

Submission No.			196		
Organisation Name or Name of Submitter			Mouna Unlimited Company (represented by Stephen Ward Town Planning & Development Consultants Limited)		
Item No.	Section Ref.	Page No.	Observation Statement	TII Response	
RE: RAILWAY (METROLINK-ESTUARY TO CHARLEMONT VIA DUBLIN AIRPORT) ORDER 2022 - LANDS AT SILLOGUE GREEN LANE AND BALLYSTRUAN LANE, SWORDS, CO. DUBLIN					
1	Introduction (page 1 and 2 of submission)	2&3	<p>In this regard, our client seeks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Relocation of the Dardistown Depot and associated services lines.</li><li>• Realignment of the Metrolink route to avoid the infringement onto its lands.</li><li>• Recognition of the permitted and established use of its sites as an abattoir which is a sensitive receptor as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment.</li><li>• Unencumbered and unrestricted access and egress to the site and unrestricted and unencumbered operational capabilities at the site and the WWTP during the course of construction and during the operational phase of the scheme.</li></ul>	Please refer to the specific responses below to these concerns.	
2	Introduction (page 3 of submission)	4	2.2 Our client has engaged with Transport Infrastructure Ireland at every opportunity during the non-statutory consultation process In 2018 and 2019 when submissions were made clearly Identifying the use of the established and permitted factory building as an abattoir. The use of part of the site by Frylite is temporary. The temporary planning permission under which Frylite operate will lapse in 2024.	TI thank you for your continued engagement with the Project. The proposed Project has taken into consideration the use of the site, and as such the Railway Order application incorporates measures to ensure the continued use of the site during construction and operational phases.	
3	Introduction (page 3 of submission)	4	It is therefore essential that the plant retains full and unencumbered access, egress and operational capability during the construction and operational phases of Metrolink. Our client Is very concerned that the assessment of the chosen route for Metrolink and the Dardistown Depot has not taken this sensitive use Into consideration in the Environmental Impact Assessment for the project.	<p>As identified in Response (2) access will be maintained to the factory at all times during both the construction and operation phase. During the determination of an appropriate location for the proposed depot (and alignment into the depot), consideration was taken of the location of this facility in order to identify the potential for a direct impact on the facility or an indirect impact in terms of potential impacts on the access to the site. The chosen depot location was chosen (partially) on the basis of ensuring that the facility could remain operational during both the construction and operational phase. Standard mitigation measures as identified in the CEMP (Appendix 5.1 to the EIA) will be implemented to ensure that there are no significant environmental effects during the construction phase. There are no anticipated significant effects identified to this site during the operational phase of the proposed Project.</p> <p>Chapter 7 (Consideration of Alternatives) section 7.7.4 presents the two-stage assessment for the identification of a location for the depot. As part of the environmental assessment of both Estuary and Dardistown locations, Population and Land Use was considered, with 'local sensitivities' identified. It is considered that the population at Dardistown would be less sensitive to disruption during the Construction Phase and/or the Operational Phase when compared to Estuary as there are fewer sensitive locations in close proximity to the proposed site and those that are present are already exposed to high levels of noise from Dublin Airport and the M50 Motorway.</p>	
4	Proposed works affecting the subject lands (page 4 of submission)	5	The Identification of 'temporary lands' takes no account of future servicing of the line or wayleaves associated with the operating line which would prevent future development. In addition, the change in the lands to accommodate future possible development as a result of the metro line, while they may be 'reinstated' at the surface, are essentially severed from surroundings lands that have no subsurface development. It is submitted that the lands either side of the tracks and particularly between the tracks should be seen as permanent as they effectively create a no development zone.	<p>Maintenance of the line is to be undertaken from the permanent railway corridor, with wayleaves included within the Railway Order application where otherwise considered necessary.</p> <p>Where the track alignment is provided as cut and cover sections, these will facilitate the provision of access across the line where required in the future, limiting severance of land areas and avoiding the need for unnecessary land take.</p>	
5	Proposed works affecting the subject lands (page 4 of submission)	5	The statutory compensation process is considered a mitigation measure under the assessment of Land Take. As such the extent of land take and potential long term impact Is a material consideration of the EIA process.	As presented in Chapter 21 (Land Take), the acquisition of the various specified rights and interests in land and property, is necessary in order to ensure the delivery of the MetroLink project in its entirety. Land owners who have land acquired will be entitled to apply for compensation in accordance with the general compulsory purchase code. Property owners who have properties that are subject to short-term and/or temporary acquisition can also apply for compensation. Compensation will be provided through the Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO).	

Submission No.			196	
Organisation Name or Name of Submitter			Mouna Unlimited Company (represented by Stephen Ward Town Planning & Development Consultants Limited)	
Item No.	Section Ref.	Page No.	Observation Statement	TII Response
RE: RAILWAY (METROLINK-ESTUARY TO CHARLEMONT VIA DUBLIN AIRPORT) ORDER 2022 - LANDS AT SILLOGUE GREEN LANE AND BALLYSTRUAN LANE, SWORDS, CO. DUBLIN				
6	Note 1 to proposed works affecting the subject lands (page 4 of submission)	5	We note there appears to be a discrepancy between the figures contained within able 21.5 of Chapter 21 of the EIAR and the Railway Order Book of Reference Second Schedule (Land which may be acquired) and Fourth Schedule (Land of which temporary possession may be taken). The total area of lands affected In both cases is 8,569sq.m.	Table 21.6 (not 21.5) in EIAR Chapter 21 (Land Take) states an area of 8569m2 required, comprising Plot ML39-T2 6742m2 (Temporary); Plot ML39-T3 1496m2 (Permanent); Plot ML3E-T21 225m2 (Temporary); and Plot ML38-T3 106m2 (Temporary).
