| | | Option 0 - Do Nothing | |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|-------|
| Criterion | Sub-Criteria | Qualitative Assessment | Score |
| | Transport Efficiency and Effectiveness | No works involved. | 4 |
| Economy | Wider Economic Impacts | The limited usage of the properties along the N83 Bridge street with most of the buildings being vacant currently. | 2 |
| | Funding Impacts | No impact of funding. | 4 |
| | Transport Quality and Reliability | Currently the transport quality is poor with HGVs needing to do the loop of the town and no facilities for safe pedestrian movements. | 2 |
| | Economy | Sub-Total Score | 12 |
| | Design Standards | The N83 Bridge Street road alignment is completely off standards and also with blind spots. | 1 |
| Safety | Collision Reduction | As per the accident data of RSA, all the accidents within study extents have occurred around the Junction at the Square except one each at Bridge Street, Barrack Street and R328. With this option, we will be leaving the issues as it is. This is bad compared to all the others options | 1 |
| | Security | No dedicated space of non-motorist users . Vulnerable for pedestrians and cyclists | 1 |
| | Safety S | Sub-Total Score | 3 |
| | Air Quality & Climate | No change to existing baseline conditions. | 3 |
| | Noise | No change to existing baseline conditions. | 4 |
| | Waste | No Waste generation required. | 7 |
| | Biodiversity (Flora and Fauna) | No identified impact based on leaving the existing bridge in situ. | 4 |
| | Agriculture | No identified impact | 4 |
| | Non-Agricultural Properties | No impacts identified at this point. | 4 |
| Environment | Architectural Heritage | The existing route is within the zone of notification surrounding the historic town of Dunmore. However, the present-day street pattern does not reflect the initial layout of the town and that it was the ford rather than the bridge that influenced the earliest street plan. | 4 |
| | Archaeological & Cultural Heritage | No Protected Structures or buildings recorded in the National Inventory of Architecture and the vast majority of the buildings, particularly at the southern end of the street, are not occupied and comprise of residential and commercial units facing onto the street. | 3 |
| | Landscape & Visual (including light) | No major change. Missed opportunity for improvement to visual impact. | 3 |
| | Soils and Geology | Neutral impact on local geology | 4 |
| | Hydrology | Installation of interceptors removes any risk to Sinking River. | 5 |
| | Hydrogeology | Considered slight or neutral due to existing infrastructure. | 4 |
| | Environme | nt Sub-Total Score | 49 |
| | Deprived Geographical Areas | Generally this option will have negative impact on the deprived geographical areas compared to the other options. | 1 |
| cessibility & Social Inclusion | Vulnerable Groups | Will have negative impact on vulnerable groups to town centre facilities with no improvement being done and leaving the safety and visibility concerns as it | 1 |
| | Accessibility & Socia | is. al Inclusion Sub-Total Score | 2 |
| | Transport Integration | This option does not provide integration of transport. HGVs need to do loop of the town of Dunmore and there is no facility for pedestrians and cyclists in the current scenario. | 2 |
| Integration | Land Use Integration | This option is not compatible with Development Plan which aims to streamline strategic connectivity and mitigates urban sprawl. | 2 |

| | Geographical Integration | This option will not offer any extra or better connectivity between hubs which would be beneficial to local services | 2 |
|-------------------|--|--|----|
| | Other Government Policy Integration: Regional Balance | This option will not offer any better links between urban centres and improvement access between ports and Airports | 3 |
| | Integration | n Sub-Total Score | 9 |
| | Ambience | Perception of fear and safety especially vulnerable users | 2 |
| Physical Activity | Absenteeism With this option, no safe footpath for people to walk as due the narrow width of the road the vehicles drive on the footpath to while crossing each other. | | 1 |
| | Reduced Health Risk | No Health benefits of Walk/cycle etc. | 1 |
| | Physical Acti | vity Sub-Total Score | 4 |
| | Route O | otion Total Score | 79 |

| | | Option 1 - Gree | n Option | |
|------------------------------|---|--|---|-------|
| Criterion | Sub-Criteria | Quantitative Assessment | Qualitative Assessment | Score |
| | Transport Efficiency and Effectiveness | CBA analyses how projects could increase overall welfare, after allowing for economic costs. If Benefits exceed Costs, or if the Benefits/Costs ratio greatly exceeds 1, then the project should add to overall welfare of society. The Present Value of Benefits relating to the transport user benefits for each option should be recorded and each option ranked on a scale from Highly Positive to Highly Negative. | Construction cost would include demolition of the existing buildings but this option won't need a new bridge on the sinking river and also this option would have major part of online road compared to other options. | 6 |
