INSPECTORS REPORT

PA0049

Development:	Development of a new National Maternity Hospital
Location:	St Vincent's University Hospital, Elm Park, Dublin 4
Planning Authority:	Dublin City Council
Applicant:	Health Service Executive
Type of Application:	Application for approval under Section 37E Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended)
Prescribed Bodies:	• Minister of Arts, Heritage, Regional, Rural and Gaeltacht Affairs (Development Applications Unit); • Minister for Communications, Climate Action and Environment; • Minister for Housing, Planning, Community and Local Government; • Minister for Transport, Tourism and Sport; • Minister for Health; • Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council; • Transport Infrastructure Ireland; • National Transport Authority; • Irish Water; • An Chomhairle Ealaion

	• Failte Ireland • An Taisce • The Heritage Council
Observers:	• Dublin Cycling Campaign • Elm Park Golf & Sports Club CLG • Cornelius & Mary O'Sullivan • Stephen & Sarah Lillis • Gemma Lyons • Liam Byrne • Eileen & Tom Clarke • Margaret Fionuala Sherwin • John P. O'Malley • Nutley Residents Association (supported by Cllr. Claire Byrne & Eamon Ryan TD) • National Maternity Hospital – Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology • National Maternity Hospital – Midwifery & Nursing Team • National Maternity Hospital – Department of Anaesthesia • National Maternity Hospital – Department of Neonatology • Dr Roger McMorrow & Others
Date of Site Inspection:	15 May, 2017 & 6 & 25 July 2017
Inspector:	Una Crosse, Senior Planning Inspector

Appendices: Appendix 1

Part 1 - List of participants who made submissions

Part 2 – Summary of Submissions

Part 3 – Planning History

Appendix 2 – Oral Hearing Agenda

Appendix 3 – Submissions received at Oral Hearing

Contents

1.0 Introduction

1.1. Context

1.1.1. An application was received by the Board from the Health Service Executive on 10 March 2017 for the development of a new National Maternity Hospital at St. Vincent's Hospital, Elm Park, Dublin 4. Permission is sought for a period of 10 years. The development is outlined in detail in Section 1.3 of this report. The application has been made under Section 37E of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The application has been accompanied by an Environmental Impact Statement and a Natura Impact Statement.

1.1.2. Pre-application consultation was undertaken by the applicant with the Board from 7th October 2014 to 2nd March 2017 (Ref. PL29S.PC0185) with six meetings held. It was determined under that process that the proposal fell within paragraphs 37A(2)(a) and (c) of the Act and that the proposal is strategic infrastructure within the meaning of Section 37A of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended.

1.2. Report Structure

1.2.1. This report comprises an assessment of the application for which approval is sought. It comprises:

- A description of the proposed development.
- A summary of the legislative framework and policy context.
- Details regarding the submissions received by prescribed bodies, planning authority and interested parties (the observers).
- A planning assessment of the merits of the project, in particular with regard to the issues raised by prescribed bodies, planning authority and the observers.
- An environmental impact assessment and appropriate assessment in respect of the proposed development.
- A recommendation in respect of the application for approval.
- Reasons and considerations and conditions in respect of the application for approval.

- Appendices providing further detail on the submissions received, the planning history of the site and the oral hearing.

1.3. Summary of the Proposed Development

1.3.1. The proposed development is described in detail at Section 1.5 below, the following is a summary:

- 244 bed National Maternity Hospital to facilitate relocation of Holles Street;
- 50,776 sq.m connected to the existing SVUH Clinical Services Building;
- 5-6 storeys in height;
- Range of medical and surgical specialities;
- Replacement facilities for displaced SVUH facilities;
- New facilities will be shared between the existing and proposed hospitals;
- Extension to existing multi-storey car park (11,884 sq.m) with 426 spaces;
- New access to multi-storey car park via an underpass from St. Ritas car park;
- New access adjacent to the current access with the existing entrance closed.
- Amendments are also proposed to the existing road network;
- Entrance plaza creating a landscaped forecourt area (2,700 sq.m in area);
- Modifications to existing road junctions at Nutley Lane and Merrion Road;
- Temporary construction access from Nutley Lane;
- Demolition of single and two-storey structures with a floorspace of 8,765 sq.m;
- Temporary single storey buildings on the site (903 sq.m);
- Construction phase of c.56 months.

1.4. Site Description

1.4.1. The area of the application site comprises 10.5 hectares of the 11.9 hectares of the St. Vincent's University Hospital Campus, with the site of the Private Hospital to the south east of the Hospital Campus excluded from the application site. The site slopes towards the Merrion Road with a difference of c.6 metres in levels. There are a large number of structures currently accommodated within the

application site. The Existing Site Layout Plan (Drawing No. NMH_OCM_A_DR_PA_010) indicates the location of the existing structures which include the following:

- Multi storey car park (MSCP) which has three levels and accommodates 496 spaces.
- Nurses Education Building which is 2-3 storey;
- St. Rita's, an 'L' shaped 5 storey structure;
- Breast Check Building - 2 storey adjacent to the Merrion Road junction;
- Carew House - 2 storey adjacent to the Merrion Road junction;
- Compound accommodating oil tanks to the rear of the Breast Check Building & Carew House;
- Mortuary – located adjacent to the Nutley Lane and Elm Park Golf Club boundary;
- Nutley Wing - connected to the Main Ward Block and is 7-storeys plus plant is connected to a part1/part 2/part 4 storey building.
- Main Ward Block which is centrally located within the Campus and is 5-storeys.
- Elm Mount unit, a 2 storey psychiatry unit.
- Herbert Wing which is 5 storeys which is connected to the building known as Our Ladys' Ward to the east of the Main Ward Block.
- Clinical Services Building which is 5 storeys and which includes the main entrance to the existing hospital and underground car park with 122 spaces accessed to the west of the Clinical Services Building and to the north of the Nutley Wing.

1.4.2. To the east of the Clinical Services Building and the Main Ward Block is the site of the proposed National Maternity Hospital. There are a number of interconnected structures within this area which are single and two storey in height and which connect to the Main Ward Block via a two-storey hospital street from where the numerous service sectors of the facility are accessed. The buildings/areas include:

- Waste marshalling yard;

- Dermatology and medical records which is linked to the kitchen and canteen by the neurology unit and connected to the main ward block;
- Transitional care unit - south of the Canteen and east of Our Lady's Ward;
- Central stores, pharmacy and the energy centre;
- This area of the Campus slopes from north to south.

1.4.3. The Campus is currently accessed from two entrances, one on the Merrion Road and the other on Nutley Lane to the east of the site with an internal access road which traverses the site in an east west axis which connects both access points. There is an internal road along the eastern boundary of the site bounding Herbert Avenue which facilitates access to the Herbert Wing of the Hospital (located along the southern site boundary and the Private Hospital to the southeast. The Private Hospital is an 8-storey plus plant structure and accommodates 260 car parking spaces within its underground car park. There are areas of surface car parking within the campus at a number of locations with 394 spaces.

1.4.4. The site is adjoined to the south by the Elm Park Golf Club, to the east by Herbert Avenue which in addition to accommodating residential dwellings also includes a Car Showroom at its junction with the Merrion Road. To the south east the site is adjoined by St. Vincent's Private Hospital which while within the Campus is outside the application boundary. To the west the site is adjoined by Nutley lane which has a mix of residential dwellings of varying types and the Merion Shopping Centre located at the junction of Nutley Lane and Merrion Road. North and north east of the site on the other side of the Merrion Road there are a mix of uses including residential, retail, pub/restaurant, petrol filling station and Church. Sydney Parade Dart Station is located approximately 300m to the northeast of the Campus.

1.5. The Proposed Development

1.5.1. Permission is sought for a period of 10 years for a development which comprises a proposed National Maternity Hospital on the St Vincent's University Hospital Campus. The proposed development is described as follows:

1.5.2. The proposed National Maternity Hospital facilitates the relocation of the existing facility at Holles Street. The proposed facility has a gross floor area of 50,776 sq.m

and is connected to the existing St. Vincent's Clinical Services Building on a number of levels. The main entrance to the building is on the northern elevation. There is an emergency access on the eastern elevation adjacent to the proposed emergency department on Level 0. The form of the new building provides for an 'L' shaped structure in three interlinked blocks each having central atriums around which the space is arranged. The building has two 'Hospital Streets' which are continued on each level one on an east west axis and the other on a north south. There are a number of garden/green areas within the building including green roofs, roof gardens and courtyards.

1.5.3. The structure is 5-6 storeys in height, with additional plant areas at roof level and a basement level, with an overall height to parapet level of 41m (47m to top of boiler flues). The floor to floor heights are 4.4m and the floor levels of the proposed structure align with the existing SVUH building at level 0 (+6.OD) and level 4 (+23.69OD).

1.5.4. The northern elevation of the building addressing Merrion Road comprises a 6 storey block, with additional plant level on the eastern corner projecting beyond the main entrance which is defined by a stone canopy which leads into an atrium traversed at a number of levels by bridge links. This canopy continues along the remainder of the northern elevation west of the entrance with the building 5 storeys with plant as it adjoins the existing hospital. There are a series of links to the existing hospital which will be visible along this elevation and interface.

1.5.5. The southern elevation addressing the Herbert Wing of the existing Hospital and the boundary with Elm Park Golf Club comprises a relatively short elevation of c.70m which is 5 storeys in height with plant level. The internal southern elevation which addresses the existing hospital building is 5 storeys above ground with a lower ground level which incorporates a courtyard (level -1). The western elevation of the proposed facility provides the interface with the existing hospital with links provided to the existing hospital at a number of locations. The building is primarily 5-storey with additional plant level above ground. The eastern elevation addresses Herbert Avenue and the existing buildings to the northeast of the campus. This elevation 6 storeys with additional plant level with set back from the building line for approximately half of its length with a setback of c.8 metres along part of the elevation at level 2 and 3 the length of which increases at level 4 to the south east

corner with a terrace created. There is a further set back over part of the length at level 5 with a terrace of c.5 metres in width.

1.5.6. The facility will provide a range of medical and surgical specialities including maternity, gynaecology, paediatrics, neonatology, pathology, genetics and 244 beds. The facility also provides replacement facilities for St Vincent's Hospital displaced by the proposed structure including a new dermatology unit (level 1), 2 new wards for the existing Hospital (Level 3), with a medical records department and finance department offices also provided.

1.5.7. New facilities to be shared between the existing and proposed hospitals include:

- New waste marshalling yard,
- Deliveries yards,
- Purchasing and stores department,
- Catering department and canteen,
- Clinical engineering and hospital sterile services department (level 4).

1.5.8. Alterations are proposed to existing laboratories within the existing hospital to facilitate connections to the existing hospital which are proposed at levels 0, 2, 3 & 4.

The arrangement of the facility can be summarised as follows:

- Level -1 has a floor area of 5,685 sq.m and accommodates offices, changing areas, workshops, storage rooms and plant/generator rooms.
- Level 0 has an area of 8,020 sq.m and includes the entrance, reception area, emergency, ultrasound, clinic suites, private clinics, allied health services such as physio and bereavement area. There are areas proposed for storage, medical records and catering facilities with a services corridor connecting to the existing hospital.
- Level +1 has a floor area of 7,870 sq.m and includes radiology, gynae area, medical records, admin area and clinical nurse specialist area. A link is proposed to the services corridor in the existing hospital.

- Level 2 has an area of 7,376 sq.m and includes post-natal wards, laboratory, canteen and offices with a link to the existing Clinical Services Building.
- Level 3 has a floor area of 7, 316 sq,m and accommodates the birthing Suite, ante natal wards and 2 wards for St Vincent's Hospital with 38 no. beds.
- Level 4 has an area of 7,409 sq.m accommodating theatres, ICU and SCBU (special care baby unit) and the hospital sterile services department. There is a direct link adjacent to the theatres to the existing theatres in the Clinical Services Building. It is stated that the overriding critical adjacency required is that new operating theatres in the Maternity Hospital are located on the same floor as the existing operating theatres in St. Vincent's Hospital to facilitate ease of access to adult critical care with both floors at the same level (23.69mOD) with all other levels set out relative to the level at this location.
- Level 5 has a floor area of 6,332 sq.m and includes 2 post-natal wards.
- Level 6 accommodates 768 sq.m of plant area.

1.5.9. An extension to the existing multi-storey car park is proposed with an area of 11,884 sq.m which comprises two levels over the length of the existing car park and a five level extension at the western end adjacent to Nutley Lane with an overall height of 19m. The extension provides for 277 additional spaces for the proposed development and 149 displaced spaces providing for 922 spaces on 5 levels. A new access is proposed to the multi-storey car park at its lowest level from the existing car park adjacent to St. Rita's under the pedestrian path via an underpass. A new access is proposed adjacent to the current access with the existing entrance closed. A new taxi holding area is proposed. Changes are also proposed to the St. Rita's car park to facilitate the proposed new access to the MSCP.

1.5.10. Amendments are also proposed to the existing road network within the Hospital Campus with the through traffic on the existing east-west axis road to be reduced by the provision of new accesses into the car parks creating a low traffic shared surface within this plaza/forecourt area. This allows the development of an entrance plaza to the front of the building the aim of which is to create a landscaped forecourt area (2,700 sq.m in area) which acts as a central focus within the Campus. Hard and soft landscaping to the perimeter of the proposed

building are proposed. Modifications are proposed to the existing road junctions at Nutley Lane and Merrion Road. A cycle path is proposed adjacent to the pedestrian path from the Merrion Road. A temporary construction access is proposed from Nutley Lane at the southwestern boundary of the site.

1.5.11. To facilitate the development, it is proposed to demolish a number of structures which have a floorspace of 8,765 sq.m. The structures to be demolished are as follows:

- Dermatology Department;
- Neurology Ward/ Medical Records;
- Central Kitchen,
- Canteen/Plant Room,
- Transitional Care Unit,
- Waste Marshalling Yard,
- Stores and Purchasing,
- Pharmacy,
- Carpenters' Workshop,
- Energy Centre (including linen providers office and laundry),
- Kitchen & Canteen Staff Changing Facilities,
- Bicycle Parking,
- VIE and Bulk Oil Store,
- Storage Unit (Nissen Hut) located to the west of the multi-storey car park.
- Existing surface car parking areas are also proposed to be removed.

1.5.12. It is proposed to construct a number of ancillary elements within the vicinity of the proposed facility or adjoining existing buildings as follows:

- ESB substation,
- Switch room,
- Oil tank enclosure adjacent to Breast Check building;

- 2 Bicycle Store enclosures adjacent to the existing Nurse Education Centre accommodating 192 bicycle spaces with new covered spaces around the campus to provide a total of 485 spaces within the Hospital Campus;
- Single storey VIE enclosure,
- single storey storage building adjacent to the multi-storey car park;
- Modifications to the Herbert Wing car park.

1.5.13. The proposal also provides for the construction of temporary single storey buildings on the site, (totalling 903 sq.m) which provide for changing facilities for catering staff, a household services store, a carpenter's workshop and a temporary canteen and access corridor. These buildings are proposed for demolition during/after construction.

1.5.14. The construction phase is estimated at approximately 56 months with a peak employment of 500-600 workers on site. The proposed hours of construction as outlined in the Draft Construction Management Plan are 07.00 – 1800 Monday to Friday, 08.00-1400 Saturday with works outside of these hours subject to the explicit permission of Dublin City Council. The working population is envisaged to be primarily those employed in the existing facility and stated to be 1,112 persons.

1.5.15. A Site Capacity Study was included with the application which provides an indication of the potential capacity of the campus to provide for the redevelopment of the hospital facility over time. The site has been divided into 6 key opportunity zones.

1.6. Application Documentation

1.6.1. Details regarding the proposed development are set out in the following application documentation received by the Board. These are referred to in the course of this assessment.

- Volume 1 – Planning Application Documentation
    - Cover Letter
    - Application Forms
    - Site Notice
    - Newspaper Notice

  - Engagement Process Report
  - Letters of Consent
  - Letters of Support
  - Schedule of Drawings
  - Letters of Consultation with Prescribed Bodies
  - Planning Report
  - Natura Impact Statement
- Volume 2 – Environmental Impact Statement.
- Volume 3 – Environmental Impact Statement Appendices
- Volume 4 – Environmental Impact Statement Photomontages
- Volume 5 – Reports
  - Architectural Design Report
  - Engineers Report
  - Draft Site Capacity Study
- Volume 6 – Design Drawings
  - Architectural Drawings
  - Landscape Drawings
  - Engineering Drawings

1.7. Planning History

1.7.1. Appendix 1 Part 4 provides a detailed outline of the planning history relevant to the application site and adjoining sites. The following table provides a summary of the planning history of the Hospital Campus from 1998 excluding developments of a minor nature.

DCC	ABP Ref.	Type of Development	Decision

Reg. Ref.			
2047/17		320 sq.m of infill offices on the ground, first and second floors of the existing 8 storey block	Grant
3876/15		New pharmacy facility ancillary to the principal hospital use at roof level of the existing Main Ward Block	Grant
3117/07		Seven storey in-patient ward building plus plant level above, comprising of 5 floors of ward accommodation (100) beds, a floor of day ward (20 beds), (7,960sq.m).	Grant
1687/07		Two storey roof top infill extension with plant level, comprising of 4 operating theatres (2,834m2) located at third, fourth and plant floor levels of the original main ward block.	Grant
5120/06	29S.223111	Private Hospital on a site of 1.9 ha, c.26,500sq.m, from 3 no. to 8 no. stories (with plant) 260 no. beds access to be routed through the SVUH site via the Merrion Road entrance	Grant
3907/00	29S.123708	Breast screening unit of 880m2 located adjacent to Carew House, Merrion Road	Grant
0279/00	29S.120754	Extension to the existing mortuary building - total floor area of new work 281m2 and other associated works located to the north of the existing mortuary building	Grant
2992/99		Psychiatry Unit (2,617m2) located to the rear of and linked to the existing main hospital block.	Grant
1575/98	29S.109451	5 storey over basement building, (14,860sq.m) built to the front (north) of and linked to the main hospital block. Existing 14 storey nurses home to be demolished.	Grant

2.0 Legislative Framework

The legislative framework and policy context for the proposed development is set out in Volume 2A of the application documentation (Planning Report). It is summarised here with the Board's attention drawn to key policy documents.

2.1. Strategic Infrastructure

2.1.1. Following pre-planning consultation with the Board, it was determined that the development falls within the scope of section 37A(2) (a) & (c) of the Planning and Development Act, 2000, as amended, and constitutes strategic infrastructure. This requires that the application be made directly to the Board in accordance with the provisions of Section 37E of the Act, as amended. The Board Direction issued in respect of PL29S.PC0185 stated that the Board noted that at the final pre-application meeting held on January 25th 2017 that the prospective applicant indicated their awareness of the emerging transportation proposal involving the closure of the Merrion Gates and associated implications for road traffic in the area which may have a bearing on the application.

2.2. Environmental Impact Assessment

2.2.1. Section 37E(1) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended states that an application for permission for development in respect of which a notice has been served under Section 37B(4)(a) shall be made to the Board and shall be accompanied by an environmental impact statement in respect of the proposed development. Therefore, EIA is mandatory. The EIS was submitted in Volumes 2, 3 & 4 of the application documentation and an EIA is undertaken at section 7 below.

2.3. Appropriate Assessment

2.3.1. Article 6(3) of the Habitats Directive (Directive 92/43/EEC) requires that 'any plan or project not directly connected with or necessary to the management of a European site but likely to have a significant effect thereon, either individually or in combination with other plans or projects shall be the subject of Appropriate

Assessment of its implications for the site in view of the site's Conservation Objectives'. The proposed development is not directly connected with or necessary to the management of any European site. A Natura Impact Statement has been submitted (V01.11) by the applicant to facilitate the Board, as competent authority, in carrying out Appropriate Assessment. An Appropriate Assessment is carried out at Section 8 of the report bel

3.0 Policy Context

The following section of the report provides a summary of the main policy provisions relevant to the proposed development. The policy outlined below relates to planning, transport and health as well as other Government policies and strategies considered of relevance. I will address each in turn as they arise at National, Regional and Local level.

3.1. National Policy Context

Planning

3.1.1. National Spatial Strategy 2002-2020

3.1.1.1. The National Spatial Strategy 2002-2020 has the stated aim of achieving a better balance of social, economic and physical development across Ireland, supported by more effective planning. The strategy seeks to drive development in the regions by proposing that areas of sufficient scale and critical mass will be built up through a network of gateways and hubs. While there are no specific references to the location of a National Maternity Hospital within the strategy Figure 3.1 of the strategy states that the Gateways are appropriate locations for Regional hospital/specialised care with hubs the appropriate location for local and/or regional hospital. In relation to key Infrastructure, section 3.7 notes that other economic infrastructure, such as hospitals, relate to particular locations and are also needed to support balanced regional development. Section 5.4.5 which deals with 'A Hierarchy of Access to Social Infrastructure' states that if hospitals or third level educational establishments are to support specialist, high-quality functions, they need to attain a certain threshold of size. Given this, such functions will tend to develop in larger settlements.

3.1.2. National Planning Framework Ireland 2040

3.1.2.1. The National Planning Framework is currently being prepared by the Department of Housing, Planning, Community and Local Government. It is stated that the intention of this framework is to provide a high-level document that will provide the

framework for future development and investment in Ireland. It is proposed to comprise the overall Plan from which other, more detailed plans will take their lead including city and county development plans and regional strategies. The National Planning Framework will also have statutory backing.

Transport

3.1.3. **Smarter Travel – A Sustainable Transport Future 2009-2020**

3.1.3.1. This document considers that achieving sustainable transport will require a suite of actions that will have complementary impacts in terms of travel demand and emissions. Although the Policy contains 49 actions, they can be grouped into essentially four overarching ones:

- Actions to reduce distance travelled by private car and encourage smarter travel, including focusing population growth in areas of employment and to encourage people to live in close proximity to places of employment and the use of pricing mechanisms or fiscal measures to encourage behavioural change,
- Actions aimed at ensuring that alternatives to the car are more widely available, mainly through a radically improved public transport service and through investment in cycling and walking,
- Actions aimed at improving the fuel efficiency of motorised transport through improved fleet structure, energy efficient driving and alternative technologies, and
- Actions aimed at strengthening institutional arrangements to deliver the targets.

3.1.4. **National Cycle Policy Framework 2009**

This framework is stated to be Ireland's first National Cycle Policy Framework and it was launched in April 2009. It outlines 19 specific objectives and details 109 individual actions, aimed at ensuring that a cycling culture is developed in Ireland to the extent that, by 2020, 10% of all journeys will be by bike.

Health

3.1.5. **National Maternity Strategy 2016-2026**

The Strategy which is the first of its kind seeks to improve maternity services in the State. It is noted that four of the country's maternity hospitals are standalone facilities including the National Maternity Hospital. The plan seeks to co-locate all of the maternity hospitals. Reference is made to plans to redevelop the hospital within the St. Vincent's Campus. Reference is also made to the relocation of the other three facilities. The proposals are supported by the Infrastructure and Capital Investment Plan 2016-2021.

3.1.6. **Building a Recovery: Infrastructure and Capital Investment, 2016-2021**

This is the Government's framework for investment in infrastructure for the period 2016 to 2021. The Capital Plan states that it prioritises spending on areas of greatest need as the economy continues its recovery, and includes just over €3 billion for investment in health infrastructure. Investment in health is focused on five main priority areas and these include: children and maternity. With regard to maternity services the Capital Plan makes specific reference to the relocation of the National Maternity Hospital to St. Vincent's University Hospital Campus and states in particular that "*the Capital Plan supports a reorganisation of national maternity services. The National Maternity Hospital will be relocated to the St. Vincent's Campus, and towards the later years of the Plan the Rotunda, the Coombe and Limerick maternity hospitals will move to Connolly Hospital, St James's Hospital and University Hospital Limerick, respectively*".

3.2. Regional Policy Context

Regional policy relating to planning and transport is set out in the following section.

Planning

3.2.1. **Regional Planning Guidelines for the Greater Dublin Area, 2010-2022**

3.2.1.1. The guidelines seek to implement the strategic planning framework set out in the National Spatial Strategy outlined above. Social Infrastructure and Sustainable Communities is addressed at Section 8 of the Guidelines with Section 8.6 dealing with Health and Healthcare Facilities which notes that like the provision of educational facilities, healthcare is not a social service provided directly by Local Authorities, however, the provision of healthcare facilities must be taken into account in planning terms. The Guidelines also address economic growth and physical infrastructure.

Transport

3.2.2. **Transport Strategy for the Greater Dublin Area, 2016-2035**

3.2.2.1. The purpose of the Strategy is stated to contribute to the economic, social and cultural progress of the Greater Dublin Area by providing for the efficient, effective and sustainable movement of people and goods.

3.2.2.2. They set out a number of core principles deriving from this strategic vision, including:

- Dublin as the capital city of Ireland and a major European centre shall grow and progress, competing with other cities in the EU, and serving a wide range of international, national, regional and local needs.
- Development in the GDA shall be directly related to investment in integrated high quality public transport services and focused on compact urban form.
- Development within the existing urban footprint of the Metropolitan Area will be consolidated to achieve a more compact urban form, allowing for the accommodation of a greater population than at present, with much-enhanced public transport system, with the expansion of the built up areas providing for well-designed urban environments linked to high quality public transport networks, enhancing the quality of life for residents and workers alike.

3.2.2.3. Section 5.9 of the Strategy states that its aim is to provide an efficient and effective transport system across the region and to accommodate future travel

growth in a managed and balanced way. Increased public transport provision and enhanced cycling and walking facilities in the urban areas will provide the means to cater for much of the increased travel demand. The principle means of achieving same is set out in a series of objectives which include:

- Encourage land use policies which support the provision of development in locations and at densities which enable the efficient provision of public transport services;
- Set maximum parking standards for all new developments, with the level of parking provision applied being based on the level of public transport accessibility;
- Reduce the availability of workplace parking in urban centres to discourage car commuting, where alternative transport options are available;
- Secure the introduction or expansion of on-street parking controls, and charging structures, that seek to reduce commuter parking and which contribute to greater parking turnover for non-commuting purposes;

3.2.3. **Greater Dublin Area Cycle Network Plan**

3.2.3.1. The National Transport Authority's 'Greater Dublin Area Cycle Network Plan' was adopted in 2014. The NTA undertook a review of existing cycle facilities in the Greater Dublin Area in order to prepare the Cycle Network Plan and set-out the strategy for the development of an integrated cycle network for the Region.

3.2.3.2. The Cycle Network Plan consists of the following route types:

- Primary Network - Main cycle arteries across the urban area, carrying most cycle traffic;
- Secondary Network - Links between the principal cycle routes and local zones; and
- Feeder Network - Connections from zones to the network levels above and/or cycle routes within local zones.

3.2.3.3. Within the vicinity of the SVUH, the Cycle Network Plan includes cycle network proposals for areas with Merrion Road a Primary Network and Nutley Lane a Secondary Network. In relation to Merrion Road it is part of Primary Radial Route 13: College Green to the South East Sector via Merrion Square and Ballsbridge, with a variant coastal route via Sandymount and Ringsend; and is additionally part of the East Coast Trail, incorporating the Sandymount/Merrion to Blackrock Corridor Study.

3.3. Local Policy Context

Dublin City Council Development Plan 2016-2022

3.3.1. Zoning of the Site

3.3.1.1. The application site is zoned Zone Z15 the objective of which is '*to protect and provide for institutional and community uses*'. Buildings for the health, safety and welfare of the public are permitted in principle.

3.3.1.2. The Plan describes these lands as generally large blocks of land, consisting of buildings and associated open spaces which are located mainly in the suburbs which include uses such as healthcare institutions. The lands are described as institutional and community lands which display a variety of characteristics ranging from institutions in open grounds to long-established complexes of buildings.

It is stated that these lands play an important role in the achievement of a more compact city in that they contribute to the creation of vibrant neighbourhoods and a sustainable well-connected city through the provision of such infrastructure as schools, hospitals and open space.

3.3.1.3. The city also includes nationally important institutions, such as hospitals and educational facilities, which as stated in section 14.1 (zoning principles), it is Council policy to cooperate with, in order to promote the strategic long-term needs of the city and the country.

3.3.1.4. Section 14.8.14 also outlines a series of criteria to be considered in respect of the development of Z15 lands:

- Consideration should be given to their potential to contribute to the development of a strategic green network and to the delivery of housing in the city.
- Development at the perimeter of the site adjacent to existing residential development shall have regard to the prevailing height of existing residential development and to standards in section 16.10 (standards for residential accommodation) in relation to aspect, natural lighting, sunlight, layout and private open space, and in section 14.7 in relation to the avoidance of abrupt transitions of scale between zonings.
- A masterplan is not required in the case of minor developments associated with the existing use or where the development proposed relates to extensions to the existing community and institutional use and would enhance the facilities.
- The requirements in respect of open for consideration uses and uses which are a material contravention are also outlined.

3.3.2. **Zoning of Adjoining Sites**

3.3.2.1. Lands within the immediate vicinity of the site are zoned for a variety of purposes including:

- Zoning Objective Z1: "*To protect, provide and improve residential amenities*". Properties along the Merrion Road, Nutley Lane and Herbert Avenue are zoned Z1.
- Zoning Objective Z2: "*To protect and/or improve the amenities of residential conservation areas*". Properties within Herbert Avenue and Estate Avenue are zoned Z2. All the properties addressing Estate Avenue and a number on Merrion Road are protected structures.
- Zoning Objective Z4: "*To provide for and improve mixed-services facilities*". The Merrion Centre located at the junction of the Merrion Road and Nutley Lane are zoned Z4.

- Zoning Objective Z9: "*To preserve, provide and improve recreational amenity and open space and green networks*". Elm Park Golf and Sports Club is located to the south of the site and is zoned Z9.
- Zoning Objective Z15: '*To protect and provide for institutional and community uses*' – the lands to the south east of the appeal site within the grounds of St. Marys Home and School for the Blind are zoned Z15.

3.3.3. Policies and Objectives

3.3.3.1. The following policies and objective are considered to be of particular relevance to the proposal.

Employment, Enterprise and Economic

3.3.3.2. Section 6.5.5 of the Plan deals with Employment, Enterprise and Economic Development. There are a number of policies within this section of the Plan that relate to the proposed development as follows:

3.3.3.3. Policy CEE20 states that it is Council policy "to recognise that hospitals and the wider healthcare sector are crucial to the wellbeing of the city, including as major sources of employment, economic development and innovation; and to promote and facilitate their development and expansion".

3.3.3.4. Specific reference is made to the proposed facility in respect of Policy CEE21(i) which provides that it is Council policy "to recognise the strategic role of the hospital complexes in the city including the proposed National Paediatric Hospital and the proposed new National Maternity Hospital and to support the provision of the appropriate volume of floor space and associated facilities necessary to secure the delivery of their services and potential; having regard to their national medical function, their role as a major employer in the city, as a generator of significant economic benefits for the economy of Dublin's inner city and a promoter of the knowledge economy through research and education links with third-level colleges in the city".

Movement and Transport

3.3.3.5. Integrated Land-Use and Transportation is addressed at Section 8.5 of the Plan. Policy MT1 states that "it is the policy of the Council to support the sustainability principles in a number of specifically mentioned documents including those outlined above in respect of National and Regional Policy". Furthermore, it is a stated objective of Dublin City Council as set out in Objective MTO1: "to encourage intensification and mixed-use development along existing and planned public transport corridors and at transport nodes where sufficient public transport capacity and accessibility exists to meet the sustainable transport requirements of the development, having regard to conservation policies set out elsewhere in this plan and the need to make best use of urban land. Dublin City Council will seek to prepare SDZs, LAPs or other plans for areas surrounding key transport nodes, where appropriate, in order to guide future sustainable development".

