

### Appendix 1E: Summary of Consultation

Initial Consultation Tuesday 12th November 2019 to Tuesday 21st January 2020

Iarnród Éireann invited feedback on the following questions:

- 1) Do you have any comments or additional information in relation to the Cork Line Level Crossings Project that you would like us to be aware of as the project progresses?
- 2) Do you have any comments on the proposed solutions for the seven level crossings as outlined through Chapters 4 to 10 of the Preliminary Design Report?
- 3) Appendix D of the Preliminary Design Report includes the Route Options Report. Do you have any comments on the Route Options Report?
- 4) Do you have any comments on the Environmental Impact Assessment Screening & Scoping Report?
- 5) How would you like Iarnród Éireann to communicate with you as the project develops?

In total, 144 submissions were received via post and email. Three petitions were received by the Project Team during the ten week consultation. There were two submissions received from local authorities, one submission was received from an elected representative, one submission received was from an educational institution, four submissions were received from statutory bodies and the remainder were from individual members of the public, such as local residents and landowners.

There were some common themes across submissions received in relation to the solutions proposed in the preliminary design report. Across the board stakeholders stated concern and apprehension that their roads would be turned into cul de sacs as a result of closing their local level crossing. They cited concern over anti-social behaviour, illegal dumping and increased isolation. Other submissions raised concerns that these proposed solutions would impact on the value of their property.

A large number of submissions expressed a preference for the Blue Route over the chosen Green Route in the case of the elimination of level crossing at XC211 Newtown, as this would allow for continued connection to the GAA complex, the holy well and the new community hall.

It should be noted that while some concerns were raised there were also submissions made in favour and broadly supported the aims of the proposed Project. The Consultation Report summarising the responses received is available to the general public on the project website: <https://www.irishrail.ie/about-us/iarnrod-eireann-projects-and-investments/cork-line-level-crossings-project>

Table E.2: Summary of Public Consultation Responses

Question	Summary of Consultation Response Issues	Where this is addressed within the Railway Order Application Documents
1	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Severance caused by the existing railway line;</li> <li>2) Safety improvements required;</li> <li>3) Delay in crossing the railway line at present;</li> <li>4) Line of sight concerns; and</li> <li>5) No substantial reason has been given to justify the solutions that have been proposed in this development. No method statement has been given for any of the solutions proposed.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) With the exception of XC187 Fantstown and XC209 Ballyhay the proposed Project will provide 24hr unfettered access across the Dublin – Cork Railway Line. This is a significant benefit from the current situation which limits access;</li> <li>2) The proposed Project is driven primarily by the need to eliminate/reduce the health and safety risk associated with any interface between a railway line and a public road. The proposed road and bridge infrastructure are in effect safety improvements ancillary to the operation</li> </ol>

