

COMHAIRLE CONTAE ÁTHA CLIATH THEAS
SOUTH DUBLIN COUNTY COUNCIL



MEETING OF SOUTH DUBLIN COUNTY COUNCIL

Monday 13th September 2021

Part 8 Report

DODDER ROAD LOWER

Report on Part 8 consultation process for the above proposal.

1. Introduction

1.1 Overview

South Dublin County Council worked with our Employers Representative Clifton Scannell Emerson and Associates in the compilation of this report, to present the outcome of the Part 8 Public Consultation undertaken in relation to the proposed changes to Lower Dodder Road, Rathfarnham, Dublin 14, as part of the Dodder Greenway Scheme.

This Report aims to summarise the concerns and recommendations submitted by the public, to respond to submissions made during the consultation period and to make recommendations in relation to the proposed development where appropriate.

The public consultation period took place between 12th March and 5th July 2021 allowing the public to provide their views and feedback on the proposal.

1.2 Outline of Public Consultation Programme

1.2.1 Non – Statutory Consultation

- Briefing to the Councillors within South Dublin County Council (SDCC) took place at the Local Area Committee meeting on March 9th 2021.
- Ahead of the formal public consultation the design team met with a representative of Dodder Road Residents Association on November 4th 2021 and draft plans were discussed. Following further feedback by way of an online survey supplied to the Council by residents, the Council made some amendments to the scheme to account for some of these comments.

- An online survey was carried out in tandem with the public consultation to which there were 31 participants.

1.2.2 Statutory Consultation

- Public consultation commenced on March 12th 2021 and was due to be concluded on April 26th 2021.
- During this period all relevant documents including drawings, reports, photomontages and drone imagery indicating existing and proposed works were displayed via a virtual consultation room.
- All relevant information was also available on the Councils consultation portal.
- During the consultation period a request was received from residents to extend the public consultation to take account of the Level 5 Covid 19 restrictions that were in place at the time. Following discussions with the local Councillors and in consideration of the public health restrictions at that time, it was agreed to extend the consultation to July 5th 2021.

1.2.3 Submissions

Following a 10-week extension to the public consultation, the consultation closed on July 5th, 2021 at 5:00pm and were to be addressed in writing to: Senior Executive Officer, Roads Department, Land Use, Planning and Transportation, County Hall, Tallaght, Dublin 24 or via the councils on-line consultation portal.

Due to Covid-19 restrictions, plans and particulars of the proposed development were available for inspection or purchase at a fee not exceeding the reasonable cost of making a copy, only by appointment, at County Hall, Tallaght, Dublin 24 during office hours from 12th March 2021 to 5th July 2021. Appointments could be made by contacting the Planning Department by email at planningdept@sdublincoco.ie or by phoning (01) 4149000.

Due to Covid-19 restrictions, plans and particulars of the proposed development were also available to view via online virtual consultation room: <https://www.innovision.ie/sdcc-drl>.

A total of 91 submissions were received by the closing date for public consultation and 33 responses to the public survey (non-statutory).

1.3 Environmental Considerations

1.3.1 Environmental Impact Assessment Screening

An Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Screening Report was prepared for the proposed works which determined that the proposed development does not exceed the thresholds that trigger the mandatory requirement for EIA and subsequently the proposed development is deemed to be a sub-threshold development. Accordingly, a Screening Assessment has been carried out in respect of this sub-threshold development in accordance with Schedule 7 of the

Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended). This EIA Screening assessment found that the proposed development is not likely to result in significant negative environmental effects. It has therefore been recommended to South Dublin County Council that the proposed development would not be likely to have significant effects on the environment by virtue of its characteristics, location, size or potential impacts and does not require an Environmental Impact Assessment Report to be undertaken.

1.3.2 Screening for Appropriate Assessment

A Screening for Appropriate Assessment (AA) Report was prepared for the proposed development in accordance with Article 6(3) of the Habitats Directive, Part XAB of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended), the relevant case law, established best practice and the Precautionary Principle. The AA Screening Report concluded that the proposed development, either individually or in combination with other plans or projects, is not likely to have significant effects on the South Dublin Bay and River Tolka Estuary SPA, South Dublin Bay SAC, North Bull Island SPA or any other European site in view of best scientific knowledge and the Conservation Objectives of the site concerned.

1.4 Legislative Background

Planning and Development Act 2000

Section 179 (3) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended), requires that the Chief Executive of a local authority shall, after the expiration of the period during which submissions or observations with respect to the proposed development may be made, in accordance with regulations under subsection (2), prepare a written report in relation to the proposed development and submit the report to the members of the authority.

Section 179(b) outlines that a report prepared in accordance with paragraph (a) shall—

- (i) describe the nature and extent of the proposed development and the principal features thereof, and shall include an appropriate plan of the development and appropriate map of the relevant area,
- (ii) Evaluate whether or not the proposed development would be consistent with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area to which the development relates, having regard to the provisions of the development plan and giving the reasons and the considerations for the evaluation.
- (iii) list the persons or bodies who made submissions or observations with respect to the proposed development in accordance with the regulations under subsection (2),
- (iv) summarise the issues, with respect to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area in which the proposed development would be situated, raised in any such submissions or observations, and give the response of the Chief Executive thereto, and (v) Recommend whether or not the proposed development should be proceeded with as proposed, or as varied or modified as recommended in the report, or should not be proceeded with, as the case may be.

Under Section 179(4) of the Planning and Development Act, members of a local authority shall, as soon as may be, consider the proposed development and the report of the Chief Executive.

Following the consideration of the Chief Executive's report, the proposed development may be carried out as recommended in the Chief Executive's report, unless the local authority, by resolution, decides to vary or modify the development, otherwise than as recommended in the Chief Executive's report, or decides not to proceed with the development. A resolution must be passed not later than 6 weeks after receipt of the Chief Executive's report.

South Dublin County Council Development Plan 2016-2022

The *South Dublin County Council Development Plan 2016-2022* sets out the Council's policies and objectives for development in the County over the period from 2016 through 2022.

ET6 Objective 1 of the Plan states that is the policy of the Council to *"support and facilitate the development of an integrated network of Greenways and Trails, including blueways/water trails, along suitable corridors, including the River Liffey, Dublin Mountains Way, Grand Canal, River Dodder and Slade Valley"*.

Furthermore, the Council aims to *"Improved facilities for pedestrians and cyclists, such as increased footpath/cyclepath widths and safer crossings"*.

Table 6.4 of the Plan sets out the Six Year Cycle Network Programme for the South Dublin Area. The Dodder Greenway Project has been included as item 1 on the list, as a proposed Green Route to extend from Bohernabreena to Rathfarnham via Firhouse and Old Bawn.

1.5 Report Structure

The remainder of this Report is structured as follows:

- **Chapter 2** provides a detail description of the proposal and sets out the scheme objectives;
- **Chapter 3** summarises the concerns and recommendations submitted by the public and provide a response to the submissions made in relation to the proposal; and
- **Chapter 4** presents the Chief Executive recommendations following consideration of the submissions.

2. Proposed Development

2.1 Description of Proposed Development

The proposed Dodder Road Lower Upgrade will modify the conditions of the existing road and pedestrian and cyclists' facilities. The existing pedestrian and cyclist's infrastructure are proposed to be widened to approximately 5 to 6 metres while the existing carriageway is proposed to be reduced to 3 to 3.5 metres and transformed into a one-way system road. The existing undesignated parking spaces on the road will be removed and layby spaces will be introduced, where possible.

The intent of the proposed scheme is to be in line with the greenway strategy and achieve a high quality of service for all the proposed routes with a general width of 5m proposed throughout. The proposed width of the cycling and pedestrian facilities for the scheme also follows the recommendation of the National Transportations Authority's National Cycle Manual where it suggests a minimum width of 2.5 metres for 2 cyclists cycling abreast with another overtaking. Given the need to also accommodate pedestrians on the route a general combined width of 5.0 metres is proposed.

The coverage offered under the proposed scheme extends from Ely's Arch on Dodder Park Road to Dodder Park Drive.

All proposed works for the project will include a fully integrated landscape plan and will accommodate all the required services or all required services diversion, if any.

The proposed Dodder Road Lower Upgrade scheme comprises of the following:

- 730 meters of 5 meter wide pedestrian and cycling facilities.
- 730 meters of road upgrade and realignment.
- Minor upgrade works to existing storm water drainage system.
- Road marking and road sign upgrade.
- 730 meter of concrete footpath upgrade.
- Public Lighting upgrade, where deemed necessary.
- All associated ancillary works and integrated landscape plans.

2.2 Plans and Details

Plans and details are available at the following link:

<https://consult.sdublincoco.ie/en/consultation/dodder-road-lower-part-8>

3. Public Consultation Submissions Summary

3.1 Overview

This section presents an analysis of the submissions and includes a summary of each of the issues raised and the responses and recommendations of the Chief Executive. The responses of the Chief Executive have been framed taking account of the statutory obligations of the local authority, relevant Government and Ministerial guidelines and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2 List of Submissions

Submissions were received during the specified period of the public consultation in respect of the proposed development from the following:

Submission Reference No.	Author
SD-C184-1 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Eric Downey
SD-C184-2 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Stephen Finn
SD-C184-3 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Shaula Connaughton Deeny
SD-C184-4 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Lorna Callanan
SD-C184-5 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Ray Cunningham
SD-C184-6 - Via Online Consultation Portal	David Foley
SD-C184-7 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Robbie Mc Guinness
SD-C184-8 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Sheila Reilly
SD-C184-9 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Proinsias Fhlannchadha
SD-C184-10 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Simon Noone
SD-C184-11 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Brendan Heneghan
SD-C184-12 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Orla Kennedy
SD-C184-13 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Dublin Cycling Campaign
SD-C184-14 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Robin Keenan
SD-C184-15 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Damien Byrne
SD-C184-16 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Lorcan Staines
SD-C184-17 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Derval Devaney
SD-C184-18 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Sandra Velthuis
SD-C184-19 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Ray Lund
SD-C184-20 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Ray Lund
SD-C184-21 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Derek Killeen
SD-C184-22 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Niels Warburton
SD-C184-23 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Damian Jackson
SD-C184-24 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Charlotte Somers
SD-C184-25 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Lorcan Connor
SD-C184-26 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Tara Keane
SD-C184-27 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Kenneth Sweeney
SD-C184-28 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Kevin Hamilton
SD-C184-29 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Martin McDonagh
SD-C184-30 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Brendan McDonald

Submission Reference No.	Author
SD-C184-31 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Alex Toole
SD-C184-32 - Via Online Consultation Portal	James Keogh
SD-C184-33 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Mark Wheeler
SD-C184-34 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Gertie DOYLE
SD-C184-35 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Ciarán Ferrie
SD-C184-36 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Hugh Raftery
SD-C184-37 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Barbara Hynes
SD-C184-38 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Anne Ryan
SD-C184-39 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Deirdre McCarthy
SD-C184-40 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Patrick McCarthy
SD-C184-41 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Ciaran Kilbride
SD-C184-42 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Anne McCarthy
SD-C184-43 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Gerard Qunn
SD-C184-44 - Via Online Consultation Portal	James Dorney
SD-C184-45 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Dodder Road Lower Residents Action Group
SD-C184-46 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Eamonn Nolan
SD-C184-47 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Adrienne Hendrick
SD-C184-48 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Garrett Bonner
SD-C184-49 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Olive O Connor
SD-C184-50 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Eilís Feehan
SD-C184-51 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Pat Loughnan
SD-C184-52 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Stephen Finn
SD-C184-53 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Linda Wheeler
SD-C184-54 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Marion McDonald
SD-C184-55 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Cathal Doherty
SD-C184-56 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Angela Crampton
SD-C184-57 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Colm Brophy
SD-C184-58 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Inland Fisheries Ireland
SD-C184-59 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Ray Lund
SD-C184-60 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Yvonne Collins
SD-C184-61 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Alex Williams
SD-C184-62 - Via Online Consultation Portal	John Meagher
SD-C184-63 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Maya Williams
SD-C184-64 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Rob Kelly
SD-C184-65 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Maria-Mercedes Abengoza
SD-C184-66 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Colm Ryan
SD-C184-67 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Fergal Ryan
SD-C184-68 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Patrick Kelly
SD-C184-69 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Shauna McGowan
SD-C184-70 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Mary Agnew
SD-C184-71 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Luke Toole
SD-C184-72 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Patricia O Keeffe
SD-C184-73 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Daragh Anglim

Submission Reference No.	Author
SD-C184-74 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Stephen Finn
SD-C184-75 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Faye Ross
SD-C184-76 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Laura Donaghy
SD-C184-77 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Lorna Callanan
SD-C184-78 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Douglas Oldrey
SD-C184-79 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Ray Lund
SD-C184-80 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Louisa Walsh
SD-C184-81 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Sara Kilbride
SD-C184-82 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Padraig Dunne
SD-C184-83 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Derek Kirwan
SD-C184-84 - Via Online Consultation Portal	John Lahart
SD-C184-85 - Via Online Consultation Portal	John Shanahan
SD-C184-86 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Lorraine Brunell
SD-C184-87 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Sheila Kilbride
SD-C184-88 - Via Online Consultation Portal	Earle Waghorne
SD-C184-89 - Via Posted Letter	Denis Haverty
SD-C184-90 - Via Posted Letter	Terry Reddy
SD-C184-91 - Via Posted Letter	Cllr. Lynn McCrave

3.3 Summary and Categorisation of Issues Raised and Chief Executive's

Responses

Submission No. SD-C184-1– Eric Downey
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I am supportive of the proposal to make Lower Dodder Road one way and improve pedestrian and cycle provision. I think the one-way direction going west will reduce rat running. 2. Cyclists should not be mixed with pedestrians. 3. However, I think this is an over-designed, expensive scheme. Restricting all through traffic on this road by installing bollards at one end would turn the road into a cycle street. Cyclists could use the road and pedestrians could use the entire existing footpath width. Red paint on the road could reinforce the cycle street concept. Eliminating through traffic means full segregation for cyclists is not needed. 4. The money saved by this approach could be used to upgrade the cycle lanes on Dodder Park Road running parallel, to fully segregated. This is a high traffic route and is much more in need of segregated cycle lanes, to link with Braemor Rd. The junction with Rathfarnham Road could also be upgraded to a Dutch protected junction.