7	Grounds of submission (page 4 of submission)	5	In particular, the position of the Dardistown Depot will have a long term Impact on this sensitive receptor that has not been adequately assessed as part of the documents submitted with the application for a Railway Order.	<p>TII disagree with the statement that the long term impact on the receptor has not been adequately assessed. The EIAR provides a comprehensive and detailed assessment of the potential impacts, mitigation measures and residual effects on sensitive and non-sensitive locations along the entire alignment. Industrial facilities are generally not considered particularly sensitive, so long as the proposed Project does not impact the operation of the facility (such as severed access). As detailed in Chapter 11 (Population and Land Use), sensitive receptors are considered to include homes(houses as well as case homes and residential facilities) and social infrastructure, including medical, educational, rehabilitation and recreational facilities (i.e. sports, leisure and recreation) along with tourism and economic facilities such as businesses and visitor attractions recognised for their cultural or historic significance and/or natural assets. However an assessment has been undertaken under a number of relevant headings identifying the potential impacts on this facility as outlined here. Air quality impact during construction and operation phases of MetroLink was assessed in Chapter 16 Air Quality of the EIAR. According to the assessment there will be no impact on the Mouna Unlimited Company’s operation during construction or operation period of MetroLink as follow: “The Construction Phase of the assessment identifies a generally negligible or beneficial effect on air quality in the vicinity of the proposed Project. Therefore, overall, it is considered that the residual effects with the EPA Guidelines (EPA 2022) and considering the likely effects of emissions from the proposed Project construction, the likely effects are considered overall Neutral, Not Significant and Medium-Term.” and “Therefore, overall, it is considered that the residual effects with the EPA Guidelines (EPA 2022) and considering the likely effect of emissions from the Operational Phase of the proposed Project, the likely effects are considered overall Neutral, Not Significant and Long-Term.”</p> <p>Ground-borne noise and vibration impact during construction and operation phases of MetroLink was assessed in the EIAR Chapter 14 Ground-borne Noise and Vibration. According to the assessment there will be no impact on the Mouna Unlimited Company’s operation due to ground-borne vibrations and no significant impact due to ground-borne noise during construction and operation phases. Airborne noise and vibration impact during construction and operation phases of Metrolink was assessed in Chapter 13 Airborne Noise and Vibration. The facilities operated by Mouna Unlimited Company are assessed as industrial buildings. According to British Standard BS 5228 – 1: 2009+A1:2014 – Fixed Limits, the noise limit is “75dB (LAeq,T) daytime (12hr) &amp; Saturday AM (6hr)”. According to the assessment in EIAR Appendix 13.7 Construction Phase modelling and Appendix 13.8 Operational Phase Modelling, this threshold will not be reached during the construction or operation of Metrolink, resulting in no impact on Mouna Unlimited Company operations. Furthermore access to the site will be maintained throughout but the construction phase and the operational phase of the project to ensure that the site can continue to operate. During the construction phase, it is considered that mitigation measures as outlined in the EIAR and the CEMP will provide sufficient protection to ensure that there are no impacts on the operation of the facility. There are no significant impacts predicted here during the operational phase of the project.</p>
8	Grounds of submission (page 5 of submission)	5	4.2 It is submitted the proposed site for the depot and associated tracks and infrastructure Is not the optimum location for the delivery of the Metrolink Project and servicing of the trams. There are adequate lands available to the west and north that could facilitate the metro line and service depot that are more suited and which also avoid land take from our client and the relocation of the depot would negate the need for the two depot access lines which sever a key proportion of the factory site. It is our client's preference to have the Metrolink line moved to the west and the depot moved to an alternative location to avoid our client's property and lands.	Options for the location of the depot and the associated access lines into the depot have been extensively assessed as part of the development of the proposed Project. The proposals incorporated in the RO application are considered to provide the best balance between operational requirements; compliance with planning designations (with the majority of the proposed site within 'General Employment' rather than 'High Technology' zoned land area; environmental impact; and retention of the ability for future adjacent land development as envisaged in local plans. Further details are provided in EIAR Chapter 7 (Consideration of Alternatives (Section 7.7.4.2 to 7.7.4.5) and EIAR Appendix A7.6 (Depot Location Options Report).
9	Proposed Works and Impact on ABP Industrial Plant (page 6 of submission)	7	Our client does not consent to any measure proposing the loss of land occupied by the Industrial facility and/or the WWTP. Any intrusion into these works has the potential to Impact upon the operating capacity of ABP business group. It is submitted that the route of the MetroLink and construction zone should be repositioned to adjacent undeveloped lands where no concerns re access to a working facility or protection of a food safe facility exists.	<p>Please refer to response item (8) above regarding the selection of depot location and track alignment.</p> <p>The proposed track alignment and depot do not impact or require land take from the Waste Water Treatment Plant (WWTP) site. Permanent land take from the industrial facility area is limited to a small area of open land on the north-west corner of the site, away from the industrial buildings.</p>

Submission No.			196	
Organisation Name or Name of Submitter			Mouna Unlimited Company (represented by Stephen Ward Town Planning & Development Consultants Limited)	
Item No.	Section Ref.	Page No.	Observation Statement	TII Response
RE: RAILWAY (METROLINK-ESTUARY TO CHARLEMONT VIA DUBLIN AIRPORT) ORDER 2022 - LANDS AT SILLOGUE GREEN LANE AND BALLYSTRUAN LANE, SWORDS, CO. DUBLIN				
10	Services (page 6 of submission)	7	Our client is gravely concerned that the proposal has the potential to impact on pipelines and other buried services crucial to the operation of the facility due to the proposal to provide the MetroLink below ground level in the vicinity of the submission lands. Our client requests cross sections, longitudinal sections and drainage proposals to fully assess the potential impact on essential services.	<p>The proposed Project has incorporated utility diversions where necessary to accommodate the proposed construction works and operational railway. For the Dardistown area these are indicated on the RO drawings in Utilities Diversions Book 1 of 4 Fingal County Council; see Ballymun Sheet 9 of 11 (Plan Drawing No ML-UC 303 9-10) and adjacent drawings with a summary of Residual Infrastructure and Utility Impacts Post Mitigation provided in EIAR Chapter 22 (Infrastructure and Utilities) Table 22.12.</p> <p>The requirement for utility diversions and protection is noted in EIAR Chapter 5 (MetroLink Construction Phase), section 5.4.10. Utility diversions known to be required at this time have been agreed in principle with the relevant statutory undertakers and the designs are included within the RO application. Following the grant of any RO all utility diversions and protection measures will be finalised and agreed with the relevant utility stakeholders (and relevant agencies).</p> <p>The assessment methodology, impact assessment and proposed mitigation measures are contained in EIAR Chapter 22 (Infrastructure &amp; Utilities).</p>
11	Sillogue Green Road Re-alignment (page 6 of submission)	7	There are no details provided for the realignment of Sillogue Green Road that serves the subject lands. The Railway Order documents contain only a plan with no dimensions. The realigned road would appear to be on fill as it passes the subject lands. Our client requests further detail to ensure that the proposed road and junctions are sufficient to cater for the HGV movements that are generated by the existing activities on site.	<p>Detailed design of the road will be undertaken at subsequent design stages subject to RO approval. The road will be designed in accordance with normal highway and junction standards, compatible with expected traffic use including HGVs.</p> <p>All road design will be subject to agreement with the relevant local authority and affected landowners where appropriate, as noted in EIAR Chapter 4 (Description of the MetroLink Project) Section 4.13.1.</p>
12	Grounds of submission 4.7 (page 6 of submission)	7	There has not been adequate consideration of the potential Impacts from the construction and operational phases of the proposed development on the ABP Plant which is a very sensitive commercial receptor.	Please refer to response item (7) above.