3.3.3.6. The Plan addresses the promotion of modal change and active travel at Section 8.5.2. In this regard it is the policy of the Council as set out at Policy MT2 that *"whilst having regard to the necessity for private car usage and the economic benefit to the city centre retail core as well as the city and national economy to continue to promote modal shift from private car use towards increased use of more sustainable forms of transport such as cycling, walking and public transport, and to co-operate with the NTA, Transport Infrastructure Ireland (TII) and other transport agencies in progressing an integrated set of transport objectives. Initiatives contained in the Government's 'Smarter Travel' document and in the NTA's Draft Transport Strategy are key elements of this approach*".

3.3.3.7. Public transport is set out in Section 8.5.3 with Section 8.5.4 dealing with the promotion of active travel that bring cycling and walking. Polices include Policy MT7 which seeks "*to improve the city's environment for walking and cycling through the implementation of improvements to thoroughfares and junctions and also through the development of new and safe routes, including the provision of foot and cycle bridges. Routes within the network will be planned in conjunction with Green Infrastructure Objectives and on foot of (inter alia) the NTA's Cycle Network Plan for the Greater Dublin Area, and the National Cycle Manual, having*

regard to policy GI5 and objective GIO18". Section 8.5.4.1 deals specifically with cycling where it is noted that Dublin City Council aims to increase mode share associated with cycling to reach a minimum target of 25%.Walking is addressed in Section 8.5.4.2 where Policy MT12 states that it is City Council policy *"to improve the pedestrian environment and promote the development of a network of pedestrian routes which link residential areas with recreational, educational and employment destinations to create a pedestrian environment that is safe and accessible to all*".

3.3.3.8. Mobility Management and Travel Planning are set out in section 8.5.5 with Policy MT13 stating that it is Council Policy "to promote best practice mobility management and travel planning to balance car use to capacity and provide for necessary mobility via sustainable transport modes".

Sustainable Communities and Neighbourhoods

3.3.3.9. Chapter 12 of the Plan deals with Sustainable Communities and Neighbourhoods. In this regard, Figure 18 illustrates a city of neighbourhoods with the subject site within the neighbourhood included as 'Merrion'. While this section of the Plan deals predominately with residential development and its integration into existing neighbourhoods or the creation of new neighbourhoods. It is stated at Section 12.5.2, 'Making Sustainable Neighbourhoods', that "*new developments should contribute to the unique identities and sense of place in Dublin's neighbourhoods. There will be a requirement for all proposals to demonstrate a positive urban design response. Applications for large-scale proposals will need to include an Urban Design Statement*".

3.3.3.10. Section 12.5.5. of the Plan addresses the Sustainable Provision and Optimum Use of Social Infrastructure. In this regard Policy SN22 states that it is the policy of the Council "*to facilitate the provision of hospital, local and other healthcare facilities in accordance with the requirements of the relevant healthcare authorities and to facilitate the consolidation or enhancement of these facilities within the city as an important resource for the city, region and State*".

3.3.4. Development Standards

Plot Ratio

3.3.4.1. Plot ratio standards are outlined in Section 16.5 of the Plan which states that the consideration of plot ratio needs to be used in conjunction with other development control measures including, site coverage, building height, public and private open space, the standards applied to residential roads, and parking provision. The Indicative Plot Ratio standard for Z15 lands is stated as 0.5-2.5. The Plan also notes that a '*higher plot ratio may be permitted in certain circumstances such as:*

• *Adjoining major public transport termini and corridors, where an appropriate mix of residential and commercial uses is proposed*

• *To facilitate comprehensive re-development in areas in need of urban renewal*

• *To maintain existing streetscape profiles*

• *Where a site already has the benefit of a higher plot ratio*

• *To facilitate the strategic role of institutions such as hospitals'*

Site Coverage

3.3.4.2. Section 16.6 deals with site coverage and states that higher site coverage may be permitted in certain circumstances such as:

• *Adjoining major public transport termini and corridors, where an appropriate mix of residential and commercial uses is proposed*

• *To facilitate comprehensive re-development in areas in need of urban renewal*

• *To maintain existing streetscape profiles*

• *Where a site already has the benefit of a higher site coverage.*

The indicative site coverage standard for Z15 lands is 50%.

Height

3.3.4.3. Building Height is addressed at Section 16.7 of the Plan with the application of height limits applied in relation to low-rise, mid-rise and taller development with heights expressed in metres rather than floors and are maximum heights. It is also noted that rail hubs are within 500m of existing and proposed LUAS, mainline, DART, DART underground and Metro. Figure 19 illustrates that locations proposed for taller, mid-rise and low rise and it is noted that the subject area is within a low-rise area. The maximum building heights in these areas are up to 24m (commercial and residential) for rail hubs and in the outer city up to 16m (commercial and residential). The Plan also addresses pre-existing height in low-rise areas and states that where a site has a pre-existing height over that stipulated above, a building of the same number of storeys may be permitted, subject to assessment against the standards set out elsewhere in the Development Plan and the submission of an Urban Design Statement outlining:

• The context with a site and area analysis which includes an appraisal of the character of the area adjoining the site

• The design principles which have been applied and how these will be translated to the development in terms of response to local character, layout, density, scale, landscape, visual appearance and impact on amenities, including sunlight

• Drawings, perspectives and photo-montages to demonstrate how the approach has been applied.

Built Heritage

3.3.4.4. The policy of the Planning Authority as set out in Policy CHC4 seeks to protect the special interest and character of all Dublin's Conservation Areas. Development within or affecting all conservation areas will contribute positively to the character and distinctiveness and take opportunities to protect and enhance the character and appearance of the area and its setting wherever possible.

Car Parking

3.3.4.5. Car parking is addressed at Section 16.38 with Map J illustrating the three areas of car parking control in the city. The site is located within zone 2 which is stated to

occur along transport corridors with the provision of parking restricted on account of the proximity of the locations to public transport. Table 16.1 sets out the car parking standards with 1 space per 100sq.m applicable in Zone 2 areas. A specific note is included in the Plan stating that "*in assessing car parking requirements for hospitals, Dublin City Council will have regard to the numbers of shift staff, core hour's staff, patients and visitors*".

Cycle Parking

3.3.4.6. Section 16.39 deals with cycle parking and notes that bicycle parking stations should be provided in strategic new public transport interchanges. Where a modal share for cycling is outlined within a Mobility Management Plan for a development, cycle parking should be provided at a level sufficient to support this modal share or as outlined in Table 16.2, whichever is greater. It is stated in Table 16.2 that in zone 2, 1 bicycle space is required per 5 hospital beds. It also states that within multi-storey car parking that at least 15% of the number of car parking spaces provided is required for bicycle spaces within all zones. In terms of the location of such facilities it states that cycle facilities should be located at ground level of multi-storey facilities and completely segregated from vehicular traffic.

3.4. National Transport Authority - Sandymount/Merrion to Blackrock Corridor Study

3.4.1.1. The NTA have produced a public consultation document in respect of the study above. The proposals include an emerging preferred option which involves the construction of a new bridge across the Dart railway line and the closure of the Merrion Gates level crossing. Bus and cycle lane enhancements are also proposed along the Merrion Road. The last date for submissions on the emerging preferred was the 31st January 2017. David Clements for the NTA stated at the oral hearing that following the consultation period which closed in January 2017 that a report with next steps was being compiled by the NTA and this report would be presented to both Dublin City Council and Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council presently.

4.0 Submissions Received

Submissions in respect of the application for approval have been received from prescribed bodies, planning authorities and observers. An overview of the issues raised by each of the participants is provided in the following section. A detailed outline of the matters raised by these participants is set out in Appendix 1 – Part 3 of this report.

4.1. Prescribed Bodies

Responses were received from the following Prescribed Bodies with a summary of issues raised outlined:

4.1.1. Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council

- Transportation Planning do not object to proposal but make observations;
- Key objectives to be provided/synchronised with the development;
- Overspill car parking in surrounding residential areas a concern.

4.1.2. Transport Infrastructure Ireland

- Response states that the TII have no specific comments.

4.1.3. National Transport Authority

- Proposal considered acceptable from a transportation point of view;
- Proposal will benefit from improvements to the traffic network;
- Site to benefit from direct public transport and improved cycle environment;
- Strategic transport benefits to the proposal from proposed projects up to 2035;
- NTA currently reviewing bus services in Dublin Metropolitan network;
- NTA engaged with SVUH as part of Smarter Travel Workplaces Programme;
- Supports approach to staff car parking and mode share of 34% by car;
- 65% visitor parking mode split based on Holles Street requires consideration;
- NTA recommend that Nutley Lane access junction is re-examined;

- Consideration to be given to providing segregated cycle facilities in the site;
- Condition required for a more detailed construction mobility plan.

4.1.4. **Irish Water**

- Sufficient water supply capacity and wastewater treatment capacity;
- Network reinforcement may be required to water supply & WW networks.

4.1.5. **Other**

4.1.5.1. No response was received from the following notified Prescribed Bodies: Minister of Arts, Heritage, Regional, Rural and Gaeltacht Affairs (Development Applications Unit), Minister for Communications, Climate Action and Environment, Minister for Housing, Planning, Community and Local Government, Minister for Transport, Tourism and Sport, Minister for Health, An Chomhairle Ealaion, Failte Ireland, An Taisce, The Heritage Council

4.2. Planning Authority

4.2.1. **Dublin City Council**

4.2.1.1. A response was received from Dublin City Council on 18 May 2017. The report comprises a report of the Executive providing its views on the effects of the proposed development on the environment and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area. The report includes 5 appendices from Roads and Traffic Planning Division, City Architect, Waste Management Division, Air Quality Monitoring and Noise Control Unit and Drainage Division. The submission also includes a resolution of the members of Dublin city Council which includes three resolutions which relate to the ownership and management of the facility and recommendations regarding exemptions from the payment of parking. It is summarised as follows under a number of headings:

- Proposal supports Development Plan including Core Strategy;
- Continued active promotion of mobility management measures welcomed;

- Importance of NMH in its medical function and role;
- Proposal considered a permissible use within the zoning on the lands;
- Plan provides greater height considered in some instances in low-rise area;
- Proposed height, form and massing of the proposal are acceptable;
- Impacts on amenity of Herbert Avenue within acceptable parameters;
- Design response successful in breaking down the scale of the building;
- Opportunity to provide for an enlarged public plaza at Merrion Road;
- More attention required to the boundaries and edges of the site;
- PA agrees that reference points chosen for analysis are the most sensitive;
- Impacts on Daylight, Sunlight & Overshadowing are small or negligible;
- Landscaping proposals around the car park welcomed;
- Roads & Traffic Planning satisfied with 'substance' of information in the EIS;
- Applicant to liaise with DCC in relation to proposed works to junctions;
- Works to the public roads to be carried out at applicant's expense;
- Additional 277 spaces proposed considered acceptable;
- Proactive mobility management for visitor and shift workers parking;
- Continued active promotion of mobility management measures welcomed;
- Level of cycle provision (270 space proposed with 49 required) welcomed;
- Suite of conditions in relation to waste outlined;
- CMP to incorporate a Noise and Vibration Management Plan;
- Residential notification procedure to be agreed with PA;
- Hours of operation during demolition and construction phase restricted;
- NIS concludes that there will be no adverse impact.

4.3. Observations

4.3.1. In response to the application made, submissions were received from 14 observers. A more detailed summary of the issues raised by the observers is set out in Part 3 of Appendix 1. A short summary is outlined as follows:

4.3.1.1. **Legal & Procedural**

- Authority of the HSE to apply for permission questioned;
- Site ownership;
- SID consultation procedure;

4.3.1.2. **Traffic & Transport**

- Traffic analysis approach;
- Use of Traffic model;
- Findings of Traffic model;
- Traffic generation approach
- Visitor traffic generation analysis and overspill car parking;
- Concerns at car mode share & rationale for selection of mode share targets;
- Key junctions and queuing;
- Primary access and parking facilities for proposal should be at the east side;
- Consideration of existing environment;
- MMP focuses on staff with little reference to patients and visitors;
- Inadequate parking proposed;
- On-street spaces within 400m at 90% capacity indicating Hospital overspill;
- Proposed construction access;
- Concern at frequency of some bus services and distance from bus services;
- Location and provision of bicycle parking and lanes;
- Implementation of Merrion Gates proposal;

4.3.1.3. **Residential Amenity**

- Impact on residential amenity of Herbert Avenue;
- Inadequate Information Submitted on adjoining residential properties;
- Hours of construction seven days a week inappropriate;
- Public consultation did not consider concerns outside the application boundary;

4.3.1.4. **Other**

- Support for the Proposal
- Governance, ownership, ethics and separation of Church and State
- Alternative Sites

4.3.1.5. The matters relevant to land use planning and environmental effects raised by the observers is addressed in the Planning Assessment Section of this report.

5.0 The Oral Hearing

5.1. An oral hearing was held in relation to the proposed development over a period of 2 days commencing on 31 May 2017 and concluding on 1 June 2017. The oral hearing schedule is contained in Appendix 2. The documents presented during the course of the hearing are included in Appendix 3. Issues discussed during the oral hearing are considered in the planning assessment below. Reference is made to observers who made submissions to the hearing and to the individuals representing the applicant.

5.2. The Board retained the services of Mr Pierce Regan, Artane Recording Studio, to record the proceedings. This recording constitutes the official record of the proceedings.

6.0 Planning Assessment

6.1. Introduction

I have examined the file and the planning history, considered national and local policies and guidance and inspected the site.

I have assessed the proposed development including the various submissions from the applicant, the planning authority, the prescribed bodies and the observers. I am satisfied that the issues raised adequately identity the key potential impacts and I will address each in turn as follows: -

- Legal and procedural issues
- Need for the Proposal
- Compliance with Planning Policy
- Traffic and Accessibility
- Residential Amenity
- Design Context and Visual Impact

The Environmental Impact Assessment is set out in Section 7 and the Appropriate Assessment at Section 8.

Each section of this report is structured so as to guide the Board to the relevant section of the EIS or other application documentation relating to the particular topic, the policies and objectives of the development plan, the substantive issues raised in the submissions and the oral hearing proceedings where relevant.

6.2. Legal and Procedural Issues

6.2.1. Relevant Documentation

6.2.1.1. The relevant volumes of the EIS and documentation are as follows:

- Volume 1 – (V01.2, V01.6, V01.10) Application form, letters of consent, Planning Report.

6.2.2. Issues raised by observers during the course of the application

6.2.2.1. A number of the submissions raise issues regarding legal matters and procedural considerations, I am satisfied that the issues raised adequately identity the key potential matters arising and I will address each in turn below: -

6.2.3. Oral Hearing

6.2.3.1. Legal matters and procedures were addressed by the applicant's legal counsel during their response to the submissions received. A copy of this response is included within Appendix 3. A matter relating to the procedure of receipt of the submission from Dublin City Council to the Board was also addressed.

6.2.4. Assessment

6.2.4.1. I would note that in the legal submission to the hearing delivered by Jarlath Fitzsimons S.C., on behalf of the applicant, he outlines the requirements of the Board under Section 37G(2) in respect of matters to be addressed. It also addresses obligations to implement EU Law and the objection to have regard to Government Policy (section 37G(2)(g)) and in this regard outlines a number of particular strategies, policies and guidelines. The submission also refers to the obligation to have regard to Development Plans (section 37G(2)(c)) and notes the conclusions of the submission from Dublin City Council particularly in respect of height, which I address below in Section 6.3.

6.2.4.2. I am satisfied that the issues raised adequately identity the key potential matters arising and I will address each in turn: -

- Works to the Public Road
- Authority of the HSE to apply for permission
- Ownership of the Lands
- Ownership of Lands along Eastern boundary
- Ownership of the Facility
- SID Consultation Process
- Submission received from Dublin City Council

- Public Consultation

6.2.5. **Works to the Public Road**

6.2.5.1. The legal submission presented at the Oral Hearing on the applicant's behalf refers to the submission of Dublin City Council to the Board, and in particular to the reference to the works proposed on the public road in the vicinity of the Merrion Road entrance, which is outside the application boundary of the proposed site.

6.2.5.2. I would refer the Board to the proposed junction improvements to the Merrion Road junction which are outlined in Arup Consulting Engineers Drawing NMH_ARU_T_DR_PA_002. Dublin City Council's submission to the Board at Section 5.6 notes that the works proposed within this drawing are located outside of the planning application boundary and include modifying existing signal controlled entrance, removal of left turn slip land and island and the relocation of the pedestrian crossings and signals.

6.2.5.3. In this regard, the legal submission seeks to clarify that the position of the applicant is that it is not requiring the Board to grant permission for development outside of the application boundary. It is suggested that it is appropriate for the Board, in considering all aspects of the development, to consider the works on the public road at the Merrion Road access as part of its environmental assessment of the proposal so that if and when the works in question are brought forward by the City Council or the applicant under a separate application that the environmental impacts of these works, which it is noted have been identified and evaluated in the documentation submitted to the Board, will have already been considered by the Board prior to making its decision on this application. I would note that I have also included this matter in the EIA at Section 7 below. It is also suggested that the Board may decide that the works to the public road in the vicinity of the Merrion Road entrance should be completed prior to the commencement of the proposed Hospital.

6.2.5.4. I would suggest to the Board, that the works set out in the drawing referred to and proposed to be carried out subject to the approval of DCC are assessed as part of the traffic impacts in particular and are therefore considered in the context of environmental effects and EIA. It is my opinion that it would be appropriate, if the Board are minded to grant permission for the proposed development that a condition is included seeking that these works are implemented prior to the occupation of the proposed development.

6.2.6. Authority of the HSE to apply for permission

6.2.6.1. One of the observations questions the authority of the applicant, the HSE, to make the application for permission. The legal submission presented to the hearing addresses this mater at Section E and states that the applicant has included within the application form details of its legal interest, in this instance referring to same as 'Other' and states that the applicant's interest is a 'state body mandated to deliver a new National Maternity Hospital at the St. Vincent's Hospital Campus'. Furthermore, it is stated that in response to the questions on the form where the applicant is not the legal owner that the name and address of the owner has been provided, in this case there are two owners, namely the St. Vincent's Healthcare Group whose address is provided and the Religious Sisters of Charity whose address is also provided. Letters of consent from both of these owners have also been provided as is required, and they are included at Volume 01.6 of the application documentation. Therefore, I would suggest to the Board that the applicant's interest in the land, the legal owners of the land and their address and letters of consent from same have been provided thereby satisfying the requirements in respect of legal interest.

6.2.7. Ownership of the Lands

6.2.7.1. As outlined above, there are two owners in respect of the lands within the application boundary. A number of submissions consider that the application documentation submitted fails to satisfactorily outline what parts of the site are owned by whom, with one submission suggesting that maps should have been provided to illustrate the ownership referring to Article 22 of the Regulations. In

response, the applicant's legal submission outlines the respective ownership of the site by the two stated owners. In this regard four maps are appended to the submission which outline the lands in the ownership of both owners. In response to the matter of meeting the requirements of Article 22 of the Regulations, the applicant notes that Article 22 of the Regulations applies to applications made under Section 34 of the Act, whereas the subject application is made under Section 37E.

6.2.8. **Ownership of Lands along Eastern boundary**

6.2.8.1. The submission received on behalf of No. 21 Herbert Avenue questions whether the access road and land bordering the properties in Herbert Avenue form part of the planning application and consider inclusion is required in respect of mitigation measures to minimise impact. While I address the issue of landscaping in relation to residential amenity in Section 6.5 below, I would note that the application boundary includes the access road which leads to the private hospital with the red line adjoining the boundary of the Campus site with the rear boundaries of Herbert Avenue.

6.2.9. **Ownership of the Facility**

6.2.9.1. A number of matters were raised in an observation and at the hearing regarding the ownership of the lands and facility once operational. Other matters regarding ethos and governance of the facility were also addressed. These matters do not come within the Board's remit in respect of assessing and determining this application.

6.2.10. **SID Consultation Process**

6.2.10.1. There is reference in a submission received by the Board to the matter of the time limit on making a submission to the Board under the provisions of Strategic Infrastructure. The applicant's Legal Counsel responded to same in their submission to the oral hearing referring to Section 37E(3) of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 which provides for a period of not less than 6 weeks for

the making of a submission with the subject application having a period of 8 weeks for submission of observations. They also note the difference between these periods and the 5-week period for submission of observations on a Section 34 planning application. Notwithstanding such differences, the subject process facilitated the receipt of observations for eight weeks following the submission of the application and in this regard the application complies with the requirements of the Act.

6.2.11. **Submission received from Dublin City Council**

6.2.11.1. The receipt of the Dublin City Council report by the Board was addressed by Ms. Fionuala Sherwin in questions of Mary Conway of Dublin City Council particularly in the context of the Council meeting held on the 8th May 2017 which considered the report of the Assistant Chief Executive and the addressee of this correspondence. I would note that this letter from Deirdre Ni Raghalligh to Mr. Richard Shakespeare was attached to the report received from the City Council and I note the content of same includes the three resolutions which relates to the ownership and management of the facility and recommendations regarding exemptions from the payment of parking.

6.2.12. **Public Consultation**

6.2.12.1. It was stated that inadequate public consultation took place in respect of the impacts likely on the receiving environment. I would refer the Board to Section 7.2.5 of this report where I address public consultation as it relates to EIA. However, I consider that the consultation undertaken, which was outlined in the presentation to the hearing by Paul O'Neill, on behalf of the applicant, provided satisfactory consultation for interested persons and organisations.

6.2.13. **Conclusion**

6.2.13.1. I consider that the legal and procedural matters which have arisen have been satisfactorily addressed.

6.3. Need for the Development

6.3.1. Relevant Documentation

6.3.1.1. The relevant volumes of the EIS and documentation are as follows:

- Volume 1 – (V01.10) Planning Application Documentation - Planning Report (Section 12);
- Volume 2 – (V02.4) Environmental Impact Statement, Section 4.3.

6.3.1.2. The strategic need for the proposed development is included in the Planning Report and EIS as outlined above. It is addressed with and within the context of Healthcare policy.

6.3.2. Issues raised by observers during the course of the application

A number of observations were received from various Departments within the existing National Maternity Hospital facility at Holles Street which outline the need for the proposal and their support for same. The matter of co-location was questioned in a number of submissions principally in the context of alternative sites.

6.3.3. Oral Hearing

The matter of the strategic need for the facility was not questioned in any of the submissions at the hearing. A number of submissions suggested the potential for the development to be accommodated on an alternative site. A new observation was made to the hearing by Dr. Roger McMorrow in support of the proposal. A submission was presented to the Oral Hearing on behalf of the applicant by Ass. Professor Shane Higgins relating to clinical considerations and need. The submissions presented by Sean Mahon in relation to design and related responses to submissions also addressed alternatives.

6.3.4. Assessment

6.3.4.1. While I address compliance with planning policy in the next section, in terms of what is considered to be the 'Strategic Need' for the proposal in the context particularly of healthcare policy, I consider there are 3 main considerations. I would note that these matters of need relate to the principle of the proposal rather than the impacts which are addressed elsewhere in this assessment. Firstly, healthcare policy which supports the proposal. Secondly, and arguably underpinning same, the critical factors as outlined by the applicant which underpin this need; and the third factor of co-location and alternative locations. I am satisfied that the following matters adequately identity the key considerations and I will address each in turn:

- Healthcare Policy
- Critical Factors Supporting Need
- Co-Location & Alternative Sites

6.3.5. **Healthcare Policy**

6.3.5.1. Healthcare Policy is addressed by the applicant in the documents outlined above, as it relates to and supports, in the applicant's view, the need for the proposed development. There is a clear process, I would suggest in arriving at the current Government policy which supports the proposal. The Independent Review of Maternity and Gynaecology Services in the Greater Dublin Area, carried out by KPMG in 2008 highlighted infrastructural constraints within the three existing maternity hospitals and considered maintaining the existing infrastructure was not an option. It stated that the facilities at the existing hospitals posed risks to health, safety, privacy and dignity. This review outlined the need for co-location of maternity services with adult acute healthcare services.

6.3.5.2. Following same, a National Maternity Strategy, 2016-2026 was produced which I would note is the first of its kind in seeking to improve maternity services in the State. It is noted that four of the country's maternity hospitals are standalone facilities including the National Maternity Hospital. The plan seeks to co-locate all of the maternity hospitals. Reference is made specifically to plans to redevelop the National Maternity Hospital within the St. Vincent's Campus. Reference is also

made to the relocation of the other facilities. The proposals set out in the Strategy are supported by 'Building a Recovery', the Infrastructure and Capital Investment Plan 2016-2021 which includes just over €3 billion for investment in health infrastructure. With regard to maternity services the Capital Plan makes specific reference to and gives support for the relocation of the National Maternity Hospital to St. Vincent's University Hospital Campus as follows: 'The Capital Plan supports a reorganisation of national maternity services. The National Maternity Hospital will be relocated to the St. Vincent's Campus, and towards the later years of the Plan the Rotunda, the Coombe and Limerick maternity hospitals will move to Connolly Hospital, St James's Hospital and University Hospital Limerick, respectively'. I would therefore suggest that in establishing a strategic need for the proposal that the proposed development is supported by Government Policy.

6.3.6. **Critical Factors Supporting Need**

6.3.6.1. In terms of the critical factors which support the need for the proposal, the first of these factors, as outlined in the applicant's supporting documentation is the significant infrastructural constraints within the existing Holles Street facility which is the largest maternity facility in State. The building which dates from the 19th century and the site on which it is located are constrained leading to significant challenges for the delivery of services. This was also addressed by Prof. Higgins in his submission to the hearing with reference to recent HIQA reports which note the fundamental challenges at the existing facility. I consider that this matter is a material consideration and I consider it has been satisfactorily demonstrated as same by the applicant.

6.3.6.2. The second factor is the increasing demand for maternity services with the number of babies delivered at the Holles Street facility increasing by c.50% in the last 20 years with 9,186 births in 2015. The constrains outlined in terms of the existing facility, I would suggest, are compounded by the increase in births. The third factor is accessibility and while less tangible than the others, the location of all three existing Maternity facilities within the city centre is outlined as a constraint. Given the population growth of the Greater Dublin Area it is considered that the current service configuration needs to be addressed to provide improved

access for women availing of the services. I consider that the factors outlined, particularly the first two, are central considerations in the assessment of need.

6.3.7. **Co-Location & Alternative Locations**

6.3.7.1. The third matter of relevance is co-location and alternative locations. Reference is made, within the documentation presented to the Board, to the current model of service delivery and to international best practice which seeks to achieve optimal clinical outcomes in maternity services by way of co-location with adult acute healthcare services. The need for co-location was outlined in the 2008 KPMG review as outlined above. Co-location is stated to enable immediate access to the full range of medical and surgical facilities of an adult acute hospital for critical and routine medical issues. The submission by Professor Higgins to the oral hearing also addresses co-location and Government policy for such co-location. I would note in particular Professor Higgins statement that from his years of clinical experience practising in the field of obstetrics and gynaecology that he is firmly of the opinion that the benefits to be derived from direct co-location with an adult hospital for maternity services are truly significant. I consider that the argument for co-location has been clearly outlined by the applicant. The provision of direct links from the proposal into the acute hospital at the 4th level of the facility for critically ill patients cannot be met by the location of the facility on a nearby alternative site.

6.3.7.2. The clinical synergies which are facilitated by same cannot be replicated, notwithstanding the proximity of some nearby sites which may or may not be available. While I do not consider that any reasonable evidence has been presented to support the exploration of alternative sites for the proposed development, particularly in light of the clinical advantages provided by co-location, I would note that I address alternative sites as it relates to EIA specifically at section 7 below.

6.3.7.3. The proposed development is supported by a new 'Model of Care' which is attached as Appendix B of the Planning Report (V01.10). A 'model of care' is described as a clinical and organisational framework for how and where healthcare services are delivered, managed and organised. The proposal herein

provides for the coming together of two of the State's largest healthcare facilities on one campus in a co-located model. This new arrangement requires a coherent and agreed methodology for the delivery of services. This model of care also sets out the existing infrastructural challenges in the Holles Street facility, the policy context supporting the co-location with St Vincent's University Hospital and then outlines the requirement for a model of care which centres on the need for a coherent and agreed methodology for the delivery of services on the campus. Professor Higgins at the oral hearing also addressed the model of care.

6.3.7.4. I would note that in his presentation to the oral hearing, Sean Mahon (Design and related matters) addressed the SVUH facilities which are proposed to be accommodated within the new Hospital. The Dermatology Department and two inpatient wards associated with SVUH are proposed for demolition in order to accommodate the proposed development. These elements account for approximately 9% of the floor area of the proposed development. The submission to the hearing refers to the options which were reviewed in terms of locating these facilities elsewhere on the Campus. It is stated that the provision of a new two-storey development for these uses would not be consistent with the overall sustainable development strategy for the site which seeks to maximise the use of the land within the campus. I consider this is reasonable. I would also note that the integration of these uses into the proposed development allows for possible future expansion of the maternity hospital if such were required. I consider that the matter has been outlined in detail in the application documentation and was set in context by Professor Higgins and Sean Mahon in their submissions to the hearing.

6.3.8. **Conclusion**

6.3.8.1. I consider that the applicants have satisfactorily addressed the matter of need for the facility at the subject location and I would note that the absence of substantive objection on the matter would support this conclusion.

6.4. Compliance with Planning Policy

6.4.1. Relevant Documentation

6.4.1.1. The relevant volumes of the EIS and documentation are as follows:

- Volume 1 (V01.10) – Planning Report
- Volume 2 (V02.3) – EIS – Planning and Development Context.
- Volume 5 (V05.1) – Architectural Design Report

6.4.2. Issues raised by observers during the course of the application

6.4.2.1. The submission received by Dublin City Council outlines their consideration of the proposal's compliance with the policy provisions included in the current City Development Plan. I will address in this section issues included within the observations related to planning policy other than policies related to traffic/transport and residential amenity which are considered in Sections 6.4 and 6.5 below.

6.4.3. Oral Hearing

6.4.3.1. A response to the issues raised in the submissions relating to planning policy was presented to the hearing by Paul O'Neill on behalf of the applicant. The matters included in the applicant's response include height, plans which are dependent on third parties, public consultation, scope of consultation and engagement with roads authorities. I will address the matter of height in this section and the other matters will be addressed in other parts of this assessment.

6.4.4. Assessment

6.4.4.1. I would note that the matter of height. which I will address below, also relates to both design impacts in section 6.6 and residential amenity which is addressed in Section 6.5 below. I am satisfied that the issues I have outlined adequately identity the key potential matters arising and I will address each in turn as follows:

- Healthcare Policy
- Zoning of the Site
- Height

6.4.5. **Healthcare Policy**

6.4.5.1. I would refer the Board to particular polices included in the Development Plan which relate to the healthcare sector and to the SVUH campus and the proposed campus in particular. The first policy of relevance, Policy CEE20, recognises the importance of hospitals and the wider healthcare sector to the wellbeing of the city which ranges from them being a major source of employment, their role in economic development and innovation and the consequent need, on the basis of these considerations to promote and facilitate their development and expansion. I would note that the submission from Dublin City Council states that the Plan recognises the importance of facilitating the development of the NMH in its medical function, role as major employer and generator of significant economic benefits and promoter of the knowledge economy.

6.4.5.2. Specific reference is made to the proposed facility in respect of Policy CEE21(i) which provides that it is Council policy to recognise the strategic role of the hospital complexes in the city including the proposed new National Maternity Hospital and to support the provision of the appropriate volume of floor space and associated facilities necessary to secure the delivery of their services and potential. This policy is set within the context of having regard to their national medical function, their role as a major employer in the city, their role as a generator of significant economic benefits for the economy of Dublin's inner city and a promoter of the knowledge economy through research and education links with third-level colleges in the city. I would suggest this policy provides clear support for the location of the proposed development, in principle at the subject site.