| Economy | Wider Economic Impacts | Competition in the market - Agglomeration - Inward investment - Labour Supply - Urban Regeneration - | Related to all elements except Economic and this option would provide better opportunities. | 5 |
| | Funding Impacts | Option 1 and 2 would bring funding from Dunmore Regeneration Scheme. Option 3 and 4 may lightly bring a portion as they are semi by-pass. Option 5 would not attract it as it is going to leave the town segregated. | Aim of scheme to deal with village revitalisation. | 6 |
| | Transport Quality and Reliability | | Currently the transport quality is poor with HGVs needing to do the loop of the town and no facilities for safe pedestrian movements. This option would improve the quality and reliability of the transport compared to the present scenario. | 6 |
| | | Economy Sub-Total Score | | 23 |
| | Design Standards | | The road could not be designed to full standards as the existing bridge which is to be retained and tied in is a constraint. On the N83 bridge street, we had to provide a very tight sub-standard radius of 26 m and this would also have some impact on visibility on the road as well. | 2 |
| Safety & Design Standards | Collision Reduction | | As per the accident data of RSA, all the accidents within study extents have occurred around the Junction at the Square except one each at Bridge Street, Barrack Street and R328. With this option, we will improve the Bridge Street and also the junction at the Square and hence, this will bring highly positive change from collision reduction perspective. | 6 |
| | Security | | This option would see dedicated space for shared pedestrian and cycle track as well. This will help for the vulnerable users like pedestrians etc. Visibility to pedestrians at the bend to bridge crossing location. | 6 |
| | | Safety Sub-Total Score | | 14 |
| | Air Quality & Climate | No overall change. Risk of dust during construction phase. | No change to existing baseline conditions following construction phase. | 3 |
| | Noise | No overall change. Risk of increased noise during construction phase. | No overall change. Risk of increased noise during construction phase. | 3 |

| Ī | Г | | | |
|------------------|--------------------------|--|---|-----|
| | | Demolition of | Extra traffic | |
| | | existing buildings | movements on site | |
| | Waste | required. Quantities | to remove any | 2 |
| | | or duration of works | • | |
| | | not yet defined. | waste. | |
| | | No identified impact | No identified impact | |
| | | based on leaving | based on leaving | |
| | Biodiversity (Flora and | the existing bridge | the existing bridge | 3 |
| | Fauna) | in situ. Possible | in situ. Possible | · · |
| | | impact on bats. | impact on bats. | |
| | Agriculturo | No identified impact | No identified impact | 4 |
| | Agriculture | | No identified impact | 4 |
| | | Requirement for | Dec. to west fee | |
| | Non-Agricultural | demolition of | Requirement for | |
| | Properties | buildings. Nature | demolition of | 2 |
| | | and extent is not | buildings | |
| | | clear at this point. | | |
| | | | The proposed re-alignment of Bridge Street is | |
| | | | within the zone of notification surrounding the | |
| | | | historic town of Dunmore. However, the present- | |
| | Architectural Heritage | | day street pattern does not reflect the initial | 4 |
| | | | layout of the town and that it was the ford rather | |
| Environment | | | than the bridge that influenced the earliest street | |
| | | | plan. | |
| | | | I ^{n a} | |
| | Archaeological & | | No Protected Structures or buildings recorded in | 3 |
| | Cultural Heritage | | the National Inventory of Architecture are | 3 |
| | | | impacted by this route | |
| | | Requirement for | Requirement for | |
| | Landscape & Visual | demolition of | demolition of | |
| | (including light) | buildings. Nature | buildings. Nature | 2 |
| | (including light) | and extent is not | and extent is not | |
| | | clear at this point | clear at this point | |
| | | May have slight | May have slight | |
| | | impact on local | impact on local | |
| | | geology but thought | geology but thought | |
| | Soils and Geology | slight due to the | slight due to the | 3 |
| | Solis and Geology | proposed | proposed | 3 |
| | | | · · | |
| | | development being | development being | |
| | | in a built area. | in a built area. | |
| | | Proximity to the | Proximity to the | |
| | | Sinking River | Sinking River | |
| | | creates a risk. If no | creates a risk. If no | |
| | Hydrology | change to existing | change to existing | 2 |
| | | bridge then this risk | bridge then this risk | |
| | | is slight to | is slight to | |
| | | moderate. | moderate. | |
| | | Considered slight | Considered slight | |
| | | or neutral due to | or neutral due to | |
| | Hydrogeology | existing | existing | 3 |
| | | infrastructure. | infrastructure. | |
| | | Environment Sub-Total Score | แบเสรน นับเนาย์. | 34 |
| | | Environment Sub-Total Score | Congrally this option will impress a second by | 54 |
| | Density of Control | | Generally this option will improve access and help | |
| | Deprived Geographical | | on the deprived geographical area however it will | 3 |