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Noted.
2. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.
3. The installation of bollards was explored at the design stage and was not chosen due to lack of available space for turning movements. One of the main objectives of the scheme

is to provide segregated cyclist facilities to ensure the safety of these users. Due to the existing layout and design of the road and traffic volumes at Dodder Road Lower, the safety of cyclists cannot be guaranteed if allow to use the road.

4. The upgrade of cycle facilities along Dodder Park Road and the junction with Rathfarnham Road are outside the extend of this scheme.

Chief Executives Recommendations

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.

Submission No. SD-C184-2– Stephen Finn
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. I wish to express our support for the above scheme, its brilliant.2. One concern we have is the exit back onto Dodder Park Road (DPR). Can this junction have two lanes one for right turns only and one for left turns only. Priority must be given to residents who have to use the one-way flow to turn left,3. and the junction must prevent traffic using the road as an evening rat run, racing down to avoid the traffic on Dodder Park Road. At present with the large yellow boxed area traffic race down the LDR and form 2 lanes to turn right back onto DPR. We need priority for residents getting out from the new one-way flow.4. Again, brilliant plans and well researched. Let the work begin.5. Further my earlier submission of support a few incidents have occurred since then. Sharing a cycle lane with a footpath does not work. Over the past few weeks, the number of users on the Lower Dodder Road (LDR) have had a few near misses with cyclist and have witnessed others. People walking are not always aware of their surroundings and to give 2m distance to oncoming walkers they unconsciously step out (forgetting they are sharing a footpath with cyclist) and a near miss occurs, and the cyclist gets abusive (been there and witnessed it). If the proposal for a Greenway is to go ahead, can you please look at the excellent cycle track on Braemor Road which is similar to the new cycle track in Stillorgan, one level for pedestrians, slight kerb for cyclists and a slight kerb for motorists. A pathway is for walking and pedestrian safety, combining it with cyclists is so dangerous and the potential for serious accidents with walkers. Over the past number of weeks, we have witnessed a huge growth in walkers and cyclist which is great, but it won't work sharing the same path.6. With regard to a one-way system for cars I fear a 5:30pm rat run as the traffic backs up from the Rathfarnham Road junction towards Braemor Road.7. As a solution can you make LDR a cyclist priority road, leaving it as is with travelling in both directions but with more ramps and narrowing to one lane at certain points, making the road a priority road for both pedestrian and cyclists.

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Noted

2. The junction analysis at this junction does not warrant additional lanes for this junction. existing traffic volumes do not require the provision of additional lanes. Dodder Road Lower is a public road and is not possible to consider priority at this junction for Residents over other traffic.
3. Traffic Calming measures will be put in place to deter “rat running”. In the worst-case scenario, with these measures in place the volumes of transient traffic will remain as they are currently.
4. Noted
5. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.
6. Traffic Calming measures will be put in place to deter “rat running”. In the worst-case scenario, with these measures in place the volumes of transient traffic will remain as they are currently
7. One of the main objectives of the scheme is to provide segregated cyclist facilities to ensure the safety of these users. Due to the existing layout and design of the road and traffic volumes at Dodder Road Lower, the safety of cyclists cannot be guaranteed if allow to use the road.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.

Submission No. SD-C184-3– Shaula Connaughton Deeny
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I live at number 32 Lower Dodder Road. I understand that it is intended to retain very little parking on the Lower Dodder Road and that the few spaces that will be retained will be outside our house. At present it is already extremely difficult to park in our own driveway due to the manner in which people park outside our house. Most days someone parks in a way that we cannot enter or exit our driveway. We need to drive our small children to and from their childcare facilities and will in future need to drive them to school. The people who park outside our house also often park there for hours at a time, sometimes for the whole day while they fish or take photographs. It is inevitable that the significant reduction of parking along our road will result in demand for the space outside our house being very high. We would therefore strongly suggest that the parking is paid for by the users. This will mean that it can be more fairly shared by all users of the greenway and will mean that people who park badly blocking our way are unlikely to remain there all day preventing us from using our car. We acknowledge that this will mean our guests will have to use permits, but we think that this is a more than reasonable trade off.

Chief Executives Responses:

1. In 2021 the Council adopted a new Parking Bye Laws, which sets out all of the Pay & Display locations across the County. This location is not included but could be considered as part of any future revisions to the Parking Bye Laws at that time. Illegal parking should be handled by Gardai.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. No changes proposed following the review of this submission.

Submission No. SD-C184-4– Lorna Callanan
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. I object to the proposal for shared surface for cyclists and pedestrians. This route is a very busy local pedestrian route for people of all ages and abilities who regularly enjoy the amenity in their neighbourhood. It is unsafe to share the surface with cyclists. The current lined separation is unsuitable as is the proposal to share the surface. It is very likely that this greenway will be heavily used therefore it is essential to ensure the safety of users from the outset. The currently located surface along the road is the only suitable location for safe pedestrian facilities. Full segregation of pedestrian surface is required and should be located along the current fence/wall, should be at least 2m in width and be fully segregated by a kerb from the cycling surface. Similar segregation is required the entire length of the greenway, similar to the Grand Canal Cycle track. As Greenways attract fast cyclists, it is essential that our most vulnerable -families, children, elderly etc -the people who currently use this route - must be protected. Lack of segregation would act as a deterrent for much of the cohort that currently use these facilities.2. The lower pathway beside the river does not fulfil the criteria for pedestrian facilities as it is unsuitable and inaccessible for the less able, children, elderly. Plus, it is very narrow, unlit and frequently flooded.3. I recommend that SDCC undertake an on-site visit ASAP and assess the current usage and conduct a risk assessment of the proposals from the point of view of vulnerable pedestrians. It will become obvious that, as currently designed, the shared surface will impact negatively on the ability of pedestrians to take their normal walk without fear of injury or collision. It is crucial that these greenway proposals are not able; and therefore, segregation of facilities is a fundamental principle of the design, particularly in urban areas where there is an established usage from both commuting and recreational pedestrians. In recent days, I witnessed 4 cyclists' whizz past an elderly pedestrian stumble and almost fall due to passing cyclists on a shared surface on Upper Churchtown Rd (where the surface is divided with a painted line only). It is critical that adequate safe provision is made, and these plans redrawn.

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.
2. Modifications to the River walkway are outside the extend of this scheme.
3. Noted. A series of Road Safety Audits at different stages of the scheme design and delivery will be carried out to ensure pedestrian safety.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433..

Submission No. SD-C184-5– Ray Cunningham

1. I support the proposal to make this road one-way for motor vehicles. This is not an access route; it makes sense to change it to a cul-de-sac.
2. The cycling track and pedestrian footpath should be segregated. There is plenty of room to separate the two, and it is much safer for both cyclists and pedestrians.

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Cul-de-sac option was explored at the design stage and was not chosen due to lack of available space for turning movements.
2. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.

Submission No. SD-C184-6– David Foley

1. The plan to make Dodder Road Lower one way is good.
2. The plan to make the cycle lane and path a shared space with pedestrians and cyclists is a mistake. It's already bad enough when large numbers of pedestrians make the cycle lane unusable and not segregating will just end up with people walking six abreast. There should be more than enough space to segregate pedestrians and cyclists, the shared space is not needed and not wanted.

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Noted
2. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.

Submission No. SD-C184-7– Robbie Mc Guinness

1. I feel it would be better to have clearly marked pedestrian and cyclist delineation. Shared space is likely to frustrate pedestrians and people using bikes.

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.

Submission No. SD-C184-8– Sheila Reilly
1. As I live and cycle in Rathfarnham, I fully support the building of this scheme. Have viewed the maps and the location and it looks to be very family and cycle friendly. Well done SDCC

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Noted

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. No changes proposed following the review of this submission.

Submission No. SD-C184-9– Sheila Reilly
1. Please see the video attached which confirms that having the same on the same level does not work as pedestrians will not stay within their boundaries and it will hinder use of the of the cycle lanes as intended. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=msMgQ1lvxE

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.

Submission No. SD-C184-10– Simon Noone

1. I support in principle the plan to make LDR one-way and give greater space to cyclists and pedestrians.
2. However, I am concerned about the plan to reduce on-street parking. Currently there is a lot of on-street parking on LDR, with people parking in order to go for walks/runs along the river. I live in one of the houses that is earmarked for on-street parking under the plan, and as things stand, we are frequently blocked in by people parking across our driveway. I am concerned that the removal of most on-street parking, with a few spaces left outside my house and others, will lead to non-stop parking outside my house, with consequent loss of amenity. I am not opposed to the on-street parking outside my house, but I am concerned that some cars will be left parked all day, with the result that others (including visitors to my house) will not be able to access the parking outside my house.
Therefore, in order to ensure appropriate circulation and availability of the on-street parking spaces, I believe it will be necessary to put in pay parking (with appropriate dispensation for residents) so as to prevent people leaving their cars parked all day,

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Noted
2. In 2021 the Council adopted a new Parking Bye Laws, which sets out all of the Pay & Display locations across the County. This location is not included but could be considered as part of any future revisions to the Parking Bye Laws at that time. Blocking of accesses/driveways is a parking offence and should be handled the Gardai.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. No changes proposed following the review of this submission.

Submission No. SD-C184-11– Brendan Heneghan

1. I have a number of issues with the proposed scheme on Lower Dodder Road. I am familiar with the area as I lived very close by for many years and I also walk the affected stretch quite often. I am also a very slow (and poor) cyclist and I find this stretch perfectly acceptable for cycling as it is, compared to most other local areas. I think the scheme proposed is in substance a solution for a non-existent problem.
2. Access for residents
 - If the residents are all in favour of the scheme, then this part of my submission can be disregarded. It is my considered view that in any hierarchy of priority, those who actually live on the road should rank very high in terms of vehicle access. I also consider it unacceptable in principle that residential roads are made one way and there is little if any city-wide precedent for this.
 - The affected houses run from no 21 at the western end to no 91 at the eastern end. While the maps you supply don't have a readily indicated scale, it would seem from the measures at the foot of the pages that the road length is about 700 metres. If a person lives in number 21 and wants to go to Rathfarnham, there is no additional journey length there; however the return trip involves travelling in addition to now the length of Dodder Park Road to the arch and

the entire length of the proposed one way section, which is an additional 1.5 km approx. Exactly the same principle applies to the occupant of no 91 if they want to access Churchtown, except the additional mileage is on the outbound journey. If a person makes five such journeys a week, they are faced with an additional 7.5km.

- Someone in the middle of the road has a longer journey coming back from Rathfarnham and a longer journey heading to Churchtown than currently. So, they are inconvenienced both ways.
- Residents will in all cases have to exit the road by a difficult and un-signalled crossing. It can be difficult to turn right there. This may become worse with BusConnects determined to funnel traffic from Templeogue down Springfield. At the moment they all have the option of driving down to the signalled junction at the arch.

3. Parking

- On a recent visit to the road mid-morning, I counted about 20 cars parked on the road, including a few partially parked on the pavement. If the roadway is to be a uniform 3.5 metres wide, parking will not be possible except where specifically provided (or maybe by entirely blocking the pavement on the side with houses). It is not clear from the drawings where parking is proposed although I surmise it may be possible in the mid-section. A few houses on the road manifestly only have currently space for one car and the loss of parking is liable to be a serious loss of residential amenity. Those people might solve the problem at a cost by surfacing their gardens; however, this is hardly desirable for properties within 10 metres of a river.

4. Current width of pavement on river side.

- As your drawings show the pavement is already about 4 metres wide on most of the road. I both cycle and walk on this stretch and this is ample room for both modes of use. There is a narrow stretch in the middle of the road. I believe that at this point, it would be possible to widen the pavement to 4 metres and effectively have a yield system where east bound traffic should yield to westbound traffic in that section of the road. This is in the vicinity of your existing section 2.2 where the current path is only 2.63 metres. Effectively you are proposing to turn the road into a construction site to get about a metre of extra pavement for most of its length.

5. Shared pedestrian/cycle space

- The current arrangement has a dedicated space for pedestrians and a dedicated space for cyclists, which I consider satisfactory from personal experience of both. I don't think it is satisfactory to mix the two. A significant proportion of cyclists, particularly those travelling at speed, seem to assume they have absolute priority on other shared facilities in the general area. This is a big issue for me wearing my pedestrian hat. This is an extra issue in the first hundred metres of the proposed scheme between Pearse Bridge and the weir - after this, at least pedestrians have the option of the path directly by the river.

6. Rat run

- An alleged justification for the scheme is that the road is used as a rat run. I think this is not a material issue in reality, based on personal experience over the years. The scheme will of course continue to allow the road to be used for through traffic westbound, subject only to ramps. It is quite difficult to exit the road at the western end anyhow, so it is not a useful rat run. Obviously, the scheme eliminates the potential for an east bound rat run. However, this is only really an issue if the east bound traffic backs up to a considerable extent at the arch, which does happen but is unusual. It also tends to be a morning peak thing.

7. The new bridge

- I am very concerned that the new bridge, like the bridge now being installed at Bushy Park will take forever to construct (the Bushy Park Bridge is over a year on the go now and still no sign of opening). Has no one considered perhaps reconstructing the current bridge (and maybe having a temporary facility to maintain a crossing)? The slope and narrowness on the current bridge does have the convenient effect of slowing down the cyclists when entering the park there.

