DART+ West - MCA Stage 2

Coolmine Level Crossing Assessment

	Parameter		Criteria	Sub-Criteria (Quantitative/ Qualitative)	Option 1	Option 3	Option 6	Option 9
					This online option is proposed along the existing Coolmine Road north of the rail line and canal and along Carpenterstown Road to the south. The option extends for 245m to the north and 210m to the south, accommodating a cross section of a 6.5m carriageway with 2m wide footpaths on both sides. There is insufficient room for with this option to accommodate dedicated cycle tracks without increasing the overall road footprint and impact on the adjacent properties further. The high side of railway is currently at a level of 65.3m above MSL at the existing level crossing with the proposed overbridge structure being at a minimum road level of 72.6m above MSL to provide the minimum clearance required for the electrification of the rail line. Embankment heights adjacent to properties north of the railway would be up to 6.6 metres while houses immediately south west of the railway would have embankments in the order of 6.4 metres high adjacent to them. A structure approximately 30m in length and at an elevation of approximately 7.3m would be required to span the railway and canal. The option would involve the construction of walled approaches to the bridge as there is insufficient space available for the construction of embankments. Initial examination suggests that the works would extend approximately 160m along Coolmine Road on each approach to the bridge. construction is likely to require the provision of noise abatement measures approximately 2.0 metres high above to the embankment. This option would also potentially require the demolition of the listed Kirkpatrick Bridge if not fully spanned.	New Overbridge Connecting St. Mochta's Grove to Luttrellpark Road.	Overbridge to East of Coolmine Road.	Option 9 provides for the closure of Coolmine Level Crossing and construction of a pedestrian and cyclist bridge in the vicinity of the level crossing (OPTION 7). Options 9 proposes local road upgrades to accommondate diverted traffic along eixisting road network. The proposed upgrades include: • Diswellstown Road Junction; Diswellstown Road /Coolmine Road Junction; Park Lodge /Castleknock Road Junction; and Porterstown Road /Diswellstown Road Junction.
1	Economy	1.1	Construction and Land Cost	Assessment of cost of construction of option, land costs and temporary works	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options**	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options**	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options**	**Significant comparative advantage over other options**
					The capital cost of this option is negatively affected by the need to construct the works while maintaining traffic on the Coolmine Road and by the need to provide nested ramps for cyclists and vulnerable road users	The capital cost of this option is negatively affected by the need to construct a pedestrian cycle bridge on Coolmine Road in addition to the offline road bridge	The capital cost of this option is negatively affected by : - the need to construct the works while maintaining traffic on the Coolmine Road; - the incorporation of significant curvature in the plan alignment which results in wider road construction; - the construction of a wide bridge over the station and the canal; - the construction of an elevated structure over the train station carpark; - the likely acquisition of 6No. house private dwellings.	Additional cost is incurred for this option due to the need to upgrade the local road network to accommodate diverted traffic consequent on closure of the level crossing.
		1.2	Long Term Maintenance costs	Ongoing annual maintenance costs associated with varied options	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options**	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options**	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options**	**Significant comparative advantage over other options**
					An overbridge would reduce maintenance requirements over a level crossing. Bridge option would determine overall maintenance costs.	An overbridge would reduce maintenance requirements over a level crossing. Bridge option would determine overall maintenance costs .	An overbridge likely to be Steel bridge to reduce deck thickness to allow for approach gradients .	Maintenance costs low - 15k ex VAT per year