6.4.6. **Zoning of the Site**

6.4.6.1. The application site is zoned Zone Z15 the objective of which is ‘to protect and provide for institutional and community uses’. Buildings for the health, safety and welfare of the public are permitted in principle. The Plan describes these lands as generally large blocks of land, consisting of buildings and associated open spaces which are located mainly in the suburbs which include uses such as healthcare institutions. The lands are described as institutional and community lands which display a variety of characteristics ranging from institutions in open grounds to long-established complexes of buildings. It is stated that these lands play an important role in the achievement of a more compact city in that they contribute to the creation of vibrant neighbourhoods and a sustainable well-connected city through the provision of such infrastructure as schools, hospitals and open space. In section 14.1 (zoning principles), it is stated that it is Council policy to cooperate with nationally important institutions, such as hospitals and educational facilities, in order to promote the strategic long-term needs of the city and the country. This outlines the importance afforded by the City Council to these complexes.

6.4.6.2. Section 14.8.14 also outlines a series of criteria to be considered in respect of the development of Z15 lands which is important to consider.

6.4.6.3. Firstly, it is stated that consideration should be given to their potential to contribute to the development of a strategic green network and to the delivery of housing in the city. While housing is not relevant in this context, I would note that the proposal seeks to create a plaza to the front of the hospital linked to the pathway onto the Merrion Road creating a more pedestrian friendly approach to the east-west link within the site. Secondly, it is stated that development at the perimeter of the site adjacent to existing residential development shall have regard to the prevailing height of existing residential development and to standards in section 16.10 (standards for residential accommodation) in relation to aspect, natural lighting, sunlight, layout and private open space, and in section 14.7 in relation to the avoidance of abrupt transitions of scale between zonings. While I address the matter of transitions in respect of residential amenity below, I address height in particular in this section in the paragraphs below.

6.4.6.4. The matter of whether a masterplan is required for the site is outlined in this section and it is stated that a masterplan is not required in the case of minor developments associated with the existing use or where the development proposed relates to extensions to the existing community and institutional use and would enhance the facilities. In this instance the proposal is effectively an extension to an existing institutional use and therefore a masterplan for the site is not required. The final matter is that the requirements in respect of open for consideration uses and uses which are a material contravention are also outlined. This is not relevant to this proposal in my opinion.

6.4.7. **Height**

6.4.7.1. The principle matter of planning policy requiring consideration, in my opinion, is height. The matter of height is addressed at Section 16.7.2 of the City Plan. This section of the Plan sets out the application of height limits as they are applied in relation to low-rise, mid-rise and taller development with maximum heights expressed in metres rather than floors. It is also noted that areas designated as rail hubs are those within 500m of existing and proposed LUAS, mainline, DART, DART underground and Metro. Figure 19 illustrates the locations proposed for taller, mid-rise and low rise and it is noted that the subject area is within a low-rise area. The maximum building heights in these areas are up to 24m (commercial and residential) for rail hubs, and in the outer city up to 16m (commercial and residential).

6.4.7.2. Given that the proposed development is located c.300m from the Sydney Parade DART station the maximum building height at the proposed location is 24m. The proposed development is part 5/part 6 storeys and at its highest is 35m to top of stair core plus plant from a ground level of +6mODM (41m overall height) given the varying ground levels across the site.

6.4.7.3. However, I note that the Plan also addresses ‘Pre-existing height’ in low-rise areas and states that where a site has a pre-existing height over that stipulated above (i.e. 24m), a building of the same number of storeys may be permitted, subject to

assessment against the standards set out elsewhere in the Development Plan and the submission of an Urban Design Statement which outlines:

• *The context with a site and area analysis which includes an appraisal of the character of the area adjoining the site*

• *The design principles which have been applied and how these will be translated to the development in terms of response to local character, layout, density, scale, landscape, visual appearance and impact on amenities, including sunlight*

• *Drawings, perspectives and photo-montages to demonstrate how the approach has been applied.*

6.4.7.4. Therefore, the Plan provides for the consideration of development with a height above the maximum stated in the Plan, if the site in question has a pre-existing height above the maximum. This is subject to assessment against a number of specific considerations which are outlined above. I would note that buildings existing on the SVUH campus include the Clinical Services Building at 5 storeys plus plant (+35.9 ODM), the Nutley Wing at 7 storeys plus plant (+40 ODM) and the Private Hospital which is 8 storeys plus plant (+45 ODM). In this regard I consider that, given the existing height already existing on the site, it is appropriate to consider the proposed development against the 'tests' outlined above.

6.4.7.5. Firstly, it is necessary to assess the proposal against the standards set out elsewhere in the Development Plan. Some standards are addressed elsewhere in this report such as transport, roads and services and car and cycle parking (section 6.4) and built heritage (Section 6.6). I would note Zone 15 has an indicative plot ratio of 0.5-2.4. The proposal has a plot ratio of c.1.59 which meets this standard. In relation to site coverage the indicative site coverage for Z15 lands is 50% with the proposal c.39%. Whilst density is most often used as a measure for residential development in this instance the tests relate, I would suggest, predominately to the protection of the amenity of adjoining uses which is addressed in Section 6.5 below. In relation to open space and green infrastructure given the hospital use is a community facility the requirement for

25% accessible open space would not apply directly to this site. However, I do consider that the creation of an entrance plaza and landscaped pedestrian boulevard creates a much softer landscaped boulevard or forecourt along the east-west axis. I address the qualitative aspects of the design of the building separately at Section 6.6 below.

6.4.7.6. The second requirement is the submission of an Urban Design Statement which specifically includes the matters outlined and which I will address in turn below. I would note that a Design Report is included at Volume 5.01 of the documentation submitted with the application. The 71-page report sets out the existing site context and then proceeds to examine the proposed design under a series of eight topics which are: Design Concept Overview, Brief and Area Schedule Analysis, General Design Layout, Building Form and Massing, Urban and Civic Design, Elevational Treatment, Materials and Construction Methods, Car Park Design and Boundary Conditions. In the context of the 'tests' included in the Development Plan I would suggest that they are addressed as follows:

The context with a site and area analysis which includes an appraisal of the character of the area adjoining the site

6.4.7.7. This test is addressed in both Section 3 of the Design Report which addresses the existing site context. This includes a site analysis which addresses topography/levels, landscape, access and circulation amongst other factors. Section 3.6 refers to the Draft Site Capacity Study which has been developed for the campus and which is included with the application documentation. I consider that Section 3 of the report addressees the requirements of the City Plan in respect of the first test.

The design principles which have been applied and how these will be translated to the development in terms of response to local character, layout, density, scale, landscape, visual appearance and impact on amenities, including sunlight.

6.4.7.8. The second test requires a consideration of the proposal in terms of the design principles and how they translate to the receiving environment. I would suggest to

the Board that section 4 of the Design Report addresses the matters outlined above.

6.4.7.9. I would note in relation to design principles that section 4.1 of the report outlines the principle design drivers which include – response to clinical brief, building form and massing, identity of the maternity hospital at SVUH, positive therapeutic environment for women and staff and a high quality public realm. The consideration of Local character and the Visual appearance and impact on amenities including sunlight is considered in the context of both the elevational treatments addressing the roads, and also in section 4.8 boundary conditions where each of the site boundaries are specifically addressed. Layout is considered at section 4.3 including entrance and access points.

6.4.7.10. Density and scale are addressed under the heading building form and massing at Section 4.4. This section addresses matters such as the principle elevations, and building height. I would note in relation to height that it is addressed specifically at page 18 in terms of building height and floor levels with two diagrams on this page delineating the existing heights in the area and another providing a sectional representation of height on the Campus. Landscape is addressed in the context of Urban and Civic design at section 4.5

Drawings, perspectives and photo-montages to demonstrate how the approach has been applied.

6.4.7.11. In addition to the drawings included with the application, the Design Report includes a series of diagrams, sketches and drawings which illustrate the approach adopted. Furthermore, Volume 4 of the documentation submitted with the application is an Appendix to the EIS which includes a series of 22 photomontages which show the existing and proposed views from these selected points. I have addressed these in detail at Section 7.2.1 of the EIA below, and I am satisfied that they provide a comprehensive assessment of the potential visual impact of the proposed height. In addition, I consider that the drawings submitted with the application and particularly the cross sections demonstrate in detail the potential impact of the proposal on the adjoining properties and areas.

I consider that the applicants have satisfactorily addressed the specific considerations required for determination of pre-existing height on the site supporting the proposed height of the development.

6.4.8. **Conclusion**

6.4.8.1. Having regard to the policy relating to healthcare, the zoning of the site and the provisions provided for the consideration of height I am of the opinion that the proposal complies with the policies outlined in the current Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022.

6.5. Traffic and Accessibility

6.5.1. Relevant Documentation

6.5.1.1. The relevant volumes of the EIS and documentation are as follows:

- Volume 1 – (V01.10) Planning Application Documentation – Planning Report
- Volume 2 – (V02.6) Traffic & Transportation
- Volume 3 – (V03.D) EIS Appendices
- Volume 6 – (V06.3) Engineering Drawings

6.5.2. Issues raised by observers during the course of the application and during the oral hearing

6.5.2.1. The most contentious issue raised during the submissions and at the Oral Hearing related to traffic. The issues raised include traffic impact on the local road network and particularly on the junction with Nutley Lane, construction traffic and access. The matter of car parking within the site including car park occupancy and the potential for overspill parking within the surrounding residential areas was also raised.

6.5.3. Oral Hearing

6.5.3.1. Presentations to the hearing relating to traffic and transportation were made by Donal McDaid of Arup Consulting on behalf of the applicant and by Tom Philips (Tom Philips & Associates) & Ciaran McKeon (Transport Insights) on behalf of the Nutley Residents Association & Elm Park Golf & Sports Club CLG. Donal McDaid was questioned by the observers in relation to traffic issues with input from Dan Moran in relation to construction matters. David Clements from the National Transport Authority was present to respond to questions in relation to the NTA submission. Brendan O'Brien, Head of Technical Services in the Environment and Transportation Departments of Dublin City Council responded to questions in relation to the submission from Dublin City Council.

6.5.4. **Assessment**

6.5.5. **Overview of Key Figures and Issues to be Addressed**

6.5.5.1. For the Boards information the following headline information may assist in the assessment of the following sections.

Staff	• SVUH - 3140 with 1884 working core weekday hours • NMH – 1112 with 667 working core weekday hours
Parking	Existing – 1012 (excluding Private hospital & mortuary) • Staff – 559, Visitors 411; Proposed Additional Spaces – 277 • Staff 135 – Visitors - 142
Peaks	<u>Campus Peak</u> AM – 0700-0800 PM – 1600- 1700 <u>Network Peak</u> AM – 0745-0845 PM – 1745-1845
Proposed Mode Shares	Staff – Car – 34%, PT – 29%, Cycle – 20%, Walk – 11% Visitors – Car – 65%
Public Transport	**DART** Sydney Parade DART station – 300m walk **Dublin Bus Services** Merrion Road – 4, 7 & 7a Nutley Lane – 47, 27x R138 (Stillorgan Road) 800m – 15 services
Trip Generation	• 152 two-way trips in AM Network Peak • 96 two-way trips in PM Network Peak
Trip Distribution	Nutley Lane AM Network Peak – 66% PM Network Peak – 65% Merrion Road AM Network Peak – 34% PM Network Peak – 35%

6.5.5.2. I am satisfied that the issues raised adequately identity the key potential impacts and I will address each in turn under the following headings:

- Approach to Assessment
- Modal Split, Public Transport & Provision for Cyclists & Pedestrians
- National Transport Authority Proposals
- Parking
- Impact on and Improvements to the Road Network/Junctions
- Construction Access

6.5.6. **Approach to Assessment**

6.5.6.1. One of the key aspects of the traffic and transportation assessment provided by the applicant and included in the EIS is the approach taken to the assessment. The approach that underpins the assessment is that of mobility management and the incorporation of demand management measures at design stage. This differs fundamentally from the more familiar predict and provide approach in terms of the level of car parking proposed and the provision of additional capacity on the road network to accommodate the additional traffic. As Donal McDaid (Arup) for the applicant, repeatedly reiterated at the Oral Hearing, there is a fundamental difference of approach within the assessment of this application with the management of mobility seeking to mitigate against traffic impact. This approach is stated to be central to the policies outlined in both the NTA Transport Strategy for the Greater Dublin Area 2016-2035 and the current Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022. I would note that consultation was undertaken by the applicant with these key stakeholders and this is outlined in Section 6.2 of the EIS.

6.5.6.2. The NTA's Transport Strategy for the Greater Dublin Area 2016-2035 refers specifically to demand management at Section 5.9. It is stated that the strategy aims to provide an efficient and effective transport system across the region accommodating future travel growth in a managed and balanced way. It is further stated that without complementary demand management measures the full benefits of the Strategy will not be achieved. The strategy outlines particular intentions in this regard which include: setting maximum parking standards for all

new developments, with the level of parking provision applied being based on the level of public transport accessibility. It also requires the reduction in the availability of workplace parking in urban centres to discourage car commuting, where alternative transport options are available. In addition, it is stated that it is the intention of the strategy to secure the introduction or expansion of on-street parking controls and charging structures, that seek to reduce commuter parking and which contribute to greater parking turnover for non-commuting purposes.

6.5.6.3. The approach to transport undertaken in the assessment included in the EIS seeks to address parking in particular. This is outlined in more detail below at section 6.5.9. There is a very clear emphasis throughout the traffic and transportation Chapter of the EIS on the approach taken to the assessment and how it seeks to comply with the polices within the NTA Strategy.

6.5.6.4. In relation to the current Dublin City Development Plan, I would suggest to the Board that the following policies are of particular relevance to the assessment of transport as it relates to the proposed development.

6.5.6.5. In this regard it is the policy of the Council as set out at Policy MT2 that while having regard to the necessity for private car usage that they seek to continue to promote modal shift from private car use towards increased use of more sustainable forms of transport such as cycling, walking and public transport. The policy also refers to the need to co-operate with the other transport agencies (NTA, TII) in progressing an integrated set of transport objectives. The policy then specifically refers to the initiatives contained in the Government's 'Smarter Travel' document and in the NTA's Draft Transport Strategy whichare key elements of this approach.

6.5.6.6. The City Plan also includes polices seeking to improve the city's environment for walking and cycling (Policy MT7) by way of improvements to thoroughfares and junctions. I would note that Section 8.5.4.1 of the Plan deals specifically with cycling where it is noted that Dublin City Council aims to increase mode share associated with cycling to reach a minimum target of 25%. In relation to walking, this mode is addressed in Section 8.5.4.2 where it is stated to be Council policy to

improve the pedestrian environment and promote the development of a network of pedestrian routes linking areas to create a safe and accessible environment (Policy MT12). Mobility Management and Travel Planning are specifically set out in section 8.5.5 of the Plan where it is stated that it is Council Policy to promote best practice mobility management and travel planning to balance car use to capacity and provide for necessary mobility via sustainable transport modes (Policy MT13).

6.5.6.7. For the benefit of the Board, in terms of their consideration of the approach undertaken I would note in particular the comments of Brendan O'Brien, Head of Technical Services in the Environment and Transportation Departments of the City Council in response to questions at the Oral Hearing. He stated that the consideration of this proposal was addressed as a mobility issue with a strong emphasis at pre-application stage placed on the development of a mobility plan and not a traffic plan. He stated that this approach is a challenge for prospective developments, however he reiterated that the approach is determined by the consideration of mobility. In response to questions from Tom Philips on the loss of amenity for residents and whether this use was considered as a special use, Mr. O'Brien stated that any proposal is assessed from a mobility perspective and how a development would work on that basis. He stated that he did not find that the proposal or traffic generation from same is excessive. He outlined that the applicant's analysis looked at car parking across the Campus and how mobility management has been addressed on the Campus to date. He outlined how a proposal of this nature would need a car park management plan and mobility management plan. He outlined how emphasis should be placed on those who can reduce car use most especially core staff working on the Campus.

6.5.6.8. There is a clear consistency in the approach within the Regional NTA strategy and the local policies included in the current City Plan. The clear thread within the approach is sustainable transport and the requirement to balance car use by mobility management measures particularly in respect of large employment hubs like the SVUH campus. I consider that the approach underpinning the assessment undertaken by the applicant in respect of traffic complies with the principles outlined above in relation to both the Greater Dublin Area Strategy and the local

City Development Plan. Therefore, my consideration of the matters arising in the following paragraphs in relation to traffic and transportation are based on the acceptability, in my opinion, of the approach undertaken.

Use of LinSig

6.5.6.9. There was considerable discussion within the submission from Nutley Lane Residents and at the Oral hearing during questioning of the applicant by Ciaran McKeon of Transport Insights on behalf of Nutley Lane Residents about the use of LinSig modelling software and its limitations. While I note the concerns expressed I also note that the use of this model was agreed with the City Council as part of assessment process. I would note that questions in this regard were not proposed to the representatives of Dublin City Council at the Oral Hearing. Given the approach to the assessment of transport as outlined in detail above, I consider that the use of LinSig provided the applicant with sufficient basis to undertake the assessment required.

Consideration of the Receiving Environment

6.5.6.10. Concern has been expressed in a number of submissions and raised at the hearing at the absence of consideration in the EIS to the receiving environment. While I acknowledge the concern of the local resident community as to the potential impacts that the proposed development may have on the area, I consider that the EIS and in this case the traffic and transportation element has been appropriately cognisant of the impacts likely to arise on the receiving environment. The clear policy and advice from the NTA and Dublin City Council is to seek to reduce congestion on the road network from developments of the scale proposed. This objective I would suggest is directly related to considering the receiving environment particularly as it relates to traffic impacts within the receiving environment. While I address parking separately below I would suggest that the observer's contention that more parking is required to facilitate the proposal is in direct opposition to the requirement to reduce congestion on the road network.

Consultation with Roads Authority

6.5.6.11. Concern was expressed by observers that insufficient consultation had been undertaken with the Roads Authority. I would suggest to the Board that both the report from Dublin City Council and the response from Brendan O'Brien, Head of Technical Services in the Environment and Transportation Departments of Dublin City Council to the questions raised at the hearing and to the submission from the NTA and response to questions of David Clements at the hearing would indicate that there was extensive consultation with the Roads Authority and that the applicant has presented their proposal on the basis of the advice received from same. As I outline above, stakeholder engagement is outlined specifically at Section 6.2 of the EIS.

6.5.7. **Modal Split, Public Transport & Provision for Cyclists**

Modal Split

6.5.7.1. The approach taken for the traffic and transport strategy is outlined in the section above with the assessment undertaken in terms of mobility and demand management rather than traffic management. Brendan O'Brien for the City Council stated at the hearing that they are interested in total mobility rather than one aspect of traffic management. He further stated, at the hearing, that they consider that the proposal is a proportionate development. This section seeks to look at the split proposed in terms of modes. Parking will be addressed specifically at Section 6.4.4 below.

6.5.7.2. I would note that the proposed development is a transfer of the existing operation from Holles Street to the proposed new facility. It was confirmed at the hearing that the total staff complement would be 1,112 persons with a core staff of 667. I have included in a table below the current modal split for Holles Street and the existing SVUH Campus and the target modal split proposed for the Campus with the proposed development.

	Car	Public Transport	Cycle	Walk
Holles Street	47%	32%	7%	12%
SVUH Campus (existing)	51%	22%	15%	8%

SVUH Campus Target (with NMH)	**34%**	**29%**	**20%**	**11%**

6.5.7.3. I would note that while the targets are ambitious, in order to implement the principles of sustainable transport, which is key to the approach in the transport strategy for the proposed development, targets such as those proposed are necessary. I note that Brendan O'Brien of Dublin City Council in response to questions on modal split stated that the modal split proposed is what Dublin City Council are looking for in terms of sustainable transport. It is clear that in order to achieve the targets proposed a number of specific measures are required and are proposed as part of the proposed development. I would note, as stated in section 6.5.1.1 of the EIS that many of the measures are already implemented on the Campus. These include limiting staff parking and charging for same, secure and covered cycle parking facilities, changing rooms and showers, good pedestrian and cycle networks on site. I also noted on my visit to the site the real time public transport information screens in the main lobby of the existing hospital.

6.5.7.4. While I address parking separately in Section 6.4.4 below, I would note the additional measures to be implemented on the Campus are included at Section 6.5.1.3 of the EIS. These include the development of a communication strategy to keep staff informed, travel information packs and information days. Real Time Passenger Information Screens are proposed within the proposed facility. Specific measures for each of the modes are outlined in the EIS and in the next number of paragraphs I propose to outline the existing facilities and the proposals to facilitate each of the modes.

Public Transport

6.5.7.5. In terms of the existing transport infrastructure facilitating the site I would note that in response to questions regarding existing transport services as opposed to proposed improvements that both Brendan O'Brien of DCC and David Clements of the NTA stated that the site is well served in terms of its existing transport infrastructure. In this regard I propose to outline the existing public transport facilities serving the site. I have outlined separately in the next section (section 6.4.3) below the proposals outlined in respect of future improvements by the NTA.

6.5.7.6. In relation to the existing public transport provision serving the site, the Sydney Parade Dart station is located approximately 300m from the site providing easy access to the DART line services and connections from same to the Intercity and Commuter rail networks at Connolly Station. While the distance from the DART to the SVUH is short it is not currently provided with any signage and if the Board are minded to grant permission such wayfinding may be conditioned. The site is therefore well served by rail. In relation to bus services, there are a number of bus services there are a number of bus stops adjoining the Campus boundary with the 4, 7 & 7a services on the R118 (Merrion Road) and the 27x and 47 services on Nutley Lane. The site is located approximately 800m from the R138 (Stillorgan Road) which benefits from a significant number of services. Table 6.1 of the EIS provides details of each of the routes and their peak and off-peak frequency in addition to the nearest bus stop for each service.

6.5.7.7. I note the submission to the Board from Transport Insights on behalf of the Nutley Lane Residents which references North American research which indicates that a distance of 1km is too far to walk to avail of bus services. In response to my question at the hearing regarding this research, Mr. McKeon did not have the name of the research but noted it was International research in North America which had been referenced by his company in a public transport study for South Dublin. He also stated that the distance people were willing to walk depended on the quality of transport that is available and that for high frequency bus services people will go further. I note at Section 6.5.1.6 of the EIS that travel surveys undertaken at the existing Campus indicate a large number of staff use the Stillorgan Road bus corridor. Given that the walk from the Campus to the R138 (Stillorgan Road) is flat with good footpaths and c.800m I consider that the use of the existing services on the R138 would be high.

6.5.7.8. Specific measures to encourage the use of public transport are outlined in section 6.5.1.6. While a number of the measures are addressed in the next section of this report (Section 6.4.3 below) I would note the planned introduction of a new stop along the UCD to Sydney Parade DART shuttle service to serve the Campus. While there was considerable discussion in the observations as to the value of this service I would note it would provide a bus service connecting the site to UCD and

to the R138 (Stillorgan Road QBC) for those for whom 800m is too far to walk and could be of benefit for example to students visiting the Campus given the academic links between UCD and the SVUH. Reference is also made to the proposed implementation of the Tallaght to UCD orbital route by the NTA with the extension of the proposed 175 service to fulfil this role. As I outlined at Section 6.4.3 below the NTA have no update on this proposal.

Cycling and Walking

6.5.7.9. Specific measures to encourage walking and cycling are outlined in sections 6.5.1.4 and 6.5.1.5 of the EIS and include the improvement of pedestrian and cycling networks and facilities within the Campus. Improvements required to the external road network are outlined and I would note that proposals for same are outlined in the next section of this report. I consider that the improvement of both infrastructure and facilities for cycling and walking will facilitate greater use of these modes either on their own or as part of linked trips with other modes. I note the concerns outlined by the Dublin Cycling Campaign regarding the scale and location of bicycle parking spaces within the Campus and the response to same provided by Donal McDaid in his submission to the oral hearing (Appendix B – section B3). The cycling provision proposed accords with the National Cycle Manual. I would also note that should there be additional demand for cycle parking to that proposed that it is stated by Mr. McDaid that there are ample spaces within the campus to provide additional cycle parking. The proposal to traffic calm the main east-west axis within the Campus will also facilitate cyclists with improvements to the Nutley Lane junction also proposed to improve the cycling environment.

6.5.7.10. While as I state above, the target mode split for the Campus with the proposed development is ambitious, I consider that given the existing public transport infrastructure and the proposals to improve the environment and facilities for cyclists and pedestrians that it can be achieved. It is however contingent on the limited provision of parking particularly for staff which is addressed in section 6.4.4 below.

6.5.8. **National Transport Authority Proposals**

6.5.8.1. Some concern was expressed by observers that schemes proposed by third parties such as the NTA were being included by the applicant in their documentation but were outside of their control. It was clarified at the hearing by David Clements for the NTA that their assessment of the acceptability of the proposed development was based on the assets currently available. Donal McDaid and Paul O'Neill for the applicant confirmed that their consideration of the proposed development was based on the existing infrastructure but the benefits of the proposed schemes were outlined and acknowledged. It was also stated by Mr. McDaid that changes could be made to the junction arrangements at the Merrion Road junction to facilitate the proposals being put forward by the NTA.

6.5.8.2. I would also note that Mr Clements provided an update on a range of schemes and proposed improvements to public transport and cycle proposals within the vicinity of the site which I will address in turn for the Board's information. In relation to the East Coast Cycle Trail Route which includes the Merrion Gates proposal, the NTA stated that following a non-statutory consultation process in relation to the emerging preferred option which closed in January 2017 that a report was being compiled by the NTA and this report would be presented to both Dublin City Council and Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council in 2017 with the next steps to be decided following completion of the report and discussions with the local authorities.

6.5.8.3. It was stated that it is proposed to increase DART frequency to 10 minutes throughout the day from Q4 of 2017. In relation to the proposed Core Bus Corridor on Merrion Road, which is full bus priority forming part of the Dun Laoghaire to City Centre Core Bus Corridor, the NTA are finalising route options with the emerging preferred route and concept design to be put forward for public consultation in October 2017. Reference was also made to the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) on Stillorgan Road which forms part of the Blanchardstown to UCD BRT Corridor. It was stated that a team has been appointed to finalise the concept design for the route which it is envisaged would be complete during the summer

with public consultation to follow. Parallel to this the EIA process has commenced with a view to lodging a planning application in 2018.

6.5.8.4. Reference was also made to the Bus Connects Project which incorporates the cycle infrastructure included in the Greater Dublin Area Cycle Network Plan. In relation to Nutley Lane, the NTA noted that it is a secondary route in the GDA Cycle Network Plan and is a route taken by a number of bus services both Metropolitan and Regional. It was stated that bus priority and cycle facilities would benefit many users of this link and that it is proposed to develop them in due course. I would note that Ciaran McKeon for the Nutley Residents Association questioned David Clements, at the Oral Hearing, on the provision of bus priority on Nutley Lane in the context of traffic congestion on this part of the local road network. However, I would note that such proposals are not yet advanced and not part of the proposed development in terms of transportation access, and therefore I do not consider it necessary to address this matter. It was clarified that there is no proposal from the NTA to extend Dublin Bus Route 175.

6.5.9. **Parking**

6.5.9.1. The following addresses the matter of parking under a number of headings having regard to the approach outlined to parking in the EIS and then specifically to the concerns raised regarding the provision of parking proposed for both staff and visitors in the observations and at the Oral Hearing. I also address the matter of overspill parking as it relates to the surrounding residential areas. In the first instance I will address the approach to parking.

Approach to and Provision of Parking

6.5.9.2. As I outlined, in section 6.4.1 above, the approach taken in respect of the traffic and transport assessment is based on demand management and not the predict and provide model. I have addressed this matter above and therefore I do not propose to repeat same other than to state to the Board that I consider that the approach to the transport strategy is acceptable and complies with GDA and DCC policy in respect of transport and movement. Arguably, key to the implementation

of such a demand management strategy is using the limitation of parking on site particularly for staff as a key mobility management tool.

6.5.9.3. Table 6.4 of the EIS outlines the existing car parking provision on site:

- 1,012 spaces for the SVUH, 559 of which are for staff, 411 for visitors and 42 disabled.
- There are three car parks on site dedicated to staff parking with staff spaces in 'shared' car parks operating on a quota basis.
- The MSCP currently has 494 spaces of which 280 for staff and 208 for visitors.
- Staff parking is charged at €3 per day on Campus with visitors charged €2.50 per hour reducing for each subsequent hour up to a maximum of €14 per day. Staff who use the 'shared' car parks after the staff quota is reached are charged visitor rates.
- Approximately 70 spaces are also rented by SVUH from Old Belvedere Rugby Club.
- An additional 306 spaces are associated with the Private Hospital and Mortuary, the parking for which is managed separately.

6.5.9.4. Off-site, parking is available on-street with a mix of free and pay and display and permit parking. Spaces paid per hour are also located at Our Lady Queen of Peace Church and the Merrion Shopping Centre. Figure 6.18 of the EIS outlines the location of pay and Display/Permit Parking and free parking within the wider area. Figure 6.19 provides an outlines of the car park profile on an hourly basis. The period 0900-1500 are the busiest periods with in excess of 800 vehicles accumulated within these hours. It is noted that practical capacity of a car park is accepted to be between 85% and 95% with the car parks on site considered to be at capacity between 10.00 and 14.00. It is noted at section 6.5.1.7 that the staff quota for parking is typically filled by 0800 and the remaining spaces by 1100.

6.5.9.5. It is proposed to provide c.426 additional spaces within the extended MSCP to facilitate the 277 proposed for the proposed maternity hospital and the 149 spaces which would be displaced within the campus by the proposed development. I

would also note that while the proposed development has an area of 50,776 sq.m, over 15,000 sq.m of this space includes replacement facilities for the existing hospital which are displaced by the proposed development and shared facilities between the existing and proposed facilities.

6.5.9.6. While I note the comments of Brendan O'Brien of DCC regarding the need to assess what can be achieved rather than what is currently provided, I would note for the Board's information that parking at the current Holles Street facility comprises a staff only car park which the applicant stated has 100 spaces. I note the comments from Ciaran McKeon for the Observers that they believed this number to be 74. There is no visitor parking at the Holles Street facility.

Development Plan Standards

6.5.9.7. In relation to car parking standards as included in the Development Plan I note the submission of Tom Philips on behalf of the Nutley Residents Association that the site, while within zone 2, is close to zone 3 with 508 spaces required for a building of the scale proposed within zone 2 and 856 within zone 3. Such provision I would suggest is the predict and provide model and not the demand management approach required by Development Plan policy. The standards in the Development Plan are maximum standards and the provision of 508 parking spaces would negate the implementation of the mobility management plan and strategy for the site and would be contrary to the principles of sustainable transport. Such parking levels would also create traffic impacts such as congestion on the road network which the principles outlined in the approach for the site seek to avoid.

6.5.9.8. I would also refer to the response of Brendan O'Brien of Dublin City Council in relation to questions on car parking standards. He stated that the emphasis is on mobility planning and that the current patterns are not sustainable. As I noted above, he specifically referred to the need to assess what can be proposed rather than what is currently proposed. I consider that developments such as that proposed on a Campus like SVUH provide an opportunity to implement

sustainable transport within the Campus and not using such an opportunity would make the achievement of sustainable transport very difficult.

