



An
Bord
Pleanála

Record of Meeting ABP-302010-18 5th meeting

Case Reference / Description	ABP-302010-18 Proposed Metrolink for Swords-Airport-City Centre corridor which includes connection to the existing Luas Green Line.		
Case Type	Pre-application consultation		
1st / 2nd / 3rd Meeting	5 th		
Date	31 st March, 2021	Start Time	11.15 a.m.
Location	N/A	End Time	1.20 p.m.
Chairperson	Brendan Wyse	Executive Officer	Kieran Somers

Attendees		
Representing An Bord Pleanála		
Staff Member	Email Address	Phone
Brendan Wyse, Assistant Director of Planning		
Kevin Moore, Senior Planning Inspector		
Kieran Somers, Executive Officer	k.somers@pleanala.ie	01-8737107

Representing the Prospective Applicant		
Ronan Hallissey, Jacobs		
John Keogh, Jacobs		
Aidan Foley, TII		
Nigel O'Neil, TII		
Neil Cowie, Jacobs		

The meeting commenced at 11.15 a.m.

Introduction:

The Board referred to its previous meeting with the prospective applicant of the 28th October, 2020 and noted that the prospective applicant had forwarded some comments on the record of this meeting by way of email.

The prospective applicant provided a brief update on the progress of the project and advised that the business case for the project is now before the Department for approval. The prospective applicant said that it expects a decision in this regard to be forthcoming in June of this year and its current intention is to lodge the subsequent Railway Order application with the Board circa end of July/early August.

Presentation by prospective applicant:

The prospective applicant advised the Board of actions which have been taken in relation to the project since the time of the previous meeting; these include the production of the St. Stephen's Green Station Options Report and the Strategic Principles Report. The prospective applicant noted that it had previously forwarded the St. Stephen's Green Station Options Report to the Board and will forward the Strategic Principles Report in due course. In relation to consultations with the OPW regarding the St. Stephen's Green Station Options Report, the prospective applicant reported that a meeting is due to take place with this body in the coming weeks. The prospective applicant said that the preferred station location for St. Stephen's Green

is set out in the options report and that it hopes to resolve this issue with the OPW prior to the lodging of the Railway Order application. With regard to the pre-application consultation process, the prospective applicant set out its intended schedule with the Board which provides for three further meetings following this one; it is intended that these will be done on a monthly basis.

With respect to the Railway Order Application boundary, the prospective applicant employed an Interactive Project Mapper and outlined for the Board's representatives the nature and extent of the proposed rail corridor with reference to various alignments, interventions, proposed structures and utilities and land-take required to facilitate the proposed development. At the Glasnevin station location, the prospective applicant said that a change of the vertical alignment will be required here to allow the interchange station to be constructed; further works to facilitate the DART Plus project will also be required at this location, but these will not form part of the Metrolink Railway Order application; however, all cumulative effects arising will be assessed in the EIAR to accompany the application.

With regard to the proposed rail route corridor, as demonstrated, the Board's representatives said that a copy of this would be beneficial for its understanding of the project generally. The prospective applicant said that it would supply this. In relation to the proposed limits of deviation to be applied for the proposed route corridor, the Board noted the fact that these were slightly different to the Metro North application and it advised the prospective applicant to address the reasons for any localised variations.

With regard to the railway elements of the proposed development, the prospective applicant provided details with regard to the following proposed stations:

- Seatown Station – details of the proposed station were provided by the prospective applicant as well as details of the revisions intended under the local authority's R132 project; the prospective applicant clarified that the works required for the R132 project would not be included in the Railway Order application.
- Swords Central Station – the prospective applicant advised that it will be having further consultations with Fingal County Council in relation to connection arrangements at this location and it noted the Board's position on

this issue as expressed in previous meetings. The Board for its part reiterated its opinion on this matter as stated in the records of these previous meetings.