| Accessibility & | Areas | | also impact on viable operation on existing | |
| Social Inclusion | | | business premises. | |
| | Vulnerable Groups | | Will have positive impact on vulnerable with | 4 |
| | · · | | improved town centre facilities | + |
| | Ac | ccessibility & Social Inclusion Sub-Tota | l Score | 7 |
| | | | On the desire line of N83 traffic with option of | |
| | | | connectivity between modes and enhancing | |
| | Transport Integration | | existing route without need for new bridge. | 5 |
| | , | | However impact on property business will require | |
| | | | greater consideration for connectivity | |
| | | | Compatible with Development Plan, aims to | |
| Integration | Land Use Integration | | streamline strategic connectivity and mitigates | 6 |
| iiicgiatioii | Land Ose integration | | , , | υ |
| | | | urban sprawl. | |
| | Geographical Integration | | Will offer connectivity between hubs and is | 5 |
| | | | beneficial to local services | - |
| | Other Government | | Links between urban centres and improvement | |
| | Policy Integration: | | access between ports and Airports | 4 |
| | Regional Balance | | access between ports and Amports | |
| | | Integration Sub-Total Score | | 20 |
| | | | | |

| | Ambience | Perception of reduced fear and attraction to feature. Perception of safety especially vulnerable | 5 | |
|-------------------|--------------------------|--|----|--|
| Physical Activity | | users | | |
| Physical Activity | Absenteeism | Use of road for exercise could potentially improve health | 3 | |
| | Reduced Health Risk | Health benefits of Walk/cycle etc. | 2 | |
| | | Physical Activity Sub-Total Score | 10 | |
| | Route Option Total Score | | | |

| | | Option 2 - Blue | e Option | |
|-----------|--|---|---|-------|
| Criterion | Sub-Criteria | Quantitative Assessment | Qualitative Assessment | Score |
| | Transport Efficiency and Effectiveness | | Construction cost would include demolition of the existing buildings but this option won't need a new bridge on the sinking river and also this option would have major part of online road compared to other options. | 6 |
| Economy | Wider Economic Impacts | Competition in the market - Agglomeration - Inward investment - Labour Supply - Urban Regeneration - | Related to all elements except Economic | 5 |
| | Funding Impacts | | Aim of scheme to deal with village revitalisation | 6 |
| | Transport Quality and Reliability | | Currently the transport quality is poor with HGVs needing to do the loop of the town and no facilities for safe pedestrian movements. This option would improve the quality and reliability of the transport compared to the present scenario. | 6 |
| | | Economy Sub-Total Score | present sections. | 23 |
| | Design Standards | , | The N83 Bridge Street road alignment is designed to standards | 7 |
| Safety | Collision Reduction | | As per the accident data of RSA, all the accidents within study extents have occurred around the Junction at the Square except one each at Bridge Street, Barrack Street and R328. With this option, we will improve the Bridge Street and also the junction at the Square and hence, this will bring highly positive change from collision reduction perspective. | 6 |
| | Security | | This option would see dedicated space for shared pedestrian and cycle track as well. This will help for the vulnerable users like pedestrians etc. This would allow people to come from the area around R360 as well to use the facility and walk to the town centre. | 7 |
| | | Safety Sub-Total Score | 1 | 20 |
| | Air Quality & Climate | No overall change. Risk of dust during construction phase. | No change to existing baseline conditions following construction phase. | 3 |
| | Noise | No overall change. Risk of increased noise during construction phase. | No change to existing baseline conditions following construction phase. | 3 |
| | Waste | Demolition of existing buildings required. Quantities or duration of works not yet defined. | Extra traffic movements on site to remove any waste. | 2 |
| | Biodiversity (Flora and Fauna) | No identified impact based on leaving the existing bridge in situ. Possible impact on bats. | No identified impact based on leaving the existing bridge in situ. Possible impact on bats. | 3 |
| | Agriculture | No identified impact | No identified impact | 4 |
| | Non-Agricultural Properties | Requirement for demolition of buildings. Nature and extent is not clear at this point. | Requirement for demolition of buildings | 2 |

| Environment | | | | |
|------------------|--|--|--|------------------------|
| | | | The proposed re-alignment of Bridge Street is | |
| | | | within the zone of notification surrounding the | |
| | | | historic town of Dunmore. However, the present- | |
| Environment — | Architectural Heritage | | day street pattern does not reflect the initial | 4 |
| | | | layout of the town and that it was the ford rather | |
| | | | than the bridge that influenced the earliest street | |
| | | | plan. | |
| | Archaeological & | | No Protected Structures or buildings recorded in | |
| 1 | Cultural Heritage | | the National Inventory of Architecture are | 3 |
| | Cultural Heritage | | impacted by this route | |