Car Park Occupancy

6.5.9.9. One of the concerns raised in respect of car parking was the operational capacity of the car park on site, and the methodology used by the applicant to identify the present car parking capacity. I would note that the car parking profile of the main car parks associated with the SVUH is presented in Figure 6.19 (excludes the Private Hospital). This shows the car park profile on an hourly basis throughout the day showing the accumulation of cars parked during each hour and the entries and exits from the car parks. Capacity is shown as 1000 vehicles and it is noted that none of the time periods reach this capacity. There is a marked increase in the use of the car parks from 7 am falling 4pm-5pm. The periods of greatest occupation are from 9am to 3pm. In response to concerns raised by Transport Insights for the Observers regarding the potential for demand pressures to be hidden during these hourly periods, the submission presented by Donal McDaid (Appendix C2) includes the Campus Car Parking accumulation profile for 15-minute periods. This information correlates with the information outlined in the EIS. While it is clear that there are periods when the car parks are close to full occupancy (96% at 11am), which is acknowledged by the applicant, the car parks continue to operate. I address wayfinding specially in the next paragraph and I would note that measures are proposed in respect of signage and wayfinding which would provide for greater car park management on site.

Wayfinding

6.5.9.10. As outlined above the management of car parking is a matter which requires Campus wide consideration. I have addressed the sense of identity which the facility will create in relation to design at Section 6.6 below and how it is likely that given the location of the proposed development on the Campus and its visibility that it will become most readily identified with the eastern area of the site and the Merrion Road junction. However, I consider it appropriate to address the matter as it relates to access and circulation within the Campus and within the environs of

the Campus and particularly in the context of wayfinding. There are two matters in respect of wayfinding in my opinion. Firstly, wayfinding within the Campus in relation to the Campus car parks and secondly, wayfinding on the public road to facilitate access from the public road into the Campus. Donal McDaid in response to questions regarding wayfinding stated that SVUH are in the process of installing traffic counting commissions so that they can implement parking guidance within the Campus. It is proposed to place effective variable message signage along the central spine street and on entry to the Campus at suitable setbacks from the junctions. I consider that wayfinding within the Campus is critical to the successful implementation of the traffic calmed forecourt in particular, and would consider that both the parking guidance that could be provided through signage would be a very useful tool in respect of circulation within the Campus.

6.5.9.11. In terms of wayfinding within the environs of the Campus and most especially for those accessing the proposed facility by car, I would suggest to the Board that limiting the amount of cars which traverse the proposed east-west traffic calmed forecourt would be opportune. It was for this reason that I asked Donal McDaid at the hearing whether consideration had been given to focusing the traffic associated with the proposal on the Merrion Road junction. In response Mr. McDaid stated that the provision of two access points to the car park provides flexibility to manage internal circulation on the Campus, and to free up the core. With the second access in place within the extended car park those travelling from the Merrion Road end will use that access point to the car park avoiding the traffic calmed forecourt. In addition, he also stated that if you were to direct traffic on Nutley Lane to the Merrion Road junction you would be bringing them through two additional signalised junctions. Choice and permeability in terms of access is required, it was stated, and it was noted that at peak times, flows can be managed with signage. I consider that the strategy proposed is appropriate in terms of wayfinding**.**

Other Matters

6.5.9.12. Sean Mahon confirmed to the oral hearing, in response to a question that the structural capacity of the MSCP was not to be a factor in determining the number

of car parking spaces required. In relation to motor cycle spaces, this matter is addressed at Section 6.5.4.2 of the EIS with the proposed provision stated to be 4% of no. of car parking spaces which would be 51-52 spaces on the Campus.

Staff Parking

6.5.9.13. It is proposed to provide 135 staff car parking spaces as part of the proposed development. This figure has been derived from an assessment of the staff working on Campus during core weekday hours. The core weekday staff for the NMH is stated to be 667 persons with 1,884 at the SVUH providing a combined 2,551 persons. (I would note that there is a typo in the section following Table 6.6 of the EIS with reference to just over 2,400 staff in Table 6.6 which should read just over 2,500 staff). The target car mode share of 34% is applied as is a 12% turnover of spaces. The estimated demand for parking from the combined Campus is 764 spaces. Taking the existing on site staff provision of 559 spaces with another 70 off site, this leaves a requirement of 135 spaces. I would note that on the basis of the approach taken in the transport strategy and the requirement to meet sustainable transport targets that the car parking proposed for staff is satisfactory, in my opinion. The limitation of staff parking on site is a key mobility management tool.

6.5.9.14. The 70 off-site spaces referred to above are stated in the EIS to be spaces rented by the SVUH from Old Belvedere Rugby Club. I would note that there was some discussion about the parking use on the Rugby Club site however, any matters related to its use for parking to facilitate the SVUH Campus are matters for the Local Authority.

Patient/Visitor Parking

6.5.9.15. The proposed provision for visitor parking at the proposed development was one of the main topics of concern both within the observations and at the oral hearing. While I outline the matter of overspill parking in the surrounding areas in the next section below, I propose to address within this section the anticipated visitors to the facility and the proposed provision of parking for same.

6.5.9.16. While the calculation of estimated visitor numbers to the facility which underpinned the predicted parking requirement caused some discussion at the oral hearing. I note that Table 6.8 of the EIS sets out the calculation for anticipated patient/visitor car parking demand. In this regard the demand is broken down into inpatients and outpatients. Inpatients would include the visitors associated with the maternity and gynaecology users of the facility (partner and family). Inpatients would predominately stay overnight but in some cases such as for gynaecology may be discharged within the same day. Outpatients are those accessing the facilities to attend a clinic. The average stay for outpatients at the facility is 2 hours. It is predicted that the number of in-patients would be 155 with a mode share of 65% coming by car. The anticipated turnover factor of spaces for inpatients is 2.5 which provides for an average stay of 5 hours over a 12-hour day with a proposed demand for parking of 41 spaces. The number of anticipated out-patients is 620 with the 65% mode share also applied to this cohort. A parking turnover factor of 4 is applied on the basis of an average stay of 2 hours for outpatient clinics over an 8 hour day, with the proposed demand for parking comprising 101 spaces. A total of 142 spaces are therefore proposed for inpatients and outpatients.

6.5.9.17. While I will address the 65% mode share below, I would note that what is of relevance to the consideration of visitor parking, particularly for inpatients, is the visiting times to the facility. Professor Higgins of the NMH stated at the oral hearing that visiting times and procedures for visitors to the proposed new hospital would be as per the existing facility at Holles Street. The current visiting regime is that each maternity patient may have 2 visitors at any one time during the visiting hours of 6pm to 8pm. A card system is in operation whereby in order to access the patient a card must be in the possession of each visitor. Outside of these hours the patient may have 1 visitor for example the patient's partner or nominated person and children, from 8.30am to 9pm. I would note therefore that the majority of visitors associated with the inpatient cohort will visit the hospital after the majority of core staff will have left the facility. The breakdown of car park occupancy referenced above shows that the car park is less than half occupied by 5pm.

6.5.9.18. For Gynaecology patients, the current practice in Holles Street is restricted to two visitors only at any one time from 8.30am to 9pm. These visitors must have a green visitors card which is given to each Gynaecology patient when they are being admitted to the hospital. In terms of the scale of gynaecology beds, Eleanor Masterson, Architect and Project Lead at the HSE, stated at the oral hearing that the existing gynaecology facility at Holles Street of 14 beds was being transferred to the new facility, and the gynaecology facility in the existing SVUH would be transferred across to provide a total of 30 beds in new NMH. She also stated that approximately 30-40% of gynaecology patients stay overnight.

6.5.9.19. The car mode share of 65% for visitors was the subject of some discussion. I would note that the NTA in their submission to the Board stated that the mode split of 65% for visitor parking was based on Holles Street and while the SVUH campus is highly accessible, that the potential for linked trips for outpatients in particular is not as high as in the existing hospital with this aspect requiring careful consideration. In questioning, the NTA did not have an alternative figure and stated it was up to the Board to determine same. However, I would note that in response to questioning on the matter, Brendan O'Brien for Dublin City Council stated that he considered that 65% was a high mode share and that it was a maximum figure and that it could be less.

6.5.9.20. While I would concur that Holles Street, given its location in the city centre is well served to take advantage of linked trips, the SVUH Campus is located adjacent to the DART line with a station c. 300m from the site. Any outpatients in the city centre, who would heretofore walk to or used linked public transport trips, could avail of DART services from one of the three city centre DART stations and access the facility within a short period of time. While there was an inference that most pregnant women accessing an outpatient clinic would have to access same by car, I would suggest that this is not the case and while it may be that outpatients, in their final trimester, may be more likely to access by car or taxi that a significant number of outpatients would be able to access the facility by other means. Therefore, I consider that the 65% car mode share for visitors is robust.

6.5.9.21. The matter of the increased capacity of the new facility over and above the existing was discussed at some length with the observers contending that given that there would be 26% more beds available at the new facility, the number of births would be greater, therefore necessitating the need for more visitor parking. It was also contended that the new facility would be more attractive to expectant mothers than existing facilities elsewhere in the city. I would note that there are 194 beds including 35 neonatal intensive care beds in the existing facility at Holles Street with 244 beds proposed in the proposed development which include 50 neonatal intensive care beds. In response it was noted by the applicant that the Maternity Strategy sought to relocate each of the existing non co-located maternity hospitals in Dublin to a site with a co-located adult hospital, and that this would provide a parity for each of the facilities. In addition, the birth rate at the existing facility appears to be falling with 9,756 births in 2010, 9,186 in 2015 and an unpublished figure of 8,851 for 2016.

6.5.9.22. In addition, Tom Philips asked Sean Mahon at the hearing whether the size of the bedrooms in the new facility would encourage an increased amount of visitors to the facility than can currently be accommodated by the facility in Holles Street. I would note the card system used in the current facility and to Sean Mahon's response that the number of visitors allowed to visit is determined by the need to protect the patient. I consider that this is reasonable and that the rationale for more spacious accommodation would provide the inpatient with greater comfort rather than facilitating greater access for visitors.

6.5.9.23. I consider that the matter of visitor parking has been satisfactorily addressed. Both the location of the site, vis-à-vis public transport and particularly links by DART from the city centre and the visiting times to the facility that sufficient parking will be available during visiting hours.

Overspill Parking within Residential Areas

6.5.9.24. There was considerable discussion at the oral hearing, and also within the observations received, about existing overspill parking within the surrounding residential streets and the potential of the proposed hospital to exacerbate the

perceived problem. Mr McKeon of Transport Insights for the Nutley Residents Association outlined his concern that overspill parking associated with the existing NMH site at Holles Street would be transferred to the residential area surrounding the SVUH. While the applicant stated that appropriate parking was provided within the Campus to facilitate the proposal I would note a number of matters.

6.5.9.25. Firstly, on-street parking within the streets in the vicinity of the Campus is pay and display public parking. Therefore, it can be used by any member of the public regardless of the nature of the trip and while located outside the properties it is not within the ownership of the properties within the area. I would note that currently the pay and display period is 3 hours. I note the comments of Brendan O'Brien of Dublin City Council in response to questions regarding on-street parking and his comments that the pay parking is not 100% used in the area and he is not aware of any great complaints. I would also refer the Board to Table 2.2 of the Transport Insights observation to the Board on behalf of Nutley Residents Association where occupancy percentages for on-street parking in the area is provided and with the exception of Nutley Lane, the 40 spaces were 90% occupied at the time of the survey. Spaces on Nutley Road and Nutley Avenue were 23% and 16% occupied respectively.

6.5.9.26. Mr. O'Brien also reiterated that the approach required of the assessment is not predict and provide, and that the application proposed meets the Guidance set out. He also referred to occasions where amendments were made to specific areas of pay and display parking such as in the vicinity of Croke Park where the 3-hour parking window had been reduced to 1-2 hours. I would note that such amendments are a matter for Dublin City Council.

While I acknowledge the concerns raised by the observers in respect of the parking provision proposed, and their concern regarding overspill parking within the residential areas in the vicinity of the site, the approach underpinning the transport management for the proposed development seeks to limit parking on the site and make greater use of other available modes and, by so doing, limit the impact of the proposal on the road network. I consider the approach is acceptable and meets the policy requirements.

6.5.10. **Impact on and Improvements to Road Network/Junctions**

Overview

6.5.10.1. While I refer again to my conclusions in respect of the approach undertaken in the assessment of traffic and transport at Section 6.4.1 above, I will address in the following section a number of concerns raised in relation to the impact on the road network and junctions in particular. I also propose to address the proposed improvement envisaged to both junctions which it is proposed will facilitate improved access and egress to the Campus.

6.5.10.2. I would also bring the Board's attention to the access and circulation strategy proposed for the Campus which is presented at Section 6.5.2 of the EIS. Pedestrian access is provided along three routes (Figure 6.32) with improvements proposed within the Campus for cycle access (Figure 6.33) including changes to the access to the multi-storey car park and the provision of an additional 235 spaces for bicycle parking. Vehicular access to the Campus includes revisions to the access to St Rita's car park, redesign of the car park and the provision of an underpass under the north-south pedestrian pathway to facilitate a new access into the Multi-storey car park. The existing access into the Multi-storey at level 2 is being replaced by a new access at Level 6. Other changes include a redesign of the Herbert Wing car park which is to be reduced, and provided with a new egress point (Figure 6.34).

6.5.10.3. It is also useful at the outset of this section for the Board to note, as stated at Section 6.4.6 of the EIS, that the Network AM peak period is from 0745-0845 and the Network PM evening peak is 1745-1845. The peak entries and exits into and out of the Campus differ with the Campus AM peak 0700-0800 and the Campus PM peak 1600-1700.

Use of Data

6.5.10.4. Concern was expressed by observers about the use of data from surveys undertaken in 2014. It was stated by Ciaran McKeon of Transport Insights at the

Oral Hearing that the use of the 2014 data was due to increased congestion on the local road network since then. I would note that the EIS (section 6.3.1.1) states that traffic surveys undertaken in January 2017 showed some decreases in volumes on the wider road network during both AM and PM peaks from the counts undertaken in 2014. However, in order to provide the worst case scenario, it was stated that the 2014 data was used for the purposes of the assessment. I would note that Figure 6.6 in the EIS provides a comparison between traffic flows from the October 2014 and January 2017 surveys. I would also note that the reduction in traffic on the network was verified by Brendan O'Brien from Dublin City Council at the Oral Hearing where he stated that from DCC's own traffic control system that there has been a reduction in traffic and a change in mode since 2014. The data, he stated, shows that there has been a 13% reduction in car traffic and 30% increase in cycle mode along this corridor since 2014. Dublin City Council are satisfied with the robustness of traffic count data. I would suggest to the Board that the 2014 data provides the assessment with a robust basis having regard to the stated reduction in car traffic along the corridor.

Internal Road Network Queuing

6.5.10.5. I would note the junction analysis undertaken of six key junctions and set out at Table 6.16 of the EIS setting out the projected junction traffic volumes for the network peaks. The % change ranges from 1-2% in general with the Nutley Lane/Campus entrance having the greatest % change at 6.8% (AM) and 6.3% (PM) which comprises a slight to moderate impact. A capacity analysis was undertaken of the 4 most proximate junctions using LinSig. The results presented are the Degree of Saturation (RFC) and the Mean Maximum queue. The results of the 4 junctions are presented in Tables 6.17-6.20 comparing the Existing and Future AM and PM network peaks.

6.5.10.6. The R118 Merrion Road/Nutley Lane junction analysis indicated that the Nutley Lane approach is approaching capacity with slight changes likely to arise following construction of the proposal. The R118 Merrion Road/SVUH junction is operating within capacity with the Campus Access approaching capacity at the PM peak. It is stated in the EIS that the proposal would have imperceptible changes with the

proposed changes to the junction improving the PM capacity, which I will address below. The Nutley Lane/SVUH entrance junction is operating at capacity at the AM peak, with the proposed changes to the junction improving the capacity which I will address below.

6.5.10.7. One of issues raised in the observations and at the Oral Hearing in respect of the assessment of traffic impact was queuing within the internal road network. Reference was made to internal queuing in the observations presented by Nutley Residents Association in their submission to the Board and at the hearing. Images were presented to the oral hearing of observed queues at both junctions within the internal road network with 50+ vehicles observed. This, it was stated, contradicts the queuing modelled at Table 6.19 & 6.20 of the EIS. In his presentation to the Oral Hearing Donal McDaid presented observed internal queue lengths at Table B1 at both junctions for both the AM and PM, Network and Campus peaks. This Table shows internal queues at Campus peak in excess of 21. He also noted that the junction performance analysis presented in the EIS at Tables 6.19 & 6.20 were for the network peak and not the Campus Peak. I would note that junction analysis for the Campus Peak is provided for the Board's information in Table B2 & Table B3 of the Presentation to the Oral Hearing by Mr. McDaid.

6.5.10.8. While I do note that queuing on the internal road access occurs and to an extent greater than that noted in the EIS, I also note that in terms of impact on the local road network that it is the impact at Network peak that is of particular relevance. I would suggest to the Board that it is likely that at any end of shift when people leave the same location at the same time that queuing exists. It is a temporary issue on the internal network and of particular relevance is the difference between the Campus Peak and the Network Peak in terms of impact on the road network. I also note as referenced in Donal McDaid's presentation to the hearing that the Campus access upgrades proposed as part of the subject proposal, in addition to the proposal additional access into the MSCP will split traffic movements between the two entrances. As a result, the occasions where internal traffic queuing becomes excessive will be greatly reduced.

Queuing on External Road Network

6.5.10.9. As outlined in the EIS (Section 6.6.3) the proposal when operational is estimated to generate a total of 152 two-way trips during the AM network peak and 96 two-way during PM network peak. It is stated that the higher levels of two-way trips during the Campus AM and PM peaks was not considered relevant as the volume of traffic on the network at these times is lower. Table 6.12 outlines the projected traffic distribution onto the road network during the Campus and Network Peaks. It is stated that the anticipated distribution of traffic reflects the current conditions where 60/65% travels to/from the south, 30/34% to/from the north, and approximately 4-6% distributed to/from Ailesbury Road. Differences between the distribution of current NMH staff to the Campus would differ slightly to the SVUH distribution, but the differences were noted to be marginal. The proposed assignment of traffic between the two Campus entrances comprise 69% entering and existing through the Nutley Lane entrance at Campus AM peak and 31% using the Merrion Road entrance. The PM Campus peak shows Nutley Lane at 55% and Merrion Road 45%.

6.5.10.10. Concern was also expressed at the queuing at Junctions along Nutley Lane which extends, it was stated, to the R138 Stillorgan Road at peak times (distance of c.800m. The EIS acknowledges that arms of the R138(Stillorgan Road)/Nutley Lane junction are at capacity. In response to questions on this matter at the Oral Hearing, Brendan O'Brien for Dublin City Council notes that there is signalised control on both junctions and a different split at different times and, while there was congestion at particular times of the day. At various times of day there is short-lived high levels of congestion but that it is not congested for the majority of time. The differing peak hours was also outlined. Therefore, I would suggest to the Board that the fact that the Campus peak occurs before the Network peak provides that the impact of the proposed development will not be significant on the existing road network.

6.5.10.11. For the Board's information I would also note that Table 6.14 of the EIS sets out the projected link traffic flows at the Campus peaks at 14 locations with the % change at each ranging from 0.7% (location 13 R138 north of R138/Nutley Lane junction) at AM and 0.5% in the PM peak to 9.1% (location 11 – Nutley Lane east of Nutley lane/Nutley Road junction) at AM peak and 6.9% at PM peak. It is

considered that the traffic generated will have a 'not significant to slight impact' on most of the neighbouring roads during the Campus peaks. Table 6.15 sets out the projected link traffic flows at the Network peaks at 14 locations with the % change at each ranging from 0.4% (location 13 R138 north of R138/Nutley Lane junction) at AM and 0.3% in the PM peak to 5.5% (location 11 – Nutley Lane east of Nutley lane/Nutley Road junction) at AM peak and 4.8% at PM peak. I would agree with the conclusion in the EIS that the traffic generated will have a 'not significant to slight impact' on most of the neighbouring roads during the network peak periods.

Nutley Lane Junction

6.5.10.12. It is stated above, in relation to internal road network queuing that the proposed changes to the junction will improve its capacity. The improvements proposed are set out in Drawing No. NMH_ARA_T_DR_PA_001. In this regard at the Nutley Lane junction it is proposed to modify the existing signal controlled entrance to allow for a longer right turn egress lane. It is proposed to provide a dedicated right turn lane on Nutley Lane with the existing carriageway to be remarked. It is also proposed to remove 8 parking spaces along Nutley lane to facilitate this right turning lane. The NTA reiterated at the oral hearing that the junction arrangement proposed at Nutley Lane requires a re-examination and that they wish to be consulted with a view to achieving a design which meets the wider transport objectives for this area with the revisions potentially requiring some of the applicant's lands. The applicants indicated at the Oral Hearing that this was acceptable.

Merrion Road Junction

6.5.10.13. In terms of the Merrion Road Junction the improvements proposed are set out in Drawing No. NMH_ARA_T_DR_PA_002. It is proposed to modify the existing signal controlled entrance with the left turn slip land and island to be removed, and pedestrian crossings and signals to be relocated. It is also proposed to provide a left and right turning lane within the internal road from the entrance to St. Rita's car park. I consider that the proposed changes to both junctions should assist in improving the capacity of both junctions. I also consider that the changes to the

MSCP and in particular the provision of a new access from St. Rita's will assist with traffic management within the Campus.

6.5.11. **Construction Access**

6.5.11.1. Concern was raised both within the written submissions and at the Oral Hearing about the absence of detail on the proposed construction access. While included within the public notices, no drawings of the proposed construction access were included within the documentation submitted. The access point located on the southwest boundary of the site adjoining the boundary with Elm Park Golf Club and Nutley Lane, this access point has been used previously to facilitate construction work on the Campus. It is proposed in the present instance to use the construction access to facilitate one-way construction traffic from Nutley Avenue along the internal access road located along the boundary with Elm Park Golf Club and for construction traffic to egress the site using the Merrion Road junction. This would limit the construction traffic accessing the Nutley Lane junction and the internal road within the campus.

6.5.11.2. I consider that the proposal is acceptable in principle, however I acknowledge the concerns of the local residents regarding the absence of any detail regarding the proposed access and in this regard requested that a drawing be made available to the Hearing to facilitate consideration of this proposed element. A drawing was provided on the applicant's behalf to the hearing the title of which is Nutley Lane Proposed Temporary Construction Access dated 1 June 2017. I would suggest to the Board that the detail of the access arrangement would be most appropriately agreed with the Planning Authority as part of the Construction Management Plan.

6.5.11.3. However, concern was expressed by observers as to the length of time that the access would remain usable and the need to clarify its use and duration of same. I would note that Dan Moran (Arup) on the applicant's behalf stated at the hearing that it was envisaged that this temporary access would be required for Phase 1 of the construction period and that following this phase that the Merrion Road access would be the primary access for the project construction. It was proposed as a reserved route (restricted use) for the Phase 2 works. It was stated at the hearing

that restricted use would mean that it would not be used ordinarily and would remain closed but not reinstated.

6.5.11.4. In this regard a proposed condition was put forward on the applicant's behalf to address this concern. The condition proposed states that the use of the proposed temporary construction access on Nutley Lane shall cease on completion of the works set out in the application and the existing boundary treatment reinstated. It further requested that the written agreement of the Planning Authority is sought. I would also suggest that it would be appropriate that the access would not be used outside of the hours of construction. In this regard I consider that the access should be closed each evening at the stipulated time. I would also suggest that it would be a closed-off junction following phase 1 until completion of works on site when it would be permanently removed and the boundary reinstated. I note the comments of Tom Philips relating to the quality of the existing hedging and would propose that the landscaping along this boundary would be of a similar standard to that proposed elsewhere on the Campus.

6.5.11.5. I also note the comments of Mary Conway of Dublin City Council at the oral hearing in relation to the exact section of the City Council which would be responsible for the agreement of matters related to the proposed construction access and note that she recommended that any condition should include agreement with the Road Works Control Section of Dublin City Council.

6.5.11.6. The proximity of the existing bus stop on Nutley Lane to the proposed construction access was also raised. I would that while moving a bus stop is a matter for the NTA in terms of licencing arrangements, the applicant confirmed that the bus stop on Nutley Lane remained in operation during the previous periods of use of this temporary construction access. In this regard I do not consider that it is necessary to require that any amendments are made to its location. Concern was expressed at the hearing about the potential of this access to interfere with third party lands and the proposed cycle path on Nutley Lane. In response Donal McDaid stated that that the drawing had been prepared to show how the access could be facilitated and that the details would be agreed with the City Council.

6.5.11.7. Separating construction traffic from normal traffic using the Nutley Lane junction is appropriate and I would suggest to the Board that if they are minded to grant permission that a condition should be attached seeking written agreement on the access design, and stipulating both its daily and permanent closure, and the landscaping following closure.

6.5.12. **Conclusion**

6.5.12.1. While I acknowledge the concerns addressed by the existing local resident community, the approach undertaken to assess the proposal is robust and based on stated policy to address mobility management on the site. The improvements proposed to the junctions will improve the capacity of same and the proposed improvements to traffic management and flow and car park management will assist, I consider, in improving circulation of traffic and pedestrians within and around the Campus.

6.6. Residential Amenity

6.6.1. Relevant Documentation

The relevant volumes of the EIS and documentation are as follows:

- Volume 1 – (V01.10) Planning Application Documentation – Planning Report
- Volume 2 – (V02.11, V02.12, V02.13) EIS – Noise, Air, Microclimate
- Volume 3 – (V03.J, V03.K, V03.L) EIS Appendices
- Volume 5 – (V05.1) Architectural Design Report
- Volume 6 – (V06.1 & V06.2) Architectural Drawings & Landscape Drawings

6.6.2. Issues raised by observers during the course of the application

6.6.2.1. A number of the submissions raise issues regarding residential amenity considerations. The impacts addressed relate to Herbert Avenue and Nultey Lane in particular both at construction and operational phases of the proposed development.

6.6.3. Oral Hearing

6.6.3.1. In response to the submissions received by the applicant's presentation (Sean Mahon) to the hearing on design and related matters addressed residential amenity. In addition, the applicant's submissions to the hearing on air and climate from Dr. Avril Challoner, on noise impact from Jennifer Harmon and on construction programme management from Dan Moran addressed issues related to the potential impacts on the adjoining residential neighbourhood during the construction phase. Issues raised related to construction traffic and access are addressed at Section 6.4 of this report.

6.6.4. Assessment

6.6.4.1. I am satisfied that the issues raised adequately identity the key potential impacts and I will address each in turn as follows:

- Herbert Avenue
  - Abrupt Transitions
  - Consideration of Herbert Avenue during design process
  - Sunlight/Daylight
  - Overlooking/Overbearing
  - Design details
  - Landscaping along boundary and Noise abatement
  - Lighting proposal along internal roadway
- Nutley Lane/Merrion Road
- Construction Impacts

6.6.4.2. The assessment of the impact of the proposal on the residential amenity of the most proximate residential dwellings relates to the impact of the proposed hospital on the residential properties along Herbert Avenue, the impact of the proposed extension to the car park on properties along Nutley Lane and Merrion Road and the construction Impacts of the proposed development on the surrounding area. As I note above, I am satisfied that the issues raised adequately identity the key potential impacts and I will address each in turn. I would also note that I have addressed matters relating to planning policy and in particular height at Section 6.3 above.

6.6.5. **Abrupt Transitions**

6.6.5.1. Reference is made in the observation from No. 21 Herbert Avenue to the requirement in the City Development Plan to avoid abrupt transitions. Section 14.7 of the Plan refers to ‘Transitional Zone Areas’ and states that it is important to avoid abrupt transitions in scale and use zones. In dealing with development proposals in these contiguous transitional zone areas, it is necessary to avoid developments that would be detrimental to the amenities of the more environmentally sensitive zones. I would suggest to the Board that the separation distances proposed between the proposed development and the existing

properties along Herbert Avenue – ranging from 47-79m - provides that an abrupt transition is avoided. This is a sufficient separation distance, in my opinion. The Plan also requires that particular attention must be paid to the use, scale, density and design of development proposals and to landscaping and screening proposals in order to protect the amenities of residential properties. I would suggest to the Board that the landscaping proposed along the western boundary of the existing internal road and that which might be conditioned as outlined below in relation to landscaping along the eastern boundary of the Campus (addressed below) would provide appropriate mitigation having regard to the separation distances proposed.

6.6.6. **Consideration of Herbert Avenue during design process**

6.6.6.1. The submission from the owners of No. 21 Herbert Avenue, under the heading amenity, considers that there are extensive studies of the Merrion Road in the application documentation but none of the closest residential enclave (Herbert and Estate Avenues) other than limited photomontages. I would not concur with this assertion. The documentation submitted to the Board, both the drawings and the reports submitted and the EIS, comprehensively outline the potential impact of the proposal on the properties along Herbert Avenue. I would refer the Board as an example to Drawing NMH_OCM_A_DR_PA_245 which provides cross sections through each of the properties along Herbert Avenue whose rear boundary addresses the application site. In addition, Chapter 13 of the EIS (V02.13) and the attendant Appendix 13 (V03.L) addresses microclimate with a shadow analysis provided of the impact of the proposed development on Herbert Avenue. The Design Report also outlines the design iterations which led to the final design proposed with the design of the eastern elevation determined having regard to the amenity of the properties on Herbert Avenue. Photomontages, as referenced by the observer, were also included from a number of locations on Herbert Avenue (View F & View G).

6.6.6.2. Concern has also been expressed about the proposed uses along the eastern elevation with reference to the blue light entrance and emergency access on the eastern elevation. The emergency access on the eastern elevation is located

approximately 66 metres from the party boundary with the properties along Herbert Avenue. Furthermore, the entrance is adjoined to the south by the waste marshalling compound and an area of landscaping which is proposed along the northern and eastern boundaries of this waste area. Therefore, the area to the east of the entrance closest to Herbert Avenue has been effectively screened from the emergency entrance. Given the separation distance between the observer's property and the location of the accesses referenced any potential impact would be negligible.

6.6.7. **Sunlight/Daylight**

6.6.7.1. The observation received from the owners of No. 21 Herbert Avenue referred to the absence of shadow studies. I would refer the Board to Volume 03.L (EIS Appendix 13.3) which includes the shadow plots arising in respect of Herbert Avenue post development. The shadow plots are shown for 21st March at 9am, 10am, 11am, 12am, 1pm, 2pm, 3pm, 4pm and 5 pm.

6.6.7.2. A question was raised at the oral hearing regarding the absence of baseline shadow plots for the existing environment in the application documentation. In response, Mr. Cosmin Ticleanu of BRE for the applicant stated that such baseline plots were not required by the Guidelines and refers to Section 13.2.1.2 of the EIS and Section 3.3 of the BRE Guidance to support his contention. Section 13.2.1.2 outlines that the BRE report states that if the centre of the window can receive more than one quarter of annual probable sunlight hours, including at least 5% of annual probable sunlight house in the winter months between 21 September and 21 March then the room should still receive enough sunlight. I consider that the response is reasonable and based on established practice. The detail included at Chapter 13 and the supporting information in Appendix 13.3 are, in my opinion, robust and satisfactorily present the potential loss of sunlight/daylight and the potential for overshadowing along Herbert Avenue which, as noted in the documentation, does not create a negative impact.

6.6.8. **Overlooking/Overbearing**

6.6.8.1. There is concern that the proposed fenestration along the eastern elevation will result in overlooking of properties along Herbert Avenue. Reference is made to the window design in the Private Hospital where the use of flared windows is considered to be an appropriate design response to overlooking. I would acknowledge that there may be a perception of overlooking of the properties along Herbert Avenue given the height of the proposed development. However, as noted elsewhere in this section, the proposed development is located between 47 and 79 metres from the rear building line of properties on Herbert Avenue. In addition, the eastern elevation has been recessed at higher levels where it addresses the properties on Herbert Avenue. It is noted in the submission from Sean Mahon (Design) that at Level 6 of the building the eastern elevation facing Herbert Avenue is recessed a further 16.2m from the building edge. In addition, as acknowledged by the observer, opaque glazing is proposed to terraces along the eastern elevation to prevent overlooking.

