



An
Bord
Pleanála

Record of 5th Meeting
ABP-306587-20

Case Reference / Description	Railway Improvement Works on the Maynooth Line and City Centre enhancements as part of the DART Expansion Programme		
Case Type	Pre-application consultation		
1st / 2nd / 3rd Meeting	5 th		
Date	17/12/20	Start Time	11 a.m.
Location	Virtually	End Time	12.00 p.m.

Representing An Bord Pleanála		
Staff Members		
Ciara Kellett, Assistant Director of Planning (Chair)		
Una Crosse, Senior Planning Inspector		
Jennifer Sherry, Executive Officer	j.sherry@pleanala.ie	01-8737266
Representing the Prospective Applicant		
Colm Reynolds, Assistant Director DART+, Iarnród Éireann		
Michael Finan, Programme Manager DART+ West, Iarnród Éireann		
Mark Conroy, Environmental Manager DART+, Iarnród Éireann		
Rita Monaghan, CIE Solicitor		

Barry Corrigan, Railway Order Manager, IDOM-ROD
Cristina Chalé Sabat, Design Manager, IDOM-ROD
Javier Duran Ruiz de Gaona, Depot Engineer, IDOM-ROD
Vicky (Chao-Ju) Chou, Structures Engineer, IDOM-ROD
Rob Goodbody, Historic Buildings Consultants

Introduction

The Board referred to the 4th meeting held with the prospective applicant on the 10th November, 2020 and the record of this meeting. The prospective applicant confirmed that it had no comments or corrections to make to the record.

Presentation

The prospective applicant set out the elements of the project, to be discussed at the present meeting as follows:

Proposed Works to Bridges (Protected or adjacent to Protected Structures)

The prospective applicant provided an overview of the overbridge assessment regarding overhead electrification equipment (OHLE) for OBG5, OBG9, OBG11 and OBG23 bridges adjacent to protected structures that require modification. The existing design and context for each bridge was outlined with the historical context/conservation status provided, followed by the MCA (multi criteria analysis) Stage 1 process of assessing the possible options moving onto the emerging preferred option at MCA stage 2 as follows:

- OBG5 adjacent to Broombridge – the prospective applicant advised the railway bridge is not a protected structure however, it is integral to the adjacent canal bridge which is a protected structure and as such, protection should be implied. In MCA Stage 1, four options were considered with option 3A for a bridge deck reconstruction with a precast arch deck the emerging preferred option at MCA Stage 2.

- OBG9 Old Navan Road Bridge – reconstruction of the bridge is not necessary with jack lifting deemed suitable.
- OBG11 adjacent to Granard Bridge (Castleknock Station) – the canal bridge and railway bridge are not directly adjoined but are in close proximity to each other. The canal bridge is a protected structure and the railway bridge is not protected but it is noted as the only skew bridge in the county. In MCA Stage 1, four options were considered with option 3 for a bridge deck reconstruction as the emerging preferred option at MCA Stage 2.
- OBG23 adjacent to Jackson's Bridge – the prospective applicant advised the canal bridge is a protected structure however, it is not clear whether the railway bridge is protected. In MCA Stage 1, five options were considered with option 3A for a bridge deck reconstruction with a precast arch deck as the emerging preferred option at MCA Stage 2.

In relation to the structural solutions to the existing arch bridges, the prospective applicant discussed the expected work to be undertaken and the potential impacts on OBG5, OBG11 and OBG23 bridges under the following topics:

- Soil improvement behind existing walls,
- demolition of existing arch and upper part of vertical walls,
- place precast concrete wall blocks and anchor them to existing walls,
- place precast arch deck,
- repair and restoration works,
- road level modification and re-profiling the approach ramps, adjacent roads / pathway access, and
- aesthetic integration of the rebuilt bridge.

Parapet Heightening

The prospective applicant also outlined solutions for parapet heightening at

- Footbridges - which include vertical panel for footbridges by attaching a solid panel (mesh screen) to the fence of the walkway to be placed in sections where electrical contact should be avoided.

- Walls – placing of obstacles in the OHLE poles area to protect against electric shock with solutions outlined such as raising elements of the walls. The areas where protecting is needed are outlined.
- Whitworth Road Fencing (Cross Guns Bridge to Lock 3) – to avoid falls from the top of wall onto railway line – Iarnród Éireann proposing the construction of vertical bars along 10cm intervals (not part of subject proposal).
- Furthermore, it was advised it will be necessary to use walls at four locations near OBD226, OBD225, OBD223 and OBD222 to protect against electric shock at the OHLE pole areas.