8. Environmental conclusion

- I am surprised at the conclusion that a scheme which involves 700 metres of construction work and a new bridge very close to the river has no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment. This seems to ignore issues such as the Dipper View clearly signed at the weir and the effect on the old structure close to the proposed new bridge. I don't think this conclusion is correct.

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Noted
2. This scheme seeks to deliver a key section of the Dodder Valley Greenway. A key objective of this project is to encourage more people to walk and cycle. The design of this scheme has carefully considered and balanced impacts on all road users including vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians. It seeks to create a more pleasant local environment along this key stretch of the Dodder Greenway. Commuting time for some residents will increase but the impact of this will be minimal taking account of the fact that local residents will no longer have to compete with transient traffic.
3. The proposed Greenway will enhance the amenity offer of the area. Informal parking exists along the street, in most instances this is not being impacted. Blocking of accesses/driveways is a parking offence and should be handled the Gardai.
4. The design has been completed in accordance with the required standards and guidelines necessary to design such a scheme.
5. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.
6. An Origin-Destination Traffic Survey was undertaken, and it was determined that over 50% of the traffic corresponds to Rat-Runners and most of rat runners head Eastbound.

Based on this it was decided that a westbound one-way will reduce the rat-running through the road.

7. Reconstructing current bridge is outside of extend of the project.
8. As outlined in the submission, Section 51(1) of the Roads Act 1993 applies to all developments in respect of which an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) is required under Section 50. An EIA Screening Report was prepared for the proposed Dodder Greenway – Dodder Road Lower Upgrade and assessed the development under the mandatory EIA criteria set out under Section 50 of the Roads Act, 1993 (as amended). The assessment found that the proposed development does not exceed any of the thresholds listed under Section 50 of the Road Act and therefore does not require a mandatory Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). The proposed development is therefore a sub threshold development.

The EIA Screening Report established that the proposed development does not require an environmental impact assessment under Section 50 of the Roads Act as amended, or the EIA Directive and therefore, Section 51(1) of the Roads Act does not apply to the proposed development. South Dublin County Council as the applicant are therefore making the planning application under Section 179 (1)(b) of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 (as amended) “where a local authority that is a planning authority proposes to carry out development”. Therefore, a Part 8 Planning Report has been prepared for the proposed development in accordance with the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended).

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.

Submission No. SD-C184-12– Orla Kennedy
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. I would just like to also highlight that improving this route for walkers will exacerbate the parking problem at the corner of Rathfarnham Park and up on to Ballytore Road which is a danger for cyclists. Currently dog walkers come from other areas to walk by the dodder (on the path you are proposing to improve) and park on the hill on Rathfarnham Park (just off Rathfarnham Road) and along Ballytore Road. The road is quite narrow, and cars go too fast up the hill. Parked cars on that hill are a real danger for cyclists. If you make Lower Dodder Road a more attractive path for walkers, have you considered this knock-on effect?? What plans do you have for keeping cyclist safe on this hill, when it is already dangerous?2. Parking is also problematic for cyclists on Orwell Road. People appear to drive to the park and park along Orwell Road. This forces cyclists out into fast moving traffic to pass out the parked cars. What plans do you have to make cycling safer here, if you make this path more attractive for walkers? I suspect your plan will make it more dangerous for cyclists.

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Informal parking exists along the Dodder Road Lower, in most instances this is not being impacted. Rathfarnham Park is outside of the extend of this scheme.
2. Orwell Road is outside of the extend of this scheme.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. No changes proposed following the review of this submission.

Submission No. SD-C184-13– Dublin Cycling Campaign
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dublin Cycling Campaign warmly welcomes the proposed upgrade to the Dodder Greenway along Lower Dodder Road. There has been a huge increase in people using this stretch of the Dodder for walking, running, cycling, dog walking and birdwatching since lockdown, and this upgrade will help to ensure that this can continue in an enhanced environment post-lockdown. We welcome in particular the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed 5m path width will help deal with congestion on this very busy walking and cycling route. • The amendment to one-way vehicular traffic along with traffic-calming is welcomed and will restore some tranquility to an area frequented by nature-lovers. 2. We question the wisdom of deciding not to segregate bicycle and pedestrian traffic on this path. As well as being a leisure facility, this is a commuting cycling route for those travelling to the city centre, and for students travelling to UCD. Shared paths do not serve either pedestrians or cyclists well and invariably lead to conflict and the potential for collisions. Increased sales of electric-assisted bikes (or e-bikes) in the locality will mean that average speeds of cyclists (especially those commuting) could be higher than observed previously. Furthermore, the flat, off-road route would be ideal for use by those on electric scooters, which will likely continue to increase in popularity with the introduction of legislation to regulate their use which is being drafted presently, so this is an additional variable that should be considered. Ultimately, we feel that providing a clear straight path is a better, more equal solution - it isn't easy for some people on cycles to keep stopping and turning, and also it isn't easy for some pedestrians (such as small children) to stay fully aware of others around them on a shared path. 3. The eastern end, near the footbridge to Orwell Park, is used by parents as a drop-off point for students attending the High School in Rathgar. While we hope that the enhanced walking and cycling facilities will encourage more students to walk or cycle, we recognise that a significant number of parents will continue to drive their children to school. Therefore, we suggest that the walking/cycling path is moved closer to the river, and a small number of parking spaces provided, at this end. 4. Bicycle Parking and Benches <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cycle parking facilities (catering for cargo bikes, trikes, hand cycles and other adaptive cycles) at the western end of the road would cater to the needs of birdwatchers who frequent this exact spot. These visitors typically arrive by car

Submission No. SD-C184-13– Dublin Cycling Campaign
(in order to transport camera equipment), so it makes sense to make the location convenient for their needs should they decide to cycle instead.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This would be a good opportunity for some public realm improvements, such as benches, along this section of the Dodder Greenway.

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Noted
2. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.
3. The provision of a drop-off area for the High School is outside the extent of this part 8 plan due to constraints on available space caused by the existing parameters on Dodder Road Lower. This can be examined at a later stage.
4. Parking has been included where spaced allowed. public realm improvements can be provided as part of the landscaping, where possible.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.

Submission No. SD-C184-14– Robin Keenan
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Hi, I regularly walk on this stretch of the dodder and believe it would be better to separate walkers from cyclists to avoid potential accidents. 2. I also believe the entire dodder route should be protected from illegal parking by separating it from the road with vegetation.

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.
2. Where possible, it can be provided as part of the landscaping.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.

Submission No. SD-C184-15– Damien Byrne
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I welcome the improvements along the proposed Dodder greenway, but I think the design requires improvements to the current proposal.

2. Pedestrians and cyclists should be segregated to make it a safer and more pleasurable route. This route is used and will be used for leisure and commuting by cyclists and it needs to be segregated to avoid conflict and stress for cyclists and pedestrians. With the removal of one car lane there is plenty of scope to make a segregated cycle lane. Also, the removal of the car lane reduces the potential for confident/fast cyclists to use the car lane in one direction thus necessitating a segregated cycling lane. There is currently a huge increase in cycling, e-bikes, electric scooters, which will likely continue to increase in popularity as is happening in other countries. The Dodder Greenway needs to have a fully segregated cycling/pedestrian route along its full path. A fully segregated route will encourage more people to use more environmentally transport options and make less use of their car. Not putting a segregated route is not the optimum solution and therefore the design should be altered.

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Noted.
2. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.

Submission No. SD-C184-16– Damien Byrne
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. I am in support of the scheme.2. Separating cyclists and walkers would improve it in my opinion. Conflict with walkers in cycle lanes and vice versa makes the route a less enjoyable experience.3. Well done. A great project!

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Noted.
2. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.
3. Noted.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.

Submission No. SD-C184-17– Derval Devaney

1. I have viewed the greenway planned for this section of the Dodder which I am very familiar with as I work nearby and cycle and jog the area frequently. While I welcome the proposal to increase the space for cyclists and pedestrians, I strongly disagree with the area being a shared space for such users. This is because:

- The health and safety of both the pedestrian and cyclist is at risk when using a shared space. For example, I was knocked off my bike due to a pedestrian and their dog stepping suddenly out in front of me while cycling in a such a shared space.
- Cycling along an area that is not segregated from pedestrians is stressful for both the cyclist and pedestrian. The risk of being knocked off your bike is greater, the risk of being hit by a cyclist is greater. It is akin to cycling on a footpath. It does not make sense to design this shared facility for both users.
- Planning such a facility for both users run the risk of cyclists continuing to use the road and not the cycle path, as the mode of transport on the road is more fluid - this can lead to frustration for motorists.

The path needs to be segregated for pedestrians and cyclists for it to be safe and for the uptake to be successful. If you observe the two way cycle lane from Blackrock to Sandycove which is separated from pedestrians, you will see that the area has witnessed an increase in cycle traffic due to the safety that a segregated cycle land affords and therefore the enjoyment it brings.

Adequate facilities that meets the needs of the users has knock-on effects such as a greater uptake of cycling, less traffic congestino, leading to improved air quality, health and wellbeing. I urge you to re-visit the plans and make this area an amenity for both pedestrians (walkers, runners and joggers) and cyclists alike which will in turn suit the needs of the motorists. Make the greenway a segregated space for pedestrians and cyclists.

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.

Submission No. SD-C184-18– Derval Devaney

1. I use this stretch along the Dodder almost daily, most frequently as a pedestrian, often by bike and occasionally by car. I welcome attention being given to the area and like aspects of the plan, such as making the road one-way and the seating overlooking the river. However, I strongly discourage the introduction of shared pedestrian/cyclist use. The path is segregated at present (albeit very imperfectly with only a painted line) and I perceive the introduction of shared use as a backward step, especially when the numbers of people walking, cycling, and scooting along here are projected to increase substantially. The past 13 months have already seen a major increase in usage and the

Submission No. SD-C184-18– Derval Devaney

scheme must be future-proofed. If the width of the road is an issue, on-street parking provision may have to be reconsidered.

2. Illegal parking by parents dropping off and collecting High School students should also be designed out.

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided..
2. The provision of a drop-off area for the High School is outside the extent of this part 8 plan due to constraints on available space caused by the existing parameters on Dodder Road Lower. It is intended to examine this at a later stage as a separate project.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.

Submission No. SD-C184-19/20– Ray Lund

1. The footpath and cycleway should be separate and not shared. Cyclists are a danger to pedestrians and should be at a different level. Crashes will occur which could be fatal. Keep the cyclist at a lower level such that they cannot hit pedestrians
2. Put a barrier in Dodder Road Lower such that the road becomes two cul-de-sacs. If the barrier is placed at the western end (near the junction of Dodder Park Drive and Dodder Road Lower) there could be a turning circle on Dodder Road Lower, while Dodder Park Drive and the existing cul-de-sac towards Rathfarnham Bridge could be separate with no turning problems.

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.
2. Options was explored at the design stage and was not chosen due to lack of available space for turning movements.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.

Submission No. SD-C184-21– Derek Killeen

1. Hello, I live in No. 2 dodder Park Grove. I have lived here for 20 years. I run/walk/drive/cycle in the area regularly and know the stretch being developed very

Submission No. SD-C184-21– Derek Killeen

well. I believe not segregating the cycle lane and footpath will put cyclists and pedestrians on a collision course. I cycle regularly from where I live to Tallaght but on Dodder View Road, not on the provided bike lane which is nothing more than the original footpath with the exception that it has bicycles painted on it. It's simply too dangerous with dogs, children, ppl walking 4 a break etc. With this development will come additional pedestrian and cyclists and a real risk of people being injured or even worse. I feel the cycle lane along dodder view road and Templeogue village is a total design failure, making the original choice of cycling on the road a safer option than the provided bike cycle lane. I would hope that we would not make these mistakes again and maybe learn from other cities who are further along on this journey than we are.

Regards,

Derek Killeen

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.

Submission No. SD-C184-22– Niels Warburton

1. I am writing to state my strong support for the improved pedestrian and cycling infrastructure on Dodder Road Lower. Reducing the motor traffic to a single lane is welcome and it will lower speeds and, of course, provides the space pedestrians/cyclists along this popular route. I have looked at the plans and approve of them, but I would make one key suggestion: that the pedestrian and cyclist infrastructure be separated. Shared space between these two groups often leads to conflict and frustration for both groups of users. A simple line painted down the middle of the new space might suffice to provide the needed segregation.

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.

Submission No. SD-C184-23– Damian Jackson

1. The cycle path should be segregated from walkers to be effective. Widening is alone is not adequate. Thank you.

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.

Submission No. SD-C184-24– Charlotte Somers

1. I am very in favour of all the new infrastructure for cyclists, myself and my three sons all cycle. However, I would not agree with having a shared space for pedestrians and cyclists on the new version of the Dodder Rd Lr. Commuting cyclists can be very intolerant of other road users, especially pedestrians. That stretch of road is a beautiful amenity to have, with the woods, the waterfall and the river. It is an area that we should all be able to enjoy, at our own pace. Putting the cyclists in with strolling pedestrians will only lead to aggravation and possibly accidents, and it will certainly make it unpleasant to walk along. If the cyclist's area has to be single file for that stretch, I think that would be better than both groups sharing.

Thank you.

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.

Submission No. SD-C184-25– Lorcan Connor

1. I welcome recent announcements to build the Dodder Greenway. I welcome the objective of enhancing current cycle facilities along Dodder Road Lower. Currently the road is two ways for traffic but is not heavily used. I believe it would lend itself to a shared space for all road users due to its relatively short length and access points at both ends.
2. Through traffic could be prevented by a barrier midway along the road. This would restrict users to residents only and avoid any major detours for residents.
3. I believe the Shared Space concept would massively enhance the area and is a perfect location to trial such an approach.

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Noted
2. Options was explored at the design stage and was not chosen due to lack of available space for turning movements.
3. One of the main objectives of the scheme is to provide segregated cyclist facilities to ensure the safety of these users. Due to the existing layout and design of the road and traffic volumes at Dodder Road Lower, the safety of cyclists/pedestrians cannot be guaranteed if allow to use the road.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. No changes proposed following the review of this submission.