DART+ West - MCA Stage 2

Coolmine Level Crossing Assessment

	Parameter		Criteria	Sub-Criteria (Quantitative/ Qualitative)	Option 1	Option 3	Option 6	Option 9
		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 comparative disadvantage over other options**
					Improvement in journey times; potential for induced trips; potential to increase congestion on surrounding road network as a result of induced traffic.	Improvement in journey times; potential for induced trips; potential to increase congestion on surrounding road network as a result of induced traffic.	Improvement in journey times; potential for induced trips; potential to increase congestion on surrounding road network as a result of induced traffic.	64% reduction in traffic volumes @ Junction North of Level Crossing; 1% incease in traffic at Junction south of level crossing; Junctions upgraded to address delays Diversion 2km for road traffic from Junction North to Junction South
2	**Integration**	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 disadvantage over other options**	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options**
					Improved interchange between modes, subject to satisfactory access to train station platforms. General reduction in journey times. There may be severance to existing connectivity on the approaches to the bridge over the canal and railway as a result of the construction of the required approach ramps. Access to the train station car park will be difficult. Primary cycle route, according to GDA Cycle Network Plan, but no room for cycle facilities on new bridge.	Rerouted access to train station car park. General improvement in connectivity and journey times. No severance to existing connectivity as a result of the construction of the required approach ramps. Coolmine Road is primary cycle route in GDA Cycle Network Plan - re-routing of traffic to new crossing point a benefit to cycling.	Improved interchange between modes, subject to satisfactory access to train station platforms. General reduction in journey times. There may be severance to existing connectivity on the approaches to the bridge over the canal and railway as a result of the construction of the required approach ramps. Access to the train station car park will be difficult and the capacity of the existing car park will be significantly reduced. Coolmine Road is primary cycle route in GDA Cycle Network Plan - Cycle track provided on overbridge	General improvement in connectivity and journey times for pedestrians & cyclists; Disimprovements to interchange caused by reduced access to the train station car park from the north.
		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 disadvantage over other options**	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options**
					Direct impacts the FCDP **Objective 142:** “Preserve the existing pedestrian and vehicular right of way at the Coolmine Level Crossing". A major negative in terms of the local policy context. Alternative pedestrian and cycle infrastructure providedd therefore it meets the 'indicative/cycle/ walking' network at this location (FDP). Land use factors: The area is a low-density suburban, well established residential area. there are no LAPs, Masterplans for the area.	Direct impacts the FCDP **Objective 142:** “Preserve the existing pedestrian and vehicular right of way at the Coolmine Level Crossing". A major negative in terms of the local policy context. Alternative pedestrian and cycle infrastructure providedd therefore it meets the 'indicative/cycle/ walking' network at this location (FDP). Direct impact to the FDP map based "Specific Objective 141 Prohibit any road bridge at this location”. It would bring traff ic through an established residential area connecting to existing road network associated with Riv erwood Court, Station Court way and St. Mochas Groove - depending on traffc lev els this could impact negativ ely on the residential amenity of these zoned areas. Land use factors: The area is a low-density suburban, well established residential area. there are no LAPs, Masterplans for the area.	Direct impacts the FCDP **Objective 142:** “Preserve the existing pedestrian and vehicular right of way at the Coolmine Level Crossing". A major negative in terms of the local policy context. Alternative pedestrian and cycle infrastructure providedd therefore it meets the 'indicative/cycle/ walking' network at this location (FDP). Option 6 travels through the existing Coolmine Train Station carpark that has a "**Specific Objective 143** Car parking provision This option may impact the future capacity to achieve this objective while also reducing the current capacity of the carpark that would be required for the likely increase of train passengers therefore affecting planning and transport integration. Land use factors: The area is a low-density suburban, well established residential area. there are no LAPs, Masterplans for the area.	Direct impacts the FCDP **Objective 142:** **“**Preserve the existing pedestrian and vehicular right of way at the Coolmine Level Crossing". A major negative in terms of the local policy context. Alternative pedestrian and cycle infrastructure providedd therefore it meets the 'indicative/cycle/ walking' network at this location (FDP). The wider road network improvements are likely to change transport and integration patterns in the area. Land use factors: The area is a low-density suburban, well established residential area. there are no LAPs, Masterplans that will be impacted.
		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**	**Comparable to other options**
					No significant effect on geographical integration.	No significant effect on geographical integration.	No significant effect on geographical integration.	No significant effect on geographical integration.