## Appendix 1E: Summary of Consultation

Question	Summary of Consultation Response Issues	Where this is addressed within the Railway Order Application Documents
		<p>of the Dublin-Cork Railway Line and also for an enhanced safety of the local public road network;</p> <p>3) As above, with the exception of XC187 Fantstown and XC209 Ballyhay the proposed Project will provide 24hr unfettered access across the Dublin – Cork Railway Line;</p> <p>4) Visibility splays have been incorporated in line with discussions with both Cork and Limerick City and County Council Highways Departments; and</p> <p>5) Refer to Volume 2, Chapter 2: Project Need and Alternatives which sets out a summary of the options considered and the rationale behind the decision making. It should be noted that public engagement has helped to shape the proposed Project resulting in an alternative Route Option from that originally advocated for XC211 Newtown and a widening of the proposed bridge at XC201 Thomastown. The PDR and Options Assessment were made available for inspection during consultation. The EIA Screening and Scoping Report also included a summary of the Options Assessment.</p>
2	<p>1) Roads turned into Cul De Sacs;</p> <p>2) Potential for anti-social behaviour;</p> <p>3) Illegal dumping;</p> <p>4) Increased Isolation; and</p> <p>5) Potential Impact upon property value.</p>	<p>1) Those sections of road that would be stopped up and no longer required (See Volume 2, Chapter 2: Project Description Inset Figures 3.7-3.12) would be broken up and landscaped.</p> <p>2) The Garda and Limerick City and County Council have enforcement powers to prevent antisocial behaviour;</p> <p>3) The Garda and Limerick City and County Council have enforcement powers to prevent unauthorised dumping;</p> <p>4) Community severance has been considered at Volume 3, Chapter 6: Population and Human Health.</p> <p>5) No evidence has been presented to show that the proposed Project will have a negative impact upon the value of property in the area.</p>
3	<p>1) Requests for alternative options to be considered;</p> <p>2) Severance of agricultural land;</p> <p>3) Negative impacts upon nearby dwellings/settlements;</p> <p>4) Roads turned into Cul De Sacs;</p> <p>5) Concerns regarding the safety of the proposed Project; and</p> <p>6) Concerns regarding the Route options report not being backed by field survey.</p>	<p>1) Not all requests for alternative options were viable and rationale for the decision-making process is summarised at Volume 2, Chapter 2: Project Need and Alternatives. In addition, as evidenced at XC211 Newtown and XC201 Thomastown, the public consultation exercise did result in changes to the originally proposed Project.</p> <p>2) The severance of agricultural land has been considered at Volume 3, Chapter 6: Population and Human Health.</p> <p>3) The potential impacts upon the amenity of nearby dwelling and settlement to the proposed Project have been considered primarily within Volume 3, Chapters 6: Population and Human Health, Volume 3, Chapter 10: Noise and Vibration, Volume 3, Chapter 13: Landscape and Visual and Volume 3, Chapter 15: Air Quality.</p> <p>4) Those sections of road that are no longer required would be broken up landscaped.</p>

Question	Summary of Consultation Response Issues	Where this is addressed within the Railway Order Application Documents
		<p>5) Safety is a key consideration of the proposed Project and its design includes embedded safety apparatus as well as consideration of relevant safety guidelines. The outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) at Volume 5, Appendix 11 sets out a range of plans to be prepared by the contractor including a Safety, Health and Environment (SHE) Plan; and</p> <p>6) Field surveys have been undertaken as set out in the applicable topic chapters at Volume 3. Furthermore, geotechnical investigations and topographical surveys have also taken place to validate the feasibility of the route selection.</p>
4	<p>1) Geological Survey of Ireland noted <i>“our records show that there are no current CGSs located within the vicinity of the proposed railway crossings”</i>.</p> <p>2) M20 Cork to Limerick commented that <i>“N/M20 project team have no objections to the proposals but as the two projects are developing simultaneously, the N/M20 project team will require updates with the progress of the levels crossings scheme as it progresses.”</i></p> <p>3) Limerick County Council made a number of points to be taken into consideration by the Project Team such as being mindful of the various planning laws in this area such as Department of Housing Planning and Local Government 2018 and the 2010 Limerick County Development to see if that fits with the proposed works.</p> <p>4) Limerick County Council also noted <i>“in the Population and human health section it might be worth stressing increased safety of the rail network following the works, in this situation perhaps it might be worth citing the accident figure mentioned earlier in the scoping reports as they relate to the seven crossing points. This might also tie in with S17.2 on page 72 of the scoping document.”</i></p> <p>5) They commented <i>“In relation to water issues, particularly for those crossings with water courses nearby (e.g. Fantstown p. 28) it would be worth giving specific details of measures designed to prevent run off and local water contamination. This might arise in S17.4 resource use and waste (p.74)</i></p>	<p>1) Noted and considered within Volume 3, Chapter 8: Soils, Geology and Hydrogeology;</p> <p>2) Noted as set out in Volume 5 Appendix 1G.</p> <p>3) Relevant Planning Policy has been considered at, Volume 2, Chapter 5: Plans, Policy and Guidance.</p> <p>4) Volume 3, Chapter 6: Population and Human Health includes consideration of the increased safety as a consequence of the proposed Project;</p> <p>5) The consideration of run off and potential for impacts upon nearby water courses has been considered within, Volume 3, Chapter 9: Water.</p> <p>6) Volume 3, Chapter 7: Biodiversity considers the potential impacts of the proposed Project on the Blackwater River (Cork/Waterford) Special Area of Conservation. Volume 5, Appendix 7H Natura Impact Statement (NIS).</p> <p>7) The Jacobs Ecology Team have engaged with IFI and consideration of the culvert and potential impacts upon fish are with Volume 3, Chapter 7: Biodiversity. In addition, a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has been undertaken at Volume 5, Appendix 9A.</p> <p>8) Refer to Volume 2, Chapter 1: Introduction and Volume 3, Chapter 11 Traffic and Transport;</p> <p>9) Refer to Volume 2, Chapter 1: Introduction and Volume 3, Chapter 11 Traffic and Transport;</p> <p>10) Health impacts have been considered at Volume 3, Chapter 6: Population and Human Health.</p> <p>11) The setback distance, orientation of the proposed road and bridge infrastructure as well as the inclusion of screening and planting will all help to reduce any potential impacts upon private amenity;</p> <p>12) The potential impacts upon the amenity of nearby dwelling and settlement to the proposed Project have been considered primarily within Volume 3, Chapters 6: Population and Human Health, Chapter 10: Noise and Vibration, , Volume 3, Chapter 13: Landscape and Visual and Volume 3, Chapter 15: Air Quality.</p>

