

MCA - Alternatives options between Wilford Junction to Old Cannaught Avenue Junction at Woodbrook Side Lod

| MCA Criteria | Assessment Sub-Criteria | EPR Option - Full Cross-section | Do MINIMUM OPTION - SIGNAL CONTROL PRIORITY | Option 1 - FULL CROSS-SECTION | Option 2 - FULL CROSS-SECTION | Option 3A REDUCED CROSS-SECTION | Option 3B REDUCED CROSS-SECTION | Option 3C REDUCED CROSS-SECTION |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| | | WIDENING TO EAST | NO WIDENING | WIDENING TO WEST | WIDENING TO BOTH SIDES, MAINTAIN EXISTING CENTRELINE | WIDENING TO EAST | WIDENING TO WEST | WIDENING BOTH SIDES |
| Economy | 1.a. Capital Cost | Reconstruction of the road, rebuilt of Side Lodge and accomodation works at 3 number residential properties | No major road works | Reconstruction of the road, and accomodation works at several residential properties. Demolition of Petrol station | Reconstruction of the road, and accomodation works at several residential properties. Demolition of Petrol station | Reconstruction of the road, rebuilt of Side Lodge and accomodation works at 3 number residential properties | Reconstruction of the road, and accomodation works at several residential properties. Demolition of Petrol station | Reconstruction of the road, rebuilt of Side Lodge and accommodation works at several residential properties. |
| | Rank | | | | | | | |
| | 1.b. Transport Reliability and Quality (Journey Time) | This option provies for bus priority and reliable journey time for buses and cyclists, as dedicated bus lanes and segregated cycle tracks are provided | This option will result in queing of general traffic and buses will not achieve journey time relability. Will impact cyclists journey time. | This option provies for bus priority and reliable journey time for buses and cyclists, as dedicated bus lanes and segregated cycle tracks are provided | This option provies for bus priority and reliable journey time for buses and cyclists, as dedicated bus lanes and segregated cycle tracks are provided | At point where bus lane is shared with cyclists, bus speeds will be restricted by slowest cyclist in the shared lane, hence this scores lower. Also, cyclists journey time scores low | At point where bus lane is shared with cyclists, bus speeds will be restricted by slowest cyclist in the shared lane, hence this scores lower. Also, cyclists journey time scores low | n At point where bus lane is shared with cyclists, bus speeds will be restricted by slowest cyclist in the shared lane, hence this scores lower. Also, cyclists journey time scores low |
| | Rank | | | | | | | |
| Integration | 2.a. Land Use Integration | Same for all options | Same for all options | Same for all options | Same for all options | Same for all options | Same for all options | Same for all options |
| | Rank | | | | | | | |
| | 2.b. Residential Population and Employment Catchments | Same for all options | Same for all options | Same for all options | Same for all options | Same for all options | Same for all options | Same for all options |
| | Rank | | | | | | | |
| | 2.c. Transport Network Integration | Integrates with Bus Network Plan and Cycle Network Plan. Also intergrates well with the planned future development at the Cais Cairon site | Does not integrate with Cycle network plan and Bus Network Plan | Integrates with Bus Network Plan and Cycle Network Plan | Integrates with Bus Network Plan and Cycle Network Plan | Integrates with Bus Network Plan but does not integrate with Cycle Network Plan | Integrates with Bus Network Plan but does not integrate with Cycle Network Plan | Integrates with Bus Network Plan but does not integrate with Cycle Network Plan |
| | Rank | | | | | | | |
| | 2.d. Cycle Network Integration | Integrates with the GDA Cycle Network Plan, primary cycle route identified | Does not integrate with GDA Cycle Network Plan, Primary Route identified | Integrates with the GDA Cycle Network Plan, primary cycle route identified | Integrates with the GDA Cycle Network Plan, primary cycle route identified | Does not integrate with GDA Cycle Network Plan, Primary Route identified | Does not integrate with GDA Cycle Network Plan, Primary Route identified | Does not integrate with GDA Cycle Network Plan, Primary Route identified |
| | Rank | | | | | | | |
| | 2.e. Traffic Network Integration | Same for all options | Same for all options | Same for all options | Same for all options | Same for all options | Same for all options | Same for all options |
| | Rank | | | | | | | |
| Accessibility & Social Inclusion | 3.a. Key Trip Attractors (Education/Health/Commercial/Employment) | Same for all options | Same for all options | Same for all options | Same for all options | Same for all options | Same for all options | Same for all options |
| | Rank | | | | | | | |
| | 3.b. Deprived Geographic Areas | Same for all options | Same for all options | Same for all options | Same for all options | Same for all options | Same for all options | Same for all options |
| Safety | 4.a. Road Safety | Provides for safety for all Road Users | This option will result in cyclist sharing general traffic lane along with buses and will result in conflict. | Provides for safety for all Road Users | Provides for safety for all Road Users | Cyclists will share bus lane and there is a risk for cyclists to enter general traffic lane, this will result in conflicts | Cyclists will share bus lane and there is a risk for cyclists to enter general traffic lane, this will result in conflicts | Cyclists will share bus lane and there is a risk for cyclists to enter general traffic lane, this will result in conflicts |
| | Rank | | | | | | | |