Glasnevin Interchange Interface

The prospective applicant advised that Iarnród Éireann have been liaising with TII to ensure a consistent approach between the proposed DART+ West and MetroLink proposals and to ensure nothing included in either RO would prejudice the other. It is envisaged that both applications will be submitted along similar timelines. The railway order for the proposed development will seek statutory approval for the interim electrification and associated works through the Glasnevin area (both GSWR and MGWR lines) based on the current alignment being mindful of the future works but in the absence of the Interchange station. The prospective applicant further advised that the EIAR submitted with the proposed development will only consider the infrastructure of the Dart+ West project. Consideration will be given to the totality of the interchange station and MetroLink as part of the Cumulative Impact Assessment. It is proposed that the Metrolink EIAR will consider the totality of the construction and operation of the Glasnevin Integrated station.

DART+ Programme Maintenance & Stabling Depot

The prospective applicant stated the depot location will be located on a site between Maynooth train station and Kilcock train station. It will be parallel to the mainline with three connections and road access from the R148. The main facilities will be an access building, main building, stabling area, service slab building, automatic washing plant, electrical substation and permanent way building. The proposed site size is 32.6 ha and

2.58 km in length. The maximum width of the site is 260m including the main building and stabling area. Levels and cross sections of the proposed development were provided as was the preliminary design of the proposed main building, slab building and the proposed drainage for the site.

Discussion

The following matters were discussed at the meeting:

- The Board's representatives enquired if the prospective applicant had or proposed to include a Planning Advisor as part of the project team. It was suggested that such professional expertise would be advisable for engagement with the planning process given the scale of the proposed development and the spectre of planning considerations which arise. Reference was made by the Board's representatives to recent legal judgements which may be of relevance and in particular to [2020] IEHC 557 in respect of the Spencer Dock SDZ and the consideration of development within same and the potential for such issues to arise in the proposed development. The applicant was advised to seek their own legal advice on the matter.
- The prospective applicant in response to the Board's representatives query advised that the bridge deck reconstruction for OBG5, OBG11 and OBG23 will involve construction work to the railway bridges only and not to the canal bridges. The Board's representatives advised the prospective applicant to be mindful of the potential impact on the entire structure incorporating the railway bridge and canal bridge in terms of the visual integrity of the structure. The Board's representatives enquired if the prospective applicant has consulted with the Architectural Heritage divisions of the Department with a view to meeting and also suggested that photomontages at each location would be useful. The prospective applicant said a meeting has been set up with the Department in the New Year. It will identify locations for photomontages which can be discussed at the next meeting with the Board and a conservation architect will be on board for the final design.

- The Board's representatives noted the OBG9 Old Navan Road Bridge is not a reconstruction but a jack lifting. The prospective applicant outlined the process of jack lifting which comprises the vertical insertion of a jack between the bridge deck and stacks ensuring higher vertical clearance. The Board enquired if OBG23 Jackson's Bridge was wide enough to accommodate a double track. The prospective applicant advised the width is sufficient however, side clearance is a problem because it is sloped.
- The Board outlined the need for the prospective applicant to present the information clearly and set out which bridges/protected structures are being directly/indirectly impacted.
- The prospective applicant in response to the Board's representatives query clarified the fencing proposed on Whitworth Road is being carried out separate to the subject project due to safety concerns. The Board advised the prospective applicant to consider how interventions on the streetscape such as screening can impact on views within an area, long ranging views and protected views.
- The Board's representatives noted the Glasnevin Interchange comprises two separate projects (DART+ West & Metrolink) and that the Dart+ West proposed development represents minimal works, such as the electrification of the line in comparison to the overall Metrolink project. The Board's representatives advised the prospective applicant to set out both projects separately, show how DART+ West and MetroLink operate independently of each other. The Board also suggested different colours for illustrative purposes be used by the prospective applicant for each project so that it is clear what is being proposed and by which project.
- The Board's representatives considered the proposed Depot between Maynooth and Kilcock to be a significant development in its own right and will review the material provided in the presentation, to be discussed at a future meeting. The Board's representatives enquired if the prospective applicant has met with Kildare County Council. The prospective applicant confirmed it has and Kildare County Council are fully aware of the scale and location of the Depot.

Conclusion

The record of the meeting will issue to the prospective applicant and it will then be a matter for the prospective applicant to submit any comments on this if it wishes to do so or at the time of a further meeting. It was agreed to hold a further meeting in January, 2021. It is proposed that the next meeting should address planning as an overall issue rather than one element.

 5/1/21

Ciara Kellett

Assistant Director of Planning