DART+ West - MCA Stage 2

Coolmine Level Crossing Assessment

	Parameter		Criteria	Sub-Criteria (Quantitative/ Qualitative)	Option 1	Option 3	Option 6	Option 9
		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 disadvantage over other options**	**Some comparative advantage over other options**
					This option supports the delivery of the higher level national and regional planning policies regarding the DART Expansion programme (NPF, RSES, GDA Transport Strategy).	This option supports the delivery of the higher level national and regional planning policies regarding the DART Expansion programme (NPF, 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, RSES, GDA Transport Strategy). Further design detail required relating to the potential negative impacts to the train station carpark and associated planning and landuse integration factors.	This option would support the delivery of the higher level national and regional planning policies regarding the DART Expansion programme (NPF, 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, qualative criteria are also used where necessary to differentiate between the options.	**Some comparative advantage over other options**	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options**	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options**	**Significant comparative advantage over other options**
					Online option will have no additional impacts to the current situation. 316 dwellings within 100m.	Moves traffic to new location and will impact different properties to the current crossing. 434 dwellings within 100m.	Moves traffic to new location and will impact different properties to the current crossing. 159 dwellings within 100m.	Removes vehicular traffic from the crossing and will therefore reduce noise impacts on the local environment. 171 dwellings within 100m. Traffic levels increase on the diversion routes where road widening and junction reconfiguration is proposed.
		3.2	**Air Quality and Climate**	Estimated number of number of receptors within 50m reviewed as part of appriasal. Options closer to more sensitive locations will have an increased risk of changes in air quality during construction or operational phases. However, qualative criteria are also used where necessary to differentiate between the options.	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options**	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options**	**Some comparative advantage over other options**	**Significant comparative advantage over other options**
					On line option. 166 dwellings within 50m potentially impacted during operational phase. Potential for construction phase dust impact is not significant when mitigation measures are put in place.	Moves traffic to new location and will impact different properties to the current crossing. 216 dwellings within 50m. Potential for construction phase dust impact is not significant when mitigation measures are put in place.	Moves traffic to new location and will impact different properties to the current crossing. 49 dwellings within 50m. Potential for construction phase dust impact is not significant when mitigation measures are put in place.	Removes vehicular traffic and the construction phase is minimal. No traffic distribution data available to assess impact on new receptors therefore assessment only considers current receptors close to the level crossing. 42 dwellings within 50m. Potential for construction phase dust impact is not significant when mitigation measures are put in place.
		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.	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options**	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options**	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options**	**Some comparative advantage over other options**
					Online overbridge option is likely to have significant impact on visual setting of adjoining residential properties at Kirkpatrick Drive, Sheepmoor Lane, Delwood Grove and Riverwood Hall. Significant visual impact for setting of Kirkpatrick Bridge - a protected structure and hence for Objective CH43 of Fingal Development Plan. Likely significant impact due to removal of roadside tree-lined hedgerows leading to railway / canal. Further information required regarding junction proposal/arrangement for Sheepmoor Lane and Kirkpatrick Drive.	Overbridge option will have very significant landscape and visual impact on open space zoned lands between St. Mochta's/Rockfield, Stationcourt Way/Kirkpatrick and through Riverwood. Very significant visual impact for residential properties at St. Mochta's, Rockfield, Stationcourt Way/Hall, Kirkpatrick and Riverwood. Demolition of residential property at Sheepmoor Lane. Tree and vegetation loss and significant visual impact in crossing the Royal Canal and hence for Objective CH43 of Fingal Development Plan. Online pedestrian cycle overbridge option will have very significant landscape and visual impact on adjacent housing estates and apartment blocks. Tree and vegetation loss and significant visual impact in crossing the Royal Canal and hence for Objective CH43 of Fingal Development Plan.	Overbridge option will have very significant visual impact on residential properties at Delwood, Cherry Drive and Rosehaven. Very significant landscape and visual impact on corridor of Royal Canal, setting of Kirkpatrick Bridge and hence for Objective CH43 of Fingal Development Plan. Demolition of residential properties at Delwood Grove.	Some loss of trees and vegetation. Visual impact for nearest properties at Delwood Grove, Sheepmoor Lane and Cherry Drive and along Royal Canal. Some impact on trees and open spaces in vicinity of road works at Diswellstown Road / Clonsilla Road Junction; Diswellstown Road Junction; Diswellstown Road / Porterstown Road Junction; and Park Lodge / Castleknock Road Junction.