| | | Requirement for | Requirement for | |
| | Landscape & Visual | demolition of | demolition of | |
| | (including light) | buildings. Nature | buildings. Nature | 2 |
| | (including light) | and extent is not | and extent is not | |
| L | | clear at this point | clear at this point | |
| | | May have slight | May have slight | |
| | | impact on local | impact on local | |
| | | geology but thought | geology but thought | |
| | Soils and Geology | slight due to the | slight due to the | 3 |
| | | proposed | proposed | |
| | | development being | development being | |
| L | | in a built area. | in a built area. | |
| | | Proximity to the | Proximity to the | |
| | | Sinking River | Sinking River | |
| | | creates a risk. If no | creates a risk. If no | |
| | Hydrology | change to existing | change to existing | 2 |
| | | bridge then this risk | bridge then this risk | |
| | | is slight to | is slight to | |
| _ | | moderate. | moderate. | |
| | | Considered slight | Considered slight | |
| | Hydrogeology | or neutral due to | or neutral due to | 3 |
| | , | existing | existing | - |
| | | infrastructure. Environment Sub-Total Score | infrastructure. | 24 |
| т | | Environment Sub-Total Score | | 34 |
| | | | Generally this option will improve access and help | |
| Г | Deprived Geographical | | on the deprived geographical area - however it | 6 |
| Accessibility & | Areas | | will impact on established built environment | 6 |
| Social Inclusion | | | albeit the parts are falling into ruin. | |
| Social inclusion | + | | Will have positive impact on vulnerable with | |
| | Vulnerable Groups | | improved town centre facilities with nature of | 4 |
| | vuillerable Groups | | improvement allowing greater visibility | 4 |
| | Δς: | cessibility & Social Inclusion Sub-Tota | | 10 |
| | | cessionity & Social inclusion Sub-10ta | on the desire line of N83 traffic with option of | 10 |
| | | | The state of the s | |
| | Transport Integration | | · | 6 |
| | Transport Integration | | connectivity between modes and enhancing | 6 |
| | Transport Integration | | connectivity between modes and enhancing existing route without need for new bridge. | 6 |
| | | | connectivity between modes and enhancing existing route without need for new bridge. Compatible with Development Plan, aims to | |
| _ | Transport Integration Land Use Integration | | connectivity between modes and enhancing existing route without need for new bridge. Compatible with Development Plan, aims to streamline strategic connectivity and mitigates | 6 |
| Integration | Land Use Integration | | connectivity between modes and enhancing existing route without need for new bridge. Compatible with Development Plan, aims to streamline strategic connectivity and mitigates urban sprawl. | 6 |
| Integration | | | connectivity between modes and enhancing existing route without need for new bridge. Compatible with Development Plan, aims to streamline strategic connectivity and mitigates urban sprawl. Will offer connectivity between hubs and is | |
| Integration | Land Use Integration | | connectivity between modes and enhancing existing route without need for new bridge. Compatible with Development Plan, aims to streamline strategic connectivity and mitigates urban sprawl. Will offer connectivity between hubs and is beneficial to local services | 6 |
| Integration | Land Use Integration Geographical Integration Other Government | | connectivity between modes and enhancing existing route without need for new bridge. Compatible with Development Plan, aims to streamline strategic connectivity and mitigates urban sprawl. Will offer connectivity between hubs and is beneficial to local services Links between urban centres and improvement | 5 |
| Integration | Land Use Integration Geographical Integration Other Government Policy Integration: | | connectivity between modes and enhancing existing route without need for new bridge. Compatible with Development Plan, aims to streamline strategic connectivity and mitigates urban sprawl. Will offer connectivity between hubs and is beneficial to local services | 6 |
| Integration | Land Use Integration Geographical Integration Other Government | Integration Sub-Total Score | connectivity between modes and enhancing existing route without need for new bridge. Compatible with Development Plan, aims to streamline strategic connectivity and mitigates urban sprawl. Will offer connectivity between hubs and is beneficial to local services Links between urban centres and improvement | 5 |
| Integration | Land Use Integration Geographical Integration Other Government Policy Integration: | Integration Sub-Total Score | connectivity between modes and enhancing existing route without need for new bridge. Compatible with Development Plan, aims to streamline strategic connectivity and mitigates urban sprawl. Will offer connectivity between hubs and is beneficial to local services Links between urban centres and improvement | 6 5 4 |