13	Grounds of submission 4.8 (page 7 of submission)	8	The proposal does not outline potential access routes to the subject lands during construction stage of MetroLink. Our client must be able to maintain unimpeded operating capacity during construction with full 24/7 accessibility and operational capability. The WWTP must also be accessible at all times for maintenance.	<p>Please refer to EIAR Chapter 4 (Description of MetroLink Project) Section 4.13.1. This states 'Where access to private or public property will be disrupted by the proposed Project, temporary/permanent alternative access is included in the design based on replacement on a like-for-like basis, subject to agreement with the affected landowners and the relevant local authority.</p> <p>The RO will apply for the replacement of any access arrangement extinguished on a like for like basis'.</p> <p>Typical construction details associated with both temporary and permanent roadworks are summarised in EIAR Chapter 5 (MetroLink Construction Phase) Section 5.5.1.</p>
14	Grounds of submission 4.9 (page 7 of submission)	8	The preliminary construction management plan that forms part of the EIAR does not provide details relevant to our client's property. Appendix 5.3 Construction Sequence Report highlights that a "full temporary road diversion" is required for Sillogue Green Road (Section 6.2 p.46 of 195) but no details are provided. Drawing ML1-JAI-EIA-ROUT_XX-DR-Y-05013 appears to include an access road through the adjacent construction area from the Naul Road via lands to the west but no description is provided of this intent. This access road crosses four separate sections of metro tracks and is also proposed as a haul route. A detailed construction management plan should identify how access will be maintained throughout the construction of the metro lines and the realigned Sillogue Road.	<p>EIAR Chapter 9 Traffic and Transport, Appendix A9.5 Scheme Traffic Management Plan provide details of Phase 1 and 2 of the proposed Temporary Traffic Management plans at Dardistown, see Section 6.5.6.2, Figures 6-13 and 6-14.</p> <p>The contractor(s) to be subsequently appointed subject to future progression of the project will be required to prepare a more detailed Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) for each specific package of works as required, building on the draft CEMP information contained in EIAR Appendix A5.1. There will thus be a specific CEMP prepared for the development of the depot and Dardistown station, which will include details of the construction programme and associated temporary works, including site haul routes, associated safety requirements and local diversions required to maintain access to properties while the works are progressed.</p>

Submission No.			196	
Organisation Name or Name of Submitter			Mouna Unlimited Company (represented by Stephen Ward Town Planning & Development Consultants Limited)	
Item No.	Section Ref.	Page No.	Observation Statement	TII Response
RE: RAILWAY (METROLINK-ESTUARY TO CHARLEMONT VIA DUBLIN AIRPORT) ORDER 2022 - LANDS AT SILLOGUE GREEN LANE AND BALLYSTRUAN LANE, SWORDS, CO. DUBLIN				
15	Grounds of submission 4.10 WWTP (page 7 of submission)	8	The route as illustrated alters the existing access to the WWTP and provides a new access road from Sillogue Green Road. The new access road and associated construction zone falls within the WWTP lands. We note the comment at Page 51 of Volume 2 Book 1 Chapter 7 (Consideration of the Alternatives) which states ' <i>At Dardistown required demolitions would be dependent on precise location of the depot location, but the only potential demolition and relocation of a private wastewater treatment plant</i> '. No part of the WWTP lands have been identified as necessary for the Metrolink project in the documents submitted with the Railway Order application.	<p>It is correct that the RO application does not require the acquisition of any lands from the WWTP site. The comment in the text referred to relates to the initial comparison of depot locations as described in the Preferred Route Design Development Report, with the depot location preferred at that time potentially impacting on the WWTP. The subsequent more detailed appraisal of depot location options as described in EIAR Appendix A7.6 revised the depot location with the location as included in the RO application not impacting the WWTP.</p> <p>Please refer to response item (2) regarding continued access during the works, which will be either on the existing Sillogue Green road; a temporary road or via the permanent realignment of the access road.</p>
16	Grounds of submission 4.11 (page 7 of submission)	8	Our client Is concerned that proposals made as part of this Railway Order will result in the inclusion of ABP lands that are not Identified as part of the documents submitted and without its consent. As already stated above, our client does not consent to any measure proposing the loss of land occupied by the industrial plant and WWTP and/or associated infrastructure, pipelines or other buried services.	Please refer to response item (15) above.
17	Grounds of submission 4.12 Dardistown Depot (page 7 of submission)	8	The proposed depot to the north of our clients' lands has the potential to generate negative impacts with regard to dust and particulate matter, light, odour, noise and vibration that could result in a decline in the quality/quantity of product from the existing plant and loss of business which in turn would have a negative impact on the wider business of ABP and related companies. The depot is of a large scale and if approved would result in a material increase of traffic using the surrounding road network. The increase in traffic has potential to negatively impact on plant related traffic. There is potential for unacceptable noise levels at the lairage area from the trams being tested and also from the operation of the depot. The depot will likely operate on a 24/7 basis (as per para. 6.11.2 of the EIAR) and would clearly generate noise, dust, odours and light spill during hours of darkness.	<p>The light impact of the Dardistown Depot was assessed in EIAR Chapter 27 (The Landscape). The proposed depot will include extensive lighting of the facility which will introduce a significant change to the night-time characteristics of the site, given the current virtual absence of lighting across the site.</p> <p>Overall, the potential effects on the visual environment and on visual amenity during the Construction Phase will be moderate and negative.</p> <p>Overall, the predicted effects on the visual environment and on visual amenity during the Operational Phase will be slight and negative.</p> <p>Appropriate mitigation measures will be taken to mitigate the visual effects as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Details of fencing, mesh netting etc used within the project which includes the use of darktoned, neutral colours (dark grey/black) and non-reflective finishes (if appropriate/practical) in order to ensure these elements are visually recessive. This assists significantly in reducing visual impact;</li><li>- The lighting strategy proposed for the public realm, particularly in respect of lighting intensity, timing control/periodicity, colour temperature and control of light spillage. This should include details of the lighting elements within the public realm associated with each station, particularly in respect of luminaire and column type, height, finish etc.</li></ul> <p>Following mitigation measures the impact on visual effects will be Slight &amp; Negative.</p>
			Response (17) continued.	<p>With regard to the Dardistown Depot and the area zoning see Response (26).</p> <p>Relating to traffic impact on the Mouna Unlimited Company’s operation during construction or operation period the assessment is detailed in Appendix 9.5 Scheme Traffic Management Plan. According to Appendix 9.5, access to Mouna Unlimited Company’s will be provided at all times due to a temporary access road whilst the permanent access road is not available.</p> <p>Traffic impact during construction, taking into consideration proposed traffic management, predicts an increase in HGV volume in the local area. This will be primarily on the R108 north of the M50 junction, of between 2% and 3% during the morning peak and with an increase of 3% in HGV volume along the R108 during the evening peak. Along Sillogue Green the predicted increase in HGV volume is higher, at 12% in the morning peak and 30% in the evening peak, however, this increase only equates to a minimal increase in actual HGV movements during both the morning and evening peaks.</p> <p>The impact on traffic during operation of MetroLink according to Chapter 9 Traffic and Transport, Table 9.136, will be Long-term Moderate and Slight Positive due to traffic reduction on the M50 and R108 Ballymun Road.</p> <p>Regarding the impact on Air quality, Noise and Vibration please refer to response item (19) below.</p>
18	Grounds of submission 4.13 (page 8 of submission)	9	It Is submitted that the proposal has not taken proper account of the plant as a very sensitive commercial receptor. The site is continually identified as 'FryLite' in the documentation submitted. The planning history detailed at section 4.4.2.5 of the Planning Report states the construction activities will not affect the temporary use of the site by Frylite but do not mentioned the abattoir.	Please refer to response item (7) above.

Submission No.			196	
Organisation Name or Name of Submitter			Mouna Unlimited Company (represented by Stephen Ward Town Planning & Development Consultants Limited)	
Item No.	Section Ref.	Page No.	Observation Statement	TII Response
RE: RAILWAY (METROLINK-ESTUARY TO CHARLEMONT VIA DUBLIN AIRPORT) ORDER 2022 - LANDS AT SILLOGUE GREEN LANE AND BALLYSTRUAN LANE, SWORDS, CO. DUBLIN				
19	Grounds of submission 4.13 (page 8 of submission)	9	The construction and operational phase will cause a significant negative impact in terms of inter alia, air quality, noise, ground borne noise and vibration. The potential environmental and operational impacts have not been adequately considered as part of the public consultation document. It is submitted that without the relocation of the depot and with clear, specific, defined and acceptable mitigating measures, the proposed development would result in a decline in the quality/quantity of product from the plant and loss of business which in turn would have negative impacts on the wider business of ABP and related companies and the ability of the Plant to operate properly.	Please refer to response to item (7) above.
