

APPENDIX E: SECTION 1 – BALLYLOUGHANE ROAD AND BELMONT JUNCTION SUBSET DETAILED MCA

Stage 2		Ballyloughane & Belmont				
Assessment Criteria	Sub-Criteria	Option 1	Option 2A	Option 2B	Option 3A	Option 3B
Economy	Capital Cost	Options 1 requires the least construction works as it doesn't involve realigning Belmont junction and has the narrowest cross section, and so has the lowest capital cost.	Options 2A & 2B have a wider cross section than 1, but don't require realigning the junction so perform neutral.	Options 2A & 2B have a wider cross section than 1, but don't require realigning the junction so perform neutral.	Options 3A & 3B which require both re-aligning the junction and more widening perform worst for capital cost.	Options 3A & 3B which require both re-aligning the junction and more widening perform worst for capital cost.
	Rank					
	Bus Journey Time and Reliability	All options have the same overall route and level of provision for buses, so are similar for average journey time. However Options 2A & 2B signalise the junctions and keep them staggered, meaning there are 2 separate signals that buses must pass through on the way in, this means that it is possible buses would have to wait longer if they arrive at these junctions on a red light. For this reason Options 2A & 2B perform worse than the other options for this criterion.	All options have the same overall route and level of provision for buses, so are similar for average journey time. However Options 2A & 2B signalise the junctions and keep them staggered, meaning there are 2 separate signals that buses must pass through on the way in, this means that it is possible buses would have to wait longer if they arrive at these junctions on a red light. For this reason Options 2A & 2B perform worse than the other options for this criterion.	All options have the same overall route and level of provision for buses, so are similar for average journey time. However Options 2A & 2B signalise the junctions and keep them staggered, meaning there are 2 separate signals that buses must pass through on the way in, this means that it is possible buses would have to wait longer if they arrive at these junctions on a red light. For this reason Options 2A & 2B perform worse than the other options for this criterion.	All options have the same overall route and level of provision for buses, so are similar for average journey time. However Options 2A & 2B signalise the junctions and keep them staggered, meaning there are 2 separate signals that buses must pass through on the way in, this means that it is possible buses would have to wait longer if they arrive at these junctions on a red light. For this reason Options 2A & 2B perform worse than the other options for this criterion.	All options have the same overall route and level of provision for buses, so are similar for average journey time. However Options 2A & 2B signalise the junctions and keep them staggered, meaning there are 2 separate signals that buses must pass through on the way in, this means that it is possible buses would have to wait longer if they arrive at these junctions on a red light. For this reason Options 2A & 2B perform worse than the other options for this criterion.
Rank						
Integration	Land Use Integration	All routes follow the existing road, while they do involve some widening of the road carriageway, no changes in land use of the area is anticipated as a result of any of the route options. For this reason all options score equally for this criterion.	All routes follow the existing road, while they do involve some widening of the road carriageway, no changes in land use of the area is anticipated as a result of any of the route options. For this reason all options score equally for this criterion.	All routes follow the existing road, while they do involve some widening of the road carriageway, no changes in land use of the area is anticipated as a result of any of the route options. For this reason all options score equally for this criterion.	All routes follow the existing road, while they do involve some widening of the road carriageway, no changes in land use of the area is anticipated as a result of any of the route options. For this reason all options score equally for this criterion.	All routes follow the existing road, while they do involve some widening of the road carriageway, no changes in land use of the area is anticipated as a result of any of the route options. For this reason all options score equally for this criterion.
	Rank					
	Transport Integration	Traffic modelling has not been performed on the junction at this stage. However, based on experience of other junctions and their performance, having 2 signalised junctions that close together with relatively low flows from each of the side roads would likely be a less efficient layout for the traffic network than keeping the junctions unsignalised. For this reason Options 2A & 2B perform worse than Options 1 for this criterion.	Traffic modelling has not been performed on the junction at this stage. However, based on experience of other junctions and their performance, bringing the junctions together and signalising them would provide a more efficient layout for the traffic network than having 2 separate signalised junctions. For this reason Options 2A & 2B perform worse than Options 3A & 3B for this criterion.	Traffic modelling has not been performed on the junction at this stage. However, based on experience of other junctions and their performance, bringing the junctions together and signalising them would provide a more efficient layout for the traffic network than having 2 separate signalised junctions. For this reason Options 2A & 2B perform worse than Options 3A & 3B for this criterion.	Traffic modelling has not been performed on the junction at this stage. However, based on experience of other junctions and their performance, bringing the junctions together and signalising them would provide a more efficient layout for the traffic network than having 2 separate signalised junctions. For this reason Options 2A & 2B perform worse than Options 3A & 3B for this criterion.	Traffic modelling has not been performed on the junction at this stage. However, based on experience of other junctions and their performance, bringing the junctions together and signalising them would provide a more efficient layout for the traffic network than having 2 separate signalised junctions. For this reason Options 2A & 2B perform worse than Options 3A & 3B for this criterion.