6.6.8.2. I would also note that the observer refers to the greater distance from the Private Hospital to the nearest domestic dwelling. However, as noted by Mr. Mahon, the private hospital ranges from 25m to 68m to No's 35 and No. 21 Herbert Avenue respectively meaning that the Private Hospital is closer to the properties along Herbert Avenue than the proposed development. I consider that the separation distance provided between the proposed development and the existing properties is sufficient to ensure that there would not be overlooking of the existing properties. Furthermore, as discussed elsewhere in this section, additional planting is proposed along the internal access road within the Campus and the existing boundary with Herbert Avenue can be augmented, as proposed in this section, to provide additional screening. I would therefore suggest to the Board that overlooking from the proposed development of the properties along Herbert Avenue would not impact negatively on their amenity.

6.6.8.3. In terms of the building creating an overbearing impact on the amenity of properties along Herbert Avenue, I would refer the Board to the separation distances proposed and to the recesses proposed along the eastern elevation as they address the properties along Herbert Avenue. I do not consider that the proposal would have an adversely overbearing impact in this regard.

6.6.9. **Design details**

6.6.9.1. Reference is made to the design details included in the elevations of the Private Hospital and the need to incorporate same into the proposed development. As noted elsewhere in this section, the private hospital is closer to the residential properties in Herbert Avenue, is a higher structure, and is located directly to the south of the properties. As such the design responses which have been incorporated were included specifically having regard to its location vis-à-vis the most proximate properties. Sean Mahon in his presentation to the hearing, in the last section of Section 3.2, notes the specific differences between the existing Private Hospital and the proposed facility which means that the mitigation incorporated into the design of the Private Hospital is not required in the proposed development. I consider that this is reasonable.

6.6.10. **Alternative Designs**

6.6.10.1. I note the submission from Lyons & Co. which considers that there was an absence of alternative designs provided. I would note that the matter of alternatives as it applies to EIA. This is discussed separately at Section 7 below with alternatives including alternative designs discussed. In his presentation to the hearing, Sean Mahon for the Applicant provided a detailed response regarding alternative layouts (section 3.1) and references the Development Control Plan, Feasibility Studies for the Campus and the Draft Site Capacity Study which accompanied the application. I would agree that in terms of alternative layouts, these studies provide evidence of alternatives considered. Mr Mahon also addresses alternative designs in his presentation to the hearing. This addresses areas of the proposal which are specifically for the maternity facility, elements which are SVUH replacement facilities and other elements which are shared. I consider that this is satisfactory addressed. In terms of alternative designs, I would note that the presentation addresses alternative building forms and massing and looks at below ground development. I consider that the concerns expressed in the observation are satisfactorily addressed in this regard.

6.6.11. **Landscaping along Boundary and Noise Abatement**

6.6.11.1. I have addressed the matter of ownership of the lands within the eastern area of the Campus adjoining Herbert Avenue at Section 6.1 above. These lands are within the red line application boundary. In this regard matters pertaining to landscaping along this boundary can be considered within this application. From my visit to the site and to No. 21 Herbert Avenue, there is existing landscaping along this boundary. However, I would note that my visit (July 2017) coincided with the foliage being in full bloom and therefore the mitigating impact of the existing landscaping has its greatest impact. In respect of the observers request for additional landscaping along this boundary I would refer the Board in particular to section 3.4 of Sean Mahon's presentation to the oral hearing in response to issues of design. It was stated that the proposal within the application is to provide additional screening along the western side of the internal roadway but that the applicant has no objection, to additional planting along the boundary with properties on Herbert Avenue (east side of the internal roadway). This can be addressed by a suitable condition.

6.6.11.2. In relation to noise abatement I would refer the Board in particular to the presentation to the hearing by Jennifer Harmon in relation to noise. This presentation looks in particular at the potential noise associated with the proposed development likely to arise along the boundary with Herbert Avenue. It is stated that the assessment undertaken was based on the screening provided by the existing wall along the boundary with the properties in Herbert Avenue. It is stated that the existing internal road is not proposed to be altered with no additional traffic forecast on same as a result of the proposal. It is also noted the existing waste marshalling and delivery yard is proposed to be redesigned with delivery traffic entering at approximately the same location as is currently used, and only occurring during daytime periods. I also note the reference to the new delivery area being lowered by up to 1.9m to form a sunken area with a new retaining wall forming the boundary running the length of the eastern boundary providing a screen height of 4m between the delivery area and existing ground level. I would

also refer the Board to Drawing NMH_OCM_A_DR_PA_245 which provides cross sections of the internal road and delivery area from Herbert Avenue. I would therefore concur with the applicant that the noise impacts have been addressed comprehensively within the proposed design along the eastern boundary and additional noise abatement measures are not required.

6.6.12. **Lighting proposal along internal roadway**

6.6.12.1. Concern is expressed by the owners of No. 21 Herbert Avenue regarding the lighting proposals to deal with the internal roadway which adjoins the eastern boundary of the Campus proximate to the rear boundaries of Herbert Avenue. I would note, in this regard, both Chapter 13 of the EIS (V02.13) which addresses potential light pollution and to the response provided by Sean Mahon at Section 3.5 of his presentation to the hearing on design issues which specifically addresses the observer's issue in this regard. The EIS notes a negligible impact from obtrusive light on Herbert Avenue or Nutley Lane. This assumption is based on computer modelling and calculations using design software. I also note the considerations outlined in terms of light spill from the proposed extension to the multi-storey car park. I consider that the applicant has addressed the concerns satisfactorily.

6.6.13. **Nutley Lane/Merrion Road**

6.6.13.1. Concern was raised in particular by the owners of both no. 67 & 69 Nutley Lane to the location and design of the proposed extension of the Multi-Storey Carpark (MSCP). The proposal before the Board seeks to extend the existing MSCP both horizontally to the west towards the Nutley Lane Campus junction by c.37 metres and vertically to an overall height of 18.84m ODM. As outlined in his presentation to the hearing on design matters, Sean Mahon for the applicant notes that the MSCP is located 20.6m from the Merrion Road footpath and 14.5m from Nutley Lane. The closest edge of the proposed car park is 51 metres from the nearest residential property on Nutley Lane (No. 85) (figures 15 & 19 of Sean Mahon Design Presentation). I would suggest to the Board that this is an acceptable separation distance such that the residential amenity of the property would not be

negatively impacted. I would also note that significant landscape proposals have been outlined for the area of the site to the north of the car park adjoining the boundary with Nutley Lane such that the proposed extension to the car park will be, in my opinion, successfully integrated into the site. I have considered the matter of light spill from the proposed extension to the car park separately above.

6.6.14. **Construction Impacts**

6.6.14.1. The potential impact of the construction phase of the proposed development has been outlined in detail in the EIS. At the oral hearing, the potential impacts of the construction phase as they relate to noise and air quality were specifically addressed by the applicant. I would note that the conclusion of both submissions is that subject to compliance with the mitigation proposed that the impact on the adjoining residential areas would not be adverse. The hours of construction were clarified. Works outside of the proposed construction hours were stated to be subject to the agreement of the Council and in exceptional circumstances. I do note that the construction period is proposed to take 56 months, which is a considerable time, and will lead to some inconvenience for adjoining residents. As outlined in the submission to the hearing relating to the Construction Programme Management, there are 3 phases to the proposed development – Campus Enabling Work's, Phase 1 (Block A) and Phase 2 (Block F). I am satisfied that the potential impacts on neighbouring properties, most particularly those on Nutley Lane and Herbert Avenue, can be mitigated and controlled by the proposed Construction Management Plan. I would also note that, in addition to protecting the residential amenity of proximate residential areas, a key factor is maintaining an operational Hospital Campus.

6.6.15. **Conclusion**

6.6.15.1. I consider that the potential impacts on the residential amenity of adjoining properties within the vicinity of the proposed development have been adequately and appropriately addressed and subject to the applicant's compliance with the mitigation measures outlined in respect of the construction phase that the

proposed development will not have an adverse impact on the existing residential community.

6.7. Design Context and Visual Impact

6.7.1. Relevant Documentation

6.7.1.1. The relevant volumes of the EIS and documentation are as follows:

- Volume 1 (V01.12)– Planning Application Documentation – Planning Report
- Volume 2 – (V02.14 & V02.15) - EIS –– Visual Impact Assessment & Cultural Heritage
- Volume 4 –(V04) EIS – Photomontages
- Volume 5 – (V05.1) - Architectural Design Report
- Volume 6 – (V06.1 & V06.2) - Architectural and Landscape Drawings.

6.7.2. Issues raised by observers during the course of the application and during the oral hearing

6.7.2.1. Issues raised regarding design and visual impact related in particular to the impact of the eastern elevation of the proposal on Herbert Avenue and to the extension to the multi-storey car park on Nutley Lane.

6.7.3. Oral Hearing

6.7.3.1. The matter of design was addressed at the Oral Hearing by Sean Mahon in his presentation regarding design and related matters. I would note that the matter of design was not specifically addressed by observers other than in relation to impact on residential amenity which is addressed in Section 6.5 above.

6.7.4. Assessment

6.7.4.1. The key issues which I have identified are as follows:

- Sense of Identity
- Layout and Landscaping
- Location and Visual Impact of Car park

- Impact on Built Heritage

6.7.5. **Sense of Identity**

6.7.5.1. One of the matters which I consider is relevant to both the consideration of design and traffic matters, as I have addressed above, is the sense of identity created by the proposed development and the subsequent creation of a sense of place on the site. While this matter was not addressed in the observations or at the hearing in any detail, I consider that it is relevant to the consideration of the application particularly as it relates to the layout of the site. The proposed hospital is located to the east of the Campus effectively bookending the east-west thoroughfare that runs through the site. While it effectively extends the existing Clinical Services Building, the design proposed provides that it has its own expression, and would be identifiable as the Maternity Hospital facility on the Campus. It is designed to both integrate with the existing Campus but also to create its own context. In this regard activity emanating to and from the facility will, I would suggest, be concentrated to the east of the Campus. I have addressed this above in terms of traffic.

6.7.5.2. In terms of the design proposed, I consider that the massing and built form integrate successfully with existing development on the Campus but equally provide that the facility is easily identifiable within the Campus. The design features apparent on the visible elevations are well considered and it is apparent from both the treatment of the elevations and the materials proposed that the design process incorporated consideration of multiple factors. I consider that the design of the entrance, which punctuates the northern elevation, creates a suitable focal point for the facility and breaks down the mass of the elevation along the northern boundary edge.

6.7.5.3. In this regard I would refer the Board to the City Architects submission included with the submission from Dublin City Council to the Board where they state that the design response is successful in breaking down the scale of the building particularly along its eastern and northern edges. In terms of design details, the City Architect refers specifically to the solid to void ratios of glazing and the pattern

of fenestration which they consider is appropriate to the scale of the building and which they consider assists in animating the building facades. Reference is also made to the use of granite facades which they consider is respectful to the tradition of building civic buildings from stone and connects the proposal to other buildings on the campus which are also clad in granite. I would also note that the City Council stated that the entrance to the emergency section at the east side of building is less evident than the main entrance and assumed access by ambulance rather than private car. As noted above, the main entrance to the hospital has been designed so that it is the focal point of entry. While I note the City Council consider that it is regrettable that direct level access is not provided on all floors, the design report and other documentation on file and Sean Mahon in his presentation to the hearing outlined in detail the level changes across the site. As is set out elsewhere in this report, the key direct access is achieved on the fourth floor level where theatres in the existing adult hospital will be rapidly accessible from theatres within the proposed facility.

6.7.5.4. I would also note that the internal spaces created by the layout are spacious and well considered allowing views from walkways within the facility which creates visual interest internally. I note the City Council submission suggests a number of internal reconfigurations in terms of the location of the shop/café and female WC however, I do not consider that the changes proposed alter the proposal materially in terms of experience. I have addressed the matter of height in the context of policy at Section 6.3 above. In addition, I have addressed height as it relates to impact on residential amenity of adjoining properties in Section 6.5. I would note, in terms of how the height of the proposal relates to the design, that the proposal integrates successfully with the existing Clinical Services Building and with the other substantial structures within the Campus.

6.7.6. **Layout and Landscaping**

6.7.6.1. One of the design features of the proposed development is the creation of an entrance plaza feature to the front of the proposed hospital from the main entrance to the hospital and car park opposite, extending along the existing east-west internal road and connecting with the north-south pedestrian pathway which

links the Merrion Road pedestrian access point to the centre of the Campus. While cars will still be facilitated through this space it is stated at Section 2.3.9.1 of the EIS that this new civic spaces accommodates drop-offs but is principally pedestrian in nature. It is described as being developed to provide the first element of the Campus 'heart' and comprises c.2,700 sq.m of landscaped forecourt area incorporating tress, signage, public art, signage and seating areas.

6.7.6.2. I note the question at the hearing regarding the number of speed bumps likely to be incorporated into the design. This emanates from the submission put forward on behalf of the Nutley Lane residents that ambulances use the Nutley Lane junction to access the hospital to avoid the speed bumps on the existing internal road. In response the Landscape Architect stated that raised platforms are proposed rather than a series of speed bumps as currently exists. The proposed new access to the Multi-Storey Carpark via the existing St Rita's car park will provide that cars using the Merrion Road entrance can access the MSCP without travelling through this space. This will facilitate a more pedestrian friendly environment. I consider that the proposed layout will improve the amenity of the Campus creating a usable outdoor space within the proposed entrance plaza outside the hospital entrance and creating a more pedestrian/cycle friendly environment along the east/west access road which will be a shared surface.

6.7.7. **Location and Visual impact of Car park**

6.7.7.1. Some concern was expressed in a number of observations at the proposed extension to the existing Multi-storey carpark (MSCP) and the potential impact of same on the properties on Nutley Lane in particular. This matter was addressed at Section 3.3 of Sean Mahon's response to the hearing who noted that the MSCP is set back 14.5m from Nutley Lane and 20.6m from the Merrion Road footpath. Reference is also made to the use of the fall in ground levels across the site. The ground level of the car park is below the level of the adjoining public road. This is outlined in a section included in this presentation (Figure No. 20). Figure 19 of the same presentation shows the distances from the proposed car park extension to the properties on Nutley Lane, with No. 85 Nutley Lane most proximate at 51 metres. The proposed extension to the car park would not, in my opinion, impact

negatively on either the visual amenity of the area nor would it impact on the residential amenity of properties in the vicinity given the separation distances proposed.

6.7.7.2. The submission from Dublin City Council referred to landscaping in the vicinity of the car park and in particular to a proposal by the Council to provide trellis and planting screening on all sides of the car park so that it would completely merged into the landscape. In response it was stated in the presentation to the hearing (section 3.3 Sean Mahon) that the north, south and eastern elevations of the car park are open for ventilation purposes and therefore it would not be possible to completely cover all sides in the trellis and planting screen. It is stated that the proposed strategy provides for screening of the 'open' elevations by a series of continuous planters which extend along the full length of each floor level with the foliage draping down to screen each floor, and providing a vegetative screen to the north, south and east elevations. The applicant in this regard has requested that the Board consider that the extensive planting proposed in the landscape strategy for the area is consistent with the current landscape features on the site. I consider that the planting proposed is appropriate and do not concur with the City Council on the need to completely screen the car park by the measure proposed.

6.7.8. **Impact on Built Heritage**

6.7.8.1. The matter of the impact of the proposal on the Z2 zoning within Herbert Avenue was raised in an observation. This area is zoned residential conservation area but I would note that it is not an Architectural Conservation Area (ACA). As I note above, the proposed development is located between 47m – 79m from the rear building lines of the properties along Herbert Avenue. The proposal development will be visible from parts of the Avenue where gaps exist in the streetscape, however I would suggest to the Board that such views are oblique and I do not consider that the proposal would have an adverse impact on the setting of Herbert Avenue. I would suggest that the location of the Private Hospital development has a more significant impact on Herbert Avenue given its location.

6.7.8.2. There are a number of structures of architectural merit within the vicinity of the eastern boundary of the Hospital Campus. Figure 15.6 of the EIS outlines the structures of architectural heritage merit within the vicinity of the site. Pembroke Cottage (Carew House) is within the Campus and located to the southeast of the proposed development as is the former entrance to Bloomfield House which comprises a stone arch in gothic style, behind which there is an existing service cabinet. Table 15.1 outlines the protected structures within 500m of the proposal with the structures on Estate Avenue the most proximate.

6.7.8.3. The policy of the Planning Authority as set out in Policy CHC4 seeks to protect the special interest and character of all Dublin's Conservation Areas. Development within or affecting all conservation areas will contribute positively to the character and distinctiveness and take opportunities to protect and enhance the character and appearance of the area and its setting wherever possible. I consider that the proposed development would not impact on the special interest or character of any buildings which are of special architectural merit.

6.7.9. **Conclusion**

6.7.9.1. As I have outlined above, I consider that the matter of the proposed design and the visual impact of same has been satisfactorily addressed by the applicant in the design and layout of the proposed development and that the development would note adversely affect the character or the visual amenity of the area.

7.0 Environmental Impact Assessment

7.1. Statutory Provisions

7.1.1. The Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Directive (2014/52/EU) entered into force on 15 May 2014, with a requirement that it be transposed into national legislation by 16 May 2017. The Directive has not to date been transposed into Irish legislation. This application was submitted to the Board prior to 16 May 2017, the date for transposition of Directive 2014/52/EU amending the 2011 EIA Directive. Under the transitional provisions of the 2014 Directive, the 2011 Directive (Directive 2011/92/EU) as transposed into Irish legislation will apply to the application.

7.1.2. The application was accompanied by an EIS, which is mandatory for the proposed development under the provisions of Section 37E(1) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended which states that an application for permission for development in respect of which a notice has been served under Section 37B(4)(a) shall be made to the Board and shall be accompanied by an environmental impact statement in respect of the proposed development.

7.1.3. The EIS is laid out as follows:

- Volume 1 - Statutory Particulars (Volume 1A) and Planning Drawings (Volume 1B);
- Volume 2 – Environmental Impact Statement including Non-Technical Summary (Volume 02.B);
- Volume 3 - Environmental Impact Statement – Appendices;
- Volume 4 - Environmental Impact Statement – Photomontages

7.1.4. As per the requirements of the EIA Directive, the EIS is required to:

- Describe the project and provides information on the site, the design of the proposed development and size of the project,
- Describe the measures envisaged to avoid, reduce, and if possible, remedy significant adverse effects,
- Provide sufficient data to identify and assess the main effects which the project is likely to have on the environment,

- Provide a description of the main alternatives studied by the developer an indication of the main reasons for the choice of alternative put forward, taking into account environmental effects, and
- Include a non-technical summary of the above information.

7.1.5. The EIS includes a Non-Technical Summary at Volume 2.B. Volume 2 also includes a number of Chapters establishing the context of the proposed development. The Introduction at Volume 2.1 outlines the stated Strategic Need for the proposed development in the context of the existing service provision and healthcare policy. It also outlines the Government decision on the proposed development. Volume 2.2 details the site and the proposed development and Volume 2.3 provides a planning and development context for the proposed development.

7.1.6. I am satisfied that the information contained in the EIS complies with article 94 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2000.

7.1.7. This EIA has had regard to the application documentation, including the EIS, the NIS, the observations received, the oral hearing proceedings and the Planning Assessment completed in Section 6 above.

7.2. Alternatives

7.2.1. The matter of alternatives is addressed in Volume 2.4 of the EIS. I would note that it was also addressed in Section C, Para. 21 of the Legal Submission presented to the oral hearing and in the submission presented to the hearing by Sean Mahon in relation to design issues. The applicant is required, by the EIA Directive which correlates to Schedule 6 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended, to provide an outline of the main alternatives studied by the developer and an indication of the main reasons for his choice, taking into account the environmental effects. The applicant sets out the EU and Irish legislative context in respect of alternatives and then outlines the strategic need and healthcare policy which they consider support the location of the proposed development on the subject site. Reference is also made to the Governments Capital Plan “Building on Recovery: Infrastructure and Capital Investment 2016-2021 which states that the National Maternity Hospital will be relocated to the St. Vincent’s Campus (pg 31).

7.2.2. In relation to alternative locations, the EIS refers to the KPMG report entitled 'Independent Review of Maternity and Gynaecology Services in the Greater Dublin Area, 2008 which proposed a reconfiguration of the existing Maternity service model and recommended preferred sites with the three maternity hospitals to be co-located with an adult acute hospital with the NMH to move to St. Vincent's Hospital. In May 2013 the Minister for Health announced the intention of the Government to relocate the NMH to St. Vincent's on the basis of the recommendations set out in the 2008 KPMG report. Reference is also made to the National Maternity Strategy 2016-2026 which refers to the proposal herein and to the objectives to ensure all maternity hospitals are co-located with adult acute hospitals. In terms of alternative locations, I consider that the applicants have provided sufficient evidence to support the location of the site particularly given the policy context which supports the proposal as outlined above in detail in Section 6.3 of this report.

7.2.3. Alternative locations on the St. Vincent's site are also addressed. The feasibility studies undertaken of the campus are outlined including the 2005 Development Control Plan which identified the low density areas of the site are considered to be underutilised. Further feasibility studies were carried out in 2012 and 2013 in respect of the accommodation of the NMH with the 2013 study providing a number of options both for the Hospital building location and form and parking options for the site.

7.2.4. Alternative designs are also addressed which looks in particular at building form, footprint, height and massing. Alternative locations and design options are also considered for the replacement SVUH facilities with the option of a standalone building considered. Alternative designs are also set out for the car park with a mix of vertical and horizontal extensions and mix of both in addition to the consideration of a new multi-storey car park. Alternative processes are set out in respect of the sequencing of building construction on the site. This is of some significance, I would suggest, given the requirement that the existing hospital facilities must remain operational during the course of the construction phase.

7.2.5. I would also note that in response to the submission from Lyons & Co. which considers that there was an absence of alternative designs provided, Sean Mahon for the Applicant provided a detailed response (section 3.1) and references the

Development Control Plan, Feasibility Studies for the Campus and the Draft Site Capacity Study which accompanied the application. Mr Mahon also addressed alternative designs in his presentation to the hearing. This addresses areas of the proposal which are specifically for the maternity facility, elements which are SVUH replacement facilities, and other elements which are shared. I consider that this is satisfactory addressed. In terms of alternative designs, I would note that the presentation addresses alternative building forms and massing and looks at below ground development. I consider that the concerns expressed in the observation are satisfactorily addressed in this regard.

7.2.6. The alternative locations on site, alternative designs for both the hospital and the car park and the alternative processes are outlined in considerable detail. The evolution of the proposal has been clearly outlined in respect of the consideration, in particular, of the capacity of the site to accommodate the proposal. In this regard I consider that the matter of the examination of alternatives has been satisfactorily addressed.

Likely Significant Direct and Indirect Effects

7.3. Human Beings

7.3.1. The likely significant direct and indirect effects on human beings are considered in respect of population, employment and the community at Volume 2.5. The community is considered to comprise the residential, working and visiting community. The predicted impacts are not considered to be significant and I would consider this to be a reasonable prediction given the established use on this Campus and the nature and extent of the proposed development. I would note that it is anticipated that the construction phase of c.56 months would generate a peak of approximately 500-600 construction jobs with the number varying throughout the various phases. Employment associated with the operational phase is stated to comprise principally the staff from the existing hospital and I note the proposed staffing complement is 1,112 persons. In terms of the impact on the community, while the construction phase is likely to have some impact on the local resident population this will not be significant. I would also note the content of the Draft Construction Management Plan included at Appendix 2.1 of Volume 3

and the alternative processes considered in order to ensure that the existing Hospital facilities remain operational. I consider that the mitigation measures proposed in respect of air quality & climate, noise & vibration and traffic & transportation seek to mitigate the potential impacts on the local resident population in particular.

7.4. Flora & Fauna

7.4.1.1. Flora and Fauna including biodiversity is addressed in Volume 2.9 of the EIS. The site comprises an existing Hospital Campus in an urban environment. Details are outlined of the surveys undertaken on the site particularly in respect of bats. Reference is also made to protected sites in order to facilitate, it is stated the Board in its carrying out of a comprehensive environmental assessment of all potential impacts on biodiversity. There are 18 European Sites within 15km of the application site the closes of which is South Dublin Bay cSAC (site code 000210) and South Dublin Bay and River Tolka SPA (site code 004024) c. 380m to the east of the application site. The proximity of the nearest pNHA (South Dublin Bay pNHA is also outlined. The mitigation measures set out in the Natura Impact Statement are included at section 9.6 of the EIS and I note are included in the draft Construction Management Plan (V03.C). The Habitat types identified within the application site are included in Figure 9.4. Bat activity was not recorded at any of the buildings on the application site with the only bat activity recorded occurring along the treeline c.135m to the south of the application site adjacent to the Elm Park Golf Club. Mitigation measures are proposed to prevent pollution (as detailed elsewhere and outlined in the Draft Construction Management Plan) and it is advised that lighting proposals for the site should adhere to Bats and Lighting Guidance. I consider that the matter of Flora and Fauna including biodiversity has been adequately addressed. Reference is also made to the Natura Impact Statement submitted and Appropriate Assessment is addressed separately at Section 8 below.

7.5. Soil

7.5.1. Soils are considered with Geology and Hydrogeology in Volume 2.7. The proposed development includes a deep excavation for the construction of a single storey basement with the base of same expected to be in glacial till. Other construction work of relevance is the cut and cover excavation for the multi-storey car park entrance ramp. In addition, works such as shallow excavations for pad foundations, secant pile walls/sheet pile walls, pavement reconstruction and disposal of groundwater are proposed. The potential impacts identified at construction phase on soils include the excavation of inert soils and contamination of soils. In relation to hydrogeology, the potential impacts identified relate to groundwater quality, flows and levels. Other impacts include dust and odours associated with excavation and disposal of soil.

7.5.2. The potential for a change in groundwater flow as a result of the construction below ground level is identified, with the significance determined as negligible. It is stated that the structures below ground level may create a barrier to flow, however the low permeability glacial till in the area suggests that any impact would be imperceptible. This is reasonable and the mitigation outlined in Section 7.6 is considered appropriate. Interaction and Cumulative Impacts are included at Section 7.10 and I note the potential interactions with Traffic & Transportation, Hydrology, Noise & Vibration, Air Quality and Waste Management all of which are outlined summarily. In terms of potential cumulative impacts, with none of the developments outlined in Table 7.16 are considered to be sufficiently proximate to create a cumulative impact.

7.6. Water

7.6.1. Hydrology is addressed in Volume 2.8 and a flood risk assessment is included at Appendix 8.1 of Volume 3. There are no surface waterbodies traversing the site. The nearest surface water body is a culverted section of the Nutley Stream located along Nutley Lane to the northwest of the site. The Elm Park stream is located c.360m to the south-east of the site. The risk of tidal flooding is stated to be very low, with groundwater flooding also low given the low water table. It is

noted that results of the Preliminary Flood Risk Mapping undertaken by the OPW and published in 2012 suggest a minor risk of pluvial flooding at the site. Measures are proposed to mitigate the risk with a fall away from the building entrance and a low-point within the landscaping external to the building serviced by gullies draining into the attenuation tank under the landscaping. The Draft Construction Management Plan proposes to include mitigation measures for the construction phase principally to prevent the pollution of waters. They are set out in detail in Section 8.6.1.1 and I am satisfied that they are well considered. Pumping of the excavation area is also proposed during construction for the deeper phases. I note that interactions are considered between Hydrology and Soils, Geology and Hydrogeology and with Hydrology and Flora and Fauna which are reasonable. No cumulative impacts are predicted.

7.7. Air

7.7.1. Volume 02.12 addresses air quality and climate and states that the greatest potential impact on air quality during the construction phase of the development is from construction dust emissions and the potential for nuisance dust and PM_{10}/$PM_{2.5}$ emissions. During the operational phase the potential for traffic related air emissions is noted in addition to the boilers and generators on site which may give rise to some air emissions. Strict mitigation is proposed and outlined in a dust minimisation plan included in Appendix 12.3 and the draft construction management plan. I consider that the assessment undertaken is satisfactory.

7.8. Climate

7.8.1. Volume 02.13 of the EIS addresses microclimate which involves the likely potential daylight, sunlight, overshadowing, light pollution and wind impacts of the proposal. In terms of daylight, sunlight and overshadowing the chapter outlines the guidance and standards applicable and means of calculation of same. The impacts on the nearest dwellings to the proposal is outlined (operational phase) at section 13.5.2 including those on Herbert Avenue, whose rear facades will face the east façade of the proposed development. Table 13.5 outlines the ratio of distance to height difference and obstruction angle from the rear of Herbert Avenue. The loss of daylight in all instances meets the BRE guidelines. Loss of

sunlight is not an issue, it is stated, as the rear of the properties in Herbert Avenue face northwest and are therefore not within 90 degrees of due south. The results for properties along Merrion Road show that they comfortably meet the obstruction angle criteria in the BRE guidelines. In terms of the impact of the proposed extension to the multi-storey car park, the obstruction angle is well below 25 degrees and is, therefore, in compliance with the BRE Guidelines.

7.8.2. In relation to sunlight provision to existing gardens, it is noted that shadow plots have been provided which are included in Appendix 13.3. The requirement in the Guidance is that at least half of a garden area should receive at least 2 hours of sunlight on 21st March with the shadow plots indicating this would be the case with the proposed development. No mitigation is considered to be necessary. I consider that the findings outlined have been satisfactorily demonstrated to meet the Guidance document referenced in the City Plan. No evidence has been produced during the application process to refute the findings and I consider that the documentation as presented is reasonable. As I outlined above in Section 6.5, a question was raised at the oral hearing regarding the absence of baseline shadow plots for the existing environment in the application documentation. In response, Mr. Cosmin Ticleanu of BRE for the applicant stated that these were not required by the Guidelines and refers to Section 13.2.1.2 of the EIS and Section 3.3 of the BRE Guidance. As noted by Mr. O'Neill for the applicant at the hearing, an analysis of the receiving environment requires an examination of same which would facilitate in this case whether the baseline conditions would necessitate the creation of baseline plots. I would concur with this argument. I also note that the potential impact of solar glare has been addressed and it is concluded that such glare would be negligible. I consider the findings to be reasonable.

7.8.2.1. In relation to light pollution, the Chapter addresses the potential of light spill on Herbert Avenue which is predicted to be negligible. In terms of mitigation during the construction phase measures are proposed for work carried out outside daylight hours. In terms of the operational phase, it is stated that good practice measures for installation and commissioning of new lighting is implemented. I consider that this matter has been satisfactorily addressed. The potential and predicted impacts on the local wind micro-climate are addressed with the potential

for the creation of windier conditions in places within the vicinity of the proposed development than currently exists. Appendix 13 includes a graphical representation of the results for the proposed development at windest season and summer. Mitigation by way of landscaping is proposed in order to address anticipated conditions near the north-east and south-east corners during the construction phase with hoarding recommended in these areas to restrict public access until the landscaping is in place.

7.9. Landscape

7.9.1. A visual impact assessment is contained at Volume 02.14 of the EIS with a series of 21 photomontages appended as Appendix 14.1 within Volume 04. I have addressed the matter of design and visual impact at Section 6.6 of the planning assessment above. I also note the comments of Dublin City Council in their submission (section 6.4.4) to the Board on the application in respect of visual impact. The Chapter outlines the definitions of visual impact (EPA Guidelines 2002) at Section 14.2.1. Having regard to the impacts at construction phase outlined at Section 14.5.1, I would concur with the conclusion that the construction phase will have limited impact with the impacts as the development nears completion as per the operational phase.