20	Grounds of submission 4.14 and 4.15 (page 8 of submission)	9	According to section 7.7.4.1.1 of the EIAR, the reasoning behind the location of a depot at Dardistown is it <i>"has potential for less significant environmental effects when compared to the proposed site at Estuary. It is also possible to mitigate the majority of the potential Impacts Identified utilising the proposed mitigation measures outlined In the relevant chapters of the EIAR"</i> .  The location of the Depot cannot be justified on this basis as the abattoir has not even identified let alone assessed and therefore no appropriate mitigation measures are included.	Please refer to response items (3) and (7) above.
21	Grounds of submission 4.16 (page 8 of submission)	9	It is submitted that there is Inadequate Information submitted to support the assessment of alternatives contained within the EIAR. Documents are referred to in the EIAR that do not appear to form part of the application. For example, the Metrolink Preferred Route Design Development Report (TII, 2019) and the Preliminary Design Report (PDR) for Metrolink published by Jacobs/Idom In 2020 (Appendix 7.6- refers).	The MetroLink Preferred Route Design Development Report (TII, 2019) is a document that was part of the 2019 public consultation on MetroLink and the document remains available on the TII MetroLink website. It describes alternatives considered to the previously published Emerging Preferred Route (EPR) information.  The present EIAR contains information for all relevant design alternatives assessed, and provides the evidence supporting the selected location of the depot as included in the RO application. Please refer to EIAR Chapter 7 (Consideration of Alternatives). Section 7.7.4 of Chapter 7 presents the assessment and identification of a preferred site for the depot for the proposed Project. It includes an assessment of an option to locate the depot at Estuary and an alternative site at Dardistown, and the assessment of localised alternative locations within the Dardistown area. Links to the aforementioned reports are also provided within the documentation. Appendix A7.6 also presents the Depot Location Options Report.
22	Grounds of submission 4.17 (page 8 of submission)	9	According to the EIAR, a multi-criteria analysis was undertaken to review nine main options and various sub options. Diagram 7.7 illustrates alternative positions numbered 1-9 however the multi-criteria analysis does not appear to form part of the EIAR or have been submitted with the Railway Order application document. This Is a key document to understand why the position as proposed was selected.	Diagram 7.7 in the EIAR Chapter 7 (Consideration of Alternatives), shows all initial options considered for the depot location at Dardistown and justification is provided for the selection of Option 8a as the proposed depot location (Section 7.7.4.2 to 7.7.4.5). EIAR Appendix A7.6 provides further details on the assessment including comparison against a further depot option.
23	Grounds of submission 4.18, 4.19 and 4.20 (page 9 of submission)	10	Section 7.7.4.3 jumps straight to the fact that the preferred site is Option 8a and provides arguments for this position. The only other option considered in any detail was a further position, called Option 10 that was put forward by 'a major landowner in the Dardistown Area' and discussed at section 7.7.4.5 of the EIAR and assessed at appendix 7.6.  It is submitted that without the detailed analysis presented to An Bord Pleanála it cannot be concluded that the position of the Dardistown Depot is the best available option. The previous position of the Dardistown Depot was approved in 2011 and demonstrates that a depot can be facilitated without access lines affecting our client's lands.  Our client notes that Option 10 would have a significant impact on its lands and operation of the existing and established industrial businesses on site and that would result in the demolition and relocation of the WWTP. Option 10 would clearly have severe detrimental impacts on the WWTP and by definition also on the factory.	Please refer to response item (21) and (22). Note that depot Option 10 was not progressed and does not form part of the RO application. Option 8A was identified as the preferred site option for the location of the Depot, following a detailed environmental analysis, presented in section 7.7.4.3 of Chapter 7 (Consideration of Alternatives). As detailed in section 7.7.4.5, following consultation with a major landowner in the Dardistown area, further analysis was undertaken to review whether an alternative site location proposed by that developer would be a feasible option for the proposed depot. This option is referred to as Option 10 and is at a similar location to Option 1 previously assessed. However, Option 10 is located approximately 200m further west than Option 1 and extends into the Dublin Airport Public Safety Zones (PSZs). It is important to note that Option 1, which is like Option 10 was not previously selected as the preferred option for key reasons relating to planning and the interface with the proposed alignment for the Greater Dublin Drainage (GDD) sewer. Nonetheless, a further multicriteria analysis was undertaken, which compared Option 10 to the previously identified preferred option (Option 8a).



Submission No.			196	
Organisation Name or Name of Submitter			Mouna Unlimited Company (represented by Stephen Ward Town Planning & Development Consultants Limited)	
Item No.	Section Ref.	Page No.	Observation Statement	TII Response
RE: RAILWAY (METROLINK-ESTUARY TO CHARLEMONT VIA DUBLIN AIRPORT) ORDER 2022 - LANDS AT SILLOGUE GREEN LANE AND BALLYSTRUAN LANE, SWORDS, CO. DUBLIN				
24	Grounds of submission 4.21 (page 9 of submission)	10	When reviewing the documentation submitted with the Railway Order application, it appears that the map contained in the Railway Order Application Documentation relating to the Fingal Development Plan 2017-2023 zoning map 11 does not take account of Variation 1 which altered the noise zones around Dublin Airport adopted on the 9th of December 2019. We also note the LAP for Dardistown no longer applies and there is no objective to prepare a new LAP in the draft FDP 2023-2029.	<p>The figures in the Planning Report relate specifically to the land use zonings that apply to lands along the alignment of the project in both the Fingal Development Plan 2017-2023 and the draft plan as of the date of lodgement of the Railway Order. For clarity, other mapped objectives, including Noise Zones were not shown. The Noise Zones incorporated into the plan in 2019 have been considered and are described in the text of the Planning Report where appropriate.</p> <p>The status of the Dardistown LAP and the requirements of the draft Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029 in this regard are noted in the Planning Report.</p>
25	Grounds of submission 4.22, 4.23 and 4.24 (page 9 of submission)	10	<p>According to the Report by Jacobs/Idom contained at Appendix 7.6 of the EIAR, the principal reason for the location of the Depot (Option 8a) "was that compared to other options. Option 8A was located mostly in the planning zone for "General Employment" and it had no interface with the planned GDD Sewer project"(p31).</p> <p>When comparing the two options (Option 8A and Option 10), Option 8A was noted as being largely (c.70%) in the General Employment Zoning. Table 6-1 states, "<i>Connecting lines are in the "High Technology Zone" but should not restrict development because they are In retained cut and can be easily slabbed at ground level</i>" (Table 6-1 of Appendix 7.6).</p> <p><i>30% of the land take required for the Dardistown Depot is zoned HT High Technology. This is a substantial area of high value land and will affect its future development both in terms of capacity and urban design. There are ample lands north of the proposed location that are zoned GE which would be more suitable for this land use.</i></p>	<p>As detailed in section 7.7.4.3 of Chapter 7 (Consideration of Alternatives), land-take for Option 8a would be from agricultural land and sports pitches. The footprint of this option is large, as the railway access route into the site would sterilise a significant area of land between the Metrolink line and the depot lines and buildings. However, this option would be largely in the “General Employment” zoning area, leaving more of the land with higher development potential (High Technology). It should also be noted that the depot at this location would be in the “ Outer Public Safety Zones”, which restrict high density development in proximity to the Dublin airport runways. The depot development is appropriate for this restricted area.