| Integration | Land Use Integration Geographical Integration Other Government Policy Integration: | Integration Sub-Total Score | connectivity between modes and enhancing existing route without need for new bridge. Compatible with Development Plan, aims to streamline strategic connectivity and mitigates urban sprawl. Will offer connectivity between hubs and is beneficial to local services Links between urban centres and improvement access between ports and Airports | 6 5 4 |
| Integration G | Land Use Integration Geographical Integration Other Government Policy Integration: Regional Balance | Integration Sub-Total Score | connectivity between modes and enhancing existing route without need for new bridge. Compatible with Development Plan, aims to streamline strategic connectivity and mitigates urban sprawl. Will offer connectivity between hubs and is beneficial to local services Links between urban centres and improvement access between ports and Airports Perception of reduced fear and attraction to | 6 5 4 21 |
| Integration | Land Use Integration Geographical Integration Other Government Policy Integration: Regional Balance Ambience | Integration Sub-Total Score | connectivity between modes and enhancing existing route without need for new bridge. Compatible with Development Plan, aims to streamline strategic connectivity and mitigates urban sprawl. Will offer connectivity between hubs and is beneficial to local services Links between urban centres and improvement access between ports and Airports Perception of reduced fear and attraction to feature. Perception of safety especially vulnerable users | 6 5 4 21 5 |
| Integration G | Land Use Integration Geographical Integration Other Government Policy Integration: Regional Balance | Integration Sub-Total Score | connectivity between modes and enhancing existing route without need for new bridge. Compatible with Development Plan, aims to streamline strategic connectivity and mitigates urban sprawl. Will offer connectivity between hubs and is beneficial to local services Links between urban centres and improvement access between ports and Airports Perception of reduced fear and attraction to feature. Perception of safety especially vulnerable | 6 5 4 21 |
| Integration G | Land Use Integration Geographical Integration Other Government Policy Integration: Regional Balance Ambience | Integration Sub-Total Score | connectivity between modes and enhancing existing route without need for new bridge. Compatible with Development Plan, aims to streamline strategic connectivity and mitigates urban sprawl. Will offer connectivity between hubs and is beneficial to local services Links between urban centres and improvement access between ports and Airports Perception of reduced fear and attraction to feature. Perception of safety especially vulnerable users Use of road for exercise could potentially improve health | 6 5 4 21 5 |
| Integration G | Land Use Integration Geographical Integration Other Government Policy Integration: Regional Balance Ambience Absenteeism | Integration Sub-Total Score Physical Activity Sub-Total Score | connectivity between modes and enhancing existing route without need for new bridge. Compatible with Development Plan, aims to streamline strategic connectivity and mitigates urban sprawl. Will offer connectivity between hubs and is beneficial to local services Links between urban centres and improvement access between ports and Airports Perception of reduced fear and attraction to feature. Perception of safety especially vulnerable users Use of road for exercise could potentially improve health Health benefits of Walk/cycle etc | 6 5 4 21 5 |

| | | Option 3 - Red | Option | |
|-------------|--|---|--|-------|
| Criterion | Sub-Criteria | Quantitative Assessment | Qualitative Assessment | Score |
| | Transport Efficiency and Effectiveness | | Construction cost would include demolition of the existing fuel station and would also need a new bridge on the sinking river .This option would see majority of its stretch as new offline carriageway. | 2 |
| Economy | Wider Economic Impacts | Competition in the market - Agglomeration - Inward investment - Labour Supply - Urban Regeneration - | Related to all elements except Economic | 5 |
| | Funding Impacts | | Aim of scheme to deal with village revitalisation | 5 |
| | Transport Quality and Reliability | | Currently the transport quality is poor with HGVs needing to do the loop of the town and no facilities for safe pedestrian movements. This option would improve the quality and reliability of the transport compared to the present scenario. | 6 |
| | | Economy Sub-Total Score | | 18 |
| | Design Standards | | The N83 Bridge Street road alignment is designed to standards | 7 |
| Safety | Collision Reduction | | As per the accident data of RSA, all the accidents within study extents have occurred around the Junction at the Square except one each at Bridge Street, Barrack Street and R328. With this option, we won't improve the Junction at the square completely though we would divert HGV traffic to the new junction. | 3 |
| | | | Also, the new junction on the Barrack Street would be closer to the junction at Barrack Square where there is a severe accident recorded in the past. This option would see dedicated space for shared | |
| | Security | | pedestrian and cycle track as well. This will help for the vulnerable users like pedestrians etc. But this will not see dedicated footpath for people coming from the R360 in the north towards the city | 5 |