- Fosterstown Station – the prospective applicant noted that further work has yet to be done with regard to landscaping arrangements at this location. A crossing point onto the R132 will be provided for here and the prospective applicant also noted that an existing Smyths Toystore will have to be removed in order to facilitate the proposed development.
- Dublin Airport Station – the prospective applicant noted that this particular station will be fully located underground and noted that consultations with the DAA are still on-going. In response to the Board's query on the matter, the prospective applicant said that the matter of connectivity with the airport will be demonstrated in the Railway Order application.
- Northwood Station – the prospective applicant noted that this will be located under the R108 and will consist of concourse, mezzanine and platform levels; it also advised that consultations have taken place with the BusConnects project team in relation to this station.
- Ballymun Station – the prospective applicant noted that this will be located on the west side of the R108; an area of open space will be provided above ground.
- Collins Avenue Station – the prospective applicant noted that this will be cognisant of the proposed BusConnects road layout.
- Griffith Park Station – the prospective applicant noted that a reinstatement of playing pitches affected by the proposed development will be provided for here; there will also be a tie-in into the BusConnects project.

The prospective applicant referred to pertinent related elements to the project as follows:

- R132 Connectivity Project – the prospective applicant said that this is a separate project on the R132 in Swords; it will involve changes to the road layout and also entail pedestrian facilities. The prospective applicant stated that proposed works for this project will not form part of the Railway Order Application for the Metrolink project; the Railway Order Application will be designed to tie into the R132 Connectivity Project and it is intended that this project will be applied for in advance of Metrolink. The prospective applicant

also noted that the R132 project will be pursued by the relevant local authority regardless of the delivery of the Metrolink project and it said that its understanding was this application would be made to the Board pursuant to section 177AE of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended; it noted that public consultations have recently concluded on this. The prospective applicant said that the Railway Order application will be assessed in a scenario whereby the R132 project is realised and also in a scenario where it is not.

- BusConnects – the prospective applicant stated that the Metrolink project has co-ordinated with the proposed design of the BusConnects project and has also provided sufficient space for this project to be realised. The prospective applicant stated that, in most locations, Metrolink is not proposing a new layout for roads, but that some road upgrades are proposed as part of the project (such as the R108 at the Collins Avenue Station location and pedestrian crossings on the R132 at the Fosterstown and Swords Central Station locations). In a general context, the prospective applicant noted that the BusConnects project intends a phased lodgement of applications to take place during 2021. The prospective applicant also said that an agreement is in place with the NTA with respect to delivery of the two projects. The Board for its part noted that a pre-application request for the BusConnects project has recently been lodged with it. In response to the Board's query on the matter, the prospective applicant said that there would be a potential for some works overlaps on the two projects in certain areas, but it added that this would not occur on a city-wide basis. The prospective applicant also said that its overall intention would be to avoid clashes in this regard and to also avoid cumulative effects of works where possible.
- ESB works – the prospective applicant advised that the Railway Order Application will include for a temporary connection in terms of power supply required for the construction phase of the project. With respect to the permanent connection which will be required for the operational phase of the project, the prospective applicant advised that a separate planning application pursuant to section 182A of the Act will be necessary. The prospective

applicant added that proposed works in relation to this will be fully assessed in the EIAR to accompany the Railway Order application. In answer to the Board's query on the matter, the prospective applicant said that proposed substations would also be included in the Railway Order application.

