

Sixteenth Schedule


SCHEDULE OF COSTS

In accordance with the provisions of section 47DD of the Transport (Railway Infrastructure) Act, 2001, as amended, the amount due to be paid by the applicant to the Commission is **€1,331,497.00**.

Note: A breakdown of the above is set out in the attached Appendix 1.

In accordance with the provisions of section 47DD of the Transport (Railway Infrastructure) Act, 2001, as amended, the Commission does not direct the applicant to pay contributions, as set out in Appendix 2, towards the costs incurred by persons during the course of consideration of the application.

Note: A breakdown of the above is set out in the attached Appendix 2.



Tom Rabbette
Member of An Coimisiún Pleanála
duly authorised to authenticate
the Seal of the Board.

Dated this 30th day of

Sept.

2025



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

**Order –
Appendix 1
ABP-314724-22**

Strategic Infrastructure Development

Cost of determining the Application

File Number: ABP-314724-22

Proposed Development: Railway (Metrolink - Estuary to Charlemont via Dublin Airport) Order [2022].

Costs incurred by An Coimisiún Pleanála in determining the application.

	An Coimisiún Pleanála's Costs	€
(1)	Cost (calculated based on Inspector's time): Inspector 1 (pre- application) - €14,818 Inspector 2 (application) - €596,544 Inspector 3 (application) - €489,233	1,100,595
(2)	Costs invoiced to the Board: Sound/recording costs - €15,498 Oral Hearing Venue – €23,000 Consultancy - €304,453.79	342,951.79
(3)	Total chargeable costs	1,443,546.79
(4)	Application Fee - €100,000 Pre-application Consultation Fee - €4,500	104,500.00
(5)	Observer fees paid - €7,550	7,550.00
(6)	Net amount due to be recouped from the applicant	1,331,497.00





An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

**Order –
Appendix 2
ABP-314724-22**

Strategic Infrastructure Development

Third party cost requests

File Number: ABP-314724-22

Proposed Development: Railway (Metrolink - Estuary to Charlemont via Dublin Airport) Order [2022]

The Commission decided on each cost application as indicated hereunder:

1. Application for costs by Anne G. Meehan:

Decision: The Commission decided that no payment towards the costs incurred by the observer during the course of consideration of the application is to be made.

Reason: A contribution towards the photocopying and stationery costs is not warranted or justified in the circumstances.

2. Application for costs by Brendan Heneghan:

Decision: The Commission decided that no payment towards the costs incurred by the observer during the course of consideration of the application is to be made.

Reason: A contribution towards the printing/photocopying costs is not warranted or justified in the circumstances.

3. Application for costs by Charlemont and Dartmouth Community Group:

Decision: The Commission decided that no payment towards the costs incurred by the observer during the course of consideration of the application is to be made.

Reason: There was no substantive or material change to the proposed development brought about from the submissions made on the application and at the Oral Hearing by the observer.



4. Application for costs by Donal O'Brolchain:

Decision: The Commission decided that no payment towards the costs incurred by the observer during the course of consideration of the application is to be made.

Reason: Issues raised are issues that would be more appropriately addressed in the policy-making phase and not at application stage. There was no substantive or material change to the proposed development brought about from the submissions made on the application and at the Oral Hearing by the observer.

5. Application for costs by Espirit Investments Limited:

Decision: The Commission decided that no payment towards the costs incurred by the observer during the course of consideration of the application is to be made.

Reason: There was no substantive or material change to the proposed development brought about from the submissions made on the application and at the Oral Hearing by the observer.

6. Application for costs by IPUT and Irish Life Assurance:

Decision: The Commission decided that no payment towards the costs incurred by the observer during the course of consideration of the application is to be made.

Reason: There was no substantive or material change to the proposed development brought about from the submissions made on the application and at the Oral Hearing by the observer.

7. Application for costs by Metro South West Group:


Decision: The Commission decided that no payment towards the costs incurred by the observer during the course of consideration of the application is to be made.

Reason: Matters raised by the witness for which the costs are sought are matters that would be more appropriately addressed in the policy-making phase and not at application stage. There was no substantive or material change to the proposed development brought about from the submissions made on the application and at the Oral Hearing by the observer.

8. Application for costs by Shandon Mill Owners Management Company CLG:

Decision: The Commission decided that no payment towards the costs incurred by the observer during the course of consideration of the application is to be made.

Reason: There was no substantive or material change to the proposed development brought about from the submissions made on the application and at the Oral Hearing by the observer.



9. Application for costs by Union Investment Real Estate GmbH:

Decision: The Commission decided that no payment towards the costs incurred by the observer during the course of consideration of the application is to be made.

Reason: There was no substantive or material change to the proposed development brought about from the submissions made on the application and at the Oral Hearing by the observer.

10. Application for costs by Wynn's Hotel:

Decision: The Commission decided that no payment towards the costs incurred by the observer during the course of consideration of the application is to be made.

Reason: There was no substantive or material change to the proposed development brought about from the submissions made on the application and at the Oral Hearing by the observer.