| | | Safety Sub-Total Score | | 15 |
| | Air Quality & Climate | No overall change. Risk of dust during construction | No change to existing baseline conditions following construction phase. | 3 |
| | Noise | phase No overall change. Risk of increased noise during construction phase. | No change to existing baseline conditions following construction phase. | 3 |
| | Waste | Quantities or duration of works not yet defined. Little or no demolition required. Construction waste will be generated in bridge building. | Extra traffic movements on site to remove any waste. | 2 |
| | Biodiversity (Flora and Fauna) | Potential for negative impact in building bridge. Some loss of habitat identified. | Potential for negative impact in building bridge. | 2 |
| | Agriculture | No identified impact | No identified impact | 4 |
| | Non-Agricultural Properties | Nature and extent is not clear at this point. | Limited requirement for demolition of buildings | 3 |
| | Architectural Heritage | | This route is located 43m west of the Augustinian Friary - a National Monument (Reg. No. 273) and a Protected Structure (No. 20). The route is located immediately west of The | 2.5 |
| Environment | Acontectular nentage | | Bank of Ireland Building - recorded in the National Inventory of Architectural Heritage (Reg. 30330009) | 2.5 |

| | | | Archaeological excavations associated with a | |
|-------------------|---|--|---|---------|
| | Archaeological & Cultural Heritage | | sewerage scheme along Barrack Street have uncovered some 287 human skeleton remains (C120, E2037). These burials are thought to be associated with the Augustinian Friary and it is possible that further remains are located in the area of Route 3. | 1.5 |
| | Landscape & Visual (including light) | Nature and extent is not clear at this point. Neutral impact predicted. | Nature and extent is not clear at this point. Neutral impact predicted. | 4 |
| | Soils and Geology | Slight to moderate impact on local geology due to excavations and construction of bridge. | Slight to moderate impact on local geology due to excavations and construction of bridge. | 2 |
| | Hydrology | Proximity to the Sinking River creates a risk. A bridge is required for this option creating a greater risk. | Proximity to the Sinking River creates a risk. A bridge is required for this option creating a greater risk. | 1 |
| | Hydrogeology | Considered moderate to slight due to excavation and requirement for a bridge to be built | Considered moderate to slight due to excavation and requirement for a bridge to be built | 2 |
| | | Environment Sub-Total Score | | 30 |
| Accessibility & | Deprived Geographical Areas | | Generally this option will improve access and help on the deprived geographical area- however it will detract from the free flow accessibility by the introduction of more torturous route to negotiate the area. | 4 |
| Social Inclusion | Vulnerable Groups | | Will have positive impact on vulnerable with improved town centre facilities with nature of improvement allowing greater visibility, however it requires new alternative route resulting in the existing substandard section remaining | 2 |
| | A | Accessibility & Social Inclusion Sub-Tota | l Score | 6 |
| | Transport Integration | | Closer to desire line of N83 traffic with option of connectivity between modes however it duplicates route and requires new bridge. | 3 |
| Integration | Land Use Integration | | Compatible with Development Plan while this is a new route and not a part of plan, aims to streamline strategic connectivity and mitigates urban sprawl. However offers less fluent integration with existing network | 5 |
| | Geographical Integration | | Will offer connectivity between hubs and is beneficial to local services | 5 |
| | Other Government Policy Integration: Regional Balance | | Links between urban centres and improvement access between ports and Airports | 4 |
| | | Integration Sub-Total Score | | 17 |
| Physical Activity | Ambience | | Perception of reduced fear and attraction to feature. Perception of safety especially vulnerable users | 4 |
| Physical Activity | Absenteeism | | Use of road for exercise could potentially improve health | 4 |
| | | | | |
| | Reduced Health Risk | Physical Activity Sub-Total Score | Health benefits of Walk/cycle etc. | 4 12 |

| | | Option 4 - Mager | nta Option | |
|-------------|---|---|--|-------|
| Criterion | Sub-Criteria | Quantitative Assessment | Qualitative Assessment | Score |
| | Transport Efficiency and Effectiveness | | Construction cost would include the need a new bridge on the sinking river .This option would see majority of its stretch as new offline carriageway. | 3 |
| Economy | Wider Economic Impacts | Competition in the market - Agglomeration - Inward investment - Labour Supply - Urban Regeneration - | Related to all elements except Economic | 4.5 |
| | Funding Impacts | _ | Aim of scheme to deal with village revitalisation | 1 |
| | Transport Quality and Reliability | | Currently the transport quality is poor with HGVs needing to do the loop of the town and no facilities for safe pedestrian movements. This option would slightly improve the quality and reliability of the transport compared to the present scenario. | 5 |