Submission No. SD-C184-26– Tara Keane
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. I m a disabled driver and Lower Dodder Road is the one place I can come to enjoy the widest possible variety of wildlife on the river because I can park anywhere along this stretch and walk across the road with a seat. I hope you make the space accessible for disabled drivers by providing disabled parking spaces at either end if the road and also somewhere in the middle so that disabled people can continue to enjoy this stretch along with pedestrians and cyclists.2. I would love if you could consider a boardwalk out like they did on the Liffey? I think space for market stalls like in Herbert Park would be great (like they have in Paris along the Seine) for artists, local food producers, booksellers, crafts etc. The green area at the Terenure end of Lower Dodder Road would be ideal for a weekend market space. Also, a kiosk with public toilet and COFFEE for all the people who use this area for recreation every day. At present there are no facilities in the immediate vicinity and a coffee station here would be a very welcome addition.3. Is it really necessary to lose the two-way access on the road? I think this will cause a lot of hassle for people. If it must go then at least can the one-way system only start after the little parking area opposite the green boxes at the Terenure end of the street. Then at least people who want to park up that end of the road can drive down and park in the little car park where the accountant’s office is without having to drive all the way around doubling back on themselves. That would be a reasonable compromise.

Chief Executives Responses:

1. 1 disable parking space has been included in the design where space allowed.
2. This is outside of extend of the project. Could be looked at a later date.
3. One-way system is proposed in order to reduce the amount of Rat-running along Dodder Road Lower and make it a safer place for pedestrians/cyclists.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. No changes proposed following the review of this submission.

Submission No. SD-C184-27– Kenneth Sweeney

1. Hi, I commend SDCC for their proposed improvements to the Dodder Greenway at Lower Dodder Road. I am particularly concerned however at the traffic impacts on the various junctions, in particular Junctions 1 and 2 referred to in the traffic study. In my opinion consideration should be given to allowing one way traffic to traverse east rather than a proposed westbound direction. By allowing traffic travel westbound it will result in more traffic at Junction 2. To continue travelling west at junction 2, it requires crossing over eastbound traffic at the same junction.
2. With the increased levels of traffic, it will more than likely require new traffic lights at this junction, which in turn will cause complications and delays given the close proximity to junction 3. However, if traffic flow along Lower Dodder Road was allowed eastbound, then traffic coming from the west could easily turn left at Junction 2 and continue onto Lower Dodder Road without crossing over of any traffic or requirement for traffic lights at this junction. Furthermore, by forcing all the traffic along Dodder Park Road, that may have travelled eastbound along Lower Dodder Road, it is introducing additional traffic volumes at Junction 1. The sequencing and timing of the traffic lights at Junction 1 has changed in recent months, with sometimes only 2-3 cars being able to pass through the lights in one green sequence, and it is common to find traffic building back to Dodder Park Grove. If cars were allowed travel eastbound on Lower Dodder Road, it would alleviate the east bound traffic at Junction 1.
3. The traffic report seems to consider the data but does not appear to make any recommendations on which is the preferential route for traffic along Lower Dodder Road and it would be welcomed that more serious consideration be given to the east bound traffic rather than west bound.

Chief Executives Responses:

1. An Origin-Destination Traffic Survey was undertaken, and it was determined that most of rat runners head Eastbound. Based on this it was decided that a westbound one-way will reduce the rat-running through the road.
2. The Council does not believe that there will be a significant worsening of traffic and queuing on Dodder Park Road. However, should this happen, it will be possible for the Council to review and amend traffic light signals to mitigation this issue in the future. The objective of the project is modal change and reduce traffic on the road.
3. The main objective of the traffic analysis was to estimate the level of impact the proposed scheme will have on the nearby junctions and to determine if such traffic impacts are within acceptable levels.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. No changes proposed following the review of this submission.

Submission No. SD-C184-28 – Kevin Hamilton

1. Shared paths for walkers and cyclists are regarded as being the worst option next to having no infrastructure at all. Given the long-term aims and policies (whether by SDCC or the country as a whole) with regards to promoting cycling and walking for recreation,

Submission No. SD-C184-28 – Kevin Hamilton

commuting and other transport, and given that the Dodder Greenway has the potential to be transformational in enabling many orbital bicycle commutes that have previously been infeasible – it's inexcusable to be planning for this sort of infrastructure. It's a solution from two decades ago for a solution meant to be for the next several decades. If the compromises necessary to create both a two-way cycle track and pedestrian walkway(s) of sufficient width are willing to be made, the more creative solution would be to keep a reduced width shared path, create a contra-flow (east-bound) segregated cycle-lane, and give cyclists heading west the option of using the vehicle carriageway if they feel comfortable and confident doing so, or else using the shared path. While it's not optimal nor best practice, it's at least an improvement on what exists now. As a long-time cyclist commuter (whether for college or work), the proposed facilities will mean I will have to bypass the Lower Dodder Road when cycling eastwards as shared paths are neither safe nor suitable for cycling at even moderate (15km/h) speeds. My experience of shared paths (such as the disastrous and frankly, embarrassing one on Scholarstown Road) is that they are not used by the vast majority of cyclists. If a solution for the future cannot be envisioned right now, the correct choice is do nothing - not to create a permanent negative change.

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.

Submission No. SD-C184-29 – Martin McDonagh

1. Rathfarnham, Terenure, Templeogue e.g. I would also be open to the Idea of moving further afield, if there were perhaps any other options. Looking forward to the viewing, keeping my fingers crossed all goes well.

Chief Executives Responses:

1. The extend of this specific proposal limits to Dodder Road Lower Only. Proposed scheme will link to the Dodder Greenway section along Springfield Avenue and the eastern Dodder Road Lower. The connectivity of the scheme to the surrounding network has been taken into consideration in the design.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. No changes proposed following the review of this submission.

Submission No. SD-C184-30 – Brendan McDonald

I don't want the current SDCC plan because:

1. It is not safe for pedestrians (sharing a path with cyclists is not safe).

It is not safe for cyclists (sharing a path with pedestrians is not safe).

2. The proposed 1-way system would make the road less safe for all non-vehicular traffic as traffic speeds are likely to increase rather than decrease. Evening time “rat-running” is not addressed.
3. The proposed 1-way system would make it extremely difficult for residents to get into and out of their driveways. At least a third of households would be significantly impacted in this way.
4. The proposed 1-way system would mean that any visitors, deliveries, carers and tradespeople will block the road when parked. That is unacceptable.

The residents have formulated an alternative proposal which addresses all of these issues:

5. A separate footpath for pedestrians (not shared with cyclists).
6. Creation of a “quiet neighbourhood road” which is achieved by (a) local access only signs at either end of the road to reduce traffic volumes and (b) effective traffic calming measures including pinch points at narrow points on the road to force vehicles to slow down in both directions and adhere to the existing 30km/h speed limit.
7. By creating a “quiet neighbourhood road”, cyclists will be able to safely cycle on the road (not on a shared path with pedestrians).
8. Keeping the road 2-way with local access only will allow residents to continue to access their houses as normal and allow visitors, deliveries, carers and tradespeople to park outside houses, without blocking the whole road.

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.
2. Traffic Calming measures will be put in place to ensure speeds are kept at acceptable levels.
3. An Auto track analysis has been carried out on the design to ensure that such manoeuvres can be accommodated in the proposed design.
4. Enhance road markings will be delivered as part of the works and these will deter illegal parking and set down along the scheme. Illegal parking to be handle by Garda.
5. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided..
6. An 'Access Only' sign cannot be provided as Dodder Road Lower is a public road with public access. Traffic calming have been integrated within the amended design.
7. One of the main objectives of the scheme is to provide segregated cyclist facilities to ensure the safety of these users. Due to the existing layout and design of the road and traffic volumes at Dodder Road Lower, the safety of cyclists cannot be guaranteed if allow to use the road.
8. One-way system is proposed in order to reduce the amount of Rat-running along Dodder Road Lower and make it a safer place for pedestrians/cyclists. An 'Access Only' sign cannot be provided as Dodder Road Lower is a public road with public access

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.

Submission No. SD-C184-31 – Alex Toole
<p>Dear Sir / Madam,</p> <p>We are glad to see that a plan is being put together for the Dodder Greenway proposal to Dodder Road Lower (DRL). We are residents, pedestrians, cyclists and motorists and already benefit from the linear park as it exists. The strip between "Pearse Bridge" and "Lord Ely Arch" is a wonderful place with quite a unique community of walkers, cyclists, pedestrians, photographers and anglers who stop to chat along this stretch. The main focal point of this amenity is the stretch between the "Dodder Weir" and "The Falls" apartments where a mix of all ages congregate to chat, nature watch or watch the world pass by. This informal gathering of locals and others passing by is central to the community, where wildlife enthusiasts share their passion and knowledge with passers-by introducing them to the wonder of nature on their doorsteps. Neighbours meet neighbours out for a stroll and children make friendships with neighbours young and old that last for years to come. Dodder Road Lower is developed only on one side of the street; houses are somewhat isolated as there are no houses opposite overlooking and providing security as is more typical in suburbia. Despite this, safety is in numbers, security is provided by neighbours looking out for each other, and each other's homes, families and neighbourhood. This informal gathering sustains vitality in local community; residents know neighbours from beyond three doors to either side, not always typical in suburbia. <u>This sense of community and belonging must be protected and enhanced as part of the redevelopment. It is integral to the success of the Greenway for this community.</u></p> <p>The linear park along Dodder Road Lower has a number of pedestrian access points; from Terenure and Rathfarnham Villages via Rathfarnham Road; from Dodder Park Road and Dodder Park Grove via the laneway adjacent to "Kongs" take away restaurant: from Ballytore Road and Dodder Park Road via the laneway and steps (next to 75 Dodder Road Lower), from the "High School and Orwell Park via the Pedestrian Bridge and to from Woodside and linking to the park locally known as "The Badgers Glen" (The park between Braemore Road and Riverside Drive) via the pathway adjacent to "Lord Ely Arch". Access to the east and west via the linear park bring pedestrians from near and far. Each access point connects people to share this wonderful amenity. It is this stretch of the proposed Greenway that we are most familiar with and on which we focus our attention.</p> <p>The following is a list of challenges that will need to be addressed for the greenway to be successful:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The road has a speed limit of 30k/hr that is too often exceeded. Some of the residents don't realise what the speed limit is as the signs at both ends of the road are poorly located2. The road is used as a through road by commuters from west to east in the morning and from east to west in the evening.3. Motorists often park on the footpath to the residential side of the street blocking the pavement to prams and pedestrians.4. Additional parking is required to allow for the overflow of cars from the commercial premises at Dodder Park Drive

5. Additional parking / Drop off is required for motorists dropping off and collecting school kids from the High School.

Motorists exceed the speed limit between the 3No. Speed ramps /speed tables, except where they need to reduce speed due to cars parked on the road or at the narrow points of the road (5m wide Between House numbers 40 and 50 DRL.)

6. Some cyclists travel too fast in such close proximity to pedestrians. It is dangerous for small children and other vulnerable pedestrians. The shared surface for pedestrians and cyclists is too narrow. Pedestrians wander onto the cycle path to the frustration and annoyance of cyclists. There is no space for local children to learn to cycle due to the danger from commuting cyclists who need to get to their destination promptly.

In recent times it is common to encounter cyclists on the lower tow path. There is not enough space to accommodate cyclists and nothing to prevent vulnerable pedestrians from falling into the river.

7. The cycleway ends abruptly at the pedestrian bridge at "Lord Ely Arch"
8. There are some Lamp Standards along the lower stretch of Dodder Road Lower that are unique to this road and help to give this road a distinctive character.

"Lord Ely Arch" 201 on Record of Protected Structures and the amenity space in front of it is cut off. Despite extensive renovation works around 10 years ago this building is degenerating due to lack of use or attention.

9. A pedestrian crossing from the Pedestrian Bridge from Orwell Park to link with the pedestrian crossing at "Lord Ely Arch" at Braemore road is required.

10. The capping to the wall of the river has been damaged for years despite multiple requests for its repair.

The wall along this stretch is quite low and was recommended to be increased in height to as a guard against falling as part of the CFRAM report from around 2012.

The fence requires maintenance. It was last painted by the community carried out in 2013.

11. There are no bins resulting in rubbish and empty bags of dog waste discarded or even left hanging on garden fences.

Dog fouling is a considerable problem, particularly along the lower footpath between the weir and Lord Ely arch.

Comments on the current South Dublin Co. Co Part 8 Proposal

South Dublin County Council has developed a strategic cycle network as part of the National Transport Authority's network for the Greater Dublin Area. A hierarchy of routes with different objectives are included within the plan. The Dodder Greenway is categorised as a "Green Route" and is the type of route planned for Dodder Road Lower. The proposal is to make Dodder Road Lower one way, from east to west. A wider shared pedestrian and cycle space of 4m to 5m would run long the river side of the road, with a 3.5m wide single lane of traffic in the middle (incorporating traffic calming measures), followed by a 2m wide pedestrian path on the house side of the road. Where the width of the road allows it in places, additional grass verges with planting and trees would be added between the traffic lane and the pedestrian path on the house side of the road. An important point to note is that the proposal involves removal of all on-street parking along the full length of the road. On an accompanying document, an angling platform is proposed approximately opposite house No. 50 LDR.

Under the Development plan the area is zoned as Objective RES, "To protect and/or improve residential amenity". This is paramount to the redesign of the "greenway". We welcome an upgrade of the greenway and see it as an opportunity to greatly improve the amenity for all by addressing the issues raised above.

Under the Strategic Cycle Network Plan, the objective of a "Green Route" is to provide tourist, recreational and leisure routes through amenity areas and along water courses, and for the Dodder Valley, connecting Bohernabreena to Rathfarnham via Firhouse and Old Bawn and linking to Dublin City Centre. The proposed plan with delineated zones for cyclists, motorists, and pedestrians, with a separate platform for anglers seems contrary to the "Green Route" objective and more akin to that of the "Primary" or "Secondary" routes.