## Appendix 1E: Summary of Consultation

Question	Summary of Consultation Response Issues	Where this is addressed within the Railway Order Application Documents
	<p><i>and the provision of a construction and Environmental management Plan (CEMP) would help address these issues." They further commented that "Impacts on water is to be commended as a good summary of the issues involved."</i></p> <p>6) Cork County Council noted "Crossings located at Ballyhea, Newtown, Ballycoskery, Shinanagh and Buttevant are all located within the catchment of the Blackwater River (Cork/Waterford) Special Area of Conservation (Site Code:2170). It is recommended that a mammal survey for otter should be carried out in respect of each of these sites and consultation should take place with NPWS and IFI in relation to each of these sites as there is potential for direct and indirect impacts on the SAC and fisheries."</p> <p>7) Inland Fisheries Ireland (IFI) commented in relation to the general topography of the location and its proximity to the main Awbeg floodplain. IFI noted "<i>your calculations on culvert dimension will be very much "flood" driven and that the relevant culvert size will adequately allow for fish passage.</i>"</p> <p>8) Transport Infrastructure Ireland (TII) made an official submission in response to the Environmental Impact Assessment scoping referral. In it they stated "<i>XC215 Shinanagh involves the closure of an existing crossing and diversion northward for local traffic to access the N20 national primary road. Treatment of the existing local road junction with the N20 national primary road, at XC215 Shinanagh which is proposed to be closed, as well as the upgrade works to the revised local road junction accommodating the diverted local road traffic to the N20 will require careful consideration. All works to national road junctions shall adhere to the standards in TII Publications and all works to the national road shall be assessed to determine the requirement for a Road Safety Audit.</i>"</p>	<p>13) Volume 3, Chapter 13: Landscape and Visual includes an assessment of key viewpoints. In instances where proposed infrastructure is in close proximity to dwellings or sensitive receptors planting will be used to help screen/soften views;</p> <p>14) This EIAR and primarily the topic specific chapters at Volume 3 assess the potential impacts of the proposed Project upon the environment.</p> <p>15) Impacts upon protected species have been considered within Volume 3, Chapter 7: Biodiversity.</p> <p>16) The proposed infrastructure has been developed with safety as its key consideration. The appearance of the infrastructure will be screened/softened by the introduction of planting. See, Volume 3, Chapter 13: Landscape and Visual and Volume 5, Appendix 13A and 13B.</p> <p>17) Potential impact upon archaeology has been considered at Volume 3, Chapter 12: Cultural Heritage.</p> <p>18) Volume 5, Appendix 9A includes a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA).</p>

