



Appendix E
MCA Tables -
Liffey Valley Bus Stops

Assessment Ranking	Description
	Significant advantages over the other options
	Some advantages over the other options
	Neutral compared to other options
	Some disadvantages over other options
	Significant disadvantages compared to other options

Assessment Criteria	Sub -Assessment Criteria	Emerging Preferred Route Option	Alternative Option
1 Economy	1.a. Capital Cost	<p>Indicative Infrastructure Costs;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no changes proposed to the existing arrangements. <p>Land Acquisition costs;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No land acquisition is required. 	<p>Indicative Infrastructure Costs include;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> New pedestrian bridge across the N4, with associated ramps and steps New segregated bus stops and associated pedestrian waiting areas <p>Land Acquisition Costs include;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1,300m² private land is required to provide the connection through to the Liffey Valley Shopping Centre Properties and land affected: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grassed area within Liffey Valley Shopping Centre
	1.b. Transport Reliability and Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indirect connection route to the transport interchange Sub-standard, poor quality, bus stop, passenger and pedestrian facilities. Inadequate provision to cater for demand 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shorter, direct route for bus passengers leading to new transport interchange High quality segregated facilities that meet the appropriate standard and cater for forecast demand
1 Economy	Summary		
2 Integration	2.a. Land Use Integration	The proposal does not integrate with the proposed land use associated with the new transport interchange within the shopping centre, nor with the development proposals for the Liffey Valley Shopping Centre.	The proposal integrates fully with the proposed land use for the new transport interchange within the shopping centre and the proposed development.

Assessment Criteria	Sub -Assessment Criteria	Emerging Preferred Route Option	Alternative Option
	2.b. Residential Population and Employment Catchments	The difference between the residential and employment catchments of the two options, and access to the route, are considered insignificant.	The difference between the residential and employment catchments of the two options, and access to the route, are considered insignificant.
	2.c. Transport Network Integration	The EPR Option proposals do not integrate with other elements of the Transport network, specifically the new transport interchange which is a key component of the Bus Network Redesign and BusConnects.	The alternative proposals provide fully integrate with the wider BusConnects proposals
	2.d. Cycle Network Integration	The EPR Option proposals maintain a shared bridge and ramps for bus passengers and cyclists wishing to access the shopping centre.	The alternative proposals allow for cyclists to be segregated from bus passengers and provide improved connectivity & integration to the Primary Cycle Route 06
2 Integration	Summary		
3 Accessibility & Social Inclusion	3.a. Key Trip Attractors (Education/ Health/ Commercial/ Employment)	There are no changes to accessibility for bus passengers with the EPR Option.	The alternative option will provide improved accessibility to the Liffey Valley Shopping Centre, as well as to many other areas via improved connectivity to the proposed transport interchange.
	3.b. Deprived Geographical Areas	Route option serves areas of Affluent to Marginally Below Average means from Pobal Deprivation Index.	Route option serves areas of Affluent to Marginally Below Average means from Pobal Deprivation Index.
3 Accessibility & Social Inclusion	Summary		

Assessment Criteria	Sub -Assessment Criteria	Emerging Preferred Route Option	Alternative Option
4 Road User Safety	4.a. Road User Safety	The EPR Option does not address existing safety issues and may lead to new concerns associated with increased numbers of bus passengers using bus stops on a high-speed dual carriageway.	The alternative proposals provide significantly safer bus stops, which will be segregated from the dual carriageway with a larger waiting and circulation area. The proposals also significantly increase the weaving lengths for eastbound buses and N4 traffic heading to the M50 northbound, as well as westbound buses and traffic coming from the M50 northbound.
4 Road User Safety	Summary		
5 Environment	5.a. Archaeology and Cultural Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No recorded National monuments in this location. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No recorded National Monuments in this location.
	5.b. Architectural Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No areas of architectural heritage in this location. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No areas of architectural heritage in this location.
	5.c. Flora and Fauna	<u>Impact on Trees</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None 	<u>Impact on Trees</u> A number of existing trees will be lost to facilitate the construction of the new EB bus stop, although the scheme's landscape proposals will replace these
	5.d. Soils and Geology	No works are proposed.	The proposed construction of the new bridge and associated ramps will be founded on bedrock which is shallow at this location. There is not anticipated to be any environmental concerns in respect of soils and geology.

Assessment Criteria	Sub -Assessment Criteria	Emerging Preferred Route Option	Alternative Option
	5.e. Hydrology	There are no areas at this location identified as being at high/medium risk from fluvial flooding. The route does not cross any major watercourses and is unlikely to affect the local hydrology.	There are no areas at this location identified as being at high/medium risk from fluvial flooding. The route does not cross any major watercourses and is unlikely to affect the local hydrology.
	5.f. Landscape and Visual	There is no significant difference in the impact of the two options on landscape and visual aspects.	There is no significant difference in the impact of the two options on landscape and visual aspects.
	5.g. Air Quality	There is no significant difference in the impact of the two options on air quality.	There is no significant difference in the impact of the two options on air quality.
	5.h. Noise and Vibration	There is no significant difference in the impact of the two options on noise and vibration.	There is no significant difference in the impact of the two options on noise and vibration.
	5.i. Land Use Character	There is no significant difference in the impact on land use character.	There is no significant difference in the impact on land use character.
5 Environment	Summary		
	Overall		



Údarás Náisiúnta Iompair
National Transport Authority

National Transport Authority
Dún Scéine
Harcourt Lane
Dublin 2
D02 WT20



Project Ireland 2040
Building Ireland's Future