DART+ West - MCA Stage 2

Coolmine Level Crossing Assessment

	Parameter		Criteria	Sub-Criteria (Quantitative/ Qualitative)	Option 1	Option 3	Option 6	Option 9
3	Environment	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 advantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative disadvantage over other options
					This option is hydrologically connected to European sites downstream in the Tolka Estuary and Dublin Bay. There is no risk of Likely Significant Effects to this or any other European site. There is potential for impacts to Royal Canal pNHA arising from noise, artifical lighting and impacts to water quality during construction. Widening of Coolmine Road on north side could result in loss of mature ash trees on the west side of road next to canal. This could be avoided if road is widened at eastern side. Demolition of Kirkpatrick Bridge could cause disturbance to and displacement of fauna as well as impact water quality in the canal. As the new structure over the railway and canal is aligned with the existing crossing there will be minimal habitat loss and less impact on the overall integrity of the pNHA.	This option is hydrologically connected to European sites downstream in the Tolka Estuary and Dublin Bay. There is no risk of Likely Significant Effects to this or any other European site. There is potential for impacts to Royal Canal pNHA arising from noise, artifical lighting and impacts to water quality during construction. New structure over the canal will fragment the ecological corridor. The construction of the pedestrian and cyclist bridge could result in tree loss north and south of the canal. Loss of woodland, scrub, amenity grassland, scattered trees and parkland is anticipated. Demolition of property on the north side of the canal on Sheepmore Lane could disturb and displace fuana	This option is hydrologically connected to European sites downstream in the Tolka Estuary and Dublin Bay. There is no risk of Likely Significant Effects to this or any other European site. There is potential for impacts to Royal Canal pNHA arising from noise, artifical lighting and impacts to water quality during construction. Large new structure over the canal which will fragment the ecological corridor. Loss of woodland and scrub habitat is anticipated.	This option is hydrologically connected to European sites downstream in the Tolka Estuary and Dublin Bay. There is no risk of Likely Significant Effects to this or any other European site. There is potential for impacts to Royal Canal pNHA arising from noise, artifical lighting and impacts to water quality during construction. The construction of the pedestrian and cyclist bridge will result in tree loss north of the canal and potentially south of the railway at Coolmine Station. New structure over the canal will fragment the ecological corridor. Road improvements will result in minor loss of trees, shrubs and grassy verges along existing roads.
		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 disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options	Significant comparative advantage over other options
					Potential direct impact on Kirkpatrick Bridge (RPS 0697) that spans over the Royal Canal. Potential indirect impact to the Royal Canal (RPS No. 0994a). indirect impact to the Royal Canal (RPS No. 0994a).	Indirect impact to the Royal Canal (RPS No. 994a).	Potential indirect impact to the Royal Canal (RPS No. 994a).	Potential indirect impact to the Royal Canal (RPS No. 994a).
		3.6	Water Resources	Overall potential significant effects on water resource attributes likely to be affected during construction and operation.	Comparable to other options	Comparable to other options	Comparable to other options	Comparable to other options
					Option likely have minimal impact on flood regime. Potential for minor impact on surface water quality during construction. Likely minimal impact on groundwater quality.	Option likely to have minimal impact on flood regime. Potential for minor impact on surface water quality during construction. Likely minimal impact on groundwater quality.	Option likely have minimal impact on flood regime. Potential for minor impact on surface water quality during construction. Likely minimal impact on groundwater quality.	Option likely have minimal impact on flood regime. Potential for minor impact on surface water quality during construction though removal of vehicular traffic likely to have a positive impact on water quality of Royal Canal overall. Likely minimal impact on groundwater quality.
		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	Some comparative disadvantage over other options	Significant comparative disadvantage over other options	Some comparative advantage over other options
					This option will reconfigure local access onto Coolmine / Carpernterstown Road. Direct impacts will include impacts to existing boundary and green areas.	This option will reconfigure local access for Riverwood Court and St. Mochta's Green/ Stationcourt Way. The non-agricultural impact will involve the acquisition of one residential property under Option 3	This option will involve the acquisition of four residential properties on the north side of the rail line. There will be a significant impact on the Coolmine Station car park.	This option will impact on Coolmine Station car park resulting in a reduction in car spaces. The proposed local road upgrades will involve minor landtake of private lands resulting in loss of car parking and boundary impacts at Woodbrook Court and properties on the Castleknock Road. Boundary impacts and loss of mature trees, hedgerow and grassed area are porposed at Laurel Lodge Park, Porterstocn Road and DIswellstown Road.