7.9.2. In terms of operational impacts, the EIS includes 21 viewpoints from where photomontages of the proposed development are provided. I would suggest that the proposal is most visible from within the Campus itself (including the Private Hospital), from the Merrion Road entrance and approach to same, and from Herbert Avenue. I propose to assess each of potential impacts identified as presented in Table 14.1 of the EIS starting with those views considered to have no impact and moving through the magnitude of impact up to those views which are considered moderate.

7.9.3. The potential impact of three of the views presented is stated to be none. They are the view from Sydney Parade Dart Station (View N), the view from Bellview Park, looking into Elm Park Golf Club (View P) and the view from the UCD Campus just south of Belfield House (View Q). I would concur with the EIS that there will be no visual impact on any of these views. The impact on one view, the view from West Pier in Dun Laoghaire (View T) is determined as none to imperceptible with the

proposal not visible from most locations and where visible the impact is imperceptible. I would tend to agree with this consideration although would suggest that it is nearer to no impact than imperceptible. The impact from the Merrion Road southeast of the Merrion Gates (View E) is considered to be none to slight. This view provides that the development would be concealed by the trees in summer and visible in winter. The photomontage shows the trees without foliage with the development visible however, I would agree that when it is visible that the impact is slight given that it is read as part of the existing development within the area.

7.9.4. Three of the views are determined to be imperceptible which is defined as capable of measurement but without noticeable consequences. The first of these views is the view from Merrion Road from the Merrion Gates (View D). I agree with this finding, with the foliage in the foreground effectively screening the impact. The view from Poolbeg (View S) is also stated to be imperceptible, which I consider reasonable as while it is visible it does not create any noticeable change to the view. The view from Howth (View U) provides that it is difficult to discern the proposed development and I consider that an imperceptible impact is appropriate.

7.9.5. Two views are determined to be imperceptible to slight. The view from Elm Park Golf Club (View O) as proposed in the montage provides that glimpses of the proposed structure are visible but given the context within which they are set the impact is slight, which I consider is reasonable. From Mount Anville Road in Mount Merrion (View R) the proposal will be visible over the treeline in the view but the impact as proposed, I would agree, is slight.

7.9.6. One view is considered to be imperceptible to moderate. This is the view near the centre of Herbert Avenue looking north (View G), where it is considered the proposal would form a minor element in the view. I would agree. The proposal effectively fills in a gap within the streetscape which would be an expected element of a view within a built up area such as the subject area. Two views assessed are considered to comprise impacts determined as slight to moderate. The view from Merrion Road southeast of Herbert Avenue (View C) I would suggest is more slight than moderate, as the roof of the structure is visible but does not dominate the view given the context within which it is set. The other view determined as slight to moderate is the view from Nutley Avenue at the entrance

to St. Michael's College (View M). The extension to the car park is visible but does not in my opinion alter the view in any negative way. The proposed hospital building reads as an add-on to the existing SVUH structure.

7.9.7. Eight of the views presented are considered to have a moderate impact. This is the most significant impact magnitude presented. Moderate impact, I note, is defined as an impact that alters the character of the environment in a manner that is consistent with emerging trends. Therefore, the test would be to see, in my opinion, whether the impact likely to arise is consistent with the recently emerging built environment. The first two views are from Merrion Road, firstly from Ailesbury Park (View A) and secondly from the Merrion Road entrance to the Campus (View B). From Ailesbury Park (View A) the proposed development is visible and alters the view but it is consistent with the existing context of buildings of similar height at either side of the view. From the entrance to the Campus from Merrion Road (View B), the proposed development is clearly visible making an impact but again is consistent with the views you would expect within the existing Hospital Campus. The content of the view, I would suggest, is not out of context.

7.9.8. The view from near the centre of Herbert Avenue looking west (View F), is similar to those outlined above, in that the proposal is clearly visible with the view altered considerably but it is read, I would suggest, within the context of the surrounding development.

7.9.9. The remaining five views are within or on the edge of the Campus itself. Views are provided from the entrance to the Private Hospital (View H), near the entrance to the Herbert Wing (View I), outside the Clinical Services Building (View J), from the vehicular access to the A & E Department (View K) and from the pedestrian lights on Nutley Lane (View L). In each of the first 4 of the 5 views, the proposed hospital is visible altering the view to a considerable degree. However, the proposal is read within the context of the existing hospital Campus which includes significant structures at present. Therefore, the change in the view is consistent with the receiving environment. I would also note the additional montages provided for View J in terms of the proposed landscaping of this area. The view from Nutley Lane (View L) is dominated by the proposed changes to the Multi-storey car park which, while changing the view, is not significantly different.

7.9.10. I would therefore conclude in terms of visual impact, that the proposal will be visible particularly within the local and immediate context but given the receiving environment of the hospital Campus that the impact is consistent with what would be expected to emerge within the site. Therefore, I would concur that the impact of greatest magnitude would be moderate and that the proposal would not have a significant adverse visual impact on the area.

7.10. Material Assets – Traffic

7.10.1. I have assessed the matter of Traffic and Transport in considerable detail at Section 6.4 above and in particular outline the approach taken to the transport strategy for the site which is underpinned by sustainable transport principles. The strategy underpinning the approach is acceptable. This includes the proposed reduction in the modal share for car users from 51% in the SVUH and 47% at the NMH to a combined 34%. The other modal shares proposed for the combined Campus are 29% using public transport, 20% cycling and 11% walking. One of the key mobility management tools proposed is the limitation of car parking on site particularly for staff. This provides that of the 277 spaces proposed for the new facility 135 spaces are for staff and 142 are for visitors to the facility. While there was some discussion as to the acceptability of the 65% for visitors using cars to access the facility I consider that this is reasonable particularly given the proximity of the Sydney Parade DART station to the facility.

7.10.2. An access and circulation strategy for the Campus is presented at Section 6.5.2 of the EIS. It should be noted that pedestrian access is provided along three routes (Figure 6.32) with improvements proposed within the Campus for cycle access (Figure 6.33) including changes to the access to the multi-storey car park with a new access point via St. Rita's Car Park and the provision of an additional 235 spaces for bicycle parking. Therefore, I consider that the improvements to the cycling and pedestrian environments including the traffic calmed forecourt will result in a more pedestrian/cycle friendly Campus. In terms of the existing accesses to the Campus, amendments are also proposed to both entrances – Nutley Lane (dedicated right turn lane on Nutley Lane, removal of 8 parking spaces and internal right turn lane extended) and Merrion Road (internal left turn lane extended, left turn slip lane and refuge island removed and direct pedestrian

crossing provided) to address issues experienced at peak periods. Subject to amendments required to facilitate cycle lanes I consider that the proposed amendments are acceptable.

7.10.3. A suite of mitigation measures is outlined for the construction phase which are set out in the Construction Traffic Management Plan and for the operational phase through the proposed Mobility Management Plan, limited staff parking on Campus, improvements to cycle facilities and improvements to the existing Campus entrances. The predicted impacts both at construction and operational phase are considered not to be significant at construction phase and at operational stage range from imperceptible to slight. I consider that the impacts predicted are reasonable and that the approach undertaken in respect of mobility and demand management provides that the impact on the traffic network will not be significant.

7.10.4. Interactions are considered in the context of the interactions with human beings, air quality and noise and vibration all of which are assessed in the individual chapters. I consider that these interactions are reasonable. Potential cumulative impacts are addressed with specific reference to the development of the RTE Campus which given the proposal to close the access onto Nutley Lane will impact positively on Nutley Lane. Impacts from the proposed office developments at the RDS and AIB Bank centre which are considered to have a negligible impact. In addition, the occupation of the office development at Elm Park are unlikely to be significant. I consider that the cumulative impacts addressed are satisfactory.

7.10.5. I consider, as I have outlined at Section 6.4 above that strategy and approach undertaken is appropriate and will I would suggest result in minimal impacts on the traffic network which is one of the objectives of such a strategy.

7.11. Utilities

7.11.1. Chapter16 of the EIS addresses the potential construction and operational impacts on utilities including natural gas, Oil (Class D), medical gases, electricity and telecommunications. In order to facilitate the continued operation of the existing Hospital on campus, the phasing has been proposed so that the functions accommodated in the buildings to be demolished are relocated to other areas of the Campus on a temporary basis. Figure 16.1 outlines the site sequencing for the

main construction works. Predicted impacts include the potential for interruptions to supplies which it is proposed with such outages to be controlled. The installation of new and relocated services within the site and around the campus will have impacts during the construction phase due to the construction activity required. Other than the increased consumption of energy to facilitate the development the operational phase is not predicted to have any impacts. Mitigation measures for the proposed construction phase are outlined which form part of the design process. I consider that the consideration of impacts is reasonable and the mitigation measures outlined are satisfactory.

7.11.2. Having regard to the considerable amount of demolition involved in decanting the application site, a detailed Construction and Demolition Waste Management Plan is included at Appendix 10.1 of Volume 3. It is estimated that there will be a total of 5706 tonnes of demolition waste (Table 10.1). For the construction phase a Construction Management Plan is proposed, a draft of which is included at Appendix 2.1) with an Operational Waste Management Plan proposed for the operational phase which is included at Appendix 10.2 and which includes clinical and non-clinical non-risk and risk waste. It is noted that the waste types envisaged are the same waste types currently generated at the existing facility. Having regard to the existing waste management facility on the site and the proposal to decant same and to provide a similar facility within the proposed scheme it is considered that the impacts identified and the proposed strategy for mitigating waste have been appropriately considered.

7.12. Cultural Heritage

7.12.1. Archaeology, architecture and cultural heritage are addressed in Chapter 15 of the EIS. In respect of archaeology, the receiving environment is set out in Section 15.3 and includes a summary of previous archaeological fieldwork in the vicinity of the site including testing adjacent to the site of Merrion Castle to the south east of the site in 2000, where nothing of significance was identified. It is noted that in 2002 testing to the south of the castle found a low density of archaeological features. In respect of the field inspection undertaken it is noted that the Hospital site has been thoroughly disturbed and it is likely that if any archaeological remains did survive within the site that they have been removed by the

development undertaken. I note that no adverse impacts are anticipated and given the scale of development that exists on the site, I consider that this is a reasonable determination. In this regard no mitigation is proposed which is satisfactory, in my opinion.

7.12.2. In respect of architecture Figure 15.6 outlines the structures with architectural heritage merit with Pembroke Cottage (Carew House) located within the Campus located to the southeast of the proposed development as is the former entrance to Bloomfield House. The structures on Herbert Avenue are outlined, as are structures along Merrion Road. Table 15.1 outlines the protected structures within 500m of the proposal with the structures on Estate Avenue the most proximate. The EIS considers that no potential adverse impacts on architecture are predicted and I would concur given the existing scale of development on the site.

7.12.3. No sties of cultural heritage merit have been identified in the area and in this regard no impacts are predicted. I consider that this is a reasonable conclusion to reach and having regard to the receiving environment the proposed development would not have significant impacts on the cultural heritage of the area.

7.13. Interactions between the foregoing

7.13.1. While impact interactions are addressed within each of the individual sections of the EIS, Table 17.1 tabulates the interactions which provides a useful tool in understanding the interactions likely to arise with a summary of same provided in Section 17.3. As an example, the interactions between human beings and the other environmental factors (traffic & transportation, waste management, noise & vibration, air quality & climate, microclimate, visual impact and archaeological, architecture and cultural heritage) is addressed in detail and highlights the potential impacts. These were addressed in the relevant preceding chapters and assessed where relevant in this assessment and therefore I do not consider it is necessary to repeat same. It is sufficient, I would suggest, to state that the EIS has satisfactorily addressed the requirement to address interactions and the proposed development is not, in my view, likely to result in significant adverse impacts in terms of the interaction of the factors of the environment.

7.14. Cumulative Impacts

7.14.1. The matter of cumulative impacts is addressed in particular at Section 17.4 of the EIS (V02.17). I would note that the section looks at a number of development types and considerations which I would suggest provides for a thorough appreciation of the impacts likely to arise either simultaneously or incrementally. I would also note that cumulative impacts were addressed within each Chapter of the EIS as they relate to the environmental factor in question. The first matter addressed is the potential for the reuse of the existing NMH facility at Holles Street following the transfer of the facility to the proposed facility. The next consideration is the cumulative impacts related to the development within the Campus itself and the recent major developments within the Campus including the Private Hospital, the Nutley Wing and the relocation of the pharmacy facility to the roof of the main hospital.

7.14.2. The EIS then looks at a number of significant private developments in the vicinity of the application site which have been granted planning permission in recent years that are at varying stages of development or that have not been developed to date. These include the Elm Park complex which proposes significant residential and office accommodation. Another significant proximate permission is for the provision of a new broadcasting facility at the RTE Campus and a new access/egress to the lands from the R138 Stillorgan Road. Proposed development at the former AIB complex on the corner of Merrion Road and Serpentine Avenue is also addressed. I would also note the reference to the proposed NTA proposals for the Merrion Road/Strand Road which have been discussed elsewhere in this report. As I note above, each section of the EIS addresses cumulative impacts and Section 17.4.2 addresses a number of environmental factors specifically as they relate to cumulative impacts such as traffic and transportation, flora and fauna, microclimate, hydrogeology and air quality and climate. I would note that most of the potential cumulative impacts arise during the construction phase which is temporary in nature.

7.15. Public Consultation

7.15.1. Having regard to:

- The length of time which the project has been in the public domain,

- The engagement undertaken by the applicant which is detailed at Section 5 of Volume 1 and Appendix 1.2 of Volume 3,
- The range of matters raised during the course of the application and at the oral hearing;
- The presentation of these matters now before the Board, and
- The requirement and capacity of the Board to consider all of the information in respect of the application, including alternatives,

7.15.2. It is considered that the public consultation undertaken by the applicant meets with the statutory requirements of Article 6(4) of the EIA Directive.

7.16. Other Matters

7.16.1. As I note above in Section 6.1, the legal submission presented at the Oral Hearing on the applicant's behalf refers to the submission of Dublin City Council to the Board and in particular to reference in same to works on the public road in the vicinity of the Merrion Road entrance which is outside the application boundary of the proposed site. In this regard, the legal submission seeks to clarify that the position of the applicant is that it is not requiring the Board to grant permission for development outside of the application boundary. It is suggested that it is appropriate for the Board, in considering all aspects of the development, to consider the works on the public road at the Merrion Road access as part of its environmental assessment of the proposal so that if and when the works in question are brought forward by the City Council, or the applicant under a separate application, that the environmental impacts of these works, which it is noted have been identified and evaluated in the documentation submitted to the Board will have already been considered by the Board prior to making its decision on this application. I would suggest that the Board may decide that the works to the public road in the vicinity of the Merrion Road entrance should be completed prior to the commencement of the proposed Hospital.

7.17. Summary and Conclusion

7.17.1. Having regard to the above, it is my view that the environmental effects arising as a consequence of the proposed development have been satisfactorily identified and assessed. I consider that the EIS is compliant with Article 94 of the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001, as amended.

8.0 Appropriate Assessment

8.1. Introduction

8.1.1. The EU Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC provides legal protection for habitats and species of European importance through the establishment of a network of designated conservation areas collectively referred to as Natura 2000 (or 'European') sites. The network includes sites designated as Special Areas of Conservation (SAC) under the EU Habitats Directive and Special Protection Areas (SPA) designated under the EU Birds Directive. In general terms, they are considered to be of exceptional importance for protecting rare, endangered or vulnerable habitats and species within the European Community.

8.1.2. Under Article 6(3) of the Habitats Directive, an Appropriate Assessment must be undertaken for any plan or programme not directly connected with or necessary to the management of a European site but likely to have a significant effect on the site in view of its conservation objectives. The proposed development is not directly connected with or necessary to the management of a European site. A Natura Impact Statement (NIS) has been submitted with the application to address the likely or possible significant effects, if any, arising from the proposed development on any European site.

8.1.3. The NIS is contained in Volume 1 (Volume 01.11) of the documentation received. The location of the Natura 2000 sites within 15km of the site is detailed in Figure 1. The NIS contains two no. appendices:

- Appendix 1 – Draft Construction Management Plan
- Appendix 2 – Development located in close proximity to the proposed development, examined as part of the In-Combination Assessment

8.1.4. I would note that neither the matter of Appropriate Assessment nor the contents of the Stage 1 or Stage 2 NIS submitted were addressed within the observations received or at the Oral Hearing. The only comments in this regard was the commentary in the Legal Submission presented to the Oral Hearing on the applicant's behalf regarding the process undertaken by the applicant and the requirements of the Board.

8.2. Screening for Appropriate Assessment

8.2.1. Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000-2015 requires the board to carry out screening for appropriate assessment of a proposed development in order to assess in view of best scientific knowledge whether the project is likely to have a significant effect on a site individually or in combination with another plan or project. Section 177U(5) directs the board to determine that an appropriate assessment of a proposed development is required if it cannot be excluded, on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development will not have a significant effect on a site in view of the conservation objectives for the sites.

8.3. Natura 2000 Sites

8.3.1. Firstly, I would note that the proposed development is not in or immediately adjacent to any Natura 2000 site. Therefore, the proposed development would not have the potential to have any direct effect on any Natura 2000 site. I would also note that I have read the NIS submitted by the applicant with the application documentation.

8.3.2. There are 11 Special Areas of Conservation and 8 Special Protection Areas within 15km of the application site, a total of 19 Natura 2000 sites. The table below includes the sites in question and notes the site name, site code, distance and orientation from same to the application site and whether a source-pathway-receptor link exists with the potential for a significant effect, and an outline of same where relevant. I note the information provided by the applicant in this regard which is included in Table 1 of the NIS and which addresses a range of potential impacts which are considered either not to arise given the absence of a link to the site, or the impact would not be considered to have a significant effect.

Special Area of Conservation (SAC)

Site Name & Code	Distance from Site	Source-Pathway-Receptor Link with potential for Significant effect.
South Dublin Bay cSAC (000210)	c.370m east of application site	Potential for construction phase surface waters carrying contaminants to enter combined sewer network discharging to Dublin Bay via Ringsend Wastewater treatment plant or the local surface water sewer network which distances to Dublin Bay.

		Potential for surface waters to be contaminated as a consequence of groundwater dewatering into the surface water body during construction as some localised contaminated land may be encountered.
North Dublin Bay cSAC (000206)	c.5km north-east of application site	Potential for construction phase surface waters carrying contaminants to enter combined sewer network discharging to Dublin Bay via Ringsend Wastewater treatment plant or the local surface water sewer network which distances to Dublin Bay. Potential for surface waters to be contaminated as a consequence of groundwater dewatering into the surface water body during construction as some localised contaminated land may be encountered.
Baldoyle Bay cSAC (000199)	c.10km northeast of application site	Distance to same provides any effect would not be significant even with potential pathway across the Bay.
Howth Head cSAC (000202)	c.9km northeast of application site	Distance to same provides any effect would not be significant even with potential pathway across the Bay.
Malahide Estuary cSAC (000205)	c.14km northeast of application site	Distance to same provides any effect would not be significant even with potential pathway across the Bay.
Rockabill to Dalkey Island cSAC (003000)	c.8km east of application site	Distance to same provides any effect would not be significant even with potential pathway across the Bay.
Glenasmole Valley cSAC (001209)	c.12km south-west of application site	No hydrological link or other pathway.
Wicklow Mountains cSAC (002122)	c.10km south-west	No hydrological link or other pathway.
Knocksink Wood cSAC (000725)	c.11km south	No hydrological link or other pathway.
Ballyman Glen cSAC (000713)	c.12km south	No hydrological link or other pathway.
Ireland's Eye cSAC (002193)	c.13km north-east	No hydrological link or other pathway.

Special Protection Areas (SPA's)

Site Name & Code	Distance from Site	Source-Pathway-Receptor Link with potential for Significant effect.
South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (004024)	c.360m east	Potential for construction phase surface waters carrying contaminants to enter combined sewer network discharging to Dublin Bay via Ringsend Wastewater treatment plant or the local surface water sewer network which distances to Dublin Bay. Potential for surface waters to be contaminated as a consequence of groundwater dewatering into the surface water body during construction as some localised contaminated land may be encountered.
North Bull Island SPA (0040006)	c.3.5km northeast	Potential for construction phase surface waters carrying contaminants to enter combined sewer network discharging to Dublin Bay via Ringsend Wastewater treatment plant or the local surface water sewer network which distances to Dublin Bay. Potential for surface waters to be contaminated as a consequence of groundwater dewatering into the surface water body during construction as some localised contaminated land may be encountered.
Baldoyle Bay SPA (004016)	c.10km northeast	Distance to same provides any effect would not be significant even with potential pathway across the Bay.
Malahide Estuary SPA (004025)	c.10km northeast	Distance to same provides any effect would not be significant even with potential pathway across the Bay.
Dalkey Islands SPA (004172)	c.7km southeast	Distance to same provides any effect would not be significant even with potential pathway across the Bay.
Wicklow Mountains SPA (004040)	c.10km south east.	No hydrological link or other pathway.
Howth Head Coast SPA (004113)	c.11km northeast	Distance to same provides any effect would not be significant even with potential pathway across the Bay.
Ireland's Eye SPA (004117)	c.13km northeast	Distance to same provides any effect would not be significant even with potential pathway across the Bay.

8.3.3. However as outlined above, not all of the sites could potentially be affected by the proposed development given the absence of any link, hydrologically or otherwise,

between the application site and the Natura 2000 sites or the distance between the application site and the Natura 2000 sites which would provide any effect would not be significant. Therefore, I would note that the following 4 sites have been identified as having a potential link to the site and which are located within 5km of the site.

- South Dublin Bay cSAC (000210);
- North Dublin Bay cSAC (000206);
- South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (004024); and
- North Bull Island SPA (0040006).

8.4. Conservation Objectives

The following section identifies the Conservation Objectives pertaining to these sites.

8.4.1. South Dublin Bay SAC (site code 000210)

One of the most proximate Natura 2000 sites to the application site, it is located c.370m to the east, detailed Conservation Objectives are available for the site (22/08/2013). The site includes Annex 1 Habitats including mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide (1140), Annual vegetation of drift lines (1210), Salicornia and other annuals colonizing mud and sand (1310), Embryonic shifting dunes (2110). The Natura 2000 Standard Data Form (NPWS, 2015b) lists the cSAC as a fine example of extensive intertidal flats, of predominantly sand with muddy sands in more sheltered areas. It provides a supporting role to important populations of wintering bird populations of Dublin Bay. Threats to the site include land reclamation, oil pollution from Dublin Port, commercial bait digging and disturbance from walkers and dogs.

8.4.2. North Dublin Bay cSAC (site code 000206)

Located 4.9km to the northeast of the application site, detailed Conservation Objectives are available for this site (06/11/13). The site includes Annex 1 Habitats including mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide (1140), annual vegetation of drift lines (1210), Salicornia and other annuals colonizing mud and sand (1310), Atlantic salt meadows (1330), Mediterranean salt meadows (1410), embryonic shifting dunes (2110), shifting dunes along the shore line

(2120), fixed coastal dunes with herbaceous vegetation (2130) and humid dune slacks (2190). The site includes the Annex 2 species known as Petalwort (1395). The Natura 2000 Standard Data Form (NPWS, 2015a) lists the cSAC as having an excellent diversity of coastal habitats. The dune system is one of the most important systems on the east coast, one of few in Ireland that is actively accreting. Threats to the site include oil pollution from Dublin Port, commercial bait digging, recreational activities and water abstraction by golf clubs.

8.4.3. **South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA**

One of the most proximate Natura 2000 site to the application site, it is located c.360m to the east of the application site, detailed Conservation Objectives are available for the site (09/03/2015). The qualifying interests are the following species: Light-bellied Brent Goose (A046 – wintering), Oystercatcher (A130 - wintering), Ringed Plover (A137 - wintering), Grey Plover (A140 - wintering), Knot (A143 – wintering), Sanderling (A144 – wintering), Dunlin (A149 – wintering), Bar-tailed Godwit (A157 – wintering), Redshank (A162 – wintering), Black-headed Gull (A179 – wintering), Roseate Tern (A192 – passage), Common Tern (A193 – breeding), Arctic Tern (A194 – passage), Wetlands & Waterbirds (A999). The Natura 2000 Standard Data Form (2015c) states that the SPA possesses extensive intertidal flats, part of which are designated as South Dublin Bay SAC, and which supports wintering waterfowl as part of the wider Dublin Bay population. The main threat to the site is land reclamation, with other threats including oil pollution from Dublin Port, commercial bait digging and disturbance by walkers and dogs.

8.4.4. **North Bull Island SPA**

Located c.3.5km to the northeast of the application site, detailed Conservation Objectives are available for the site (09/03/2015). The reasons for designation are the following species: Light-bellied Brent Goose (A046 – wintering), Shelduck (A048- wintering), Teal (A052- wintering), Pintail (A054 – wintering), Shoveler (A056 – Wintering), Oystercatcher (A130 - wintering), Golden Plover (A140 - wintering), Grey Plover (A140 - wintering), Knot (A143 – wintering), Sanderling (A144 – wintering), Dunlin (A149 – wintering), Black-tailed Godwit (A156 – wintering), Bar-tailed Godwit (A157 – wintering), Curlew (A160 – wintering),

Redshank (A162 – wintering), Turnstone (A169 – wintering), Black-headed Gull (A179 – wintering), Wetlands & Waterbirds (A999). The Natura 2000 Standard Data Form (NPWS, 2015d) lists the SPA as one of the top ten sites in the country for wintering waterfowl. The quality of the estuarine habitats in the SPA are considered to be very good, part of which are designated as North Dublin Bay cSAC. There are no serious imminent threats to the wintering birds. Threats to the site include oil pollution from Dublin Port along with localised commercial bait digging, disturbance from activities such as sailing, walkers and dogs.

8.5. Likely Significant Effects

8.5.1. I note the statement in the NIS regarding the qualifying interests potentially exposed to risk where it states that all of the intertidal and estuarine habitats within Dublin Bay's European sites would be potentially at risk from silt-laden surface water discharges, contaminated water discharges or an accidental pollution incident during construction works associated with the proposed development, if they were of a sufficient magnitude and duration to affect water quality in Dublin Bay. South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA and North Bull Island SPA are designated for a range of wintering bird species and they would be vulnerable to the potential effects of silt laden surface water discharges, contaminated water discharges or an accidental pollution incident during construction works associated with the proposed development, if they were of a sufficient magnitude and duration to affect water quality in Dublin Bay.

8.5.2. Therefore, a risk exists although the significance of this risk is subject to consideration and I would argue is determined by the design measures incorporated into the design of the proposal and those included for the proposed construction management of the site. In this regard I would like to address the potential likely and potential significant effects of the proposal within the context of the aforementioned site's conservation objectives in light of best scientific knowledge in the field.

8.5.3. The Board is required to assess the potential (a) likely and (b) significant effects (direct or indirect) of the project alone on the European site(s) solely within the context of the site's conservation objectives in light of best scientific knowledge in

the field. As I have outlined above, and as outlined in the EIS there is an indirect pathway from the site to the Natura 2000 sites outlined via the surface water networks. I would suggest to the Board that the questions of most importance, in this regard, is whether the potential risk is firstly significant and secondly whether the mitigation measures proposed to negate same are measures which would be implemented with or without an appropriate assessment of the proposal.

8.5.4. In terms of potential risks, there is the potential for construction phase surface waters carrying contaminants to enter the combined sewer network discharging to Dublin Bay via Ringsend Wastewater treatment plant or the local surface water sewer network which discharges to Dublin Bay. The potential may also arise for surface waters to be contaminated as a consequence of disposal into surface water of groundwater dewatering which may have become polluted.

8.5.5. I note the applicant's contention in their NIS that in the case of the four European sites listed above for which the possibility of significant impacts cannot be excluded, the only likely significant risks to those European sites (in the absence of mitigation) (my emphasis) arises from potential construction-related surface water discharges from the proposed development and the potential for these effects to reach downstream European sites. It was their conclusion that likely significant effects on these four European sites may arise in the absence of mitigation.

8.5.6. I would also note that within both the Stage 1 and Stage 2 sections of the NIS, submitted by the applicant, that it is reiterated that the only potential adverse effects on the site integrity of the four European sites referred to above arise from potential construction-related surface water discharges from the proposed development and the potential for these effects to reach downstream European sites which they clarify in each case would arise in the absence of mitigation.

8.5.7. The risks arising include accidental spillages of oils, cement or other potential pollutants during construction works, run-off of sediment into the SACs and SPAs in Dublin Bay and run-off of contaminated waters into the receiving water environment. However, I would also refer the Board to Sections 6.1.1, 6.1.2 and 6.1.3 of the NIS where the potential impact prediction for each of the potential effects without mitigation is stated as '*unlikely to have adverse effect on the sites*

integrity'. This I would reiterate is, without mitigation. Therefore, the contention is that even without mitigation that significant effects are unlikely to arise.

8.6. Mitigation Measures

8.6.1. The NIS outlines the proposed mitigation measures in detail. A project-specific Draft Construction Management Plan (DCMP) is included as Appendix 1 of the NIS and it is proposed that it will be implemented by the contractor during the construction of the proposed development. The DCMP covers all potentially polluting activities and includes mitigation measures for critical elements such as storage and handling of harmful materials. All personnel working on the site will be trained in the implementation of emergency procedures. The DCMP, it is stated, has been formulated in consideration of standard best international practice with a list of the Guidelines and Manuals incorporated outlined. The draft Construction Management Plan, I would note, is also appended to the EIS (Appendix 2.1). The mitigation measures are also included at Section 9.6.1.1 of the EIS in relation to the prevention of pollution during construction as it relates to Flora and Fauna. The NIS then outlines a suite of specific mitigation measures which, it states, the construction contractor will be required to implement, all of which are set out in the DCMP, for release of hydrocarbons, polluting chemicals, sediment/silt and contaminated waters control.

8.6.2. For ease of reference the measures proposed are as follows:

- Specific measures to prevent the release of sediment over baseline conditions to Dublin Bay during the construction work, which will be implemented as the need arises. These measures include, but are not limited to, the use of silt fences, silt curtains, settlement lagoons and filter materials. This is particularly important when undertaking any works/upgrading to the surface and foul water drainage networks at the proposed development site.
- Provision of exclusion zones and barriers (e.g. silt fences) between earthworks, stockpiles and temporary surfaces to prevent sediment washing into the existing drainage systems and hence the downstream receiving water environment.

- Provision of temporary construction surface drainage and sediment control measures to be in place before earthworks commence.
- Weather conditions will be taken into account when planning construction activities to minimise risk of run-off from the site.
- Prevailing weather and environmental conditions will be taken into account prior to the pouring of cementitious materials for the works adjacent to surface water drainage features, or drainage features connected to same. Pumped concrete will be monitored to ensure no accidental discharge. Mixer washings and excess concrete will not be discharged to existing surface water drainage systems. Concrete washout areas will be located remote from any surface water drainage features, where feasible, to avoid accidental discharge to watercourses.
- Any fuels of chemicals (including hydrocarbons or any polluting chemicals) will be stored in a bunded area to prevent any seepage of into the local surface water network or groundwater.
- All mobile fuel bowsers shall carry a skill kit and operatives must have spill response training. All fuel containing equipment such as portable generators shall be placed on drip trays. All fuels and chemicals required to be stored on-site will be clearly marked.
- Implementation of response measures to potential pollution incidents.
- Emergency procedures and spillage kits will be available and construction staff will be familiar with emergency procedures in the event of accidental fuel spillages.
- All trucks will have a built-on tarpaulin that will cover excavated material as it is being hauled off-site and wheel wash facilities will be provided at all site egress points.
- A secant pile cut-off wall is the primary source of groundwater control during construction. Any seepage/infiltration through the vertical face of the wall, together with ingress at designated weephole locations, and surface ponding from rainfall events will be gathered locally to facilitate pumping with subsequent discharge, under licence, to the local sewerage drainage network.