The existing layout comprises of a similar layout to that currently proposed for which the following observations can be made any day of the week. A combined delineated cycle path and footpath, results in frustration for cyclists and pedestrians alike. Pedestrians engaged in conversation or wearing headphones are relaxing, not watching out for hazards until they attempt to cross a road. Cyclists have to avoid pedestrians creating frustration to them as they try to keep momentum and go on their way. If they decide to cycle on the road to avoid pedestrians, they get abused by motorists telling them to use the cycle path. A cycle path along this stretch would work better if ample space were provided that would allow cyclists, pedestrians, and motorists to avoid each other. The constraints of the space available do not allow for this, nor are they in tune with the objectives of a "Green Route".

12. The proposed layout includes a single 3.5m wide carriageway with one way traffic, with no provision of any visitor parking. Motorists can be observed any day exceeding the 30km/hr speed limit on this road, only slowing down where the road has speed ramps or the carriageway is narrowed. The existing road varies in width between 4.8 m and 9 m wide with the majority 5m to 6m wide (ie. 2.5m to 3m wide for each direction) Traffic travels slower along the narrower stretch due to the width of the carriageway, obstructions from on-street parking and oncoming traffic. Based on observation, the proposal of a single one-way carriageway with no obstructions will result increased traffic speeds.
13. The proposal includes removal of all on street parking along Lower Dodder Road with grass verge is proposed where possible. Contrary to this proposal, there is clear evidence of a requirement for on street parking. In addition to the obvious requirement for visitor parking to residents in any suburban setting, parking overflowing from the commercial development at Dodder Park Drive is evident. In a similar way parking for pick up and drop off of students near the access to "The High School" occurs daily during the school year. The zoning objective of the commercial premises to protect, improve and provide for the future of development of local centres needs to be incorporated as part of any design proposal. In absence of on street parking provision, the proposed grass verge will become the visitor/on street parking as can be observed already outside some houses on Dodder Road Lower as well as on Dodder Park Road.

Our Proposal

14. In a number of locations including Brookmount Lawns, and Glenview Park Tallaght as well as Rathdown Drive in Terenure as part of the new cycleway, the roadway and cycle path are combined with priority given to cyclists, with on street parking and two-way traffic provided. In this arrangement, motorists do not feel they own the space and drive slower and more carefully, giving way to cyclists. A similar type of arrangement could work at Dodder Road Lower if traffic was reduced to local access only for motor traffic. As part of the overall Greenway plan, "Lord Ely Arch" would become an obvious focal point along the Greenway ideal for a picnic area, possible tourist information or a cafe with parking provided along the edge of the green space and an obvious location for "Dublin Bikes" or the like pick up and drop off which would breathe new life into this potential resource. Wouldn't it be apt to see the disused 'Lord Ely Arch', once the gateway to Rathfarnham Castle, was to become the gateway into the new South Dublin Greenway?

I hope that these observations and comments will help to achieve a successful greenway that enhances and improves the Dodder Valley Linear Park, the residential amenity of Dodder Road lower unlocking its full potential. I look forward to seeing a more detailed plan that benefits from our insight and addresses our concerns. Should you wish to discuss or contact any issues raised, please do not hesitate to contact us,

Yours sincerely,
Alex O'Toole

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Traffic calming have been integrated within the revised design to ensure speeds through the road are kept at acceptable levels.
2. Traffic Calming measures will be put in place to deter "rat running". In the worst-case scenario, with these measures in place the volumes of transient traffic will remain as they are currently
3. Enhance road markings will be delivered as part of the works and these will deter illegal parking and set down along the scheme. Illegal parking to be handle by Garda.
4. Informal parking exists along the street, in most instances this is not being impacted.
5. The provision of a drop-off area for the High School is outside the extent of this part 8 plan due to constraints on available space caused by the existing parameters on Dodder Road Lower. This can be examined at a later stage.
6. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.
7. Proposed scheme will link to the Dodder Greenway section along Springfield Avenue and the eastern Dodder Road Lower. The connectivity of the scheme to the surrounding network has been taken into consideration in the design.
8. Noted.
9. An uncontrolled crossing has been included at this location.
10. This is outside of the extend of the project.
11. Improvements to the public realm will be provide as part of the scheme.

12. Ramps and narrow points have been integrated within the revised design to ensure speeds through the road are kept at acceptable levels.
13. Informal parking exists along the street, in most instances this is not being impacted. Drop-off area will be included within amended design.
14. One of the main objectives of the scheme is to provide segregated cyclist facilities to ensure the safety of these users. Due to the existing layout and design of the road today and traffic volumes at Dodder Road Lower, the safety of cyclists cannot be guaranteed if allow to use the road.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.
2. Additional improvements to the public realm such as changes to finishes, seating, etc., are included in amended design and can also be incorporated at detailed design stage.

Submission No. SD-C184-32 – James Keogh
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I wish to make a submission for the proposed road works for LDR. We are a family with 2 young children. We own private cars, but we also cycle regularly for commuting to school and work and recreationally. We very much welcome the promotion of walking and cycling in our area but we would have several concerns about the proposed works as follows: 2. Having a shared cycle lane and pedestrian path is already causing some conflict with cyclists coming at speed and veering out of the way of children who naturally tend to wander. We have had a few unfortunate instances of people on bikes shouting at our kids for straying into the cycle lane and also pedestrians shouting at us for propping our bikes against the fence trying to get the kids ready. 3. We would find it much safer to have the cycle lane segregated with bollards or a clear delineation or failing that encourage the bikes to share road space with the cars but enforce a much slower speed limit with regular pinch points 4. Having one way traffic in our view would encourage drivers using the road as a 'rat run' to speed up rather than slow down. It might also increase the volume of traffic on the road at evening rush hour, when the flow of traffic is heavily from east to west 5. The one-way system would lead to delivery vans etc blocking the road 6. The one-way system would lead to increased journey times and more emissions from cars 7. The current plans would remove on street parking which for us would limit our ability to have visitors 8. Narrowing the road would also make it more difficult to reverse out of our driveway

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Noted
2. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided..

3. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.. Traffic Calming measures will be put in place to ensure speeds are kept at acceptable levels.
4. Traffic Calming measures will be put in place to deter “rat running”. In the worst-case scenario, with these measures in place the volumes of transient traffic will remain as they are currently
5. Enhance road markings will be delivered as part of the works and these will deter illegal parking and set down along the scheme. Illegal parking to be handle by Garda.
6. This scheme seeks to deliver a key section of the Dodder Valley Greenway. A key objective of this project is to encourage more people to walk and cycle. The design of this scheme has carefully considered and balanced impacts on all road users including vehicles, cyclists, and pedestrians. It seeks to create a more pleasant local environment along this key stretch of the Dodder Greenway. The intention of the proposed Greenway is to attract more pedestrian and cycle users to the area and reduce the number of vehicles passing through the area. The scheme should therefore enhance the local environment.
7. Informal parking exists along the street, in most instances this is not being impacted.
8. An Auto track analysis has been carried out on the design to ensure that such manoeuvres can be accommodated in the proposed design.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.

<p>Submission No. SD-C184-33 – Mark Wheeler</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I live in 28 Dodder Road Lower. We love our road, the river walks, and the wildlife along this stretch of the Dodder. We were very excited and supportive when we first heard that some positive work was going to be carried out along this stretch of the river. This was enhanced by the size of the budget available for this work (€2.3 million for a 700 metre stretch of road, or €33,000 per metre of road). However, the lack of ambition and the complete lack of improvement in the amenity value along the road, along with the missed opportunity to further improve the beauty of this stretch of road and the significant safety and accessibility issues which will be caused by the SDCC current proposal is very evident. <p>ISSUES</p> <p>There are a number of specific issues with the current plan which I wish to raise in this submission. And while I am in favour of development and of developing a Greenway, I am fully opposed to the current proposal as to how this is to be done.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Amenity: the lack of any ambition in improving the beauty and amenity value of this stretch of road (when the opportunity and budget are there). The existing plan does absolutely nothing to improve this stretch of road. There is no improvement to the look and feel of the road or riverside walkway. There is no improvement or inclusion of
--

improved standing or sitting areas for the many photographers, fishermen or many walkers or wildlife spotters.

3. There is no usage of the many examples of attractive traffic calming measures that are used in other parts of the country or around Europe (cobble raised surfaces Grafton Street style, avenues of trees, stone bollards or planters).
4. There is no improvement of the riverside walls or fencing.
5. Safety: The safety of pedestrians, cyclists, children and motorists. The current plan puts pedestrians, prams and cyclists on the same shared surface (with cyclists going in both directions). This is even more dangerous than the existing shared pedestrian and cycle path, particularly as it is to be expected that cyclists on a “new and improved” Greenway will travel much faster than they currently do. As a parent of three young children, I am totally opposed to the increased risk to their lives and limbs this will cause when they walk along the river outside their homes. The same safety concerns apply not just to children, but to all pedestrians.
6. Safety: The conversion of a road into one way is known to increase the speed of traffic along that road since drivers no longer have the concern of traffic coming from the opposite direction. Traffic speed along Dodder Road Lower is already a safety risk and concern for many residents along the road.
7. Access and accessibility: The concentration of on-road parking into one small area of the road (at a point where the residents don’t want it and where it is not needed) will fail to provide the parking spaces close enough to houses which are required for ambulances, care workers, skips and builders, delivery vans and visitors. Parking spaces must be close enough to houses to be useful. Some specifically designated parking spaces at intervals along the road and the removal of the car park zone near the West end of the road is essential.
8. Access and accessibility: The current plan narrow the roadway significantly and makes it one way. This will cause further safety issues as residents will need to mount the footpath in their cars on a regular basis in order to get in and out of their drives. This is an issue that is causing very serious worries for many of my more elderly neighbours who fear they will be unable to continue driving because they will not even be able to get into their driveways.
9. Access and accessibility: The current plan make the road one way. This will cause extra traffic on the road as residents at the East end of the road need to travel the full length of the road to go anywhere. It will also cause much longer traffic journeys for residents at the East end of the road, especially at rush hour (going into work) when they need to travel the full length of the road and join the rush hour traffic at a point further from their destination than they started

POSITIVE SUGGESTIONS

10. I therefore would like to see the road left as a two-way with cyclists sharing the road with motorists and cyclists having full priority.
11. In order to both slow traffic and reduce traffic speeds I would like to see the road made “Access only” for residents and essential deliveries.

Submission No. SD-C184-33 – Mark Wheeler

12. I would like to see variations in the road surface introduced as a traffic calming and beautification measure (Grafton Street style).
13. I would like to see the use of stone bollards as the separators between the pedestrian section of the road and the shared cyclist/motorist section.
14. I would like to see the current proposal of numerous condensed parking spaces at the East end of the road removed in favour of small numbers of parking spaces interspersed along the length of the road.
15. I fully support the Alternative Plans presented to SDCC by the Residents Group of Lower Dodder Road

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Noted
2. Improvement or inclusion of improved standing or sitting areas can be provided as part of the landscaping, Where possible.
3. Traffic calming has been integrated within the amended design.
4. Some boundary treatments will be upgraded as part of the scheme.
5. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.
6. Traffic Calming measures will be put in place to ensure speeds are kept at acceptable levels.
7. Access for emergency vehicles will be unobstructed. Informal parking exists along the street, in most instances this is not being impacted.
8. An Auto track analysis has been carried out on the design to ensure that such manoeuvres can be accommodated in the proposed design.
9. This scheme seeks to deliver a key section of the Dodder Valley Greenway. A key objective of this project is to encourage more people to walk and cycle. The design of this scheme has carefully considered and balanced impacts on all road users including vehicles, cyclists, and pedestrians. It seeks to create a more pleasant local environment along this key stretch of the Dodder Greenway. Commuting time for some residents will increase but the impact of this will be minimal taking account of the fact that local residents will no longer have to compete with transient traffic.
10. One of the main objectives of the scheme is to provide segregated cyclist facilities to ensure the safety of these users. Due to the existing layout and design of the road and traffic volumes at Dodder Road Lower, the safety of cyclists cannot be guaranteed if allow to use the road.
11. An 'Access Only' sign cannot be provided as Dodder Road Lower is a public road with public access.
12. Traffic Calming in the form of ramps and speed tables have been integrated within the amended design.
13. Separation between both surfaces will be provided where space allows.
14. Informal parking exists along the street, in most instances this is not being impacted.
15. Noted. A comprehensive response to the residents' proposal has been provided within section 3.4 of this Report.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.
2. Additional improvements to the public realm such as changes to finishes, seating, etc., are included in amended design and can also be incorporated at detailed design stage.

Submission No. SD-C184-34 – Gertie DOYLE
I object to the proposed scheme as it will
1. Make it very difficult to get in or out of the driveway
2. The one-way system is unworkable as it will restrict access and add considerable distance to every journey

Chief Executives Responses:

1. An Auto track analysis has been carried out on the design to ensure that such manoeuvres can be accommodated in the proposed design.
2. This scheme seeks to deliver a key section of the Dodder Valley Greenway. A key objective of this project is to encourage more people to walk and cycle. The design of this scheme has carefully considered and balanced impacts on all road users including vehicles, cyclists, and pedestrians. It seeks to create a more pleasant local environment along this key stretch of the Dodder Greenway. Commuting time for some residents will increase but the impact of this will be minimal taking account of the fact that local residents will no longer have to compete with transient traffic.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. No changes proposed following the review of this submission.