</p> <p>This proposed location for the Dardistown Depot has a number of advantages over alternative site locations including the following:</p> <p>* This site has more limited encroachment on lands zoned for “High Technology” development in the Dardistown Local Area Plan than other site options assessed. The majority of the proposed site occurs within areas designated for “General Employment” development. It is preferable that the site occupies the “General Employment” area as this area is more limited in terms of its future development potential than the “High Technology” zoned land as it is restricted by the presence of Outer Public Safety Zones which restricts the density of development allowed due to proximity to the runways at Dublin Airport.</p> <p>* The approach tracks to this option does not sterilise as much land when compared to other options. This means that there is a reduced land area required for this Depot site option including lands effected by the access tracks. This means that impacts on development land in the area is reduced (when compared to other options);</p> <p>* Operation of the depot is enhanced by allowing additional tracks and switches accessing the stabling area.</p> <p>Please refer to Depot Location Options Report in Appendix A7.6 for details of the full assessment.</p>
26	Grounds of submission 4.25, 4.26 and 4.27 (page 10 of submission)	11	<p>As acknowledged in the consideration of alternatives at section 7.7.4.1 of the EIAR, ""Under the Fingal Development Plan 2017-2023, a metro depot is not Identified as “Permitted In Principle” or as “Not Permitted” under either of the zoning objectives. However it goes on to say, ‘in this regard, it is considered that a Depot is permissible at this location, particularly given the recognition of the depot within the Dardistown LAP."</p> <p>It is submitted that this statement does not in fact reflect the provisions of the zoning objective. The Use Classes related to the zoning objective of 'High Technology'* as contained in both the current Fingal Development Plan 2017-2023 and the draft Fingal Development Plan 2023-2019 list the following as 'Not Permitted':</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Vehicle Servicing/Maintenance Garage</li><li>• Road Transport Depot</li></ul> <p>In comparison, lands zoned General Employment permit these uses.</p> <p>According to the Planning Report ‘the proposed Depot is consistent with the Vehicle Servicing/Maintenance Garage, permitted in GE zoned lands’ (para. 4.4.2.6). It is submitted therefore that it cannot be consistent with the HT zoning objective.</p>	<p>The proposed depot comprises a number of related uses, including vehicle stabling, storage, maintenance, offices and administration.</p> <p>The depot is concentrated on the General Employment lands with some of the overall site extending to the High Technology zoned lands. The stabling, maintenance and servicing takes place on the General Employment lands. In this regard, the works on the General Employment zoned land comply with the permitted uses for this zoning objective. In respect of the High Technology zoning the proposed uses under the proposed Railway Order relate to track routing and ancillary works and not of the nature of maintenance or servicing. The works on the High Technology zoning are therefore, not specifically identified as Permitted or Not Permitted. The Fingal Development Plan notes that ‘Uses which are neither ‘Permitted in Principle’ nor ‘Not Permitted’ will be assessed in terms of their contribution towards the achievement of the Zoning Objective and Vision and their compliance and consistency with the policies and objectives of the Development Plan.’.</p> <p>The vision of the ‘HT’ zoning objective will be fulfilled by the proposed Project, as in the long term it will deliver a high quality and highly accessible station that opens the lands to higher intensity employment uses.</p>

Submission No.			196	
Organisation Name or Name of Submitter			Mouna Unlimited Company (represented by Stephen Ward Town Planning & Development Consultants Limited)	
Item No.	Section Ref.	Page No.	Observation Statement	TII Response
RE: RAILWAY (METROLINK-ESTUARY TO CHARLEMONT VIA DUBLIN AIRPORT) ORDER 2022 - LANDS AT SILLOGUE GREEN LANE AND BALLYSTRUAN LANE, SWORDS, CO. DUBLIN				
27	Grounds of submission 4.28 and 4.29 (page 10 of submission)	11	<p>The overall conclusion of the Planning Report submitted with the Railway Order application states, ‘in two locations, the proposed Project does not comply fully with the current zoning objectives of the lands through which, or under which, it passes. The two locations are at the Intervention Shaft at Albert College Park and St. Stephen’s Green, in both locations under the current DCDP 2016-2022.’. No aspect of the project is found to be contrary to the zoning objectives of lands that fall within the FDP 2017-2023.</p> <p><b><i>It is recognised that, whilst in certain circumstances An Bord Pleanála has the power to grant permission to a Railway Order even if it is in material contravention of a Development Plan this power is not unlimited. However, it is submitted that the applicant should accurately identify the aspects of the development plan, particularly the zoning objectives it will contravene.</i></b></p>	The Fingal Development Plan notes that ‘Uses which are neither ‘Permitted in Principle’ nor ‘Not Permitted’ will be assessed in terms of their contribution towards the achievement of the Zoning Objective and Vision and their compliance and consistency with the policies and objectives of the Development Plan.’ As set out in the Planning Report, the Proposed Project contributes towards the zoning objectives and vision of each of the areas through which it passes and, therefore, does not contravene the zoning objectives of the Fingal Development Plan 2017-2023 or the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029.
28	Grounds of submission 4.31 (page 10 of submission)	11	Land take for this the chosen option 8A would sterilise a significant area of land between the Metrolink line and the depot lines and buildings due to Its circuitous alignment.	Please refer to response item (4).
29	Grounds of submission 4.32 (page 11 of submission)	12	The outer public safety zone has been deemed appropriate for the location of the Dardistown Depot. It is submitted that the entire depot should be located within lands zoned GE to allow for more sensitive land uses to be located on the more valuable lands zoned HT.	Please refer to response item (8).
30	Grounds of submission 4.33 (page 11 of submission)	12	The depot location adjacent to the Dardistown station limits the potential for the station to be centrally located in a highly valuable development area. The depot effectively cuts off 50% of the station's development potential which is dominated by the depot. Any future commercial development would be one sided and offer poor urban integration.	Please refer to response item (8) and response item (26)
31	Grounds of submission 4.34 (page 11 of submission)	12	Architects Henry J. Lyons and Company has prepared an indicative masterplan attached at appendix C. The analysis of the potential impact of the depot on the proposed Metro station at Dardistown clearly demonstrates the missed opportunity that would result If the depot is located in Dardistown and the negative impact it would have on the future development of the High Technology zone and opportunities for placemaking. As identified in the EIAR, “the design of Dardistown Station is complicated by the need to provide rail links into the Depot”(4.16.3.3). By removing the depot from Dardistown a more efficient and successful masterplan can be achieved.	Assessment of the depot location between a site at Estuary and a site at Dardistown concluded that a location at Dardistown for the depot was preferable - see EIAR Chapter 7 (Consideration of Alternatives) Section 7.7.4 for details.
32	Grounds of submission 4.38 (page 12 of submission)	13	It is submitted that the detailed design of the Dardistown Station and lands required for its operation should have been considered as part of the Railway Order application.	The RO application provides for the detailed design of the station appropriate for its future use although initial use will be restricted for MetroLink access to the depot only. Pending future development of the Dardistown lands, the RO proposals provide for adjacent local landscaping and appropriate road access to the station, which could be enhanced as part of future development plans by others, subject to necessary planning approvals. Please refer to EIAR Chapter 4 (Description of the MetroLink Project), Section 4.16.3.