Prior to any discharge, the water will be passed through silt traps and hydrocarbon/oil interceptors within the construction site confines. This will result in the separation of sediment from the water prior to its discharge and will ensure that the water is of adequate quality before it enters the local authority drainage system. The use of silt traps and interceptors will be supplemented by proper housekeeping and control measures such as regular testing and monitoring of water quality to ensure compliance.

- The pumping of groundwater, which has risen up due to excavation works, will only be required during the deeper phases of excavation when the confining properties of the glacial till are overcome by groundwater pressures, with the proposed locations of pumpwells selected so as to minimise the volume of pumping. It is estimated that the required pumping rate will be low. The water will be pumped under a fully-enclosed system and it is thus envisaged that the water to be discharged will be clean groundwater. It is therefore proposed that the water be discharged via the existing storm drainage network under a discharge licence regulated by Dublin City Council. Qualitative and quantitative monitoring will be adopted to ensure that the water is of sufficient quality to discharge to the river. The use of silt traps will be adopted if the monitoring indicates the requirement for same with no silt or contaminated water permitted to discharge to the receiving water environment.
- Water supplies shall be recycled for use in the wheel wash. All waters shall be drained through appropriate filter material prior to discharge from the construction sites.
- The removal of any made ground material, which may be contaminated, from the construction site and transportation to an appropriate licenced facility shall be carried out in accordance with the Waste Management Act, best practice and guidelines for same.
- A discovery procedure for contaminated material will be prepared and adopted by the appointed contractor prior to excavation works commencing on site. These documents will detail how potentially contaminated material will be dealt with during the excavation phase.

- Implementation of measures to minimise waste and ensure correct handling, storage and disposal of waste (most notably wet concrete, pile arisings and asphalt).

8.6.3. I would also note para. 29 of the Legal Submission presented to the Oral hearing which states that a range of precautionary measures have been incorporated into the project design, and other mitigation measures have been developed and proposed, with the purpose of avoiding or minimising impacts on the qualifying interests of the relevant European sites.

8.6.4. The NIS states that the mitigation measures outlined above when implemented will ensure that no adverse effects on European sites North Dublin Bay cSAC, South Dublin Bay cSAC, South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA and North Bull Island SPA will arise from the construction or operational stages of the proposed development.

8.6.5. The NIS concludes that the measures will succeed in maintaining the conservation status of the relevant Natura 2000 sites and that no reasonable scientific doubt remains as to the absence of any adverse effects on the integrity of the North Dublin Bay cSAC, South Dublin Bay cSAC, South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA and North Bull Island SPA. I would point out to the Board that the mitigation measures outlined above are also included as mitigation measures in the EIS. As I have stated above, the draft Construction Management Plan is included as Appendix 2.1 of the EIS. Therefore, the measures are part of the application documentation submitted to the Board and are not additional measures required to address concerns raised in respect of the potential to cause significant effects on the Natura 2000 sites in view of the Conservation Objectives for the sites. This, in my opinion, would support the contention that there is not a significant risk to the Natura 2000 sites in question from the proposed development.

8.6.6. Furthermore, I would point out to the Board that the measures set out in the NIS which are described as mitigating potential indirect effects on the Natura 2000 sites are well established standard construction methods to avoid a deterioration in the quality of surface waters arising from ground works. They are fully and properly described in the documentation submitted by the applicant (as outlined

above). Their implementation would ensure that the proposed development would not have the potential to have a negative effect on the quality of the surface water on the site of the proposed development, and therefore the waters into which these discharges ultimately flow. As such they should be regarded as best work practices that are an integral part of the proposed development that will be implemented by those carrying out that development at the same time and as part of the same process, as opposed to separate measures that would be conceived and implemented to mitigate potential impact on Natura 2000 sites. Arguably, the measures set out above would be required by the proper planning and sustainable development of the area, even if no question of an indirect effect on a Natura 2000 site arose.

8.6.7. The fact that they will prevent a negative impact on the quality of waters within the SAC and SPA means that the proposed development itself would not be likely to have a significant effect on any Natura 2000 site. Therefore, the likelihood of any significant effect can be excluded on the basis of the objective information contained in the EIS and NIS in relation to the nature of the habitats and drainage regime in and around the application site and between it and the Natura 2000 sites.

8.7. Conclusion on Stage 1 Screening

8.7.1. I note the applicant's statement in the NIS that it is acknowledged that there is the potential (albeit a low likelihood) in the absence of mitigation for the proposed development to have significant indirect or indirect cumulative impacts on four European sites, with the implementation of the detailed mitigation measures identified in this NIS, the integrity of those European sites will not be adversely affected. They state that a range of precautionary measures have been incorporated into the project design, and other mitigation measures have been developed and proposed, with the purpose of avoiding or minimising impacts on the qualifying interests and conservation objectives of the relevant European sites. As I outline above these measures are incorporated into the design of the development and/or are included as mitigation measures in the EIS. They are also best construction practice. The draft Construction Management Plan appended to the NIS is also included as Appendix 2.1 of the EIS.

8.7.2. Notwithstanding the submission of an NIS in order the facilitate the Board in carrying out an Appropriate Assessment, I consider that the particular characteristics of the project for which consent is sought in the current application, including its location and the means by which water quality would be protected during its construction, are such that it would **not** be likely to have a significant effect on any Natura 2000 site, either individually or in combination with other projects. This exclusion can be made in view of best scientific knowledge and on the basis on the objective information set out in the EIS, NIS and this report.

8.7.3. It is therefore reasonable to conclude that on the basis of the information on the file, which I consider adequate in order to issue a screening determination, that the proposed development, individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to have a significant effect on European Sites: South Dublin Bay cSAC (000210), North Dublin Bay cSAC (000206), South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (004024); and North Bull Island SPA (0040006), or any other European site, in view of the site's Conservation Objectives, and a Stage 2 Appropriate Assessment is not therefore required.

8.7.4. Having regard to the assessments outlined in Sections 6, 7 & 8 above, I recommend that approval for the development be granted, subject to the conditions set out below.

9.0 Recommendation

9.1. Reasons and Considerations

9.1.1. Having regard to:

a) the provisions of the National Maternity Strategy 2016-2026, which seeks to co-locate all maternity hospitals and refers to the proposal to redevelop the National Maternity Hospital within the St Vincent's Campus;
b) the provisions of Building a Recovery: Infrastructure and Capital Investment, 2016 – 2021 which supports a reorganisation of national maternity services including the relocation of the National Maternity Hospital to the St. Vincent's Campus;
c) the provisions of the National Spatial Strategy 2002-2020;
d) the provisions of Smarter Travel – A Sustainable Transport Future 2009-2020;
e) the provisions of the Regional Planning Guidelines for the Greater Dublin Area 2010-2022,
f) the provisions of the Transport Strategy for the Greater Dublin Area, 2016-2035;
g) the provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022;
h) the community need, public interest served and the overall benefits to be achieved from the proposed development,
i) all documentation on file including; the Environmental Impact Statement; the Natura Impact Statement; and the submissions and observations made in respect of the application, including at the oral hearing,
j) the design and layout of the proposed development.

9.1.2. It is considered that;

- the proposed development supports the implementation of the Maternity Strategy 2016 which seeks to co-locate Maternity Hospitals within the State with Adult Acute Hospitals
- the proposal meets the stated policies and objectives of the Dublin City Development Plan 2016-2022 particularly in respect of Healthcare and Movement and Transport.

- the proposed development will significantly improve maternal healthcare provision at local and National level.

9.1.3. Having considered alternative locations, designs and layouts, it is considered that it has been demonstrated that the proposed location and design is the most appropriate solution to satisfy the requirements in respect of Maternity care and the overall development of the St Vincent's University Hospital Campus.

9.1.4. Having regard to the demonstrated strategic need for the development, the approach taken by the applicant in terms of the detailed design of the development, which has sought to minimise impacts on residential amenity and on the road network, it is considered that any impacts on residential amenity or on the traffic network would not be significant.

9.1.5. The Board completed an environmental impact assessment of the proposed development, taking into account:

- The nature, scale and extent of the proposed development;
- The environmental impact statement submitted with the application;
- The submissions from the planning authority, prescribed bodies and observers in the course of the application, including submissions made to the oral hearing;
- The applicant's response to the observations received as presented at the oral hearing;
- The Senior Planning Inspectors report and recommendation dated the 1st August 2017.

9.1.6. The Board considered that the environmental impact statement supported by the information submitted by the applicant at the oral hearing, identifies and describes adequately the direct and indirect effects of the proposed development on the environment.

9.1.7. The Board accepted and adopted the report of the Senior Planning Inspector, including the examination of the information presented by the applicant including the environmental impact statement and the submissions during the course of the application, and the reasoned conclusion.

9.1.8. The Board concluded, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, including compliance with the mitigation measures proposed, that the impact of the proposed development on the environment would be acceptable and that the proposed development:

- would not seriously injure the amenities of, or properties in, the wider area through which it is located,
- would be acceptable in terms of traffic safety and convenience,
- would not result in significant visual or landscape impacts in the wider area within which it is located,
- would not seriously injure the ecology of the area, including bird life, protected special and habitats, and areas designated for environmental protection,
- would not seriously detract from the character or setting of significant features of architectural or archaeological heritage,
- would not be prejudicial to public health.

9.1.9. Notwithstanding the submission of an NIS the Board accepted and adopted the screening assessment carried out by the Senior Planning Inspector in respect of the identification of the European sites which could potentially be affected, and the identification and assessment of the potential likely significant effects of the proposed development, either individually or in combination with other plans or projects, on these European sites in view of the sites' conservation objectives. The Board was satisfied that the proposed development, either individually or in combination with other plans or projects, would not be likely to have a significant effect on the following European Sites: South Dublin Bay cSAC (000210), North Dublin Bay cSAC (000206), South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA (004024); and North Bull Island SPA (0040006), or any other European site, in view of the site's Conservation Objectives, and a Stage 2 Appropriate Assessment is not therefore required.

Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application and the further particulars submitted by the applicant at the Oral Hearing, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with a planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.

   Reason: In the interest of clarity

2. The period during which the development hereby permitted may be carried out shall be ten years from the date of this Order

   Reason: In the interest of clarity.

3. The mitigation measures and commitments identified in the Environmental Impact Statement, the Natura Impact Statement, and other plans and particulars submitted with the planning application, and the further particulars submitted by the applicant at the Oral Hearing, shall be implemented in full by the developer, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions.

   Reason: In the interest of clarity and protection of the environment during construction and operational phases of development

4. Prior to the commencement of development, the applicant shall submit for the written agreement of the planning authority, following consultation with the National Transport Authority, details in relation to cycle lane provision

along both Nutley Lane and the Merrion Road as it relates to the proposed junction improvements.

Reason: In the interest of traffic and cycle safety and convenience.

5. Prior to commencement of development all works proposed on the public road network and in particular at the Nutley Lane and Merrion Road junctions into the Campus shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority. The works shall be completed prior to the commencement of the proposed Hospital development (Phase 1). All works to the public road including removal of car parking, provision of right turning lanes shall be carried out at the applicant's expense and at no cost to the planning authority with materials to be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority.

   Reason: In the interests of sustainable development, traffic safety and to avoid traffic congestion on the adjacent road network.

6. Prior to the commencement of development, the following shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority:

a) A Mobility Management Plan which shall be implemented on the first occupation of the National Maternity Hospital at St. Vincent's University Hospital Campus. The MMP shall indicate details regarding a Mobility Manager for the site.
b) A Car Park Management Plan for the St. Vincent's University Hospital Campus which shall include details regarding signage for car parks within and in the environs of the Campus, manner and frequency of monitoring of the use of car parks in particular the use by staff and visitors.
c) The location of signage which may be proposed on public roads as part of any wayfinding strategy including wayfinding to and from Sydney Parade Dart Station.

The agreed Mobility Management Plan, Car Park Management Plan and wayfinding signage shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of the National Maternity Hospital unless otherwise agreed with the planning authority.

Reason: In the interests of sustainable development, traffic safety and to avoid traffic congestion on the adjacent road network.

7. Prior to the commencement of development, a Construction Management Plan, including a Construction Traffic Management Plan, shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with the planning authority.

   Reason: To protect the amenities of neighbouring properties and in the interest of traffic safety.

8. Use of the proposed temporary construction access on Nutley Lane shall be used for construction access only and shall be closed outside of the permitted hours of construction. It shall also be closed off following the completion of Phase 1 of the proposed construction works. The use shall permanently cease on completion of the proposed development and the existing boundary reinstated. The details of the proposed access, arrangements for daily closure and reinstatement shall be incorporated into the proposed Construction Management Plan and submitted to and agreed in writing with the Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development.

   Reason: In the interest of traffic safety and residential amenity.

9. Prior to the commencement of development, details of landscaping to be proposed along the eastern boundary of the Campus as it bounds with Herbert Avenue shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Planning Authority. All planting/landscaping proposed shall be maintained, and if any tree or plant dies or is otherwise lost, it shall be replaced by a

plant of the same species, variety and size within the planting season following such loss.

Reason: In the interest of residential and visual amenity

10. Details of the materials, colours and textures of all the external finishes to the National Maternity Hospital, signage proposed to the elevations and screening measures for roof plant shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to the commencement of development.

    Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

11. Water supply and drainage arrangements, including the disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services and shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to the commencement of development.

    Reason: In the interest of public health.

12. The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area of the planning authority that is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to An Bord Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.

Reason: It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission.

Una Crosse

Senior Planning Inspector

August 2017

APPENDIX 1

Part 1 – List of Participants who made Submissions

Part 2 – Summary of Observations

Part 3 – Planning History

APPENDIX 1 - Part 1

List of Participants Who Made Submissions

Prescribed Bodies Who Made Submissions

Transport Infrastructure Ireland

National Transport Authority

Irish Water

Dun-Laoghaire Rathdown County Council

List of Observers

1. Dublin Cycling Campaign
2. Elm Park Golf & Sports Club CLG
3. Cornelius & Mary O'Sullivan
4. Stephen & Sarah Lillis
5. Gemma Lyons
6. Liam Byrne
7. Eileen & Tom Clarke
8. Margaret Fionuala Sherwin
9. John P. O'Malley
10. Nutley Residents Association supported by Cllr. Claire Byrne & Eamon Ryan TD
11. National Maternity Hospital – Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology
12. National Maternity Hospital – Midwifery & Nursing Team
13. National Maternity Hospital – Department of Anaesthesia
14. National Maternity Hospital – Department of Neonatology
15. Additional Observer at hearing – Dr. Roger McMorrow & Others, Department of Anaesthesia, NMH & SVUH.

APPENDIX 1 - Part 2
Summary of Observations

14 observations have been submitted in respect of the application for approval from both individuals and groups. An additional observation was made at the Oral Hearing. 4 submissions were received from Prescribed Bodies. A list of all observers is set out above in Part 1 of this Appendix.

It is evident from the submissions made that there is overlap in terms of the issues raised. In order to avoid undue repetition, the issues are summarised below under individual topics for the information of the Board. An overview of the issues raised by each of the participants is provided at Section 4 of the report.

Prescribed Bodies

Responses were received from the following Prescribed Bodies:

Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council

The submission received is summarised as follows:

- Transportation Planning Section do not object to proposal but make a number of points;
- If key objectives included in Sustainable Transport Strategy are in place from outset of proposal would encourage use of sustainable transport;
- Existing cycle facilities on Rock Road between site and County boundary are poor with NTA objectives to deliver segregated cycle facilities along this section and a two-way cycle route along Nutley Lane to be prioritised to synchronise with the development;
- Recommended that Key Objective 2 (pg 104) for provision of new stop on the shuttle bus at hospital entrance be in place prior to commencement of use of proposal and available for all hospital users and maintained until a service on suggested Dundrum-UCD core orbital Bus Corridor extended to St. Vincent's is provided;

- Issue of overspill car parking in surrounding residential areas in DLR is a concern but note that DLR are in process of implementing parking measures (max. 3 hours) in area marked green on Fig. 6.18 (pg6-40 of EIS) later this year;

Transport Infrastructure Ireland

Response states that the TII have no specific comments.

National Transport Authority

The submission received is summarised as follows:

- Proposal considered acceptable from a transportation point of view due to presence of Dart & Commuter Rail services within 5 minutes' walk to the site, frequency of bus services and range of locations connected, high levels of cycling on site and ease of connection to national road network;
- Proposal will benefit from improvements to the traffic network including improved frequencies to DART services, Core Bus Corridor on Merrion Road, East Coast Trail cycle route and Bus Rapid Transport on the R138 Stillorgan Road;
- Site will benefit from high degree of direct accessibility by public transport and much improved cycle environment;
- Designs for Core Bus Corridor and East Coast Trail yet to be developed and may require junction layout which differs from proposal at entrance from Merrion Road and Nutley Lane/Merrion Road and some land may need to be acquired from the Campus but neither scheme will have a substantive impact on the proposal or the assessment of its likely impact;
- Strategic transport benefits to the proposal from proposed projects up to 2035 including DART expansion programme, Luas to Lucan, Finglas and Poolbeg, Complete BRT & Core Bus Network and Metro from Swords to Brides Glen and once in place most settlements in Greater Dublin Area within one interchange of proposed by public transport;
- NTA currently reviewing bus services in Dublin Metropolitan network and currently premature to assess merits of applicant's proposal to extend orbital

service to serve the proposal. Presence of an additional significant trip attractor at this location a factor in assessment of service requirements in the area as part of wider review;

- Concur that capacity of the current public transport offer is adequate to meet the future travel demands of the Campus;
- NTA fully engaged with SVUH as part of Smarter Travel Workplaces Programme and supportive of approach being taken by applicant and will support initiatives undertaken across the Campus aimed at reducing car use and any adverse impacts on the local road network;
- Supports approach to staff car parking and consider mode share of 34% by car is reasonable target;
- Mode split of 65% for visitor parking based on Holles Street and while SVUH campus highly accessible potential for linked trips for outpatients in particular not as high as in existing hospital with this aspect requiring careful consideration;
- NTA recommend that Nutley Lane access junction is re-examined with a view to providing for cyclists turning into and out of the Campus in line with the National Cycle Manual with the taxi holding area forming part of this re-examination;
- Consideration should be given to providing segregated cycle facilities through the site;
- Recommended that a condition is attached to any grant of permission requiring a more detailed construction mobility plan to include how it is proposed to minimise the number of construction vehicle movements on the local road during peak hours, how it is proposed to minimise disruption to public transport during construction and how pedestrian/cyclists will enter the site during the construction period via dedicated entrances segregated from construction vehicles;

Irish Water

The submission received is summarised as follows:

- Confirm sufficient water supply capacity and wastewater treatment capacity to service proposal;
- Network reinforcement may be required to Irish Water's water supply and wastewater networks to accommodate proposed pending further investigation and clarification but do not anticipate any insurmountable difficulty;
- Connection to public service network subject to a connection agreement and infrastructure must be designed and provided in accordance with Irish Water's Standards and Codes of Practice;
- Any division of Irish Water Assets subject to a diversion agreement with Irish Water;

No response was received from the following notified Prescribed Bodies: Minister of Arts, Heritage, Regional, Rural and Gaeltacht Affairs (Development Applications Unit), Minister for Communications, Climate Action and Environment, Minister for Housing, Planning, Community and Local Government, Minister for Transport, Tourism and Sport, Minister for Health, An Chomhairle Ealaion, Failte Ireland, An Taisce, The Heritage Council

Planning Authority

Dublin City Council

A response was received from Dublin City Council on 18 May 2017. The report comprises a report of the Executive providing its views on the effects of the proposed development on the environment and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area. The report includes 5 appendices from Roads and Traffic Planning Division, City Architect, Waste Management Division, Air Quality Monitoring and Noise Control Unit and Drainage Division. The submission also included a resolution of the members of Dublin City Council which include three resolutions which relate to the ownership and management of the facility and recommendations regarding exemptions from the payment of parking. The submission is summarised as follows under a number of headings:

Development Plan Context – Core Strategy

- Proposal supports the creation of a compact, quality, green, connected city, one of strands of core strategy, with the campus under-developed in the city context with low density environment not making optimum use of urban land located close to public transport infrastructure;
- Proposal facilitates creation of a greener and more connected city through improved pedestrian, cycle and vehicular routes;
- Continued active promotion of mobility management measures welcomed with Council proposing to work closely with the campus to promote modal split;
- Proposed plaza deemed appropriate in scale, design and materials acting as an anchor for the entire campus;
- Creation of a new access route and entrance to the multi—storey car park well considered and facilitates amenity of the new entrance plaza by removing through traffic from the spine road;
- New cycle lane adjacent to pedestrian north south boulevard facilitates improved access to the campus and links within which due consideration given to universal access requirements in the design of the scheme;
- Plan recognises the importance of facilitating the development of the NMH in its medical function, role as major employer and generator of significant economic benefits and promoter of knowledge economy;
- Proposal supports the economic and community development of the local area attracting new health and knowledge related industries to the area;
- Local Economic and Community Plan (LECP), which promotes economic and community development goals, is central element of development plan core strategy;

Development Plan Context – City-Wide Policy

- Proposal is stated to be supported by a number of policies in the Plan with the following of particular relevance: Policy CC3, Policy CC4, Policy SC13, Policy SC16, Policy SC19, Policy SC25, Policy CEE1(i), Policy CEE2, Policy CEE3, Policy CEE20, CEE21(i), Policy MT1, Policy MT11, Policy MT14, Policy MT16,

Policy GI02, Policy SN22, Policy CHC4, Policy SN1, Policy SN7, Policy SN16, Policy SN22, Policy SN30.

- Proposal aids the consolidation and enhancement of existing facilities at SVUH and will act as a key anchor in attraction of additional activities to further stimulate growth and critical mass;

Development Plan – Zoning Policy and Development Standards including Height

- Proposal considered a permissible use within the zoning on the lands;
- Proposal will help reinforce position of SVUH as a centre of excellence in health care with policy set out to support the provision of the appropriate volume of floorspace to secure its delivery;
- City Plan requirement for masterplans for larger developments on institutional lands, not applicable as no such requirement for development relating to extensions and enhancement of existing institutional uses;
- Site capacity study submitted which outlines proposed phasing of development across the site and provides for expansion of the proposal;
- Proposed plot ratio of 1.59 within the indicative plot ratio of 0.5-2.5 for Z15 lands with site coverage at 39% less than the max. indicative of 50%;
- Site is located within Low Rise for purposes of Height as defined in Chapter 16 with plan providing buildings up to 24m in height are permissible;
- Noted that plant, flues and lift overruns are not included in height of building as long as they are set back and properly screened and do not cause shadowing;
- Stated proposal rises to a maximum of 35m to top of stair core from ground level of +6mODM (41mODM to top of lift shaft and 47.3ODM to top of boiler flues with proposal above maximum building height permitted at Section 16.7.2;
- Plan provides that greater height considered in some instances such as where there is a pre-existing height on a site in a low-rise area subject to appraisal of the area, application of design principles and photo-montages to show approach;

- Campus includes buildings with pre-existing height over the maximum with 5-storey Clinical Services building (+35.94ODM), 7-storey Nutley Wing (+40ODM) and 8-storey Private Hospital (45.1 ODM);
- Urban design report included with application noting variation in topography across the site with Architects Division noting scale and form of hospital respectful to its existing context;
- Proposed height, form and massing of the proposal are acceptable from a visual perspective relating well to the prevailing height and context;

Impacts on Residential Amenity

- Stepping back of building from residential development along Herbert Avenue allows for the impacts on these residences to be significantly reduced and within acceptable parameters;
- Overlooking from east elevation of the rear of properties on Herbert Ave a concern and noted that separation distances of between 47m-63m provided between proposal and closest 6 houses on Herbert Ave. which is considered adequate to protect amenity;
- Opaque glazing proposed on external terraces to avoid overlooking with windows designed to direct views away from residences along Herbert Avenue;
- Elevation visible from Merrion Road (north elevation) designed to introduce an open space at first floor level over the entrance thinning out the mass of this elevation with setbacks of between 58-85m at main entrance and 140m at western end of facade;

Design & Visual Impact

- Design response successful in breaking down the scale of the building particularly along its eastern and northern edges;
- Solid to void ratios of glazing and pattern of fenestration appropriate to scale of the building and assist in animating the building facades, oblique reveals to some windows, proposed screens and vertical fin articulations add interest and break down mass with granite facades respectful to tradition of building civic

buildings from stone and connects proposal to other buildings on the campus which are clad in granite;

- Agree that locations identified in VIA are most sensitive visual reference points and consider assessment acceptable welcoming no finding of significant or profound impact;
- Entrance to emergency section at east side of building less evident than main entrance and assumed access by ambulance rather than private car;
- Regrettable that direct level access not provided on all floors but location of lifts noted appearing to facilitate stepped/ramped links;
- Internal reconfigurations suggested in terms of location of shop/café and female WC;
- Opportunity at northern end of the hospital site to provide for an enlarged public plaza addressing the Merrion Road to integrate campus into adjoining area;
- Site capacity study could seek relocation of the car park to a more concealed location;
- More attention needs to be given to the boundaries and edges of the site and how hospitals future development will assist in improving the urban form and visual quality of the area;

Daylight, Sunlight & Overshadowing

- PA agrees that reference points chosen for analysis are the most sensitive;
- Concurs that given scale of proposal, impacts are small or negligible and within BRE guidelines and would mostly be considered not significant;

Microclimate and Wind

- Notes findings of studies and request applicant be required to carry out the necessary mitigation measures proposed including provision of landscaping and conditions included requiring monitoring of landscape implementation;

Extension of Car Park

- Landscaping proposals extended around the car park and proposals to green the car park building welcomed assissting in softening the appearance of the building;
- No objection to proposal to extend car park but given visibility considered appropriate that screening measures applied and recommended that the trellis and planting screen proposed should be provided on all sides of the car park to completely merge it into the landscape;

Drainage Division

- No objection subject to all drainage elements being constructed in accordance with both the Engineers Report and Flood Risk Assessment report;
- Drainage designed and constructed on the completely separate system with Stormwater attenuated and SuDS being implemented;

Movement and Transport

- Roads and Traffic Planning Division (RTPD) satisfied with 'substance' of information in the EIS;
- Applicant to liaise with DCC in relation to proposed works to junctions onto Merrion Road and Nutley Lane with revisions to road network to be agreed with Environment and transportation Dept. prior to commencement of development;
- Works to the public roads to be carried out at applicant's expense and to detailed requirements of DCC;
- Maximum parking provision as per the Development Plan standards would be 508 spaces with the additional 277 spaces proposed considered acceptable;
- Proactive mobility management shall ensure adequate car parking spaces are available for visitor and shift workers;
- Noted that the AM & PM peaks on the local road network differ from the hospital campus peaks;
- Continued active promotion of mobility management measures welcomed;
- Level of cycle provision (270 space proposed with 49 required) welcomed;

- Proposed development does not preclude the delivery of the final layout of the cycle route and request applicant liaise with NTA in terms of their requirements for the road network adjoining the Hospital Campus;
- Detailed Construction Management Plan for the site to be submitted and agreed with Environment and Transportation Dept. prior to commencement;

Waste Regulation

- Suite of conditions outlined including requirement for a Construction and Demolition Waste Management Plan

Air Quality Monitoring and Noise Control

- Construction Management Plan to incorporate a Noise and Vibration Management Plan to be agreed in writing with PA prior to commencement of development;
- Residential notification procedure to be agreed with PA;
- Hours of operation during demolition and construction phase restricted to 0700-1800 Monday to Friday and 0800-1400 Saturday with permission to work outside these hours subject to approval of DCC;

Sustainable Building Design

- PA welcomes applicants building energy rating target of A3;

Appropriate Assessment

- NIS concludes that there will be no adverse impact on the integrity of any of the four relevant sites with the full implementation of the mitigation measures outlined;

Recommended Conditions

- A suite of recommended conditions related to roads and traffic, building design and landscaping, waste regulation, air quality monitoring and noise control and drainage are set out in Section 8 of the report.

Observations

In response to the application made, submissions were received from 14 observers. The issues raised by observers are summarised in the following section under headings and sub-headings. A more detailed summary of the issues raised by the observers are set out under the heading used below in Part 3 of Appendix 1.

Legal/Procedural Issues

- Authority of the HSE to apply for permission not established;
- Legal owners of site not listed as a party to the application and irregular that applicant not holder of legal title and status of consent, which could be withdrawn at any time, appears unsatisfactory;
- Issue of title appears to be a fundamental pre-requisite to any planning application;
- As site is charged or mortgaged, the charge holders ought to exhibit consent, with no correspondence or agreement to this effect exhibited;
- Letters of consent state St. Vincent's Healthcare Group owns the lands and Letter from Religious Sisters of Charity states they own part of the lands with clarification required;
- No maps attached showing the land in the owners landholding and seek Board request relevant folios;
- Concerns raised at the time afforded to make submissions under SID procedure;

Consideration of Alternative Locations

- No details provided of efforts to locate the development on other sites;
- Alternative sites should be considered such as RTE lands, lands at Clonskeagh Hospital or Elm Park Golf Club;
- Alternative sites would provide better parking and access with rapid transfer possible to St. Vincent's.