Submission No. SD-C184-35 – Ciarán Ferrie
The proposal to improve cycling and walking facilities on Dodder Road Lower is very welcome as it will complete an existing gap in the off-road cycling route along the Dodder River however, I have some concerns about the current proposal.
1. This route is a very well used cycling route and walking route already and can be quite busy at times as a recreational route. With the improvements proposed, including new bridge links into Bushy Park further upstream and the connecting up of various cycle tracks along the Dodder, it is also likely to become an attractive commuter route for people cycling and this is to be encouraged. The route has the potential to take a lot of private car traffic off the road with its proximity to several secondary schools and the potential to link up with the proposed Dodder Greenway in the Dublin City Council area to create a link right into the heart of the city at Grand Canal Docks. With that in mind it is very important that the infrastructure caters for this potential traffic. The current proposal to have a shared walking and cycling track will not achieve this aim and will result in unnecessary conflict between people walking and people cycling. Separation of the walking and cycling routes will be essential to ensuring that this route can be enjoyed safely by all. It is widely acknowledged that shared routes of this nature are a suboptimal solution for both people walking and people cycling. This is especially so for

Submission No. SD-C184-35 – Ciarán Ferrie

people with disabilities. The presence of people cycling on a shared path can be a restricting factor or a deterrent for people with a visual impairment or with some neurological disabilities. This will be heightened by the inevitable use of the route as a commuter route, and it is important that the design considers this. With overall widths exceeding 5m there would seem to be ample space to provide separation, added to which there is a grass verge which could allow additional width, if necessary, in some areas.

2. There may also be scope to reduce the proposed carriageway width on the road noting that it is higher than the existing carriageway width and
3. that the road is a local access road with a 30km/h speed limit.
4. How the route connects into the Dodder Greenway Phase 4 at the western end is unclear. If this proposal is to be constructed in advance of the Phase 4 works it is important that there is a clear, safe, and accessible route from the new cycle track to the existing on-road cycle track leading up to Rathfarnham Road. This is not currently illustrated in the drawings attached to this proposal.

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.
2. The proposed carriageway width has been drawn in accordance with the guidelines stipulated for such design.
3. An 'Access Only' sign cannot be provided as Dodder Road Lower is a public road with public access.
4. Proposed scheme will link to the Dodder Greenway section along Springfield Avenue and the eastern Dodder Road Lower. The connectivity of the scheme to the surrounding network has been taken into consideration in the design.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.

Submission No. SD-C184-36 – Hugh Raftery

1. Hi there,
I'm not sure if this has been considered as I did not see any mention in the documents available. There is an opportunity to introduce some Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) to this project. The design team should meet with the relevant engineers in Dublin City Council to discuss appropriate measures. One example is to run rainwater under the cycle and footpath, into raingardens along the river. While there will be some additional cost, it will improve the quality of water in the Dodder and alleviate flood risk down-stream.
Details can be viewed here:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Umlomytz9i8>
Kind regards,
Hugh Raftery

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Appropriate Sustainable Drainage measures, relevant to this scheme, will be provided at detailed design stage. Improvement of the quality of water in the Dodder is outside the scope of this scheme.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. No changes proposed following the review of this submission.

Submission No. SD-C184-37 – Hugh Raftery

1. The river Dodder on Lr Dodder Road is an amenity that is used by many individuals who are not residents of the road, for many different purposes, exercise, photography which all contribute to their wellbeing and mental good health.
2. In the current proposal there does not appear be any allowance for these people to have vehicular access to the river. By keeping the road 2 way with local access only, these people would still be able to gain access to the road, park their cars and benefit from the wonderful amenity that the River Dodder is.
The proposed plan would by using shared space for cyclists and pedestrians put both parties at risk. By separating the levels between cyclists and pedestrians it would make travel safer for both parties.
3. The current proposal to route vehicular traffic in a one-way system with a narrowed roadway from Ely Arch to Rathfarnham would cause a Rat Run in the evenings and would (i) seriously challenge the access and egress of residents to their properties.
4. (ii) mean that the roadway would be blocked should a resident require the assistance of a carer, tradesperson, or delivery.
5. (iii) increase environmental pollution due to longer journey times for all motorised vehicles.
6. By using local access only signage at either end of the road, thereby creating a quiet neighbourhood road
7. and putting in pinch points at areas of the road that are narrow anyway, therefore forcing motor vehicles to slow down in both directions and maintain the 30km/hr limit.
8. (i) Access/Egress to properties is maintained.
9. (ii) Leaving the current 2-way traffic with local access only will continue the residents' ability to access their houses as normal and allow for any visitors, deliveries, tradespeople, with no issue to traffic on the road.
10. (iii) Cyclists will be able to cycle safely on the road, which also maintains safety for the pedestrians on the footpath.

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Noted
2. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.

3. Traffic Calming measures will be put in place to deter “rat running”. In the worst-case scenario, with these measures in place the volumes of transient traffic will remain as they are currently
4. Enhance road markings and set down areas will be delivered as part of the works, and these will deter illegal parking along the scheme. Illegal parking to be handle by Garda.
5. The intention of the proposed Greenway is to attract more pedestrian and cycle users to the area and reduce the number of vehicles passing through the area. The scheme should therefore enhance the local environment.
6. An 'Access Only' sign cannot be provided as Dodder Road Lower is a public road with public access.
7. Traffic calming has been integrated within the amended design.
8. Access to Dodder Road Lower will be maintained through the eastern end of the road.
9. Enhance road markings and set down areas will be delivered as part of the works, and these will deter illegal parking by visitors, deliveries, and tradespeople along the scheme. Illegal parking to be handle by Garda.
10. One of the main objectives of the scheme is to provide segregated cyclist facilities to ensure the safety of these users. Due to the existing layout and design of the road and traffic volumes at Dodder Road Lower, the safety of cyclists cannot be guaranteed if allow to use the road.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.

Submission No. SD-C184-38 – Anne Ryan
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I Anne Ryan, formally request that Sth Dublin Co, Council reconsider the current part 8 proposal on the Lower Dodder Road and adopt changes proposed by the residents to implement a design that is safer for all users of the road and does not negatively impact residents. 2. I am totally against a One-way system 3. and a shared pedestrian/cycle path.

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Noted
2. One-way system is proposed in order to reduce the amount of Rat-running along Dodder Road Lower and make it a safer place for pedestrians/cyclists.
3. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433

Submission No. SD-C184-39 – Deirdre McCarthy
<p>As a resident of Lower Dodder Road for the past 35 years, I am herewith submitting my views on the proposed Greenway for Lower Dodder Road. I have grave misgivings in relation to the recent proposal of changes to the layout of the road directly in front of my home.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. First of all, a two-way traffic system is of paramount importance to the safe passage of vehicles, most notably emergency service vehicles such as ambulances which have been utilised by young and old residents in very recent months. Due to the high age profile currently resident on the road, funerals unfortunately have become a frequent occurrence. The existing narrow double-carriage road currently causes problems for undertakers. As you can imagine this compounds the feelings of stress and grief experienced by residents during times of mourning. 2. For environmental purposes a double-carriage way is necessary for the timely collection of refuse and skips. Removal and delivery trucks especially of grocery and pharmaceutical supplies need clear access to our road. Visitors and taxis need to be able to park safely and comfortably especially those vehicles that are wheelchair accessible. 3. The proposed one-way traffic system will raise huge safety concerns such as the absence of traffic signals to aid turning right onto Dodder Park Road. This will personally affect me every day on my journey to work. 4. The proposed system will make the road dangerous for pedestrians, both young and old due to the likelihood of speeding traffic during the morning and evening rush hour when motorists use the road as a short cut.

Chief Executives Responses:

1. One-way system is proposed in order to reduce the amount of Rat-running along Dodder Road Lower and make it a safer place for pedestrians/cyclists.
2. Road safety audit has been carried out to ensure that the design safely accommodate all users. Refuse, delivery trucks, and wheelchair accessible vehicles can safely be accommodated with current design.
3. Adjustment to the junction layout will be considered to ease traffic flows.
4. Traffic Calming measures will be put in place to deter “rat running”. In the worst-case scenario, with these measures in place the volumes of transient traffic will remain as they are currently

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. No changes proposed following the review of this submission.

Submission No. SD-C184-40 – Patrick McCarthy
<p>Proposed Greenway Development at Lower Dodder Road</p> <p>As a long-time resident (35 years), I wish to offer some observations on the proposed developments at Lower Dodder Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I am particularly concerned at the proposal to reduce the road to a one-lane carriage way which would be very inconvenient to residents exiting their driveways

Submission No. SD-C184-40 – Patrick McCarthy

2. and would also present problems for visiting vehicles, including emergency service vehicles.
3. As for the work proposed to be undertaken on the pedestrian and cycle way, this development was completed some years ago to the satisfaction of the local resident population. These works resulted in three pedestrian footpaths of more than adequate capacity. Two paths are at road level and one path at river walk level. A cycle lane was also laid down in a shared space with one of the pedestrian pathways at road level. This current arrangement is working very well and, in my opinion, needs no change to be undertaken.
4. I feel that in general, the Lower Dodder Road has a pleasing layout which has the support of the vast majority of local residents and is more than adequate for all users.

Yours sincerely,
Patrick McCarthy.

Chief Executives Responses:

1. An Auto track analysis has been carried out on the design to ensure that such manoeuvres can be accommodated in the proposed design.
2. An Auto track analysis has been carried out on the design to ensure that such vehicles can be accommodated in the proposed design. The results of this analysis showed that the proposed design will not present any challenges to the emergency services vehicles.
3. Further space for pedestrians and cyclists is needed to ensure that the infrastructure can cater for the anticipated demand of the Dodder Greenway.
4. Noted

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. No changes proposed following the review of this submission.

Submission No. SD-C184-41 – Ciaran Kilbride

Dear Sir/Madam,

I refer to the above proposal which involves considerable changes for the residents of Lower Dodder Road.

1. Whilst the plans from SDCC are welcome, and a Greenway along the Dodder River is both desirable and admirable – there are a number of important changes proposed which will have a huge effect on the day to day lives of those living along this road. In addition, there is considerable disquiet with the total lack of public engagement in the planning of this project. SDCC have stated that there were “positive conversations with local residents” regarding this proposal. The local residents refute this suggestion totally and in fact would feel that there has been a complete lack of consideration and concern for the residents, and no representation of their views.

This plan as it stands will Greatly impact on the Health and Safety of ALL our Residents.

2. Substantially increasing the difficulty if not impossibility of accessing their own homes by car

Submission No. SD-C184-41 – Ciaran Kilbride

3. Bring a total abolition of visitor parking close to most homes along Lower Dodder Road
4. Present very serious and real difficulties for Emergencies services to access homes on Lower Dodder Road
5. Restrict residents from having any products or services delivered to their homes
6. Greatly increasing the likelihood of Lower Dodder Road becoming a rat run from east to west
7. Pose real difficulties and serious threats of injury for pedestrians using the shared footpath with no delineation from cyclists
8. The residents of Lower Dodder Road fully acknowledge the wonderful amenity that is the Dodder River and it's riverside walks. The plans of SDCC to improve access to this great amenity must indeed be supported, all the while ensuring that those living along the river are not adversely affected to such an extent.

All these changes pose real and serious changes to our community and we must be afforded to right to meet with our neighbours to openly discuss the plans. We feel it is only fair and democratic that our worries and concerns about the current plan can be aired. We also feel that we have worthwhile alternatives suggestions to the current plan. However, in this current pandemic it is simply not possible for the residents of Lower Dodder Road to meet and hold an open and frank discussion. Without breaking all current Level5 restriction rules, which we assume SDCC is not suggesting we should do, then we cannot meet and cannot express the view or consensus of the residents.

I therefore request that SDCC REALISE along with the NTA that there is consensus within the residents. We are all behind the counter proposal which has been provided to the Senior engineer. It is absolutely imperative that we who live on DRL have a say in the future of our living area. We must be listened to as this plan will impact on the Residents for the next 50 to 100 years.

Yours in good faith,

Name: Ciaran Kilbride

Signature: Ciaran Kilbride

Address: 90 Lower Dodder Road

Date:24/06/2021

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Representatives of SDCC met with a representative of the Dodder Road Lower residents on November 11th 2021. The preliminary scheme was discussed in which concerns over the removal of existing parking arrangements were raised. These concerns were addressed in the design as much as possible which allows for designated parking areas but also leaves the residents side of the road mainly unaltered.
2. An Auto track analysis has been carried out on the design to ensure that such manoeuvres can be accommodated in the proposed design.
3. Informal parking exists along the street, in most instances this is not being impacted.
4. An Auto track analysis has been carried out on the design to ensure that such vehicles can be accommodated in the proposed design. The results of this analysis showed that the proposed design will not present any challenges to the emergency services vehicles.

Access for emergency vehicles will be unobstructed. Informal parking exists along the street, in most instances this is not being impacted.

5. Informal parking exists along the street that in most instances is not being impacted. This can continue to be used by delivery vehicles to serve the Residents of DRL. Set down areas are also included in the design.
6. Traffic Calming measures will be put in place to deter “rat running”. In the worst-case scenario, with these measures in place the volumes of transient traffic will remain as they are currently. An Origin-Destination Traffic Survey was undertaken, and it was determined that most of rat runners head Eastbound. Based on this it was decided that a westbound one-way will reduce the rat-running through the road.
7. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.
8. Noted. All submissions have received an appropriate response in this report. The residents’ suggestions have been taken into consideration and changes were applied where possible.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.