| | 5.a. Archaeology and Cultural Heritage | No impact on archaeological or undesignated cultural heritage features. Impact on Woodbrook Side Lodge is significant. | No impact on archaeolgoical or undesignated cultural heritage features. No impact on Woodbrook Side Lodge and demesne lands. | No impact on archaeolgoical or undesignated cultural heritage features. | No impact on archaeolgoical or undesignated cultural heritage features. Impact on Woodbrook Side Lodge. | No impact on archaeological or undesignated cultural heritage features. Impact on Woodbrook Side Lodge is significant. | No impact on archaeolgoical or undesignated cultural heritage features. No impact on Woodbrook Side Lodge and demesne lands. Impact on the boundary wall of Rathmore as a heritage feature | No impact on archaeolgoical or undesignated cultural heritage features. Impact on Woodbrook Side Lodge and demesne lands. Impact on the boundary wall of Rathmore as a heritage feature |
| | Rank 5.b. Architectural Heritage | The current proposal would result in the loss of the lodge and its boundary and pedestrian gate. The lodge is a protected structure. | No impact on archaeolgoical features. No impact on Woodbrook Side Lodge and demesne lands. | Impact on the boundary of Rathmore as a heritage feature. This feature was previously moved and rebuilt so is of low architectural heritage value. | Depending on how much land take occurs on the east side, the Side Lodge will still be impacted, which is a protected structure. Boundary of Rathmore also impacted. | Would still result in impact on the Side Lodge and its boundary and pedestrian gate. The lodge is a protected structure. | Impact on the boundary of Rathmore as a heritage feature. This feature was previously moved and rebuilt so is of low architectural heritage value. | Depending on how much land take occurs on the east side, the Side Lodge will still be impacted, which is a protected structure. Boundary of Rathmore also impacted. |
| | Rank | | | | | | | |
| | 5.c. Flora & Fauna | Impacts to amenity grassland, ornamental residential hedgerows, and occasional planted teeelines on eastern side of road. Preferable over the optin that affects both sides of the road, | No Impact as existing environment is retained | Impacts to ornamental residential hedgerows and occasional planted teeelines on western side of road. Preferable over the option that affects both sides of the road, | Impacts and reduction of amenity grassland, ornamental hedgerows and treelines on both sides of road. | Impacts to amenity grassland, ornamental residential hedgerows, and occasional planted teeelines on eastern side of road. Preferable over the option that affects both sides of the road, | Impacts to ornamental residential hedgerows and occasional planted teeelines on western side of road. Preferable over the option that affects both sides of the road, | e Impacts and reduction of amenity grassland, ornamental hedgerows and treelines on both sides of road. |
| | Rank | | | | | | | |
| | 5.d. Soils and Geology | Preferable over other options as it will have no impact on petrol station | No Impact as existing environment is retained | Impact on Circle K Petrol station where there may be contaminated land present | Impact on Circle K Petrol station where there may be contaminated land present | Preferable over other options as it will have no impact on petrol station | Impact on Circle K Petrol station where there may be contaminated land present | Impact on Circle K Petrol station where there may be contaminated land present |
| | Rank | Constanting | Paracles all patients | Complete all postures | Complete all postures | Francisco II anticos | Comp for all patters | Para for all patients |
| | S.e. Hydrology Rank | Same for all options | Same for all options | Same for all options | Same for all options | Same for all options | Same for all options | Same for all options |
| | 5.f. Landscape and Visual | Land-take mostly into open ground, long, open driveways into properties on east | No impart | Land-take mostly into landscaped front gardens on west side of road, impacting on garden | Land, take from both cides would still impact front exclose on wort cide of | Land, take mostly into onen ground, long, onen drivourur into organiti | Land-take mostly into landscaped front gardens on west side of road, impacting on garden wal | Ile Landstake mostly into onen ground, long, coop drivoussy into proportio |
| | Rank | side of road so landscape impact slightly less than other two options | The impact | walls and garden features | impacting on garden walls and garden features | side of road so landscape impact slightly less than other two options | Land-take mostly into landscaped front gardens on west side of road, impacting on garden wal and garden features | side of road so landscape impact slightly less than other two options |
| | | | | A 6 H 4 | | | A 2 11 11 | A C II II |
| | 5.g. Air Quality Rank | Same for all options | Same for all options | Same for all options | Same for all options | Same for all options | Same for all options | Same for all options |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | 5.h. Noise and Vibration | Same for all options | Same for all options | Same for all options | Same for all options | Same for all options | Same for all options | Same for all options |
| | The state of the s | | | | | | | |
| | 5.I Land Use Character | Impacts front garden of 3 no properlies with longer gardens and Windsor Motors car park as a result of land-take into the east side | | Impacts on properties and Circle K petrol station on west side. Land-take requirements will greatly reduce from gardens of houses on west side, bringing the carriageway close to the front of the properties. The petrol station will be significantly affected, with the loss of several rows of pumps and large impacts on the shop building, which may render the business unviable. | | Impacts front garden of 3 no properlies with longer gardens and Windsor Motors car park as a result of land-take into the east side. Lesser impact compared to EPR Option | Impacts on properties and Circlek petrol station on west side. Land-take requirements will greatly reduce from gardens of houses on west side, bringing the carriageway close to the fron of the properties. The petrol station will be significantly affected, with the loss of several rows of pumps and large impacts on the shop building, which may render the business unviable. | |
| | Rank | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

1