DART+ West - MCA Stage 2

Coolmine Level Crossing Assessment

	Parameter		Criteria	Sub-Criteria (Quantitative/ Qualitative)	Option 1	Option 3	Option 6	Option 9
		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**	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options**	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options**	**Some comparative advantage over other options**
					Overbridge options require fill import to the site for construction over existing roadway (Minor negative). Potential for ground contamination is considered low, subject to further investigation. No pits or quarries are present. Comparative advantage is considered as construction is proposed on existing route and unlikely to encounter new areas of soft ground or contamination.	Overbridge options require fill import to the site for construction in open ground (Minor negative). Potential for ground contamination is considered low, subject to further investigation. No pits or quarries are present.	Some existing made ground cover on-site (requires walkover survey / investigation). This overbridge option requires increased fill import to the site, more than other options and yet fill would be onto ground that has been built on already (Minor negative). Potential for ground contamination is considered low, subject to further investigation. No pits or quarries are present.	Cycle/pedestrian overbridge option requires less fill import to the site. Also provides for construction over existing roadway (Minor negative). Potential for ground contamination is considered low, subject to further investigation. No pits or quarries are present. Comparative advantage is considered as construction is proposed on existing route and unlikely to encounter new areas of soft ground or contamination.
		3.9	**Radiation and Stray Current**	Overall likely impact on existing sources of electromagnetic radiation.	**Comparable to other options**	**Comparable to other options**	**Comparable to other options**	**Comparable to 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.	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.	**Comparable to other options**	**Comparable to other options**	**Comparable to other options**	**Comparable to other options**
					No significant diversion for traffic. Options enhances access, particularly for vulnerable groups through the incorporation of shallow rises and gradients, enhancement of pedestrian, cycle and mobility impaired access.	No significant diversion for traffic. Options enhances access, particularly for vulnerable groups through the incorporation of shallow rises and gradients, enhancement of pedestrian, cycle and mobility impaired access.	No significant diversion for traffic. Options enhances access, particularly for vulnerable groups through the incorporation of shallow rises and gradients, enhancement of pedestrian, cycle and mobility impaired access.	No significant diversion for traffic. Options enhances access, particularly for vulnerable groups through the incorporation of shallow rises and gradients, enhancement of pedestrian, cycle and mobility impaired access.
		4.2	**Stations Accessibility**	Quantification of increased service levels to the vulnerable groups.	**Comparable to other options**	**Comparable to other options**	**Comparable to other options**	**Comparable to 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 This option does not significantly affect access to the station	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 This option does not significantly affect access to the station
		4.3	**Social Inclusion**	Service levels impacts including severance of community groups; Severance from community facilities consequent on an option.	**Comparable to other options**	**Comparable to other options**	**Comparable to other options**	**Comparable to other options**
					This option does not cause community severence. This option does not affect access to community amenities	This option does not cause community severence. This option does not curtail access to community amenities Diverted distance route 1.5km (3.3x diversion route)	This option does not cause community severence. This option does not curtail access to community amenities Diverted distance route 821m (1.2x diversion route).	The enhancement of the local road network to address traffic delays due to divrted traffic diversions curtails diversions to 2km for cars. Pedestrians and cyclists have good access

DART+ West - MCA Stage 2

Coolmine Level Crossing Assessment

	Parameter		Criteria	Sub-Criteria (Quantitative/ Qualitative)	Option 1	Option 3	Option 6	Option 9
5	**Safety**	5.1	**Rail Safety**	Safety for Rail users – removal of Level crossings is considered a significant safety enhancement	**Comparable to other options**	**Comparable to other options**	**Comparable to other options**	**Comparable to 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	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	**Comparable to other options**	**Comparable to other options**	**Comparable to other options**	**Comparable to other options**
					This option closes the level crossing - removes a signficant hazard to transport users; This option will not significantly divert traffic.	This option closes the level crossing - removes a signficant hazard to transport users; This option will not significantly divert traffic. This option incorporates good segregation for pedestrians, cyclists and cars from railway traffic.	This option closes the level crossing - removes a signficant hazard to transport users; This option will not significantly divert traffic. This option incorporates good segregation for pedestrians, cyclists and cars from railway traffic.	This option closes the level crossing - removes a signficant hazard to transport users; This option will result in traffic diversions of up to 2.0km but does not cause increased congestion on the local road network. This option incorporates good segregation for pedestrians, cyclists and cars from railway traffic.
		5.3	**Pedestrian, Cyclist and Vulnerable Road user Safety**	Quality of Access for these road users. removal of interfaces	**Comparable to other options**	**Comparable to other options**	**Comparable to other options**	**Comparable to other options**
					This option closes the level crossing. It provides a new link along approximately the same line as the original; Nested ramps are envisaged to constrain gradients to a maximum of 5% for vulnerable road users. The junction strategy for vulnerable road users is unaffected by this option; This option incorporates good segregation for pedestrians, cyclists and cars from railway traffic.	This option closes the level crossing. It provides a new link along approximately the same line as the original; A pedestrian cycle bridge is envisaged with gradients constrained to a maximum of 5% for vulnerable road users. The junction strategy for vulnerable road users is unaffected by this option; This option incorporates good segregation for pedestrians, cyclists and cars from railway traffic.	This option closes the level crossing. It provides a new link along approximately the same line as the original; Nested ramps are envisaged to constrain gradients to a maximum of 5% for vulnerable road users. The junction strategy for vulnerable road users is unaffected by this option; This option incorporates good segregation for pedestrians, cyclists and cars from railway traffic.	This option removes the level crossing. It replaces pedestrian and cycle access with a pedestrian cycle bridge. Other vulnerable road users are diverted onto the improved road network. Diverted road users will be required to negotiate up to 6No additional junctions including traffic light junctions and roundabouts, typically turning left travelling southbound, right if travelling northbound. Enhanced facilities to current best practice are envisaged. This options partially provides for segregation on the diversion routes for vulnerable road users.