33	Grounds of submission 4.39 (page 12 of submission)	13	Dardistown is one of the 16no. stations listed as part of Metrolink. There has been no provision made for a public access road or car parking for passengers using this station in the future. It also would appear that there has been no assessment of the potential impact of this additional loading on the surrounding road network, including the M50. It is submitted that a sensitivity analysis of the future scenario should include Dardlstown as an operational station.	<p>Please refer to response item (32).</p> <p>In addition, car parking is not proposed at any MetroLink station (including Dardistown) except for Estuary where an adjacent park and ride site is proposed. The station locations are intended to support pedestrian and cycle access together with public transport interchange. See also EIAR Volume 5 Appendix A9.2 Overall Project Traffic &amp; Transportation Assessment, Section 2.7, Dardistown Depot.</p>

Submission No.			196	
Organisation Name or Name of Submitter			Mouna Unlimited Company (represented by Stephen Ward Town Planning & Development Consultants Limited)	
Item No.	Section Ref.	Page No.	Observation Statement	TII Response
RE: RAILWAY (METROLINK-ESTUARY TO CHARLEMONT VIA DUBLIN AIRPORT) ORDER 2022 - LANDS AT SILLOGUE GREEN LANE AND BALLYSTRUAN LANE, SWORDS, CO. DUBLIN				
34	Grounds of submission 4.40 (page 12 of submission)	13	The location of the depot at Dardistown station will curtail the options for a public access road and car parking in the future due to lands to the north being cut off and sterilized leaving a single sided station. Locating car parking on lands to the south or south east would represent an inefficient use of limited high value lands to the south zoned for High Technology uses.	Please refer to response item (33).
35	Conclusion, point 5.1 (page 14 of submission)	15	It is clear that the route as now proposed will have significant negative impacts on the submission lands during the construction and operational phases. It is submitted that the project does not take account of the plant as a very sensitive commercial receptor.	Please refer to response item (7).
36	Conclusion, point 5.2 (page 14 of submission)	15	The existing plant and its associated infrastructure should be a central consideration of the Environmental Impact Assessment Report for this part of the route as the results will be crucial in determining the potential Impact on the viability and operational capacity of this industrial facility. At this stage the preference of Mouna Unlimited/ ABP Ireland would be to reposition the line of the tracks and relocate the proposed depot elsewhere so the potential impacts on our client's business are removed, rather than attempt to mitigate such Impacts.	Please refer to response item (7).
37	Conclusion, point 5.3 (page 14 of submission)	15	ABP remain willing to engage in a constructive manner with MetroLink and Transport Infrastructure Ireland to reach an amicable position that accommodates the requirements of the permitted and established ABP facility and WWTP whilst at the same time accommodating the development of the MetroLink Project.	Please refer to response item (8) and (26) in relation to the compliance of the proposed Project with zoning objectives at this location.
38	Appendix B, Waterman Moylan Consulting Engineers Limited Submission, Engineering Related Concerns, Sillogue Green Road (page 2)	24	<p>The details contained within the railway order provide plan images only of the proposed road with no details in terms of vertical profile, broad cross section or dimensions.</p> <p>The road is shown to be straight with a new priority junction to serve our Clients property. This road is used by Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs). There is no Information provided to demonstrate that the road is suitable for HGVs turning.</p> <p>Our Clients would seek to receive full details for the design of this access road so that it can be properly assessed in term of suitability to serve the existing facility on our Clients property and indeed to serve the future development of the property in accordance with the current land zoning contained within the Fingal County Council Development Plan.</p>	Please refer to response item (11).
39	Appendix B, Waterman Moylan Consulting Engineers Limited Submission, Engineering Related Concerns, Construction Management (page 2 and 3)	24&25	<p>There are limited details contained within the railway order which set out how access to our Clients property will be maintained. Details of our Clients property, which contains two parcels of land and which both require access are shown on Figure 2.</p> <p>It is imperative that access to our Clients property is maintained at all times.</p> <p>We would seek to receive full details of the proposed temporary access which should clearly demonstrate how access (vehicular/Pedestrian/Cycle) will be maintained at all times. This will enable us to properly assess the proposals for access to our Clients property during the construction stage of the project. Details of the proposed temporary junction onto the existing R108 together with an appropriate Road Safety Audit of the junction and the temporary access road should be provided. The temporary access road would also appear to be intended for use as one of the main access points for construction traffic. The safety issues associated with using this access to serve our Clients property, whilst also as a primary access for construction traffic, needs to be properly considered.</p>	Please refer to response item (11) and (14).



Submission No.			196	
Organisation Name or Name of Submitter			Mouna Unlimited Company (represented by Stephen Ward Town Planning & Development Consultants Limited)	
Item No.	Section Ref.	Page No.	Observation Statement	TII Response
RE: RAILWAY (METROLINK-ESTUARY TO CHARLEMONT VIA DUBLIN AIRPORT) ORDER 2022 - LANDS AT SILLOGUE GREEN LANE AND BALLYSTRUAN LANE, SWORDS, CO. DUBLIN				
40	Appendix B, Waterman Moylan Consulting Engineers Limited Submission, Engineering Related Concerns, Existing Services (page 3 to 5)	25 to 27	<p>Existing services which currently serve our Clients property need to be maintained at all times.</p> <p>The current MetroLink proposals are likely to impact upon this foul water rising main which has been acknowledged in the Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIAR). It is suggested in the EIAR that the rising ain can be decommissioned and diverted.</p> <p>No details are provided in respect of the decommissioning or diversion. Details should be provided so that the potential impact on the operation of our Clients property can be properly assessed.</p> <p>The Figures contained within the EIAR which illustrate the existing utilities with the Metro Line overlaid do not appear to have any regard for the proposed Dardistown Depot or for the rail lines which are required to access the depot. The proposed Depot and associated rail lines are likely to impact existing utilities which currently serve our Clients property.</p>	Please refer to response item (10).
41	Appendix B, Waterman Moylan Consulting Engineers Limited Submission, Engineering Related Concerns, Noise & Air Quality (page 5 and 6)	27&28	<p>Our Clients would have concerns regarding noise and air quality arising from the works and how they might impact upon to the operation of our Clients property, both during construction stage and during operational stage. In this regard there is an existing business operating from the property and the lands are zoned to facilitate future development, both of which need to be considered when assessing the noise and air quality impacts.</p>	Please refer to response item (19).
42	Appendix B, Waterman Moylan Consulting Engineers Limited Submission, Conclusion (page 7)	29	<p>a) Sillogue Green Road (also referred to as Ballystruan Lane) - Proper details for the proposed road realignment have not been provided and should include dimensioned road cross section, Longitudinal Section showing proposed levels, Auto tracking for HGV's and a Road Safety Audit.</p>	Please refer to response item (11).
43	Appendix B, Waterman Moylan Consulting Engineers Limited Submission, Conclusion (page 7)	29	<p>b) Construction Management/Temporary Road Access - Proper details for the proposed temporary road access have not been provided which should include details of road alignment and levels, pedestrian and cycle access, junction details onto the R108 and Road Safety Audit. The intended use of this temporary access for both our clients property and as a primary construction traffic access needs to be properly considered and the risks that this could pose to pedestrians and cyclists accessing our Clients property. Access to all of the property owned by our Clients' needs to be provided at all times. In this regard there are two parcels of land that require access to be maintained.</p>	Please refer to response item (11) and (14).