Traffic Impact, Transportation, Access, Parking & Public Transport

Impact Analysis Approach

- While an assessment of traffic impacts undertaken, approach not consistent with national or international best practice for a development of scale proposed;
- LinSig modelling software used for analysis incorrectly referred to as a UK Dept of Transport software application but it was designed by JCT Consultancy;
- In absence of Irish guidance in respect of appropriate use of traffic modelling software, guidance from Transport for London deemed to represent an appropriate reference point (Traffic Modelling Guidelines TfL Traffic Management and Network Performance – Best Practice, Version 3);
- Tfl guidance recommends not using LinSig where junctions are interdependent - i.e. when queuing from one junctions extends to and through another junction, thus affecting operation of latter junction;
- Inconsistent with international best practice, undermining confidence in findings of traffic impact analysis;
- No supporting evidence provided to show LinSig model has been calibrated and validated to reflect existing conditions on the network and queuing data at key junctions which would have been used to validate traffic models does not appear to have been collected;

Trip Generation

- Traffic modelling presented in Section 6.6.3.4 of EIS confined to network peaks with Campus peaks excluded with TII Guidelines recommending both periods be assessed if there are differing peaks;
- Excluding the development peak from analysis appears a major omission with queuing having the potential to negatively impact on emergency vehicles in addition to staff, patient and visitor traffic;
- Assessment criteria in Table 6.10 lacks quantifiable indicators to determine which significance of impact category is appropriate with subjective judgement presented deficient;

- Road network in the area not constructed to facilitate volumes of traffic currently using the network or additional volumes;
- Reference in TIA to decrease in volumes on wider road network between 2014 & 2017 due to wider road network congestion and not result of reduced road network demand;
- Analysis of developments traffic impact does not appear to be supported by queue length observation which would have supported the selection of the most appropriate traffic modelling software with LinSig inappropriate or if LinSig selected, queue length data would have represented an essential element of the validation process;
- Absence of information in the EIS Traffic and Transportation Chapter setting out existing operating conditions within the site's road network a major omission;
- Traffic generation approach based on number of parking spaces proposed for the Campus but takes no account of overspill car parking the impacts of same have not been analysed which is inconsistent with TII Guidelines;
- Patient and Visitor traffic generation potential of NMH not appropriately factored into the traffic generation analysis with visitor patterns not based on evidence from existing hospital;
- Projected increase of NMH in-patient and out-patient numbers (7% & 6%) is not consistent with projected increase in bed numbers, as EIS predicts bedcount would increase by 41% providing analysis in EIS of traffic generation and parking requirements not robust;
- Staff travel survey reference to bias towards car drivers not supported by evidence of findings of previous validation surveys and statement that slightly lower car more share representative of existing situation not apparent;
- Possibility that respondents understated extent of off-campus parking explaining discrepancies between travel survey findings and on-site car park occupancies;
- Arrivals to hospital before 0700 appears to correspond to reduced public transport frequency;

- Statistical robustness of visitor surveys unclear as no data provided on daily patient or visitor numbers at Holles Street or SVUH;
- Desktop review of Holles Street site indicates capacity for c.75 cars with staff survey implying 74% of staff that drive park there which is 230 staff and appears extent of overspill off-site staff car parking both at Holles Street and SVUH has been substantially underestimated;
- Car mode share of 34% appears over-optimistic and unachievable with greater staff use of mixed-use car parks likely;
- SVUH have existing comprehensive MMP but high levels of staff car park occupancies with factors external to the site constraining the potential to reduce car use;
- Rationale for selection of mode share targets unclear with best practice indicating staff in each distance band be identified alongside current modes and based on accessibility considerations for each mode targets are then set for each distance band with no such data in the EIS;
- Current place of residence of NMH staff, which is more widespread not considered in setting targets with EIS statement that overtime staff distribution will become more similar to SVUH likely to take years;
- Given longer distance of current NMH staff to SVUH 11% walking target and 20% cycling target lack credibility.
- Gaps in EIS including absence of visitor numbers at the existing NMH, patient and visitor arrival and departure profiles throughout the day;
- Applicant should carry out a comprehensive assessment of the proposals receiving environment in relation to existing operating conditions of the local road network both on and off site;
- Existing off-site traffic conditions poor at peak times with extensive delays and queuing;
- Current traffic volumes currently relieved by lax enforcement of traffic regulations such as time-restricted left turn from Nutley Lane onto Nutley Road creating a rat-run;

- Insufficient evidence is provided to sustain the argument that the hospital attendance figures will not have a significant impact on roads already at or close to capacity;
- Key junctions at or over capacity during peak hours;
- Blocking back impacts from Merrion Gates or on Nutley Lane at peak hours not considered in traffic modelling;
- Extensive queuing in westbound Direction on Nutley Lane back to Stillorgan Road junction in evening peak impacting on egress of traffic from the site;
- Extensive queuing of up to 250m from both junctions along the internal roads and delay was observed within the Campus at Campus peak time (1600-1700) with only one reference to same in EIS at Section 6.5.2;
- No data re. current or projected visitor numbers at NMH or SVUH provided in EIS;
- Absence of information in the EIS setting out existing operating conditions within the sites road network a major omission/oversight;
- Analysis of the site access junctions to establish impact on traffic (and emergency vehicles) during 'campus peak' should have been completed;
- Pedestrian crossings noted to be frequently obstructed during peak periods due to queuing vehicles;
- Slightly extended filter lane on Nutley Lane not sufficient to solve problem
- Propose that there should be a right turning lane into SVUH from Nutley Lane, filter lane turning left out of SVUH onto Nutley Lane and no right turn from SVUH onto Nutley Lane;
- Primary access and parking facilities for new proposal should be located at the east side of the site with Nutley Lane access 80-100% saturated;
- Proposal considered in isolation from the neighbouring Nutley environment with insufficient consideration of the local context and impacts;
- Right turn from Elm Park onto Nutley Lane difficult in the morning;
- Difficult to walk across Nutley Lane during heavy traffic;

- New Taxi holding area will increase pressure on Nutley Lane/Campus junction;
- While study of Merrion Road corridor (pg 95 PR) undertaken, there does not appear to be a study of the Nutley Lane corridor;
- Impact of proposed bus stop for UCD-DART shuttle on traffic on Nutley Lane;
- Mobility Management Plan focuses on staff with little reference to patients and visitors;
- No reference to possible future increase in activity at the hospital;
- No information provided on numbers attending for post-graduate medical specialist training or Clinicians from around the Country;

Junction Modelling

- Stillorgan Road/Nutley Lane – modelled queues of 25 vehicles on Nutley Lane substantially less than those observed in evening peak where queues are 800m+;
- Clarity required in relation to how changes achieved to Degree of Saturation on the Nutley Lane arm and Stillorgan Road arm following completion;
- Merrion Road/Campus Entrance – credibility regarding stated current levels of queuing compared to those observed;
- Fall in DoS on site access arms lacks credibility given increased delay on road network resulting from increased site traffic generation which is not reflected in the traffic models.

Parking

Campus Wide Parking

- Forecast demand of 277 spaces lacks credibility due to excessively ambitious mode share targets, failure to consider increased bed capacity compared to Holles Street, lack of consideration of intra-hour demand fluctuations; and failure to consider visitor car parking requirements with no evidence provided from Holles Street to support approach;
- Not been demonstrated that the proposal accords with Dublin City Council's car parking standards;

- Operational capacity of a car park based on range of 85-90% and depends on car park layout, with parking on subject site provided in a range of different areas;
- Assessment of parking requirements based on data from October 2014 (2.5 years old) with no data provided for peak occupancy;
- Analysis approach by one-hour time periods does not take account of inter-hour demand peaks arising due to staff changeover/overlapping appointment times;
- Occupancy observations from car parking review show car parks within SVUH operating above their theoretical capacity indicating unsatisfactory operation;
- Occasional parking outside of designated spaces observed indicating occupancy may have previously exceeded 100%;
- EIS states breast check car parks accessible to visitors and patients but only accessible to permit holders with code activated gates;
- High level of staff parking demand indicating ongoing mobility management initiatives have limited effectiveness and challenges credibility of the car mode share targets in the EIS;
- Insufficient parking proposed at 277 additional spaces, 5% of which are designated for disabled parking;
- Additional 135 staff car parking spaces for core weekday staff of 667 persons;
- No account taken of temporary increased demand due to staff changeover;
- Insufficient data provided to support provision of 142 additional spaces for patients/visitors with no evidence to support the assumption of a 2.5 per space turnover for inpatients/ 4 for out-patient over a 12-hour day and 8-hour respectively with no accounting for peak demand fluctuations;
- Short visitor stays profile likely to lead to parking on-street and with limited capacity within 400m walk catchment will limit parking use by residents.

Multi-Storey Car Park

- Car park extension not appropriate as should be closer to proposal adjacent to Merrion Road entrance;
- Extension will be visually obtrusive on Nutley Lane and request layout is changed;
- No assessment of noise or light pollution from the extension to the multi-storey car park;
- Occupancy levels in car park observed to be above theoretical operating capacity typically considered as 85%-90%;
- Cost of parking should be reduced within the campus and no charge of overnight parking for staff;
- Parking for construction staff not resolved;
- Impact on existing parking during construction of extension to multi-storey and works/use of existing surface car park;

Parking within Residential Areas

- No consideration given in TIA to current capacities or operating conditions for on-street or off-street parking;
- Current parking occupancy levels along adjoining streets significantly high and close to capacity;
- On-street spaces within 400m at 90% capacity indicating overspill from the Hospital;
- Adequate or sufficiently cheap parking not provided for staff, visitors or patients making access and parking for residents challenging;
- Condition on any permission should require parking within the campus provided at a lower cost than on surrounding streets
- Proposal should be contingent on DCC designating ‘Residents Only’ for all parking on Herbert Avenue;

Construction Traffic and Temporary Construction Access

- Insufficient information provided to allow a thorough assessment of the suitability of this access with no preliminary design junction layout provided.

- No estimate of construction staff numbers provided and no information on level of on-site car parking proposed;
- Concern at impact of construction traffic on existing severe queuing on Nutley Lane;
- Object to opening of temporary entrance onto Nutley Lane for construction as construction traffic should enter and exit from the east side of the campus;
- A more even allocation of construction traffic between Nutley Lane and Merrion Road could be arranged to ensure construction impacts are distributed rather than focusing on one single road;
- Undertaking should be provided that it would be closed permanently following completion and would never be converted into a permanent entrance;
- Reference to fire road connecting to Nutley Lane access incorrect as the road referred to does not connect to Nutley Lane and may refer to temporary construction access;
- No details provided as to whether the construction access will take all construction traffic and if so level of construction traffic will be intolerable;
- Truck movements require in and out trips so actual movements twice that quoted;
- Statements in Draft Construction Management Plan that there will be pressures on surrounding road networks contradicts statements in Planning Report that there will be no significant impact;
- Opportunity should be provided to Residents to make submissions to resolution of Construction Management Plan;

Public Transport

- Public transport mode shares unsupported by evidence presented in the EIS and lack credibility;
- Development over-reliant on the proposals outlined in the NTA correspondence of 29/01/2016 which are beyond the control of the applicant with no guarantee proposals will be implemented in short, medium or long term;

- Unclear if any of proposals have committed funding steams or if or when they will be delivered and limited emphasis should be placed on same;
- Existing bus stop within proposed waiting Lane on Nutley Lane should be moved further down Nutley lane where road is wider with proper access from the stop to avoid impeding flow of traffic;
- Many bus services referenced are infrequent with large number of staff arriving before 0800 when services less frequent;
- Bus journey times and bus reliability not considered and statements regarding bus routes being adequate not justified;
- Bus stop serving the hospital on opposite side of Nutley Lane at junction with Nutley Avenue should also be moved and a shelter provided;
- Request additional bus stops on both sides of the Road outside Merrion Shopping Centre where stops previously provided;
- Board should make recommendations to reduce traffic volumes at the new hospital;
- Likely vast majority of staff will continue to use car or bus with limited use of DART or bicycle;
- Parking should be omitted from Nutley Lane, bicycle lanes provided and if sufficient width a bus/taxi lane;
- Reference to proposed improvements in NTA correspondence are proposals and require third parties to carry them out with no detail on progress of same;
- Need for bus stop on the UCD-DART station shuttle bus not clear, if DART station so close and limited service provided not outlined;
- Proposed new stop along UCD to DART shuttle service likely to offer limited benefit for staff;
- No apparent plans to extend the 175 oribtual bus service from Tallaght to UCD via SVUH;

- Bus stops on Stillorgan Road (1,100m) are in excess of maximum acceptable walk time for public transport by bus of 500m and considered outside the walking catchment of the SVUH Campus;

Cycling

Bicycle Parking

- Discontinuous cycle lane provision on Merrion Road and absence of cycle infrastructure on Nutley Lane likely to undermine attractiveness of cycling.
- Inadequate provision of cycle parking spaces with National Cycle Manual (Section 5.57) recommending 1 spaces for each car parking space with deficit of 804 spaces;
- Cycle mode share of 20% would imply need for 510 spaces with 485 proposed;
- Location of cycle parking spaces at the multi-storey car park conflict with guidelines requiring cycle parking is located close to entrance and closer to the entrance than the nearest non-disabled car parking space;
- Inappropriate for cyclists to share common access ramps with cars with specific requirements for the slope of access ramps for bikes;
- EIS admits lack of capacity improvements for parking bicycles on site since 2011 despite growth of cycling modal share;
- Existing cycle parking facing entrance to the SVUH inappropriate and inadequate;
- Visitor bike parking of 30 spaces inadequate;
- No Dublin Bike hubs located on Campus;

Cycle Lanes

- Proposal for two-way cycle lane along Nutley Lane not feasible within existing configuration and vague reference to improved footpaths;
- Major gaps in cycle lane provision along Merrion Road and absence of any on Nutley Lane with existing cycle infrastructure deemed to represent a barrier to further growth in staff cycle use;
- On-street parking on Nutley Lane should be removed as a hazard to cyclists required to use footpath and should be used as a cycle lane;

- Cycle route required adjacent to and separate from the pedestrian route between junction of Nutley Lane and Merrion Road and main entrance to SVUH;
- Cycle lanes should have a buffer with parked cars to avoid 'dooring';
- Mobility manager should be appointed with traffic management plan required for the Campus;

Sandymount/Merrion to Blackrock Corridor Study

- Scale of proposed works and junction redesign and effect on the access to the cul-de-sac unclear and residents made this observation to NTA;
- Uncertainty surrounding road development and the proposed development prejudicial to residents and their properties;
- Consideration of the impact of the uncertainty regarding road access will need to be weighed as part of application;
- Concern that proposals for Merrion Gates may not be implemented, given cost, and the potential impact this would have on the development as submitted;
- Did Merrion Gates proposal require material changes to the proposed development compared to application ready to be lodged in December 2015;

Other

- New hospital should have 2/3 satellite clinics within core catchment areas to undertake routine scanning reducing need to travel to the hospital;
- Public consultation did not consider concerns outside the application boundary and engagements with relevant Roads Authorities not meaningful;

Residential Amenity

Transition between Existing Residential and Proposed Development

- Eastern area of site abutting rear of Herbert Ave currently single and two-storey with balance of residential scale and amenity with a large public development sought;
- City Development Plan requires consideration be given to existing residential amenity and abrupt transitions should be provided;

- Herbert Avenue zoned Z2 which seeks to protect the special interest of conservation areas with the St Vincent's campus zoned Z15 and in the 'Low Rise' category;
- Proposal towers above existing domestic scale on Herbert Avenue with an abrupt transition;
- While Private Hospital is high-rise, orientation of the building, space around it and distance between it and domestic dwellings lessens transition;
- Design details of Private Hospital address the transitions in scale and mass which proposal does less successfully with further consideration required to the height and mass;
- Window design and orientation of Private Hospital not adopted and should be considered with use flared out design on east elevation and use of brise soleil considered beneficial;
- No alternative design plans provided;
- Height of last development on the site used as justification to increase the height of the next with no limit;

Ownership of lands along Eastern Boundary and Treatment of Same

- Access road and land bordering properties in Herbert Avenue not part of planning application and mitigating measures required to minimise impact so unclear whether hospital owner will facilitate landscaping this boundary;
- As no planting proposed along the eastern boundary, planting in addition to noise abatement screening should be a pre-commencement condition with appropriate consents required;
- Residents seek consultation and agreement on the planting scheme and noise abatement screening of sufficient height, with suggestions for planting outlined, which should be in place pre commencement;
- No specific lighting proposals to deal with the internal roadway closest to Herbert Avenue;

Uses Proposed on Eastern Elevation of Proposal

- Ambulance set down area, blue light entrance and emergency access on east of building with 24-hour access closest to Herbert Avenue and consideration could be given to moving these elsewhere and failing this landscaping, screening and noise abatement along boundary;

Inadequate Information Submitted

- In relation to sunlight there are no shadow studies provided regarding impact on their home and garden and require such studies are carried out;
- No study of Herbert Avenue during design process and limited photomontages with existing heights on campus used to justify proposal but not the adjoining residential neighbourhood;

Hours of Construction

- Not appropriate to facilitate construction work seven days a week and works outside of hours proposed in a residential area;

Support for the Proposal

- Submissions received in support of the proposal are summarised as follows:
- Project is of vital regional and national importance and will facilitate the implementation of improvements outlined in the Maternity Strategy 2016;
- Proposal will facilitate the enhancement and development of neonatology services within the GDA;
- Location on a shared campus with SVUH, one of Irelands leading teaching hospitals provides the optimal model for provision of services.
- Proposed co-location significant milestone towards further development of excellence in neonatal services, safe obstetric and gynaecological care;
- Proposal will revolutionise the provision of maternity and gynaecological care facilitating rapid access between clinical departments;

Other Matters

- Matters raised regarding governance, ownership of proposed facility, ethics of proposed facility and matters related to separation of Church and State;

Public Representatives

An email received in support of the concerns raised in submissions made by the Nutley Residents Association outlined the following:

1) Traffic and transport issues during the construction phase

2) Traffic and transport issues during the operational phase

3) The potential parking issues that could arise and the impact of these on the local residents as a result of this development.

APPENDIX 1 - Part 3

Planning History

A table setting out the details of the planning history on the site is included at Section 1.6 of the report. The following provides a description of the proposal and details regarding some adjoining sites. Invalid applications have not been attached.

On Site

Reg. Ref. 2047/17

Proposal: Construction of: - 320 sq.m of infill offices in an existing void space on the ground, first and second floors of the existing 8 storey block and 520 sq.m of modular offices on two floors on the Sisters of Charity Caritas Campus connected to the hospital by a covered walkway 62 m in length.

Decision: Grant

Reg. Ref. 3876/15

Proposal: New pharmacy facility ancillary to the principal hospital use at roof level of the existing Main Ward Block in the form of a new 2 and 3 storey structure

Decision: Grant

Reg. Ref. WEB1047/12

Proposal: Replacement of existing access ramps to meet the building regulations, new single storey canopy structure to the front entrance, planter boxes and signage, all to the existing Merrion Wing, Dermatology Department on the hospital campus.

Decision: Grant

Reg. Ref. 2008/12

Proposal: Permission and retention for development to a previously permitted 8 storey over basement building (Reg. Refs. 3117/07 3458/09 and 4070/10) at SVUH. Provision of a generator compound, provision of a new fire exit from Concourse level on the northern end of the ward block, provision of plant on level 7 roof.

Decision: Grant

Reg. Ref. 4070/10

Proposal: Amend previously permitted development (Reg. Ref. 3117/07) and subsequent amendment permission (Reg. Ref. 3458/09) for minor alterations to the previously permitted 8 storey over basement building - a minor reorientation of the building, the relocation of the lift core into the main body of the building, the resulting re-planning of internal accommodation and services, associated elevational modifications and a minor increase in the gross floor area of 205m2. The development is located between the Genome Resource Building/ Education Research Building and the Convent Building at the south west part of the SVUHC.

Decision: Grant

Reg. Ref. 3458/09

Proposal: Changes to approved permission (Reg. Ref. 3117/07) comprising changes to elevations and an extension to basement to accommodate plant room to total area of 610.7m2. The development is located between the Genome Resource Building/ Education Research Building and the Convent Building at the south west part of the SVUHC

Decision: Grant

Reg. Ref. 2807/08

Proposal: 2 no. Vodafone antennae and three cabinets on the rooftop of St. Vincent's University Hospital.

Decision: Grant

Reg. Ref. 1439/08

Proposal: Two storey Workshop with changing and canteen facilities of a total gross area of 240m2, with associated minor works.

Decision: Grant

Reg. Ref. 5925/07

Proposal: Portacabin to accommodate the pain management service located at the rear of the former convent at the southwest end of the campus and the landscaping works at Nutley Lane Boundary.

Decision: Grant

Reg. Ref. 4714/07

Proposal: 110kV to medium voltage electrical transformer station.

Decision: Grant

Reg. Ref. 4578/07

Proposal: 96,000 litre oil tank and a 60,000 litre cold water storage tank, with associated minor works on two sites with a combined area of 99m2 located between the Boiler House and the New Pharmacy buildings, both sites are located at the north-east part of the campus.

Decision: Grant

Reg. Ref. 3225/07

Proposal: 1 no. single storey 83.27m2 aseptic laboratory extension to the rear of the existing private hospital to the rear of the existing private hospital.

Decision: Grant

Reg. Ref. 3117/07

Proposal: Construct a seven storey in-patient ward building plus plant level above, comprising of 5 floors of ward accommodation (100) beds, a floor of day ward (20 beds), a ground floor level of administrative and support accommodation, and basement plant room, linking to the main hospital street at ground floor level, and associated minor works to a total area of 7,960msq. The development was located between the Genome Resource building/Education Research Building and Convent building at the south-west part of the Campus.

Decision: Grant

Reg. Ref. 1687/07

Proposal: Construct a two storey roof top infill extension with plant level, comprising of 4 operating theatres and clinical support accommodation, linking to the new main clinical block at third, fourth and plant level and associated

minor works to a total area of 2,834m2 located at third, fourth and plant floor levels of the original main ward block.

Decision: Grant

Reg. Ref. 6700/06

Proposal: Single storey 95m2 aseptic laboratory extension to the hospital and the construction of a single storey 7.7m2 plant enclosure.

Decision: Grant

Reg. Ref. 5120/06, ABP Ref. PL. 29S. 223111

Proposal: Permission for a Private Hospital on a site measuring 1.9 ha within the St. Vincent's University Hospital Campus known as St. Anthony's and located in the southern end of Herbert Avenue with construction of the principal Hospital Building measuring c.26,500sq.m and ranging in height from 3 no. to 8 no. stories (with plant at roof level) to principally accommodate 260 no. beds, operating theatres, a high dependency unit, an accident and emergency/minor injuries department, x-ray and ambulatory day care facilities and other support clinical and non-clinical services, consulting suites, pathology facilities, a pharmacy, a hospital restaurant and general administration. Existing vehicular access via Herbert Avenue was closed off except for exceptional emergency use with all future vehicular access to the site (including everyday emergency traffic) was to be routed through the St. Vincent's University Hospital site via the Merrion Road entrance.

Decision: Grant on Appeal

Reg. Ref. 4216/06

Proposal: Permission to renew the existing planning permission Reg. Ref. 1716/01 for the construction of a single storey temporary building and other associated minor works to a total area of 115m2 located to the west of the existing St Anthony's Building at Herbert Avenue.

Decision: Grant

Reg. Ref. 4208/06

Proposal: Permission to renew the existing planning permission Reg. Ref. 1720/01 for the construction of a single storey temporary building and other associated minor works to a total area of 250m2 located to the rear of the former School of Diagnostic Imaging at Herbert Avenue.

Decision: Grant

Reg. Ref. 3223/06

Proposal: Renew the existing planning permission Reg. Ref. 1030/01 for the construction of a first floor addition to each of two existing single storey temporary buildings located to the rear of the existing hospital buildings.

Decision: Grant

Reg. Ref. 3709/05

Proposal: Permanent retention of emergency generator in an acoustic enclosure located adjacent to existing ESB substation at Herbert Avenue.

Decision: Grant

Reg. Ref. 2039/05

Proposal: Permission to extend Reg. Ref. 0343/00 for a single two story temporary building for office type use of total area 248m2 linking to existing School of Nursing and other associated minor works located in the courtyard between the existing School of Nursing and existing Assembly Hall to the north of the site.

Decision: Grant

Reg. Ref. 2038/05

Proposal: Extend Reg. Ref. 1020/00 for the single two story temporary building for hospital ward use of total area of 548m2 linking to existing main hospital building located in the green area to the south of the hospital restaurant.

Decision: Grant

Reg. Ref. 4265/04

Proposal: Renew Reg. Reg. 3618/99 for three single storey temporary buildings, the relocation of two existing temporary buildings and an extension to one of the

relocated temporary buildings 712m2 located to the rear of the existing hospital buildings.

Decision: Grant

Reg. Ref. 2328/03

Proposal: Change of use of existing 3 storey medical residence building (1,014m2) to accommodate medical, administrative and storage.

Decision: Grant

Reg. Ref. 1720/01

Proposal: Single storey temporary building to a total area of 250m2.

Decision: Grant

Reg. Ref. 1716/01

Proposal: Single storey temporary building to a total area of 115m2.

Decision: Grant

Reg. Ref. 1030/01

Description: First floor addition to each of two existing single storey temporary buildings, to a total area of 555m2 located to the rear of the existing hospital buildings.

Decision: Grant

Reg. Ref. 0983/01

Proposal: Revision to Grant Order No.P5672 for minor alterations to elevations, to increase site area and to provide 1 no. parking bay.

Decision: Grant

Reg. Ref. 3907/00, ABP. Reg. Ref. PL29S.123708

Proposal: Breast screening unit containing screening and associated facilities as part of the overall development of its facilities consisting of a two storey building with a floor area of 880m2 located adjacent to Carew House, Merrion Road.

Decision: Grant on Appeal

Reg. Ref. 2827/00

Proposal: Ground gas installation (AGI) in small single storey building (7.2m x 6.3m floor area).

Decision: Grant

Reg. Ref. 1020/00

Proposal: Single storey temporary building for hospital ward use of total area of 548m2 linking to the existing main hospital building ward located in the green area to the south of the hospital restaurant.

Decision: Grant

Reg. Ref. 0432/00

Proposal: Single storey Waste Marshalling Yard, Gas Bottle Store and associated site works with total floor area of the new works is 835m2.

Decision: Grant

Reg. Ref. 0343/00

Description: Two storey temporary building of office type use of total area 248m2 linking to existing School of Nursing located in the courtyard between the existing School of Nursing and existing Assembly Hall to the north of the site.

Decision: Grant

Reg. Ref. 0279/00, ABP. Reg. Ref. PL29S.120754

Proposal: Partial demolition (22m2) and construction of a single storey plus roof level plant extension to the existing mortuary building - total floor area of new work 281m2 and other associated works located to the north of the existing mortuary building.

Decision: Grant on Appeal

Reg. Ref. 0231/00

Proposal: Single storey Pharmaceutical bulk store extension with roof level Plant to the rear of the hospital building. The total floor area of the new work is 98m2.

Decision: Grant

Reg. Ref. 3618/99

Proposal: Three single storey temporary buildings, the relocation of two existing temporary buildings and an extension to one of the relocated temporary buildings, total area of new buildings 712m2 located to the rear of the existing hospital buildings.

Decision: Grant

Reg. Ref. 2992/99

Proposal: Psychiatry Unit, containing ward areas and ancillary accommodation, as part of the overall development of its facilities comprising a single storey over basement with a roof level plant room building having a floor area of 2,617m2 located to the rear of and is linked to the existing main hospital block.

Decision: Grant

Reg. Ref. 1137/99

Proposal: Two storey temporary building totalling 155sq.m to accommodate the Merrion Unit of National Breast Screening Programme located to the south east of Carew House.

Decision: Grant

Reg. Ref. 1575/98, ABP. Reg. Ref. PL 29S.109451

Proposal: First phase of the redevelopment of facilities at Elm Park, Dublin 4 consisting of a 5 storey over basement building, (14,860sq.m) built to the front (north) of and linked to the main hospital block accommodating accident and emergency department at ground floor level with a new entrance to the west, Ambulatory Day Care, Diagnostic imaging, Pathology Laboratory and Intensive Care Unit. Part of the fourth floor was proposed but not fitted out to accommodate operating theatres in the next phase of the development. The basement level was to accommodate carparking and service access with the building forming the new main entrance to the hospital and required the existing 14 storey nurses home be demolished. A screened landscape split-level partially sunken carpark (part 2 storey, part 3 storey) to accommodate 500 cars to the northern perimeter of the site replaced existing surface carparking in this area. The existing 2 storey Pathology Building was demolished to make way for a new 3 storey building to accommodate further Ambulatory Day Care Facility. The existing helipad was relocated to a position near the demolished nurses home. Existing vehicular access to the site was retained. The internal vehicular layout was modified and surface carparking was rearranged and extended. A new

pedestrian access route was provided from the Merrion Road/Nutley Lane junction.

Decision: Grant on Appeal

Reg. Ref. 2026/98

Proposal: Alterations, partial reconstruction and retention of remaining magnetic resonance imaging and diagnostic facility building.

Decision: Grant

On Adjoining Sites

St. Mary's Home and School for the Blind

Reg. Ref. 4515/08

Proposal: Construction of a glazed extension of approximately 11.5m2 to the front entrance.

Decision: Grant

Reg. Ref. 2799/04

Proposal: Single storey extension to existing convalescent home, St Marys, Merrion Road, Dublin 4.

Decision: Grant

Reg. Ref. 1539/02, ABP. Reg. Ref. PL29S. 201622

Proposal: Mixed Use Scheme comprising residential development, office buildings, hotel, private hospital and housing for the elderly; ancillary facilities include a conference centre, restaurant, leisure centre, crèche and pavilions and an underground carpark at Elm Park, Merrion Road, Dublin 4.

Decision: Grant on appeal

Reg. Ref. 1986/00

Proposal: New convent.

Decision: Grant

Reg. Ref. 1366/98

Proposal: Single storey extension to St Oliver's unit.

Decision: Grant

Herbert Avenue

Reg. Ref. WWEB1065/16

Proposal: Change of use from clinical surgery and offices to residential accommodation at 33 Herbert Avenue

Decision: Grant

Reg. Ref. 2835/12 (PL29S.241079)

Proposal: New vehicular entrance gateway and dished pavement at 21 Herbert Avenue.

Decision: Granted on Appeal

Reg. Ref. 2824/12 (PLPL29S.241078)

Proposal: Two storey extension at 21 Herbert Avenue

Decision: Granted on Appeal

Reg. Ref. 2334/12

Proposal: single storey non-habitable, non-commercial outbuilding at 21 Herbert Avenue

Decision: Grant

Reg. Ref. WEB1036/12

Proposal: Two storey extension to the rear of the dwelling, new vehicular entrance at 21 Herbert Avenue

Decision: Refuse

Reg. Ref. 5226/08

Proposal: demolition, renovation and extension works to existing medical consulting rooms, contained within an existing two storey semi-detached building at 2 Herbert Avenue.

Decision: Grant

Reg. Ref. 2468/04

Proposal: New driveway at 2A Herbert Avenue

Decision: Grant

Reg. Ref. 0635/99

Proposal: Extension to rear no. 12 Herbert Avenue and extension and conservatory to rear playschool at no. 10.

Decision: Grant

Public Road

Reg. Ref. 1507/97

Proposal: Erect a bus shelter (Dublin Bus).

Decision: Grant

APPENDIX 2

Oral Hearing Agenda

Day and Date: 10 AM - Wednesday 31 May 2017	
Time	**Topic**
AM	• Opening of oral hearing by Inspector • Applicant: Summary of proposed development (max. 10 minutes) • Applicant: Response to issues raised in observations –
13:00 – 14:00	**Break**
PM	• Applicant: Response to issues raised in observations • Observers' Submissions from Nutley Residents Association, Elm Park Golf & Sports Club, Fionuala Sherwin & John P. O'Malley
Day and Date: 10 AM - Thursday 1 June 2017	
AM	• Questioning of Participants including National Transport Authority, Dublin City Council and Applicant by Tom Philips & Ciaran McKeon on behalf of Nutley Residents Association & Elm Park Golf & Sports Club, and by Fionuala Sherwin
13:00 – 14:00	**Break**
PM	• Questioning continued. • Closing submissions from Tom Philips & Ciaran McKeon on behalf of Nutley Residents Association & Elm Park Golf & Sports Club, Fionuala Sherwin, John P. O'Malley & Applicant. • Closing of Hearing by Inspector

APPENDIX 3

Documents Presented to the Oral Hearing

Applicant

- Introduction to Proposed development with accompanying presentation – Sean Mahon
- Outline Legal Submissions – Jarlath Fitzsimons S.C & Michael Wall B.L
- Co-location & Modal of Care – Ass. Professor Shane Higgins
- Town Planning – Paul O'Neill
- Design and Related Responses with accompanying presentation – Sean Mahon & Others (Stephen Diamond & Cosmin Ticleanu)
- Traffic & Transportation – Donal McDaid
- Construction Programme Management – Dan Moran
- Traffic Impact – Air Quality with accompanying presentation – Dr. Avril Challoner
- Noise with accompanying presentation – Jennifer Harmon
- Series of 5 slides related to Traffic, Access, Parking, LinSig
- Drawing – Nutley Lane Proposed Temporary Construction Access with associated wording of Proposed Condition

Observers

- Presentation by Tom Philips on behalf of Nutley Lane Residents' Association
- Presentation by Ciaran McKeon on behalf of Nutley Lane Residents' Association
- A2 & A3 aerial photographs on behalf of Nutley Lane Residents' Association
- Presentation by Tom Philips on behalf of Elm Park Golf & Sports Club CLG
- Presentation by Ciaran McKeon on behalf of Elm Park Golf & Sports Club CLG
- Observation from Dr. Roger McMorrow and Others