DART+ West - MCA Stage 2

Coolmine Level Crossing Assessment

	Parameter		Criteria	Sub-Criteria (Quantitative/ Qualitative)	Option 1	Option 3	Option 6	Option 9
6	Physical Activity	6.1	**Connectivity to adjoining cycling facilities**	Analysis of the extent that the scheme connects with cycle tracks.	**Comparable to other options**	**Comparable to other options**	**Comparable to other options**	**Comparable to other options**
					This option supports good linkage between existing and proposed cycle facilities The quality of access to the train station for pedestrians and cyclists is good in respect of this option.	This option supports good linkage between existing and proposed cycle facilities The quality of access to the train station for pedestrians and cyclists is good in respect of this option.	This option supports good linkage between existing and proposed cycle facilities The quality of access to the train station for pedestrians and cyclists is good in respect of this option.	This option supports good linkage between existing and proposed cycle facilities The quality of access to the train station for pedestrians and cyclists is good in respect of this option.
		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	**Comparable to other options**	**Comparable to other options**	**Comparable to other options**	**Comparable to other options**
					Cross Railway journey = 0.3km over the proposed bridge. Diversion for cyclists when level crossing closed 0.3km The principal high amenity greenspace in the vicinity of the existing train station is the Royal canal. This access is maintained by the proposed bridge scheme.	Cross Railway journey = 0.3km over the proposed bridge. Diversion for cyclists when level crossing closed 0.3km The principal high amenity greenspace in the vicinity of the existing train station is the Royal canal. This access is maintained by the proposed bridge scheme.	Cross Railway journey = 0.3km over the proposed bridge. Diversion for cyclists when level crossing closed 0.3km The principal high amenity greenspace in the vicinity of the existing train station is the Royal canal. This access is maintained by the proposed bridge scheme.	Cross Railway journey = 0.3km over the proposed bridge. Diversion for cyclists when level crossing closed 0.3km The principal high amenity greenspace in the vicinity of the existing train station is the Royal canal. This access is maintained by the proposed bridge scheme.

	Criteria		Option 1	Option 3	Option 6	Option 9
1	**Economy**		**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options**	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options**	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options**	**Significant comparative advantage over other options**
2	**Integration**		**Some comparative advantage over other options**	**Some comparative advantage over other options**	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options**	**Some comparative advantage over other options**
3	**Environment**		**Some comparative advantage over other options**	**Significant comparative disadvantage over other options**	**Some comparative disadvantage over other options**	**Significant comparative advantage over other options**
4	**Accessibility and social inclusion**		**Comparable to other options**	**Comparable to other options**	**Comparable to other options**	**Comparable to other options**
5	**Safety**		**Comparable to other options**	**Comparable to other options**	**Comparable to other options**	**Comparable to other options**
6	**Physical Activity**		**Comparable to other options**	**Comparable to other options**	**Comparable to other options**	**Comparable to other options**
	Preferred		**No**	**No**	**No**	**Yes**