- DART Plus – the prospective applicant advised that this project will provide for upgrade and electrification in respect of the Kildare and Maynooth lines; it added that separate Irish Rail consent applications will be required for these proposed works. The prospective applicant advised that the Railway Order Application will include the construction of the station box for the Metrolink and DART Plus projects and also alignment changes necessary to deliver an interchange station at Glasnevin. With respect to this particular project and others (such as the R132 and BusConnects), the Board's representatives noted that cumulative effects might be a significant issue on the instant project from a public perspective.
- Playing Fields Replacement – the prospective applicant said that there will be an interface provided for with existing playing pitches along the proposed route (at Balheary Park, Dardistown, Albert College Park and Griffith Park locations). The prospective applicant advised that the pitches in question will require reinstatement or redesign and that such works will form part of the Railway Order Application. The prospective applicant said that certain pitches may be provided for outside the boundary of the Railway Order Application and that any replacement pitches off-site will not form part of the application. The prospective applicant also advised that all pitch provisions arising from the application will be fully assessed in the EIAR.
- O'Connell Street Station – the prospective applicant reported on on-going engagement/consultations with landowners in this area and design development co-ordination (with particular regard to consultations with representatives from Dublin City Council and the Department regarding protected structures in the area). The prospective applicant said that there will now be a reduction in the impact of proposed works on 59 and 60 O'Connell Street. With respect to the proposed development by

Hammerson's, the prospective applicant said that the current intention is to lodge this in proposed phases (circa early Quarter 2 2021 and circa late Quarter 2 2021). The prospective applicant also advised that the Railway Order Application will include all works necessary to provide the proposed station in this location.

With regard to stakeholder engagement, the prospective applicant provided the Board's representatives with an update on this. Key consultations which have taken place since October 2020 include Fingal County Council, Dublin City Council, the OPW, Irish Rail, the Mater Hospital, Trinity College, Waterways Ireland, the DAA and certain utility providers.

In relation to drawings to be produced in respect of the proposed development, the prospective applicant said that preparation work has begun on these and said that they will describe the project in full. The prospective applicant said that the project drawings will be A1 in terms of size and there will be approximately 600 drawings which will describe alignment and structures along the proposed route; these will not include property drawings. The prospective applicant added that key dimensions will be provided on the drawings and it also stated its intention to include drawings with respect to utilities. Noting this, the Board's representatives said that the more information that can be provided, the better as long as this would not lead to an issue of over-complexity. The prospective applicant noted this and, with regard to utility drawings, said that these would be provided as a separate pack of drawings. The Board also enquired as to whether any 3D visualisations are intended as part of the application. The prospective applicant replied that such visualisations are to be prepared, but a decision has yet to be taken on whether these would be incorporated into the EIAR; it also pointed out that the 3D visualisations would be provided on a project website; it also noted that approximately 120 photomontages will be prepared.

With regard to any decision to indicate proposed tunnelling works/substratum elements as part of the red line boundary of the proposed development, the prospective applicant indicated its intention to take legal advice on this; it said it would revert to the Board on the matter in due course.

With respect to materials and waste management, the prospective applicant noted that Article 27 is one of the key project elements which it is seeking to address. The prospective applicant noted the significant amount of spoil material which would arise from the proposed development (proposed station boxes and tunnelling works) and said that it is seeking to have this spoil material classified under Article 27 for re-use on 3rd party sites. The prospective applicant advised of on-going engagement/consultations with respect to Article 27 in terms of the EPA and Eastern Midlands waste region; a separate consent will be required from the EPA. The prospective applicant said that the key mitigation measure with regard to waste will be identified in the EIAR; it also stated that the residual impacts assessment section of the EIAR will address the potential environmental effects in the event that the Article 27 application to the EPA is not approved. The prospective applicant expressed its hope that the Article 27 application will be approved but said that other scenarios are also being considered. The Board's representatives noted this and said that the approach being taken appears reasonable. The prospective applicant enquired as to whether the Board might consider having a meeting with representatives of the EPA on this issue as part of the instant pre-application process. The Board said that it would consider this request and revert to the prospective applicant on it in due course.

Conclusion:

In line with the prospective applicant's pre-application roadmap, the next meeting with the Board is due to take place circa the end of April 2021. It will be a matter for the prospective applicant to revert to the Board on potential dates for this. The record of the instant meeting will issue to the prospective applicant in the meantime.

The meeting concluded at 1.20 p.m.

Brendan Wyse

Assistant Director of Planning