	Rank					
	Cyclist Integration	All options provide a continuous dedicated cycle track for both inbound and outbound cyclists through the junction. As the level of provision is the same for all options, they perform equally for this criterion.	All options provide a continuous dedicated cycle track for both inbound and outbound cyclists through the junction. As the level of provision is the same for all options, they perform equally for this criterion.	All options provide a continuous dedicated cycle track for both inbound and outbound cyclists through the junction. As the level of provision is the same for all options, they perform equally for this criterion.	All options provide a continuous dedicated cycle track for both inbound and outbound cyclists through the junction. As the level of provision is the same for all options, they perform equally for this criterion.	All options provide a continuous dedicated cycle track for both inbound and outbound cyclists through the junction. As the level of provision is the same for all options, they perform equally for this criterion.
	Rank					
Pedestrian Integration	All options provide a continuous footpaths. However as Option 1 does not provide signalised crossings across the side road junctions it performs worse than the other options for this criterion.	All options provide a continuous footpaths. However as Option 1 does not provide signalised crossings across the side road junctions it performs worse than the other options for this criterion.	All options provide a continuous footpaths. However as Option 1 does not provide signalised crossings across the side road junctions it performs worse than the other options for this criterion.	All options provide a continuous footpaths. However as Option 1 does not provide signalised crossings across the side road junctions it performs worse than the other options for this criterion.	All options provide a continuous footpaths. However as Option 1 does not provide signalised crossings across the side road junctions it performs worse than the other options for this criterion.	
Rank						
Accessibility and Social Inclusion	Vulnerable Groups	Option 1 performs worse for Vulnerable Groups, as it does not provide signalised crossings over the side road junctions, meaning vulnerable groups would be better served by the other options that do.	Option 1 performs worse for Vulnerable Groups, as it does not provide signalised crossings over the side road junctions, meaning vulnerable groups would be better served by the other options that do.	Option 1 performs worse for Vulnerable Groups, as it does not provide signalised crossings over the side road junctions, meaning vulnerable groups would be better served by the other options that do.	Option 1 performs worse for Vulnerable Groups, as it does not provide signalised crossings over the side road junctions, meaning vulnerable groups would be better served by the other options that do.	Option 1 performs worse for Vulnerable Groups, as it does not provide signalised crossings over the side road junctions, meaning vulnerable groups would be better served by the other options that do.
	Rank					
Safety	Road Safety	Options 2A & 3B that bring the junctions together provide a simpler and more standard road layout than Options 2A & 2B. For this reason, they perform better for road safety than Options 2A & 3B. Option 1 does not provide a signalised junction and therefore performs worse for road safety as signalised junctions limit conflict between road users, therefore Option 1 performs worse than the other options for this criterion. Options 3A and 2A move the accesses to Galwegians Rugby Club and Flannery's Hotel to Belmont, and therefore they have a slight safety advantage as they reduce the number of potential conflicts between cyclists and pedestrians on Dublin Road and cars accessing these areas.	Options 3A & 3B that bring the junctions together provide a simpler and more standard road layout than Options 2A & 2B. For this reason, they perform better for road safety than Options 2A & 3B. Option 1 does not provide a signalised junction and therefore performs worse for road safety as signalised junctions limit conflict between road users, therefore Option 1 performs worse than the other options for this criterion. Options 3A and 2A move the accesses to Galwegians Rugby Club and Flannery's Hotel to Belmont, and therefore they have a slight safety advantage as they reduce the number of potential conflicts between cyclists and pedestrians on Dublin Road and cars accessing these areas.	Options 3A & 3B that bring the junctions together provide a simpler and more standard road layout than Options 2A & 2B. For this reason, they perform better for road safety than Options 2A & 3B. Option 1 does not provide a signalised junction and therefore performs worse for road safety as signalised junctions limit conflict between road users, therefore Option 1 performs worse than the other options for this criterion. Options 3A and 2A move the accesses to Galwegians Rugby Club and Flannery's Hotel to Belmont, and therefore they have a slight safety advantage as they reduce the number of potential conflicts between cyclists and pedestrians on Dublin Road and cars accessing these areas.	Options 3A & 3B that bring the junctions together provide a simpler and more standard road layout than Options 2A & 2B. For this reason, they perform better for road safety than Options 2A & 3B. Option 1 does not provide a signalised junction and therefore performs worse for road safety as signalised junctions limit conflict between road users, therefore Option 1 performs worse than the other options for this criterion. Options 3A and 2A move the accesses to Galwegians Rugby Club and Flannery's Hotel to Belmont, and therefore they have a slight safety advantage as they reduce the number of potential conflicts between cyclists and pedestrians on Dublin Road and cars accessing these areas.	Options 3A & 3B that bring the junctions together provide a simpler and more standard road layout than Options 2A & 2B. For this reason, they perform better for road safety than Options 2A & 3B. Option 1 does not provide a signalised junction and therefore performs worse for road safety as signalised junctions limit conflict between road users, therefore Option 1 performs worse than the other options for this criterion. Options 3A and 2A move the accesses to Galwegians Rugby Club and Flannery's Hotel to Belmont, and therefore they have a slight safety advantage as they reduce the number of potential conflicts between cyclists and pedestrians on Dublin Road and cars accessing these areas.
