



An
Bord
Pleanála

Record of Meeting ABP-311682-21 2nd meeting

| | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------------|------------|
| Case Reference / Description | ABP-311682-21 BusConnects Galway: Cross-City Link (University Road to Dublin Road). University Road to Dublin Road, Galway City | | |
| Case Type | Pre-application consultation | | |
| 1st / 2nd / 3rd Meeting | 2 nd | | |
| Date | 29/03/22 | Start Time | 11.00 a.m. |
| Location | MS Teams | End Time | 12.10 p.m. |

| |
|--|
| Representing An Bord Pleanála |
| Brendan Wyse, Assistant Director of Planning (Chair) |
| Niall Haverty, Senior Planning Inspector |
| Niamh Thornton, Executive Officer |
| Representing the Prospective Applicant |
| Michael Lally |
| Colm O'Riordan |
| Brian Burke |
| Donal McDaid |
| Sinead Whyte |
| Conor Crowther |
| Uinsinn Finn |

The Board referred to the record of the last meeting and the prospective applicant stated that it had no comments to make on same.

The Board noted receipt of the draft EIA Screening Report.

Presentation by the prospective applicant:

The prospective applicant opened its presentation with a summary of the proposed scheme and the need for same.

The prospective applicant then outlined a number of changes to the proposed scheme since the first meeting in January, 2022. These changes and the locations of same are depicted in the presentation. The changes include a change to the extent of the scheme on Dock Road, resulting from further engagement with the developer of the Bonham Quay development, changes around Eyre Square to incorporate adjusted landscaping design and retention of existing trees, and changes at Moneenageisha Court to provide replacement carparking, resulting from engagement with the landowner.

All other changes to the scheme were described as relatively minor in nature.

The prospective applicant then presented several photomontages, depicting the proposed changes to road alignment, footpaths, public realms, landscaping etc. at various points along the scheme.

The Board's representatives noted that the photomontages were very useful and requested that the prospective applicant provide the Board with a copy of same.

Discussion:

The Board's representatives advised that the prospective applicant be sure to refer to the correct legislation when making their applications. Similar types of roads application have been made pursuant to section 51 of the Roads Act, 1993 with

related CPOs under the Housing Act, rather than the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, as outlined in the presentation. The prospective applicant was advised to consider this and it was noted that the Dublin BusConnects projects may be instructive, given that their timeline appears to be more advanced.

The Board's representatives noted that a large part of the Inner-City Access Route (ICAR) was also being delivered as part of this application. It was advised that the applicant be clear in including this in the development description.

The prospective applicant stated that a number of transport schemes were to be delivered under the Galway Transport Strategy, to be applied for individually following the relevant planning processes, and that the ICAR was necessary to meet the objective of the Cross-City Link. The prospective applicant stated that they were providing as much of the ICAR as was needed to implement the Cross City Link. With regard to the consenting mechanism for the remainder of the ICAR, it was stated that this was under consideration.

Regarding the reporting of alternatives considered, it was clarified that this would be done at macro and micro levels, including mode, route options and scheme design.

The prospective applicant clarified that the construction site compound by the docks, as mentioned in the EIA Screening Report, would be rented from the Harbour and not acquired by way of CPO. It was clarified that this site, route hauls and stockpiling of materials would be addressed in the Construction Environmental Management Plan. The Board's representatives noted the proximity to the water and the need for management of stockpiles and potential pollutants.

Noting the Citywide scope of the project, the Board's representatives advised that the prospective applicant be clear in the application as to how the phasing of the project would be managed and the associated timescales.

It was noted that the application would be lodged during the lifespan of the current Development Plan, but that a decision would likely be made after the new Development Plan comes into effect. The prospective applicant stated that they have been engaging with the planning department to ensure the proposed development will not be in contravention of the Development Plan. It was also noted that the

prospective applicant would continue to monitor the emergence of any revised Galway Transport Strategy.

There was a discussion held around the draft EIA Screening Report which was provided to the Board prior to the meeting.

The Board's representatives re-iterated the importance of being very clear in the application documentation as to the necessity for an EIAR.

It was noted at the outset that the report did not appear to refer to phasing for the construction of the project. This could be a critical measure in avoiding many of the cumulative effects identified in the report. This was noted by the prospective applicant who stated that it is something that could be discussed with Galway City Council both in relation to the proposed development and other major infrastructural projects planned for the city.

The Board's representatives focused on Part 5 of the draft Report in particular, providing feedback under the various headings. It was advised that a more balanced approach could be taken to the conclusions in this Part. With the focus currently on the negative impacts, it was advised that the positive impacts of the project also be included so that conclusions could be more clearly drawn on the net likely significant effects of the project. An example of this is under the heading Air Quality, where the negative impacts during construction are noted without reference to the positive impact the project could have on air quality once completed. It was noted that mitigation measures can be considered in EIA screening. It was advised that the Report could conclude more clearly on the specific likely significant effects that drive the requirement for EIA. The Board advised that the prospective applicant be cognisant of the language used in the report. It was also advised to note in the Report that any impacts on European Sites would be addressed in the Natura Impact Statement.

The prospective applicant stated that it intends to submit the application to the Board at the end of May, 2022.

A brief discussion was had regarding application procedures. Further advice on application procedures can be given closer to the time of application.

Conclusion:

The Board advised the prospective applicant that it is open to it to keep the pre-application process open but that no further meetings are required from the Board's perspective. The prospective applicant is asked to provide the Board with a copy of the photomontages presented during the meeting.

The record of the instant meeting will issue in the meantime and the prospective applicant can submit any comments it may have in writing or alternatively bring any comments for discussion at the time of any further meeting. The onus is on the prospective applicant to either request a further meeting or formal closure of the instant pre-application consultation process.

PP  06/04/2022.
Brendan Wyse
Assistant Director of Planning