number of properties potentially impacted by the construction/operation are same.	Comparable to the Other Option/ Neutral Construction and operation phase impacts are similar for both schemes and the variation to track lowering and road raising will not result in any significant variation in impact. Similarly, the number of properties potentially impacted by the construction/operation are same.
	Summary Evaluation			Comparable to the Other Option / Neutral

Area around KYLEMORE ROAD				
CAF Parameters	Sub-Criteria	Basis for Comparative Analysis	Option 9 Assessment	Option 10 Assessment
4. Accessibility and Social Inclusion considers social deprivation, geographic isolation and mobility and sensory deprivation	Impact on Vulnerable Groups / Local Residents	The option which provides a higher degree of accessibility and safety for vulnerable groups was preferable.	Comparable to the other Option / Neutral Both options will continue to provide equivalent or enhanced accessibility and connectivity for vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists and communities north and south over the railway. Both options will require temporary closure of the bridge during construction; the construction management plan will consider options to reduce impact on all users.	Comparable to the other Option Both options will continue to provide equivalent or enhanced accessibility and connectivity for vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists and communities north and south over the railway. Both options will require temporary closure of the bridge during construction; the construction management plan will consider options to reduce impact on all users.
	Accessibility (stations)	The option which provided the best accessibility to the station was preferable.	Comparable to the other Option / Neutral	Comparable to the other Option / Neutral
	Accessibility (bridge)	The option which minimised severance across bridges was preferable.	Comparable to the other Option / Neutral Both options will continue to provide equivalent or enhanced accessibility and connectivity for vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists and communities north and south over the railway. Both options will require temporary closure of the bridge during construction; the construction management plan will consider options to reduce impact on all users.	Comparable to the other Option / Neutral Both options will continue to provide equivalent or enhanced accessibility and connectivity for vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists and communities north and south over the railway. Both options will require temporary closure of the bridge during construction; the construction management plan will consider options to reduce impact on all users.
	Social inclusion	The option which provided a higher degree of accessibility and connectivity for vulnerable groups was preferable.	Comparable to the other Option / Neutral Provides localised attractiveness for vulnerable users and will provide ease of connecting to future schemes encouraging the same.	Comparable to the other Option / Neutral Provides localised attractiveness for vulnerable users and will provide ease of connecting to future schemes encouraging the same.
	Summary Evaluation		Comparable to the Other Option / Neutral	Comparable to the Other Option / Neutral
	5. Safety - Safety is concerned with the impact of the investment on the number of transport related accidents.	Rail Safety	The option which provided the best rail safety solution was preferable.	Comparable to the other Option / Neutral Safety enhancements at road level will include provision of H4 containment on approaches and parapet
Vehicular Traffic Safety		The option which provides the best vehicular safety solution was preferable.	Comparable to the other Option / Neutral Replacement bridge and approaches will meet all necessary safety standards.	Comparable to the other Option / Neutral Replacement bridge and approaches will meet all necessary safety standards.
Pedestrians, cyclists, road users and neighbours safety		The option which provides the best safety solution for different road users was preferable.	Comparable to the other Option / Neutral Reinstatement of paved areas will provide for segregation between pedestrian and cycle ways; therefore it will be of a higher standard than that which currently exists.	Comparable to the other Option / Neutral Reinstatement of paved areas will provide for segregation between pedestrian and cycle ways; therefore it will be of a higher standard than that which currently exists.
Summary Evaluation			Comparable to the Other Option / Neutral	Comparable to the Other Option / Neutral

Area around KYLEMORE ROAD				
CAF Parameters	Sub-Criteria	Basis for Comparative Analysis	Option 9 Assessment	Option 10 Assessment
6. Physical Activity - (where applicable) This relates to the health benefits derived from using different transport modes	Connectivity to adjoining cycle facilities	The option that provided better connectivity between trip generators (green areas / key attractions) and that promoted physical activity was preferable.	Comparable to the other Option / Neutral The final reinstalment would provide a defined cycle lane as noted above and as such any future schemes could be connected to it accordingly and therefore would improve existing and future cycle schemes.	Comparable to the other Option / Neutral The final reinstalment would provide a defined cycle lane as noted above and as such any future schemes could be connected to it accordingly and therefore would improve existing and future cycle schemes.
	Permeability and local connectivity	The option that provided better connectivity between trip generators and that promoted physical activity was preferable.	Comparable to the other Option / Neutral Provides localised attractiveness for Vulnerable users and will provide ease of connecting to future schemes encouraging the same,	Comparable to the other Option / Neutral Provides localised attractiveness for Vulnerable users and will provide ease of connecting to future schemes encouraging the same,
	Summary Evaluation		Comparable to the other Option / Neutral	Comparable to the other Option / Neutral

Area around KYLEMORE ROAD CAF Summary Table

CAF Parameters	Option 9	Option 10
1. Economy	Comparable to the Other Option / Neutral	Comparable to the Other Option / Neutral
2. Integration	Comparable to the Other Option / Neutral	Comparable to the Other Option / Neutral
3. Environment	Comparable to the Other Option / Neutral	Comparable to the Other Option / Neutral
4. Accessibility and Social Inclusion	Comparable to the Other Option / Neutral	Comparable to the Other Option / Neutral
5. Safety	Comparable to the Other Option / Neutral	Comparable to the Other Option / Neutral
6. Physical Activity	Comparable to the other Option / Neutral	Comparable to the other Option / Neutral
Conclusion	Comparable to the Other Option / Neutral	Comparable to the Other Option / Neutral

Comparison Criteria Legend
Significant Comparative Disadvantage over the Other Option
Some Comparative Disadvantage over the Other Option
Comparable to the Other Option / Neutral
Some Comparative Advantage over the Other Option
Significant Comparative Advantage over the Other Option