44	Appendix B, Waterman Moylan Consulting Engineers Limited Submission, Conclusion (page 7)	29	<p>c) Existing Services - It is imperative that the existing services to our Clients property are maintained at all times. Our Clients have concerns regarding the intention to decommission and divert their private foul water rising main which currently serves the property. No details of the decommissioning/diversion appear to be contained within the Railway Order documents submitted.</p>	Please refer to response item (10).
45	Appendix B, Waterman Moylan Consulting Engineers Limited Submission, Conclusion (page 7)	29	<p>d) Noise and Air Quality - Our Clients have concerns regarding noise and air quality arising from the works and how they might impact upon to the operation of our Clients property, both during construction stage and during operational stage.</p>	Please refer to response item (19).

Submission No.			196	
Organisation Name or Name of Submitter			Mouna Unlimited Company (represented by Stephen Ward Town Planning & Development Consultants Limited)	
Item No.	Section Ref.	Page No.	Observation Statement	TII Response
RE: RAILWAY (METROLINK-ESTUARY TO CHARLEMONT VIA DUBLIN AIRPORT) ORDER 2022 - LANDS AT SILLOGUE GREEN LANE AND BALLYSTRUAN LANE, SWORDS, CO. DUBLIN				
46	Appendix C, Colliers Report, Planning Recommendation	33&34	In consideration of land use, planning, and environmental impacts we do not consider that TII have presented a scheme that aligns with the zoning objectives contained in the Fingal Development Plan 2017-2023 and the emerging Draft Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029. Moreover, the proposed scheme will result in significant negative consequences for the proper planning and sustainable development in the area In which it is proposed to carry out the railway works. In particular, the proposed depot and ancillary service lines will negatively impact the surrounding lands.	Please refer to response item (8) and (26).
47	Appendix C, Colliers Report, Sustainability	34	We note reference to the Climate Action and Low Carbon Development (Amended) Act 2021 in the MetroLink Planning report. We note no comment regarding carbon emissions that relate to the construction phase, only references to the reductions into the future. The main sections in the planning report relating to Greenhouse Gases 1 .2.1 .2 page 5, Project Response 3.4.1. 1 page 24, Climate Action Plan 2021 3.4,7 page 31. All references are to the future Public Transport reduction in emissions. We note that no assessment has been included to have specific regard to emissions during the construction phase.	The assessment of emissions during the construction phase is presented (along with emissions for operation period) in Chapter 17 (Climate) of the EIAR. For more information regarding carbon emissions please refer to Section 17.7 Residual Impacts (17.7.1 Construction Phase). The proposed Project with mitigation measures will result in total Construction Phase GHG emissions of 1,1149Kt CO2eq over an 9.25-year period equivalent to an annualised total of 0.37% of Ireland’s non-ETS 2030 emissions target or 2.0% of the 2030 transport sector carbon budget. Over the predicted 60-year lifespan the annualised emissions due to the initial Construction Phase and ongoing maintenance of the proposed Project will reach at most 0.049% of Ireland’s non-ETS 2030 emissions target or 0.27% of the 2030 transport sector carbon budget. The significance criteria for impacts (IEMA 2022) states that the impact significance must be taken from the project as a whole over its lifecycle rather than individual phases. Over the predicted 60-year lifespan the annualised emissions due to the proposed Project will reach at most 0.013% of Ireland’s non-ETS 2030 emissions target or 0.071% of the 2030 Transport Sector Carbon Budget (Department of the Taoiseach 2022). The increase occurs due to the considerable Construction Phase embodied carbon, which will be further mitigated during detailed design, and is not as a result of operational emissions as this phase is beneficial with respect to carbon emissions.
48	Appendix C, Colliers Report, Depot Location	36	The TII state that the benefit of locating the depot at a central location on the network (Dardistown) rather than at the end of the route at Lissenhall enables efficient train operations limiting empty coach stock running. The location of the depot in Dardistown is not aligned with those policies of Fingal County Council and will have significant negative consequences on the proper planning and sustainable development in the area and will have a significant negative impact on proper planning and sustainable development of the area (see details of the concerns at page 34 and 35)	Please refer to response item (26) regarding compliance of the proposed Project with zoning objectives.  The selection of location of the depot at Dardistown, rather than at Estuary, is described in the EIAR Chapter 7 (Consideration of Alternatives) Section 7.7.4. It was also initially presented in the 2019 Preferred Route public consultation, with assessment and recommendation for the depot to be at Dardistown rather than at the end of the line at Estuary described in the Preferred Route Design Development Report, Appendix C, and which is available on the TII website. In addition to the specific points in the Respondent's letter, this report also noted that a depot at Dardistown: - will provide a better operational location, much more central to the overall MetroLink and thus providing easier and more efficient accessibility for addressing incidents on the line; - from a maintenance perspective it provides more flexibility and longer maintenance periods overnight than a depot at Estuary; and - The Depot’s location at Dardistown has less environmental impacts than the location at Estuary, with reduced potential for impacts on biodiversity and other sensitive receptors having regard to noise, air quality and water. Furthermore, there would be less impact on properties and a reduced potential for impact on traffic.
49	Appendix C, Colliers Report, Business Interruption	36	No Information has been provided regarding continuation of operation of the business during the scheme and into the future and an extinguishment of the business In those circumstances must be considered. (see details of the concerns at page 35)	Please refer to response item (3).
50	Appendix C, Colliers Report, Access and Egress	35	There are no details of the realigned Sillogue Green Road that serves the subject site. We would need to be able to ensure that the proposed road and junctions are sufficient to cater for the HGV movements during and post construction that are generated by the existing activities on the property.	Please refer to response item (11).

Submission No.			196		
Organisation Name or Name of Submitter			Mouna Unlimited Company (represented by Stephen Ward Town Planning & Development Consultants Limited)		
Item No.	Section Ref.	Page No.	Observation Statement	TII Response	
RE: RAILWAY (METROLINK-ESTUARY TO CHARLEMONT VIA DUBLIN AIRPORT) ORDER 2022 - LANDS AT SILLOGUE GREEN LANE AND BALLYSTRUAN LANE, SWORDS, CO. DUBLIN					
51	Appendix C, Colliers Report, Proposed Temporary & Permanent Acquisitions	35&36	<p>The nature of both the Permanent Take and Temporary Take have not been provided and the method of implementing those acquisitions has not been provided. Lands identified as "Temporary Acquisitions" when returned may not be capable of development or use and may also have a negative impact on the adjacent lands.</p> <p>The proposed scheme will result in significant complications Into the future regarding provision of suitable access and services to the subject site which will require that any future upgrades to access or services will need to take into account the presence of the proposed depot rail line which will be in open-cut and subterranean construction.</p> <p>In the absence of satisfactory detail of mitigation measures and a method statement for the implementation of the proposed scheme of works that will ensure continuation of operations during the scheme and into the future then the extinguishment of the business will occur at this location based on the proposed scheme and a significant loss to the property owner / operator will occur.</p>	Please refer to response item (3).	
52	Appendix C, Colliers Report, Accommodation Works	35 & 36	<p>No details of Accommodation Works have been provided for consideration of the Impacted parties to assess the potential impact of the scheme and suitability or otherwise of those works.</p> <p>We recommend that further clarification in this regard is requested from An Bord Pleanála.</p>	Please refer to response item (10) and (11).	