## Appendix 1E: Summary of Consultation

Question	Summary of Consultation Response Issues	Where this is addressed within the Railway Order Application Documents
	<p>9) TII further stated that for the purpose of the EIA scoping report <i>"consultations shall be necessary with: Cork County Council Transportation Department and Cork National Roads Office, especially with regard to operation and safety of the existing N20 and associated improvement schemes with particular regard to site XC215 Shinanagh and potential diversions associated with level crossings at Ballyhea/Newton and Buttevant, and M20 Project Office and associated Mid-West National Road Design Office Limerick."</i></p> <p>10) Concerns regarding health impacts;</p> <p>11) Impacts upon privacy;</p> <p>12) Concerns regarding impact upon amenity;</p> <p>13) Loss of views;</p> <p>14) Negative impacts upon the environment;</p> <p>15) Concerns regarding Impacts upon protected species;</p> <p>16) Negative aesthetic appearance of proposed Project;</p> <p>17) Impacts upon archaeology; and</p> <p>18) Flooding.</p>	
5	<p>1) Concerns raised due to lack of communication;</p> <p>2) Queries regarding a nominated liaison officer to deal with queries; and</p> <p>3) A petition with five names was received on behalf of the residents of Beechwood Drive, Corrin Drive, Ballycoskery and Newtown outlining concerns with the proposed preferred (green) option. The residents requested a meeting with the Project Team at their earliest convenience to arrive at a <i>"mutually acceptable solution."</i></p>	<p>1) A significant level of effort has been invested in consultation with key stakeholders and the public. This is summarised at Volume 2, Chapter 1: Introduction and Volume 5, Appendix 1H which includes a Public Consultation Plan;</p> <p>2) Queries regarding the proposed Project were accepted at the following email address: CLLC@irishrail.ie. Also, IÉ had a dedication liaison officer who has worked directly with the local community throughout the consultation; and</p> <p>3) A meeting took place between members of Project Team and the residents on the 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2019. A summary of the discussion is included at Volume 3, Chapter 1: Introduction.</p>

### Further Consultation (XC211 Newtown 'Blue Route') Monday 10th February to Friday 6th March 2020

Iarnród Éireann invited feedback on the following questions:

- 1) Do you have any comments or additional information in relation to the XC211 Newtown Blue Route that you would like us to be aware of as the project progresses?
- 2) Do you have any comments on the proposed solutions for XC211 Newtown Blue Route as outlined through Chapters 4 to 10 of the Preliminary Design Report?

## Appendix 1E: Summary of Consultation

- 3) Appendix D of the Preliminary Design Report includes the Route Options Report. Do you have any comments on the XC211 Newtown Blue Route?
- 4) Do you have any comments on the Environmental Impact Assessment Screening & Scoping Report in relation to the XC211 Newtown Blue Route?
- 5) How would you like Iarnród Éireann to communicate with you as the project develops?

Although Iarnród Éireann issued the above consultation questions and sought feedback in relation to these all of the responses received did not specifically address the questions and instead provided general comments. For that reason, this section captures the overall sentiment of these submissions and does not break down each submission by consultation question as was previously undertaken in the Cork Line Level Crossings Project Public Consultation Report.

In total, 11 submissions were received during this further consultation period which ran from Monday, 10 February to Friday, 6 March 2020. One of these submissions was received after the consultation period had closed, but a decision was taken by the Project Team to include the submission.

The overall sentiment of this further consultation was positive with many residents expressing their satisfaction that it was now proposed to change the preferred option for the elimination of level crossing XC211 Newtown, from the Green Route to the Blue Route. The Consultation Report summarising the responses received is available to the general public on the project website: <https://www.irishrail.ie/about-us/iarnrod-eireann-projects-and-investments/cork-line-level-crossings-project>

Table E.1: Summary of Public Consultation Responses

Consultation Response Issues	Where this is addressed within the Railway Order Application Documents
<p>One resident remarked "I would like to say that the revised proposal (the blue route) represents a significant improvement on the original proposal in that it avoids running a thoroughfare through a housing estate, avoids severance of the highly populated north side of the parish and the village; ensures easy access to the church, school and community hall from the populous north side of the parish; avoids fragmentation and severance of the village." However, the resident also noted that "The above endorsement was made prior to taking sight of the official plans and drawings prepared by Jacobs" and "also made without reference to any possible impact on the red option proposed for Ballycoskery."</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Another resident stated, "having revived the revised plan for the proposed closure of Newtown Level Crossing XC211 Newtown- I am happy that this is a considerable improvement." However, they also commented that they "would however like to see specific plans and drawings of the new proposal."</p>	<p>The general arrangement as well as a plan and profile drawing were provided during the further consultation exercise.</p>