| | | Economy Sub-Total Score | | 13.5 |
| | Design Standards | | The N83 Bridge Street road alignment is designed to standards | 7 |
| Safety | Collision Reduction | | As per the accident data of RSA, all the accidents within study extents have occurred around the Junction at the Square except one each at Bridge Street, Barrack Street and R328. With this option, we won't be doing anything at the junction at the square and also N83 Bridge Street. Though the traffic would be diverted from the current Bridge street. But people who want to come to the city would be still using the Bridge Street and the Junction at the Square. | 3 |
| | Security | | This option would see dedicated space for shared pedestrian and cycle track as well. This will help for the vulnerable users like pedestrians etc. But this will not see dedicated footpath for people coming from the R360 in the north towards the city | 5 |
| | | Safety Sub-Total Score | | 15 |
| | Air Quality & Climate | No overall change. Risk of dust during construction phase. | No change to existing baseline conditions following construction phase. | 3 |
| | Noise | No overall change. Risk of increased noise during construction phase. | No change to existing baseline conditions following construction phase. | 3 |
| | Waste | Quantities or duration of works not yet defined. demolition required. Construction waste will be generated in bridge building. | Extra traffic movements on site to remove any waste. | 2 |
| | Biodiversity (Flora and Fauna) | Potential for negative impact in building bridge. Some loss of habitat identified. | Potential for negative impact in building bridge. | 2 |
| | Agriculture | No identified impact | No identified impact | 4 |
| | Non-Agricultural | Nature and extent is not clear at this | Limited requirement for demolition of buildings | 3 |
| Environment | Properties Architectural Heritage | point. | , | 3 |
| | Architectural Heritage Archaeological & | | | |
| | Cultural Heritage | | | 3.5 |
| | Landscape & Visual (including light) | Nature and extent is not clear at this point. Neutral impact predicted. | Nature and extent is not clear at this point. Neutral impact predicted. | 4 |
| | Soils and Geology | Slight to moderate impact on local geology due to excavations and construction of bridge. | Slight to moderate impact on local geology due to excavations and construction of bridge. | 2 |
| | Hydrology | Proximity to the Sinking River creates a risk. A bridge is required for this option creating a greater risk. | Proximity to the Sinking River creates a risk. A bridge is required for this option creating a greater risk. | 1 |

| | Hydrogeology | Considered moderate to slight due to excavation and requirement for a bridge to be built. | Considered moderate to slight due to excavation and requirement for a bridge to be built. | 2 | |
|--------------------------|---|---|--|----------|--|
| | | Environment Sub-Total Score | | 32.5 | |
| Accessibility & | Deprived Geographical Areas | | Generally this option will not help the deprived geographical area and result in more difficult accessibility | 2 | |
| Social Inclusion | Vulnerable Groups | | Will have little positive impact on vulnerable with improved facilities removed from the desire line vulnerable groups | 2 | |
| | A | ccessibility & Social Inclusion Sub-Tota | l Score | 4 | |
| | Transport Integration | | Further distance from desire line of N83 traffic with lesser option of connectivity between modes which will inevitably concentrate on village centre | 2 | |
| Integration | Land Use Integration | | route not on Development Plan, will link the strategic connectivity on N83 but will not mitigates urban sprawl and offers less fluent integration with existing network. Could potentially open up further lands for development | 4 | |
| | Geographical Integration | | Will offer connectivity between hubs but not as beneficial to local services | 4 | |
| | Other Government Policy Integration: Regional Balance | | Links between urban centres and improvement access between ports and Airports | 4 | |
| | | Integration Sub-Total Score | | 14 | |
| Physical Activity | Ambience | | Perception of reduced fear and attraction to feature less evident as off desire line and longer distance. Perception of safety especially vulnerable users will not be as attractive because of longer length | 3 | |
| | Absenteeism | | Use of road for exercise could potentially improve health additional length | 5 | |
| | Reduced Health Risk | | Health benefits of Walk/cycle etc. | 5 | |
| | | Physical Activity Sub-Total Score | | 13 92 | |
| Route Option Total Score | | | | | |

| | | Option 5 - Cyar | Option | |
|-------------|--|--|---|-------|
| Criterion | Sub-Criteria | Quantitative Assessment | Qualitative Assessment | Score |
| | Transport Efficiency and Effectiveness | | Construction cost would include the need a new bridge on the sinking river .This option would see majority of its stretch as new offline carriageway. | 3 |
