

An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Record of Meeting ABP-310268-21

<b>Case Reference / Description</b>	ABP-310268-21 Development of port lands on Poolbeg Peninsula, construction of a Southern Port Access Route comprising of a new bridge across the river Liffey. Poolbeg Peninsula and River Liffey, Dublin City		
<b>Case Type</b>	Pre-application consultation		
<b>1st / 2nd / 3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting</b>	1 <sup>st</sup> Meeting with Dublin City Council		
<b>Date</b>	22/07/22	<b>Start Time</b>	14:30 p.m.
<b>Location</b>	MS Teams	<b>End Time</b>	15:20 p.m.

<b>Representing An Bord Pleanála</b>
Ciara Kellett, Assistant Director of Planning
Karla McBride, Senior Planning Inspector
Niamh Thornton, Executive Officer
<b>Representing the Prospective Applicant</b>
Mary Conway, Deputy City Planner, DCC
John O'Hara, City Planning Officer, DCC

The meeting commenced at 14.30 p.m.

The Board's representatives introduced themselves, welcomed Dublin City Council to the meeting and thanked the Council for facilitating the meeting. The Board's representatives advised the Council that the instant meeting is a consultation in respect of the proposed development which the Board may hold with bodies other than the prospective applicant. 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 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 Council may submit comments on the record which will form part of the case file.

#### **Discussion:**

Dublin City Council (DCC) representatives confirmed that they had received copies of the General Arrangement plan for the proposed development, the focus of today's meeting.

#### **Southern Port Access Road (SPAR):**

The Board's representatives initiated discussion around the SPAR and asked for DCC's views on same. DCC advised that the road had been discussed in broad terms, that they were not clear on whether the bridge over the Liffey would be an arching or flat bridge and mentioned that an underground bridge had also been discussed but this option appears not to have been progressed. It was noted that the bridge would be located on the seaward side of the Tom Clarke bridge and would be openable to allow traffic up river.

Regarding the possibility of the SPAR being a private road, allowing access for waste vehicles and public transport, DCC stated that dedicated private roads are generally discouraged and that it would be preferred if the road serve other developments in Poolbeg with multi-modal transport options.

DCC has had discussions with the prospective applicant in relation to pedestrian/cyclist access into this area of Poolbeg and the South Bull Wall and nature reserves and how the proposal can increase modal split and give meaning to the soft edge policy.

The Board's representatives noted that the prospective applicant has stated that the SPAR is fundamental to the project and its preference to have it as a dedicated road is in an effort to move port traffic as efficiently as possible, without having to compete or add to commuter/local traffic.

The Council stated that it supports the future proofing of the SPAR to allow for the possible extension of the Luas line.

DCC stated that it had suggested a rail connection between the North and South Ports.

DCC shared their concerns at the number and size of roundabouts in the area with DCC proposing to remove a roundabout on South Bank Road, noting that feedback has suggested that roundabouts are not conducive to safe cycling. DCC also shared their concerns about the scale and location of the proposed roundabout south of the Hotel site, particularly in terms of the potential impact on the setting and amenity of this structure.

It was noted that the prospective applicant is in discussions with renewable energy providers about the possibility of providing a landing site as part of the proposed development. This option is provided for in the General Arrangement. No further details have been received by the Council or the Board.

DCC shared their concerns over the lack of a hierarchy of transport modes in the current General Arrangement plan.

DCC also stated that the prospective applicant must demonstrate that the proposed development and road alignment particularly in the vicinity of the South Bank Road will not compromise the future development opportunity of the SDZ.

### District Heating:

It was noted that there will be a requirement for an additional plant for district heating. Provision has been made for this in the General Arrangement plan, reference was made to a 1-hectare site on the plan.

### Park Access:

Regarding the park areas provided for in the General Arrangement plan, DCC outlined the need to demonstrate connectivity between public open spaces and stated that the prospective applicant must demonstrate how the three park areas can be connected in a safe and attractive way.

The Board clarified that the proposed development would come to the Board as one SID application. It was noted that this would be the third application within the 2040 Masterplan. The prospective applicant has advised that this will be the final application.

In terms of archaeology, DCC mentioned the integrity of the South Bull Wall and the remains of a fever hospital on Pigeon House Road, stating that the prospective applicant should indicate how these sites of archaeological interest will be incorporated into the landscape and not lost to the proposed development.

The turning circle within the water was also discussed in terms of the importance of the preservation of the structure of the old harbour.

DCC noted the presence of a sailing/rowing club in the area


DCC noted that the road proposed to run north of the roundabout south of the hotel is partly encroaching on DCC land adding that the applicant should demonstrate that this will not have any impact on the historic building.

### Conclusion:

The Board may request a further meeting with Dublin City Council in 2023 before the closure of the pre-application consultation process.

The record of the instant meeting will issue in the meantime and the Council can submit any comments it may have in writing or alternatively bring any comments for discussion at the time of any further meeting.

The meeting concluded at 15:20 p.m.

 2/8/22

**Ciara Kellett**

**Assistant Director of Planning**