

Hello all, and thank you inspector again for giving me the opportunity to address the hearing.

A. I would first like to raise an issue that Dr Hogan raised in relation to my previous written and oral submission, but it also pertains to elements I am raising in this submission to the oral hearing. This was when he was addressing my concerns about the psychological and other health impacts, in relation to the proposed Metrolink project on people of The Court, Dalcassian Downs. I believe he stated or it was certainly written in response to my written submission, that a PubMed search was conducted in relation to the construction of the recent Elizabeth line in London to determine if this project was associated with adverse psychological impacts and that there is no publication suggesting that this is the case. I have looked up PubMed and I had difficulty finding any studies in relation to the psychological or other health impacts pertaining to the construction of the Elizabeth line on affected residents. I would appreciate if he could identify the studies in question. Do these studies look at the effects of excessive noise and a lack of light on local residents to the extent that this Metrolink project would entail for the people of the The Court, Dalcassian Downs? I did find many studies linking excessive noise and a lack of natural light to poor health outcomes^{i ii iii iv v}. I am surprised that such studies weren't referenced in the response to my written submission regarding the effects of the project on the health and wellbeing of people in The Court, Dalcassian Downs.

In addition, I noted that Dr Hogan cited that trains were the least harmful method of transportation when it comes to noise when he was

referencing the WHO guidelines. My point at the last hearing was that it is the construction noise that ~~will~~^{could} be harmful to resident's health.

B. Our Constitution and The European Convention on Human Rights confirm that every person is entitled to the peaceful enjoyment of their home. Of course these rights may be regulated by the principles of social justice and the needs of the common good. A balance must be found between the interests of the apartment owners/residents and the conflicting interests of Metrolink.

The placing of the hoardings so close to the front of our buildings seriously decreases natural daylight. Daylight has a vital influence on human health at physical, physiological and psychological levels. Detailed research on natural light and wellbeing demonstrates the effect light has on our circadian rhythms, sleep cycle, hormones, and general mood^{vi}. In addition to losing out on daylight, all apartment owners will lose a large amount of their gardens for several years during construction. Many residents are retired, there are children in the court apartments and many residents work from home.

While the question of relocation has been raised by TII, the reality is there is a complete lack of suitable properties anywhere in this area due to the housing and rental crisis. I would like to know how TII propose to address this.

C. The location of the hoardings, together with the positioning of the silos, so that they effectively interfere with daylight and bring the building site to within a metre and a half from the apartments, is a

design and engineering issue that should be addressed. It is not good enough to say that there is no other way.

It is the function of the professionals employed to design and plan the development to ensure that the State, through its administrative authorities, can be said to have struck a fair balance between the general good of society and the serious interference in the peaceful enjoyment of their homes by a number of apartment occupants. We may be a small minority but it is for this very purpose that such rights are in existence and we are entitled to be treated fairly.

On page 2 of the Environmental Impact Assessment Report -Volume 5 Appendix 5.5 – Glasnevin Station Construction report - the northern boundary of the site is shown as being in line with the rear boundary of Houses 45 and 46 Dalcassian Downs. This site boundary also adjoins an open space of 6.79 acres which is attached to a local school. From looking at an aerial photograph of the area it would appear that the total area of The Court, Dalcassian Downs carpark, if taken temporarily from this field would have no adverse effect whatsoever on the use of that field. It is approximately 1% of the field area.

Reference has been made at this hearing to the construction of the Crossrail Elizabeth line in London some years ago. An article on the “Engineering design management on the Elizabeth line” confirms that there were many minor and major design changes carried out during the design stages. Some of the design changes included changes to the contractors preferred method of construction. The magnitude of the engineering challenges in that project, and there were many, can be no greater than in the construction of Metrolink.

D. It is my opinion that the combined adverse effects of this development, details of which we have previously heard, suggest that the designers should be more diligent in planning the layout of the site. Innovative and sympathetic reconsideration of the design issues around the site layout is surely possible to avoid the potentially disastrous consequences for us.

Failure to address these matters will in my opinion bring our grievances above the necessary level to show that, taking into account all other options, the State will have failed to strike a fair balance between our interests and the common good.

The intensity, duration and physical and mental effects of this interference in the peaceful enjoyment of our homes is a serious breach of the rights of those of us affected. I would like to know how TII plan to compensate residents for the profound disturbance and impact on their quality of life that this project entails. Indeed, this proposed project has caused 6 years of stress for residents of The Court already. In addition, should this project go ahead, it is not possible to accept an explanation that certain alterations cannot be made to ensure that the authorities maintain a fair balance between both interests.

Thank You.