## Appendix 1E: Summary of Consultation

Consultation Response Issues	Where this is addressed within the Railway Order Application Documents
<p>Another resident stated, "I have reviewed the revised plan for the proposed closure of Newtown Level Crossing, XC211 Newtown which introduces a new road from Newtown Bridge to the present level crossing on the east side of the railway line and I am in agreement that it represents a marked improvement on the original proposal." This resident also stated, "what I have reviewed is not the final plans and drawings for the new proposal and would like to be kept informed of future developments."</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>One stakeholder asked that it be noted that "the bridge over the tracks beside the Newtown Crossing would have to be widened to accommodate traffic - if changes to the crossings are proceeded with. The existing bridge would be too narrow to accommodate traffic."</p>	<p>The design of the proposed road and bridge infrastructure has evolved in discussion with Cork County Council Highway Department.</p>
<p>Only one resident submitted an objection to the proposal. The resident living on the Charleville side of the level crossing outlined the following reasons for their objection. "Our main concern with this project is we strongly object to the proposed closure of this crossing. This is one of the oldest rights-of-way in Ballyhea and is used not just by us but by a large number of people for access to school etc. It is also one of the most popular walking routes in the parish." They further stated that they "strongly object to a proposed new road – Blue Route as this will make our property into a cul-de-sac" and would "be taking away one of our rights of way." The resident added that they would be seeking legal advice on this issue would seek compensation if the proposed route was approved.</p>	<p>The reasons for the taking forward the XC211 Newtown Blue Route are set out at Volume 2 Chapter 2: Project Need and Alternatives.</p>
<p>Ballyhea National School commented on the revised proposed solution for XC211 Newtown. In their submission they stated "the revised proposed solution (blue solution) appears to be more consistent than its antecedent in that it allows for a greater ease of access to Ballyhea National School from the northern side of the parish. Without such an ease of access, an adverse impact on the school's catchment area could be foreseen with some parents availing of easier access to schools in Charleville."</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>The trustees of Ballyhea National School (the landowners) also submitted to this period of further consultation echoing the sentiment of the Ballyhea National School submission. They stated that they "wished to indicate a greater satisfaction with the revised proposed solution for the eventual closure of the level crossing at Newtown (XC211 Newtown)." They added "the first proposed solution lacked all credibility from various perspectives, including health and safety norms and exhibited poor liability management." They added that "the revised proposed solution has the benefit of conserving accessibility to the school and community hall from the north and also accessibility to the sporting facilities at Ballyhea GAA."</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

## Appendix 1E: Summary of Consultation

Consultation Response Issues	Where this is addressed within the Railway Order Application Documents
<p>Their submission did note that <i>"it would be necessary however to minimise the environmental impact of the new road on the east side of the railway line from the Newtown bridge to the present level crossing."</i> Finally, the Board of Trustees stated that their submission <i>"is made with the provision that no detailed plans or drawings have been made available for inspection and no statement has been made with regard to its possible impact on the proposed red solution at level crossing XC212 Ballycoskery."</i></p>	<p>Detailed plans/alignment drawings were provided during public consultation. The EIAR has considered the environmental impacts of the XC211 Newtown 'Blue Route'. This has largely been covered at Volume 3 (the specific topic Chapters).</p>
<p>Transport Infrastructure Ireland (TII) stated that they wished to acknowledge receipt of the notice of further consultation and that they had nothing further to submit to this consultation.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Geographical Survey of Ireland stated <i>"we are pleased to see that the information provided, and details included within our previous submission...has been incorporated into the decision and planning process. At this stage we have no further comments to add."</i></p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>The Department of Agriculture, Food and the Marine stated they <i>"had no submissions or observations to make at this time."</i></p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>One submission was received from the N/M20 Project Team who are working on behalf of Limerick City and County Council. In it they stated that they <i>"had no objections at this stage to the proposals but would request that you keep us updated on any further changes."</i></p>	<p>Noted.</p>