Submission No. SD-C184-42 – Anne McCarthy
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. I am a resident of Lower Dodder Road for the past 35 years. A short number of years ago, a number of changes to the road were made to facilitate cyclists. This cycleway was constructed to allow pedestrians and cyclists to co-exist on a shared space. This arrangement is working well for all users.2. I welcome the enhancement of the road at the Dun Laoghaire- Rathdown end by the introduction of a small amenity area including seating and landscaping.3. My one major objection is the proposed reduction of the road space to one lane. This would cause serious risk, great inconvenience and indeed hardship to residents. I have in mind, the accessing of utility vehicles such as ambulances, fire tenders and delivery vans (transporting pharmaceutical and grocery goods). It would also be difficult to exit from driveways onto a single carriageway which by its nature is narrower than the existing roadway and visitors. This would impede larger vehicles that are wheelchair accessible. The old adage comes to mind; If it isn't broke, don't fix it.4. When you do undertake the landscaping work, please replace the trees on the verges directly outside our homes. They are blocking natural light for a significant part of the year. More appropriate planting would be welcome. An Eir technician has also highlighted the trees as the main cause of the slow broadband to our homes. The telephone wires are enveloped in the trees. We have family members who work from home and require speedy internet access. <p>Yours sincerely, Anne McCarthy</p>

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Further space for pedestrians and cyclists is needed to ensure that the infrastructure can cater for the anticipated demand of the Dodder Greenway.
2. Noted.
3. An Auto track analysis has been carried out on the design to ensure that such vehicles and manoeuvres into driveways can be accommodated in the proposed design. Access for emergency vehicles will be unobstructed. Informal parking exists along the street, in most instances this is not being impacted.
4. It is not envisaged to remove any mature trees as part of this scheme.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Additional improvements to the public realm such as changes to finishes, seating, etc., are included in amended design and can also be incorporated at detailed design stage.

Submission No. SD-C184-43 – Gerard Quinn
Hi, We live on lower Dodder Road (number 62) and have some comments on the proposals being considered: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The cycling path and walking path is not safe, we've seen many collisions and close calls, unsafe for cyclist and pedestrians.2. 1 way system will result in an increased speed in 1 direction (the rat run will be worse, even if only 1 direction)3. For residents like us, one way is far worse, and will lead to traffic getting out at one end, and longer queues on the main Dodder Road as people loop around.4. There'll be more driving for residents, not less (more emissions etc)5. Taxis, visitors, deliveries etc will be more difficult We think the proposal is better as <ol style="list-style-type: none">6. Single pedestrian footpath...far safer esp for kids7. Local only access will lead to a quieter road and therefore a much more useable amenity by locals, walkers, families etc.8. We cycle as a family, and it would be much better to cycle off the path on a controlled road9. For residents, 2-way access is far better esp for visitors, emergencies, deliveries etc.
Thanks - Quinn family (number 62)

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.
2. Traffic Calming measures will be put in place to ensure speeds are kept at acceptable levels and to deter "rat running".
3. Adjustment to the Dodder Park Drive/ Dodder Park Road junction layout will be considered to ease traffic flows.
4. The intention of the proposed Greenway is to attract more pedestrian and cycle users to the area and reduce the number of vehicles passing through the area. The scheme should therefore enhance the local environment. This scheme seeks to deliver a key section of

the Dodder Valley Greenway. A key objective of this project is to encourage more people to walk and cycle. The design of this scheme has carefully considered and balanced impacts on all road users including vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians. It seeks to create a more pleasant local environment along this key stretch of the Dodder Greenway. Commuting time for some residents will increase but the impact of this will be minimal taking account of the fact that local residents will no longer have to compete with transient traffic.

5. An Auto track analysis has been carried out on the design to ensure that such vehicles can be accommodated in the proposed design. Informal parking exists along the street, in most instances this is not being impacted. The results of this analysis showed that the proposed design will not present any challenges to the emergency services vehicles.
6. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided..
7. An 'Access Only' sign cannot be provided as Dodder Road Lower is a public road with public access.
8. One of the main objectives of the scheme is to provide segregated cyclist facilities to ensure the safety of these users. Due to the existing layout and design of the road and traffic volumes at Dodder Road Lower, the safety of cyclists cannot be guaranteed if allow to use the road.
9. Access for emergency vehicles will be unobstructed.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.

Submission No. SD-C184-44 – James Dorney
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I am opposed to a one-way system being implemented on LDR. I am opposed to narrowing the road to 1.8m. I am opposed to cyclists sharing the pedestrian path 2. I require practical and efficient traffic and speeding restrictions on LDR. 3. I require practical measures to avoid irresponsible (illegal) parking in the white line area at the junction of LDR and Dodder Park Drive. 4. I require inspection of the river barrier wall at the junction of LDR and Dodder Park Drive as it is cracked and could present a flood risk. 5. I hold that as this is a residential area the interests of the residents be paramount as opposed to the interests of casual and transient visitors. 6. I fully support the submission by the Dodder Road Residents Group.

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Noted.
2. Traffic Calming measures, such as ramp and narrow points, will be put in place to ensure speeds are kept at acceptable levels
3. Enhanced road markings to prevent illegal parking will be implemented as part of the works.
4. This is outside of extend of the project. River Barrier Walls are an asset of the Office of Public Work (OPW).
5. Noted.
6. Noted. A comprehensive response to the residents’ proposal has been provided within section 3.4 of this Report.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.

<p>Submission No. SD-C184-45 – Dodder Road Lower Residents Action Group</p> <p>To Whom it concerns,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Please find below a summary of the views of the Dodder Road Lower Action Group AGAINST the proposed SDCC Part 8 plans for the Dodder Greenway on Lower Dodder Road. <p>In addition, attached are a submission cover letter, details of an alternative proposal, scanned letters of support for the alternative proposal from nearly 80% of homes on Dodder Road Lower and various supporting images and videos as detailed in the submission cover letter.</p> <p>The existing SDCC plan for LDR does not work for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">2. Far from enhancing the residential amenity of the area the proposal reduces the amenity.3. It is not safe for pedestrians (sharing a path with cyclists is not safe). It is not safe for cyclists (sharing a path with pedestrians is not safe).4. The proposed 1-way system would make the road less safe for all non-vehicular traffic as traffic speeds are likely to increase rather than decrease. Evening time “rat-running” is not addressed.5. The proposed 1-way system would make it extremely difficult for residents to get into and out of their driveways. At least a third of households would be significantly impacted in this way.6. The proposed 1-way system would mean that any visitors, deliveries, carers and tradespeople will block the road when parked. That is unacceptable.7. The proposed 1-way system would result in increased journey times and increased carbon footprint for all motorised forms of transport.8. The residents have formulated a counterproposal which addresses all of these issues:

Submission No. SD-C184-45 – Dodder Road Lower Residents Action Group

9. By enhancing the visual and recreational amenity of the road (paving, seating, planting etc.) it is made to look and feel more like a safe environment for pedestrians and cyclists.
10. Separate footpath for pedestrians (not shared with cyclists).
11. Creation of a “quiet neighbourhood road” which is achieved by (a) local access only signs at either end of the road to reduce traffic volumes and
12. (b) effective traffic calming measures including pinch points at narrow points on the road to force vehicles to slow down in both directions and adhere to the existing 30km/h speed limit.
13. By creating a “quiet neighbourhood road”, cyclists will be able to safely cycle on the road (not on a shared path with pedestrians).

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Noted. A comprehensive response to the residents’ proposal has been provided within section 3.4 of this Report.
2. The proposed Greenway should serve to enhance the amenity offer of the area.
3. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.
4. Traffic Calming measures, such as ramp and speed tables, will be put in place to ensure speeds are kept at acceptable levels and to deter "rat running". However, in considering the proposal submitted by the residents, a traffic calming intervention that retains a level of two way vehicle movement along the road, but that significantly reduces vehicle speeds and actively discourages through vehicle with a subsequent reduction in vehicle movements could achieve an acceptably safe outcome for cyclists.
Separate to any decision on this Part 8 planning application. The Council is prepared to trial a traffic calming design along the Dodder Lower Road that retains some level of two-way vehicle movement and as part of the trial will assess if that does result in a sufficiently safe environment for cyclists. That trial will be progressed separately to determination on this Part 8 planning application
5. An Auto track analysis has been carried out on the design to ensure that such manoeuvres into driveways can be accommodated in the proposed design.
6. Enhance road markings will be delivered as part of the works and these will deter illegal parking and set down along the scheme. Illegal parking is a matter for the Garda.
7. This scheme seeks to deliver a key section of the Dodder Valley Greenway. A key objective of this project is to encourage more people to walk and cycle. The design of this scheme has carefully considered and balanced impacts on all road users including vehicles, cyclists, and pedestrians. It seeks to create a more pleasant local environment along this key stretch of the Dodder Greenway. Commuting time for some residents will increase but the impact of this will be minimal taking account of the fact that local residents will no longer have to compete with transient traffic.
8. Noted
9. The visual and recreational amenity of the road (paving, seating, planting etc.) can be enhanced as part of the landscaping, where possible.
10. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.

11. Noted
12. Traffic calming such as ramps and speed tables have been integrated within the amended design.
13. One of the main objectives of the scheme is to provide segregated cyclist facilities to ensure the safety of these users. Due to the existing layout and design of the road and traffic volumes at Dodder Road Lower, the safety of cyclists cannot be guaranteed if allow to use the road. At the pre-liminary design stage the Council carried out Traffic Counts that identified approximately 1,400 vehicle movements a day along this road. This number of movements may not ensure a sufficiently safe environment for cyclists as the number of movements are likely be too high to be acceptable. As such this option was not progressed

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.
2. Additional improvements to the public realm such as seating, finishes etc., are included in amended design and can be further incorporated at detailed design stage.

Submission No. SD-C184-46 – Eamonn Nolan
<p>Hello,</p> <p>I wanted to make a submission in respect of the proposed Part 8 development of the Dodder Greenway on Lower Dodder Road, Rathfarnham, Dublin.14.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I am a resident of Lower Dodder Road, I have lived and enjoyed the area for the last 30 years. I felt lucky and privileged to live in such a beautiful scenic part of South Dublin. The proposed Dodder Greenway is a wonderful idea and I fully support the development of a greenway along the Dodder River. For South Dublin County Council to create a greenway along the Dodder River is an admirable idea and to be commended. 2. However, in the course of planning such a greenway, consideration MUST be given to the residents who live in the area. Regrettably it would appear that no consideration whatsoever has been given to the residents along Lower Dodder Road. 3. It would appear that SDCC, in an effort to facilitate more pedestrians and cyclists along Lower Dodder Road, are simply planning to widen the riverside footpath to 5M wide , and thereby reduce the roadway to a single lane carriageway 3.5M wide running east to west. 4. There is little or no amenity enhancement along this stretch of the river, and there is certainly no consideration shown to the residents for the continued enjoyed use of their own homes. <p>I strongly object to the South Dublin County Council proposed plan for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. The creation of a 3.5M wide single carriageway oneway road will be a huge disruption to the lives of all residents along this road. There are a small number of parking spaces to be provided, all together, at the upper end of the road. So, there will be no parking

outside my house for visitors, deliveries, people working in my home, but most importantly for EMERGENCY services.

6. If a vehicle stops outside my home - the whole road will be blocked. This proposal is totally and utterly unworkable and will create chaos along the road.
7. Simply making the road oneway does not in itself ensure a safer road, and in fact could very easily have the opposite effect. The Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets specifically states that making a road oneway could “Promote faster speeds as drivers are likely to drive faster when no risk is perceived from oncoming traffic”
8. A 3.5M wide roadway outside my home will make it virtually impossible for me to enter and exit my own home without constantly and continually having to mount a footpath. This, on a continuous and ongoing basis is simply not acceptable. If it were to happen, I would be obliged to widen my entrance, move gate pillars, have new gates manufactured and have my widen driveway resurfaced. Naturally I will be seeking compensation from SDCC towards the cost of these works, as I am sure will 40 or 50 more homes along Lower Dodder Road.
9. The creation of a 5m wide pathway along the riverside of Lower Dodder Road to be shared by pedestrians and cyclists is quite simply a receipt for disaster. I live along this road, I see what happens every day, I do not need engineers or surveyors from SDCC or the NTA to tell me what will happen here – I see it already. There are daily conflicts and confrontations between cyclists and pedestrians, mainly because the people on foot along the road are not just pedestrians. They are families out walking and meet other families and chat, they are fishermen along the river, and they are photographers filming the abundant wildlife along the river. The cyclists, not all but many, fly by , going far too fast and causing a danger to themselves and to people on foot. A cyclist who is travelling at 25KPH hitting a pedestrian or worse still a child can and could cause serious and life changing injuries.
10. The residents of Lower Dodder Road combined and working together have made a submission along with their own plan and vision for this road. It is a far better and user-friendly plan than the SDCC plan.
11. Its emphasis is on reducing the volume of traffic using Lower Dodder Road as a rat – run. It includes making the road LOCAL ACCESS ONLY,
12. tightening the entrance at both ends, creating pinch points along the road
13. and giving cyclists priority on the road. All these measures combined will simply make it impractical as a rat-run.
14. The road can still remain twoway and parking can be permitted.
15. There are numerous suggested amenity improvements including planting and seating.
16. This alternate plan was submitted under the title DLReactiongroup and the reference is SD-C184-45. I support this plan fully and 100% and would urge South Dublin County Council to take these wonderfully creative and useable suggestions onboard and to amend their own plan accordingly.

Eamonn Nolan,
85 Lower Dodder Road,

Submission No. SD-C184-46 – Eamonn Nolan
Rathfarnham. Dublin.14. Mail: etn1899@gmail.com

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Noted.
2. Representatives of SDCC met with a representative of the Dodder Road Lower residents on November 11th 2021. The preliminary scheme was discussed in which concerns over the removal of existing parking arrangements were raised. These concerns were addressed in the design as much as possible which allows for designated parking areas but also leaves the residents side of the road mainly unaltered.
3. Reduction of the carriageway is needed to accommodate the additional space for pedestrians and cyclists.
4. The proposed Greenway will enhance the amenity offer of the area.
5. Access for emergency vehicles will be unobstructed. Informal parking exists along the street, in most instances this is not being impacted.
6. Enhance road markings will be delivered as part of the works and these will deter illegal parking and set down along the scheme. Illegal parking to be handle by Garda.
7. Traffic Calming measures will be put in place to ensure speeds are kept at acceptable levels
8. An Auto track analysis has been carried out on the design to ensure that such manoeuvres can be accommodated in the proposed design.
9. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.
10. Noted.
11. An 'Access Only' sign cannot be provided as Dodder Road Lower is a public road with public access.
12. Traffic calming has been integrated within the amended design.
13. One of the main objectives of the scheme is to provide segregated cyclist facilities to ensure the safety of these users. Due to the existing layout and design of the road and traffic volumes at Dodder Road Lower, the safety of cyclists cannot be guaranteed if allow to use the road.
14. Informal parking exists along the street, in most instances this is not being impacted.
15. Where possible it can be provided as part of the landscaping.
16. Noted. The proposal has been taken into consideration. A comprehensive response to the residents' proposal has been provided within section 3.4 of this Report.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.
2. Additional improvements to the public realm such as seating, finishes etc., are included in amended design and can be further incorporated at detailed design stage.

