

Direction CD-020813-25 ABP-314724-22

The Commission met on the 26/09/2024 to consider applications for costs under section 47DD of the Transport (Railway Infrastructure) Act 2001, as amended, by a number of observers to the application. The Commission considered each cost application. The Commission further considered the Inspector's Report in the context of the cost applications. The Inspectors who prepared the report, and who also conducted the Oral Hearing into the application, were in attendance for part of the meeting.

The Commission decided on each cost application as indicated hereunder.

Application for costs by Anne G. Meehan:

Decision: The Commission decided that no payment towards the costs incurred by the observer during the course of consideration of the application is to be made.

Reason: A contribution towards the photocopying and stationery costs is not warranted or justified in the circumstances.

Application for costs by Brendan Heneghan:

Decision: The Commission decided that no payment towards the costs incurred by the observer during the course of consideration of the application is to be made.

Reason: A contribution towards the printing/photocopying costs is not warranted or justified in the circumstances.

Application for costs by Charlemont and Dartmouth Community Group:

Decision: The Commission decided that no payment towards the costs incurred by the observer during the course of consideration of the application is to be made.

Reason: There was no substantive or material change to the proposed development brought about from the submissions made on the application and at the Oral Hearing by the observer.

Application for costs by Donal O'Brolchain:

Decision: The Commission decided that no payment towards the costs incurred by the observer during the course of consideration of the application is to be made.

Reason: Issues raised are issues that would be more appropriately addressed in the policy-making phase and not at application stage. There was no substantive or material change to the proposed development brought about from the submissions made on the application and at the Oral Hearing by the observer.

Application for costs by Espirit Investments Limited:

Decision: The Commission decided that no payment towards the costs incurred by the observer during the course of consideration of the application is to be made.

Reason: There was no substantive or material change to the proposed development brought about from the submissions made on the application and at the Oral Hearing by the observer.

Application for costs by IPUT and Irish Life Assurance:

Decision: The Commission decided that no payment towards the costs incurred by the observer during the course of consideration of the application is to be made.

Reason: There was no substantive or material change to the proposed development brought about from the submissions made on the application and at the Oral Hearing by the observer.

Application for costs by Metro South West Group:

Decision: The Commission decided that no payment towards the costs incurred by the observer during the course of consideration of the application is to be made.

Reason: Matters raised by the witness for which the costs are sought are matters that would be more appropriately addressed in the policy-making phase and not at application stage. There was no substantive or material change to the proposed development brought about from the submissions made on the application and at the Oral Hearing by the observer.

Application for costs by Shandon Mill Owners Management Company CLG:

Decision: The Commission decided that no payment towards the costs incurred by the observer during the course of consideration of the application is to be made.

Reason: There was no substantive or material change to the proposed development brought about from the submissions made on the application and at the Oral Hearing by the observer.

Application for costs by Union Investment Real Estate GmbH:

Decision: The Commission decided that no payment towards the costs incurred by the observer during the course of consideration of the application is to be made.

Reason: There was no substantive or material change to the proposed development brought about from the submissions made on the application and at the Oral Hearing by the observer.

Application for costs by Wynn's Hotel:

Decision: The Commission decided that no payment towards the costs incurred by the observer during the course of consideration of the application is to be made.

Reason: There was no substantive or material change to the proposed development brought about from the submissions made on the application and at the Oral Hearing by the observer.

Planning

Commissioner:

Date: 26/09/2025

Tom Rabbette

ABP-314724-22 Direction Page 3 of 3