	Rank					

Stage 2		Ballyloughane & Belmont				
Assessment Criteria	Sub-Criteria	Option 1	Option 2A	Option 2B	Option 3A	Option 3B
Environment	Archaeological, Architectural and Cultural Heritage	No impact anticipated as a result of any option	No impact anticipated as a result of any option	No impact anticipated as a result of any option	No impact anticipated as a result of any option	No impact anticipated as a result of any option
	Rank					
	Biodiversity	SPA and SAC boundary within 800m of southern most section of the route. QU/SC species potentially within disturbance distance. Tree removal could disturb/impact birds if undertaken during the breeding season. Young tree removal from northern section. Non-native flora species present along the north of the junction and in the south-east corner.	As option 1 Including greater grassland removal from the north.	As option 1	As option 2	As option 4
	Rank					
	Soils and Geology	All options require widening of the road cross section and related earthworks. However no significant issues or impacts are anticipated as a result of any of the options. For this reason all options score equally for this criterion.	All options require widening of the road cross section and related earthworks. However no significant issues or impacts are anticipated as a result of any of the options. For this reason all options score equally for this criterion.	All options require widening of the road cross section and related earthworks. However no significant issues or impacts are anticipated as a result of any of the options. For this reason all options score equally for this criterion.	All options require widening of the road cross section and related earthworks. However no significant issues or impacts are anticipated as a result of any of the options. For this reason all options score equally for this criterion.	All options require widening of the road cross section and related earthworks. However no significant issues or impacts are anticipated as a result of any of the options. For this reason all options score equally for this criterion.
	Rank					
	Landscape and visual	Requirement to set back stone walls. Requirement for tree removal along the northern boundary.	Requirement to set back stone walls. Requirement for tree removal along the northern boundary.	Requirement to set back stone walls. Requirement for tree removal along the northern boundary. This option performed only slightly better as it is expected to require the removal of two trees less.	Requirement to set back stone walls. Requirement for tree removal along the northern boundary. Introduction of new access road.	Requirement to set back stone walls. Requirement for tree removal along the northern boundary. Introduction of new access road.
	Rank					
	Noise, vibration and air quality	Noise - Traffic lanes remain within existing boundary. No Noise impacts expected (Light Green) Air Quality - Minimal difference in route options (Neutral)	Noise - Northbound Bus Lane moves closer to hotel and residential properties north (Light Red) Air Quality - Minimal difference in route options (Neutral)	Noise - Traffic lanes remain largely within existing boundary. No Noise impacts expected (Light Green) Air Quality - Minimal difference in route options (Neutral)	Noise - Northbound Bus Lane moves closer to hotel and residential properties north (Light Red) Air Quality - Minimal difference in route options (Neutral)	Noise - Northbound Bus Lane moves marginally closer to residential properties to north, however impacts would be minimal (Light Green) Air Quality - Minimal difference in route options. However Option 5 provides the best accommodation for buses and active travel while requiring slightly less widening.
	Rank					
	Land Use and Built Environment	Options 1, 2B & 3B keep the existing entrances to Flannery's Hotel and Galwegians Rugby Club, based on the public consultation performed this is preferred by stakeholders at both of these properties. Furthermore the residents of Belmont preferred this solution as it maintained more of the greenspace by the Belmont estate. For these reasons Options 1, 2B & 3B perform best for this criterion.	Options 1, 2B & 3B keep the existing entrances to Flannery's Hotel and Galwegians Rugby Club, based on the public consultation performed this is preferred by stakeholders at both of these properties. Furthermore the residents of Belmont preferred this solution as it maintained more of the greenspace by the Belmont estate. For these reasons Options 1, 2B & 3B perform best for this criterion.	Options 1, 2B & 3B keep the existing entrances to Flannery's Hotel and Galwegians Rugby Club, based on the public consultation performed this is preferred by stakeholders at both of these properties. Furthermore the residents of Belmont preferred this solution as it maintained more of the greenspace by the Belmont estate. For these reasons Options 1, 2B & 3B perform best for this criterion.	Options 1, 2B & 3B keep the existing entrances to Flannery's Hotel and Galwegians Rugby Club, based on the public consultation performed this is preferred by stakeholders at both of these properties. Furthermore the residents of Belmont preferred this solution as it maintained more of the greenspace by the Belmont estate. For these reasons Options 1, 2B & 3B perform best for this criterion.	Options 1, 2B & 3B keep the existing entrances to Flannery's Hotel and Galwegians Rugby Club, based on the public consultation performed this is preferred by stakeholders at both of these properties. Furthermore the residents of Belmont preferred this solution as it maintained more of the greenspace by the Belmont estate. For these reasons Options 1, 2B & 3B perform best for this criterion.
	Rank					
	Climate and Carbon	Minimal difference in route options.	Minimal difference in route options.	Minimal difference in route options.	Minimal difference in route options.	Minimal difference in route options. This option has the best active travel accommodation, similar to Option 4 but requires less widening which reduces the embodied carbon emissions.
Rank						