



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Record of Meeting ABP-300667-18 1<sup>st</sup> meeting

<b>Case Reference / Description</b>	ABP-300667-18  Upgrade to baggage screening system at Dublin Airport, County Dublin.		
<b>Case Type</b>	Pre-application consultation		
<b>1<sup>st</sup> / 2<sup>nd</sup> / 3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting</b>	1 <sup>st</sup>		
<b>Date</b>	18/05/18	<b>Start Time</b>	10 a.m.
<b>Location</b>	Parnell Room	<b>End Time</b>	11 a.m.
<b>Chairperson</b>	Philip Green	<b>Executive Officer</b>	Kieran Somers

<b>Attendees</b>		
<b>Representing An Bord Pleanála</b>		
<b>Staff Member</b>	<b>Email Address</b>	<b>Phone</b>
Philip Green, Assistant Director of Planning		
Pauline Fitzpatrick, Senior Planning Inspector		
David Curran, Senior Executive Officer		
Kieran Somers, Executive Officer	k.somers@pleanala.ie	01-8737107

<b>Representing the Prospective Applicant</b>		
Yvonne Dalton, Group Head of Planning, Dublin Airport Authority		
Stephen Byrne, Head of Design and Delivery, Dublin Airport Authority		

The meeting commenced at 10 a.m.

**Introduction:**

The Board referred to the letter received from the prospective applicant requesting pre-application consultations and advised the prospective applicant that the instant meeting essentially constituted an information-gathering exercise for the Board; it also invited the prospective applicant to outline the nature of the proposed development and to highlight any matters it wished to receive advice on from the Board.

The Board mentioned general procedures in relation to the pre-application consultation process as follows:

- The Board will keep a record of this meeting and any other meetings, if held. Such records will form part of the file which will be made available publicly at the conclusion of the process. The record of the meeting will not be amended by the Board once finalised, but the prospective applicant may submit comments on the record which will form part of the case file.
- The Board will serve notice at the conclusion of the process as to the strategic infrastructure status of the proposed development. It may form a preliminary view at an early stage in the process on the matter.

- A further meeting or meetings may be held in respect of the proposed development.
- Further information may be requested by the Board and public consultations may also be directed by the Board.
- The Board may hold consultations in respect of the proposed development with other bodies.
- The holding of consultations does not prejudice the Board in any way and cannot be relied upon in the formal planning process or any legal proceedings.

The Board said that the main purpose of the instant meeting was to seek further information from the prospective applicant in order to inform its determination as to whether or not the proposed development might constitute strategic infrastructure.

#### **Presentation by prospective applicant:**

The prospective applicant outlined the nature and extent of the proposed development which comprises a new baggage handling system and ancillary elements in Terminal 1. The prospective applicant said that EU security requirements obligate the carrying out of the proposed development and that it is not a case that there is a shortfall in baggage handling capacity. With respect to the existing baggage handling system, the prospective applicant provided the Board with a brief overview. It said that the instant project concerns the mandatory upgrading of hold baggage screening facilities from Standard 2 to Standard 3 which it likened to an update from X-ray machines to CT-scan. The proposal will entail the replacement of 10 existing machines with 5 – 6 machines. The prospective applicant noted that the proposed new machines are much larger than the existing ones and can handle more bags per hour. It noted the difference between these machines with respect to tonnage, scale and imaging capability. It stated that the overall project will

encompass the aforementioned upgrade of the baggage screening system, a conveyor belt between Terminal 1 and Terminal 2, a new control room and a building structure to house works. Post development, Terminal 1 would be fully compliant with EU legislation.

The prospective applicant further elaborated on the need for the proposed development. It said that the security legislation in question stems from the 1988 Lockerbie air disaster and noted that since that time security requirements have continued to increase, including a requirement to screen 100 per cent of all checked-in baggage.

From an operational point of view, the prospective applicant noted that it will need to keep the airport operating as per normal during the carrying out of the required works; it added that it has tried to determine the optimal way to carry out the proposed works without disturbing essential day-to-day activities. It proposes to use the location of a redundant baggage carousel building to the east of the baggage hall located between Terminals 1 and 2 to accommodate the majority of the new equipment. The prospective applicant said that the exact requirements are not fully defined at this point in time and also noted that a tendering process is still on-going. A further, small extension may be required to the rear of the existing baggage hall to facilitate the equipment to be installed at the western end.

The prospective applicant emphasised that the proposed development has a significant time constraint with respect to compliance with EU legislation and that the works in question must be realised whilst maintaining the existing live operations at Dublin Airport. The prospective applicant said that the deadline it is working towards is September 2020.

**Board queries:**

The Board's representatives sought clarity with respect to the new upgraded machines and where these will be positioned within the airport. The prospective applicant elaborated on this point and noted that these alterations will not result in a decrease in the number of carousels as regards the front-of-house operations.

The Board queried the future usage of Area 14. Noting that there are currently two machines in this location at the present time, the prospective applicant said that it had not yet determined the future plans for Area 14 in respect of front-of-house operations.

The prospective applicant clarified for the record that off-loading positions in Terminal 1 will remain the same. With regard to the existing building to be used to house the new equipment, the prospective applicant said that plans for it would be conditional on the outcome of the tendering process which is on-going; the said building might be demolished or else adapted to facilitate proposed works. The prospective applicant also signalled that a new build might take place on the existing footprint in this location.

In a general context, the Board referred to the instant case and other pre-application request cases which have come before it in the recent past. The Board remarked that, in a cumulative sense, these proposed developments must have implications for the overall workings and potential operational capacity of the airport. The Board said that it needed to have a better understanding of the general framework and how such developments as the instant one fit into the longer-term goals of and strategic plan for the airport. The prospective applicant replied that it has been formulating a masterplan with regard to the overall structure and operations of the airport. It highlighted the fact that it is difficult to devise a long-term plan in this respect as the nature of technologies and requirements of airlines are ever-changing and evolving. The prospective applicant also remarked that a masterplan would be premature pending the Department of Transport's review of operational requirements at the airport. Other reviews such as a traffic review of the airport area were also noted. The prospective applicant undertook to provide the Board with as comprehensive a picture of the airport going forward as possible.

**Conclusion:**

The Board said that it will consider the matters which have arisen in the instant meeting and will revert to the prospective applicant in due course. In response to the prospective applicant's query on the matter, the Board said that it had not yet arrived at a preliminary view as to whether the proposed development would constitute strategic infrastructure.

The record of the instant meeting will issue to the prospective applicant in the meantime and the Board will seek to revert in as timely a fashion as possible.

The meeting concluded at 11 a.m.

---

**Philip Green****Assistant Director of Planning**