53	Appendix D, Henry J Lyons Report, Concerns regarding Depot Proposals (page 7 of the report)	45	<p>The proposed depot location, by way of its mass, location and orientation severely hinders the orderly development of the subject site and the surrounding area.</p> <p>Whilst the benefits of the Metrolink mainline are noted and appreciated with regards to unlocking the full development potential of the site, the presence of spur lines within the redline and wider context substantially limits potential for development.</p>	Please refer to response item (8) regarding depot location and response (4) regarding interface between spur lines and land use.	
54	Appendix D, Henry J Lyons Report, Loss of development lands (page 8 of the report)	46	<p>Dardistown causes a significant portion of the larger of the two sites to be impinged upon. 14% of the larger landholding will be subject to either temporary or permanent sterilisation. The corner of the site effected by this sterilisation is in a prominent position, with the revised proposal significantly impacting on a potentially high density portion of the site.</p> <p>In addition, the proposed combination of temporary landholdings (ML 3E T3, T19 &amp; T21) along the front of the site risk denying access to either of the sites existing frontages. This will effectively landlock the site, making the existing uses inaccessible and jeopardising future development potential as the duration of control of these lands is not specified.</p>	Please refer to response item (3).	
55	Appendix D, Henry J Lyons Report, Zone Usage & Sterilised Areas (page 9 of the report)	47	<p>Such significant areas of sterilisation may affect the economic viability of proposals within the subject site and adjoining lands under separate ownership to the extent that this entire area may fail to launch.</p> <p>We note significant lower value lands to the north, closer to the airport, may be more suited to such use cases and land consumption.</p>	Please refer to response item (8).	
56	Appendix D, Henry J Lyons Report, Maximising Opportunity (page 10 of the report)	48	<p>However, the proposed siting of the depot consumes large quantities of this prime area, and serves to diminish the potential of the remainder.</p>	Please refer to response item (8).	

Submission No.			196	
Organisation Name or Name of Submitter			Mouna Unlimited Company (represented by Stephen Ward Town Planning & Development Consultants Limited)	
Item No.	Section Ref.	Page No.	Observation Statement	TII Response
RE: RAILWAY (METROLINK-ESTUARY TO CHARLEMONT VIA DUBLIN AIRPORT) ORDER 2022 - LANDS AT SILLOGUE GREEN LANE AND BALLYSTRUAN LANE, SWORDS, CO. DUBLIN				
57	Appendix D, Henry J Lyons Report, Proposed Railway Design (page 12 of the report)	50	<p>The 2022 Railway Order proposal includes additional areas of land acquisition on a variety of terms - terms that as yet seem to not be fully defined.</p> <p>It would be to the betterment of the entire development zone if the road provided as a replacement to the current access road be built in a manner that aligns with the LAP, and that benefits alt local land users.</p> <p>We have shown this shared 50/50 with the land owner to the north in our studies which follow.</p>	<p>The proposed access road from the R108 (realigned Sillogue Green) provides access to both the Dardistown Station and the existing industrial facilities in the area. This road could in the future development plans for the area be upgraded and incorporated as part of a main access to the development if required and approved through the planning process.</p>
58	Appendix D, Henry J Lyons Report, Full development potential (page 17of the report)	55	<p>We note that we do not have details on the ability to build on or close to the CPO lands, either during or after Metrolink construction, or the impact this may have on routing services to the site - which poses a serious viability risk for the entire scheme.</p>	<p>MetroLink will be a catalyst for and provide opportunity for future development and regeneration. While the MetroLink Railway Order does not include for future neighbouring or overhead development, the tunnels and stations are designed to support appropriate future imposed loads.</p> <p>TII will be required to make submissions in relation to planning applications for proposed future developments on or adjacent to MetroLink and there will necessarily be some engineering constraints (such as permissible loadings) required. However MetroLink is committed to engaging with known development proposals and new development proposals as they emerge with the intent of facilitating such developments as they emerge to the maximum extent consistent with the safe operation of the proposed Project.</p> <p>Again in common with other existing rail and tunnel projects, following grant of the Railway Order and development of detailed design, TII will produce “Guidance Note for Developers” that will be the subject of bye-laws following the grant of Railway Order and which is designed to facilitate future adjacent or over-site development while protecting the integrity and safety of the MetroLink works and operations. It is inappropriate and unworkable to produce this policy at this stage because it would have to be in broad terms that deal not only with the current RO proposal and any contingencies that might arise from the Board seeking revised designs or new conditionality as part of the RO application process.</p> <p>Therefore at this stage TII is dealing with known development proposals on a case by case basis, TII will work with parties in the future to assist with the wider development of sites over and above stations and tunnels. In this context TII has successfully engaged with a number of developers over the last two years to accommodate development over and in proximity to the alignment and there have been no material restrictions on development subject to the implementation of agreed design and mitigation measures and it is not anticipated that MetroLink will have a material impact on the development potential of sites above and in proximity to the alignment in future.</p>
59	Appendix D, Henry J Lyons Report, Partial development potential (page 17of the report)	55	<p>The identity of the development is partially diluted.</p> <p>One 10 storey HQ grade building lost.</p> <p>We have been advised by Mouna Unlimited that the CPO of and positioning within of mainlines in the red and orange areas would constitute a fair and balanced agreement between both sides - Mouna Unlimited noting that the introduction of Metrolink and the Dardistown stop has benefits to their landholding.</p> <p>Alongside this, the lands in yellow would need to be excluded from CPO and available for free and unencumbered development.</p>	<p>Please refer to response item (8) and (26).</p>
60	Appendix D, Henry J Lyons Report, Restricted development potential (page 17of the report)	55	<p>The potential of an ‘unfinished’ corner to the site makes it difficult to market to tenants and potentially serves as a risk to its commercial viability.</p> <p>A further 8 story HQ grade building lost.</p> <p>The loss of a further key building will have an impact on the economic viability of the scheme.</p>	<p>Please refer to response item (8) and (26).</p>

Submission No.			196	
Organisation Name or Name of Submitter			Mouna Unlimited Company (represented by Stephen Ward Town Planning & Development Consultants Limited)	
Item No.	Section Ref.	Page No.	Observation Statement	TII Response
RE: RAILWAY (METROLINK-ESTUARY TO CHARLEMONT VIA DUBLIN AIRPORT) ORDER 2022 - LANDS AT SILLOGUE GREEN LANE AND BALLYSTRUAN LANE, SWORDS, CO. DUBLIN				
61	Appendix D, Henry J Lyons Report, Conclusion (page 19 of the report)	57	<p>The siting of a Depot and the associated spur lines in this area largely sterilises the ability of Mouna Unlimited and adjacent landholders to develop the area in an orderly, well considered and viable manner.</p> <p>The proposal will create in excess of 7ha of sterilised, vacant land within the High Technology zone, with further sterilised land in adjacent zones.</p> <p>Similarly, any collective ambitions of all landholders to create a meaningful sense of place are substantially curtailed by the construction of a single sided station.</p> <p>There is great opportunity here to create a destination on par with those currently being developed around the southern Luas Green Line extension, however the locating of the depot here would all but eliminate the potential for similar north of the M50.</p> <p>By moving the depot out of the High Technology Zone, all stakeholders will have the freedom to create a critical area of national and global importance, supported by Metrolink, but not handicapped by same.</p>	Please refer to response item (8) and (26).