| Economy | Wider Economic Impacts | Competition in the market - Agglomeration - Inward investment - Labour Supply - Urban Regeneration - | Related to all elements except Economic | 4.5 |
| | Funding Impacts | | Aim of scheme to deal with village revitalisation | 1 |
| | Transport Quality and Reliability | | Currently the transport quality is poor with HGVs needing to do the loop of the town and no facilities for safe pedestrian movements. This option would slightly improve the quality and reliability of the transport compared to the present scenario. | 5 |
| | | Economy Sub-Total Score | | 13.5 |
| | Design Standards | | The N83 Bridge Street road alignment is designed to standards | 7 |
| Safety | Collision Reduction | | As per the accident data of RSA, all the accidents within study extents have occurred around the Junction at the Square except one each at Bridge Street, Barrack Street and R328. With this option, we won't be doing anything at the junction at the square and also N83 Bridge Street. Though the traffic would be diverted from the current Bridge street. But people who want to come to the city would be still using the Bridge | 3 |
| | Security | | Street and the Junction at the Square. This option wont have a footpath as it is a by pass from the town centre. | 4 |
| | | Safety Sub-Total Score | from the town centre. | 14 |
| | | · | | 14 |
| | Air Quality & Climate | No overall change. Greater risk of dust during construction phase from other options due to size. | No overall change. Greater risk of dust during construction phase from other options due to size. | 2 |
| | Noise | Risk of increased noise during construction phase due to size. | Risk of increased noise during construction phase due to size. | 2 |
| | Waste | Quantities or duration of works not yet defined. demolition required. Construction waste will be generated in bridge building. | Extra traffic movements on site to remove any waste. | 2 |
| | Biodiversity (Flora and Fauna) | Potential for negative impact in building bridge. Some loss of habitat identified. | Potential for negative impact in building bridge. | 2 |
| | Agriculture | Some impact on agricultural fields identified. | Some impact on agricultural fields identified. | 3 |
| Environment | Non-Agricultural Properties | None identified. | None identified. | 4 |
| | Architectural Heritage | | | 3 |
| | Archaeological & Cultural Heritage | | | 4.5 |
| | Landscape & Visual (including light) | Slight to moderate impact predicted due to size of option. | Slight to moderate impact predicted due to size of option. | 2 |
| | Soils and Geology | Slight to moderate impact on local geology due to excavations and construction of bridge. | Slight to moderate impact on local geology due to excavations and construction of bridge. | 2 |
| | Hydrology | Proximity to the Sinking River creates a risk. A bridge is required for this option creating a greater risk. | Proximity to the Sinking River creates a risk. A bridge is required for this option creating a greater risk. | 1 |
| | Hydrogeology | Considered moderate to slight due to excavation and requirement for a bridge to be built. | Considered moderate to slight due to excavation and requirement for a bridge to be built. | 2 |
| | | Environment Sub-Total Score | | 29.5 |

| | Deprived Geographical | Generally this option will not help the deprived | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|-------|
| Accessibility & Social Inclusion | Areas | geographical area and is too far removed for | 1 |
| | Vulnerable Groups | transport integration | |
| | | Will have little positive impact on vulnerable with | |
| | | improved facilities removed from the desire line | 1 |
| | | of vulnerable groups | |
| | Ac | ccessibility & Social Inclusion Sub-Total Score | 2 |
| | | Greatest distance from desire line of N83 traffic | 1 |
| Integration | Transport Integration | with least option of connectivity between modes | 1 |
| | | which will inevitably concentrate on village centre | |
| | Land Use Integration | Which will increasely contacted on village centre | 3 |
| | | route not on Development Plan, will link the | |
| | | strategic connectivity on N83 but will not mitigate | |
| | | urban sprawl and offers less fluent integration | |
| | | with existing network. Could potentially open up | |
| | | further lands for development | |
| | Geographical Integration | · | 4 |
| | | Will offer connectivity between hubs but not as | |
| | | beneficial to local services | |
| | Other Government Policy Integration: | Links between urban centres and improvement | · 1 / |
| | | access between ports and Airports | |
| | Regional Balance | | |
| Integration Sub-Total Score | | | 12 |
| | | Perception of reduced fear and attraction to | |
| Physical Activity | Ambience | feature less evident as off desire line and longer | 3 |
| | | distance. Perception of safety especially | |
| | | vulnerable users will not be as attractive because | |
| | | of longer length | |
| | Absenteeism | Use of road for exercise could potentially improve | 6 |
| | But and the diff St. | health - this is longer route | |
| | Reduced Health Risk | Health benefits of Walk/cycle etc. | 6 |
| Physical Activity Sub-Total Score | | | 15 |
| Route Option Total Score | | | 86 |