Dear SDCC

1. I am a resident on Lower Dodder Road and would like to notify you of my objection to the proposed changes to Lower Dodder Road. The first I heard about these proposals was last November when we received a letter from our Residents' Association. Up to that point I was unaware of these major changes proposed by SDCC.

You mentioned on your website that you were in discussion with the residents in relation to on the road, the road used as a rat run and the cycle/pedestrian lane not wide enough - I would like to know who you spoke to as no-one from the Council discussed any of these issues with me and if they had of spoken to me, I would have advised them that these are not problems I have on the road.

I am strongly against these changes as outlined below: -

Practicality

2. One of my biggest concerns is the proposal of a one-way system. It appears that no consideration was given to the practicality of this one-way system for the residents, which would result in severe delays every day.
3. There is also no evidence to suggest that a one-way system slows traffic.
4. Widening the road to 3.5m is insufficient room for cars to safely overtake on the road. Scenarios include getting stuck behind bin lorry collections, deliveries etc.
5. In addition, major disruptions would occur if any construction work was undertaken on a resident's home, which would stop the flow of traffic completely, these include delivery/removal of skips, building materials etc. Any construction work undertaken on the road itself e.g. ESB, broadband services etc, would also result in the traffic on the road coming to a standstill.

Parking

6. Parking is going to be a big issue on this road and is also a concern. There is very little off-street parking for a large proportion of the residents and their visitors. Where do the SDCC propose they park? It's not realistic to expect residents to park 5/600 meters from their home. This will result in off-street parking onto busier roads with increase traffic flow, this is a recipe for disaster.
7. There is no consideration for the people who drop off/pick up their kids up from the High School use Orwell Park. The proposal might discourage people from using the park, but for others it will mean they will have to park further away, thereby increasing traffic flow for the surrounding areas. This could potentially increase pedestrian accidents as they would now have to cross busier roads to get to the park/school.

Lack of Contingency Plan

8. There is no contingency plan put forward for possible road closures. The road by Ely Arch regularly gets flooded throughout the winter and is often closed. How are residents going to gain access? Dodder Park Road is more susceptible to flooding historically due to flooding from the Dargle, this will cut off all access for residents to their homes. This would also be the case in any circumstances which resulted in the closure of Dodder Park Road i.e. car crash. There would be no direct access to the road from West to East

if the road was to close. This would result in the resident taking a long diversion to gain access to the road on the proposed one way east to west direction via Rathgar or Nutgrove.

Environment

9. These proposals would result in the falling of mature trees on the road which would be devastating to local wildlife and beauty of the area.

Cost

10. This is an extremely expensive proposal with little reward. It is very poor use of money, and it should be spent on better causes than an overpriced walkway and a road that doesn't need changing.

The proposed changes to the road need to work for the residents and it doesn't. They are extreme changes being proposed, with negative impacts to everyday life. This green way realistically will only be used on the weekends and during times of good weather. It's not good value for money and I don't think the cost and impact to residents is justified.

There are several low-cost measures that could be carried out on the road that would improve the traffic flow while causing minimal disruptions to the residents.

11. I would recommend putting a no left-hand turn except local access only between 7 am and 10 am Monday to Friday coming from Dodder Park Road going west to east onto the Lower Dodder Road. Another sign can also be put up on the Lower Dodder Road by the Ely's Arch going west to east stating no right hand turns between 4:30pm to 6:30 pm. This would significantly reduce the traffic flow on the road.
12. Streetlights could be installed along the current walkway along the bank of the Dodder River.
13. Orwell and Dodder Park are both in derelict conditions. Both these parks require serious funding. The current paths are covered in mud and silt from the river, other paths are damaged making it difficult and unenjoyable to walk along. Improving the park itself would be much more beneficial to the area.

I hope you consider my above concerns and revisit your plans

Yours faithfully
Adrienne Hendrick
87 Lower Dodder Road
Rathfarnham
Dublin 14

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Representatives of SDCC met with a representative of the Dodder Road Lower residents on November 11th 2021. The preliminary scheme was discussed in which concerns over the removal of existing parking arrangements were raised. These concerns were addressed in the design as much as possible which allows for designated parking areas but also leaves the residents side of the road mainly unaltered.

2. This scheme seeks to deliver a key section of the Dodder Valley Greenway. A key objective of this project is to encourage more people to walk and cycle. The design of this scheme has carefully considered and balanced impacts on all road users including vehicles, cyclists, and pedestrians. It seeks to create a more pleasant local environment along this key stretch of the Dodder Greenway. Commuting time for some residents will increase but the impact of this will be minimal taking account of the fact that local residents will no longer have to compete with transient traffic.
3. Traffic Calming measures will be put in place to ensure speeds are kept at acceptable levels
4. Enhance road markings and set down areas will be delivered as part of the works, and these will deter illegal parking and set down along the scheme. Illegal parking to be handle by Garda.
5. Road safety audit has been carried out to ensure that the design safely accommodate all users. Refuse and delivery trucks can be safely accommodated with current design. Road closures will be dealt with through specific requests and appropriate temporary traffic management plans will be implemented to achieve same.
6. Informal parking exists along the street, in most instances this is not being impacted.
7. The provision of a drop-off area for the High School is outside the extent of this part 8 plan due to constraints on available space caused by the existing parameters on Dodder Road Lower. This can be examined at a later stage.
8. Road closures will be dealt with through specific requests and appropriate temporary traffic management plans will be implemented to achieve same.
9. It is not envisaged to remove any mature trees as part of this scheme.
10. Observation noted.
11. An 'Access Only' sign cannot be provided as Dodder Road Lower is a public road with public access.
12. This is outside of extend of the project.
13. This is outside of extend of the project.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. No changes proposed following the review of this submission.

Submission No. SD-C184-48 – Garrett Bonner
<p>I have been living on Lower Dodder Road for the past eight years and have a young family. While I accept that something has to be done to improve the transportation infrastructure of the road, I do not believe that what has been proposed by South Dublin County Council will be of any benefit to the residents of the road or to the general public. Some of the reasons for this opinion include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Making the road one way will make the road even more unsafe for pedestrians and cyclists and speeds of cars on the road are likely to increase. 2. If the road is one-way, East to West, then it will still be used as a short-cut in the evening and again the speeds will increase.

3. The proposal will mean that the road will be a lot narrower than it already is and this will make it virtually impossible for many residents to get out of their driveways without going up on the extended pathway.
4. There would be no on-street parking to the East of the road and very little to the West. Where are visitors, carers or tradespeople meant to park? What are emergency vehicles meant to do? On bin collection days, are we meant to queue up behind the lorry for the entire length of the road?
5. Sharing a path with cyclists is not safe for pedestrians and sharing a path with pedestrians is not safe for cyclists.
6. The increased journey times caused by the one-way system is not going to be good for the environment.

I completely agree that something needs to be done to the road and I would propose the following:

Keep the road as a two way system but try to reduce the amount of traffic on it by:

7. Traffic Calming measures such as chicanes (see Mount Merrion) or narrowing of the road with pinch points.
8. Highly visible signage with “Local Access Only” and 30KMP. Current speed signs are not visible and as a result the speed limit is not observed.
9. If the speed of the motorised vehicles on the road is reduced, then cyclists can be moved on to the road and the path becomes safe for pedestrians.
10. Keeping the road two-way will mean that residents will be able to have visitors, carers, tradespeople and deliveries without the entire road being blocked.

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Traffic Calming measures will be put in place to ensure speeds are kept at acceptable levels
2. Traffic Calming measures will be put in place to deter “rat running”. In the worst-case scenario, with these measures in place the volumes of transient traffic will remain as they are currently.
3. An Auto track analysis has been carried out on the design to ensure that such manoeuvres can be accommodated in the proposed design.
4. Enhance road markings and set down areas will be delivered as part of the works, and these will deter illegal parking and set down along the scheme. Illegal parking to be handle by Garda.
5. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.
6. The intention of the proposed Greenway is to attract more pedestrian and cycle users to the area and reduce the number of vehicles passing through the area. The scheme should therefore enhance the local environment.
7. Traffic calming has been integrated within the amended design.
8. An 'Access Only' sign cannot be provided as Dodder Road Lower is a public road with public access.

9. One of the main objectives of the scheme is to provide segregated cyclist facilities to ensure the safety of these users. Due to the existing layout and design of the road and traffic volumes at Dodder Road Lower, the safety of cyclists cannot be guaranteed if allow to use the road.
10. Enhance road markings will be delivered as part of the works and these will deter illegal parking and set down along the scheme. Illegal parking to be handle by Garda.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.

Submission No. SD-C184-49 – Olive O Connor
<p>I have been living on Lower Dodder Road for the past eight years and have a young family who love living on the road and using all the local amenities</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I completely understand that the road in its current guise is dangerous, and something needs to be done, however I do not believe that what has been proposed by South Dublin County Council will be of any benefit to the residents of the road or indeed to the public who use the road at every hour of the day. The proposed changes to the Road- Health and Safety Concerns 2. The proposal will mean that the road will be a lot narrower than it already is and this will make it virtually impossible for many residents to get out of their driveways without going up on the extended pathway, thereby creating a huge Health and Safety issue. 3. Making the road one way will make the road even more unsafe for pedestrians and cyclists and speeds of cars on the road are likely to increase. Sharing a path with cyclists is not safe for pedestrians and sharing a path with pedestrians is not safe for cyclists. 4. If the road is one-way, East to West, then it will still be used as a short-cut in the evening and again the speeds will increase. 5. What are emergency vehicles meant to do? The proposed changes to the Road- Environmental Reasons 6. The increased journey times caused by the one-way system will adversely affect the environment around the Dodder. The proposed one-way system would greatly increase the carbon footprint for all motorised forms of transport. The proposed changes to the Road- Parking/Access 7. Where are visitors, carers or tradespeople meant to park? The Road is very mixed in relation to the age of residents, so we would have families with childcare needs, elderly and infirm residents who have daily carers coming in on a daily basis. There would be no on-street parking to the East of the road and very little to the West. 8. On bin collection days, are we meant to queue up behind the lorry for the entire length of the road? I agree that something needs to be done to the road and I would propose the following: Keep the road as a two-way system but try to reduce the amount of traffic on it by: 9. Highly visible signage with “Local Access Only” and 30KMP. Current speed signs are not visible and as a result the speed limit is not observed

Submission No. SD-C184-49 – Olive O Connor

10. If the speed of the motorised vehicles on the road is reduced, then cyclists can be moved on to the road and the path becomes safe for pedestrians.

11. Speed Cameras- would definitely act as a deterrent

Traffic Calming measures such as chicanes or narrowing of the road with pinch points.

12. Keeping the road two-way will mean that residents will be able to have visitors, carers, tradespeople and deliveries without the entire road being blocked.

kind regards

Olive O Connor

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Observation noted.
2. An Auto track analysis has been carried out on the design to ensure that such manoeuvres can be accommodated in the proposed design.
3. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.
4. Traffic Calming measures will be put in place to deter “rat running”. In the worst-case scenario, with these measures in place the volumes of transient traffic will remain as they are currently.
5. Access for emergency vehicles will be unobstructed. Informal parking exists along the street, in most instances this is not being impacted.
6. The intention of the proposed Greenway is to attract more pedestrian and cycle users to the area and reduce the number of vehicles passing through the area. The scheme should therefore enhance the local environment.
7. Informal parking exists along the street, in most instances this is not being impacted. A set down area has been provided.
8. Enhance road markings and set down areas will be delivered as part of the works, and these will deter illegal parking and set down along the scheme. Illegal parking to be handle by Garda.
9. An 'Access Only' sign cannot be provided as Dodder Road Lower is a public road with public access.
10. One of the main objectives of the scheme is to provide segregated cyclist facilities to ensure the safety of these users. Due to the existing layout and design of the road and traffic volumes at Dodder Road Lower, the safety of cyclists cannot be guaranteed if allow to use the road.
11. Traffic calming has been integrated within the amended design to ensure speeds through the road are kept at acceptable levels. Under GDPR legislation, the Council does not have the authority to collect and use data from a speed camera that will lead to a prosecution. This is a matter entirely for the Gardai.
12. Enhance road markings and set down areas will be delivered as part of the works, and these will deter illegal parking and set down along the scheme. Illegal parking to be handle by Garda.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.

<p>Submission No. SD-C184-50 – Eilís Feehan</p> <p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>I am a resident of Lower Dodder Road and I welcome the development of a Greenway along the road. As a pedestrian, cyclist and motorist I do have some issues with the original proposal from the council.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. My vision is for a space where pedestrians and cyclists get absolute priority. During the first lockdown, with almost no traffic on the road the whole atmosphere of the space changed. People walked on the road, the space was used differently and as a result the atmosphere changed. As a pedestrian I know that a shared pedestrian and cycle path is dangerous because of the likelihood of collisions. I have witnessed such an incident on the current shared path directly across from my home. Pedestrians require space to stop and talk, they will move out without looking, as it stands people walk on the part of the pathway delineated for cyclists all the time. 2. As a cyclist I would be much happier to share space with cars than pedestrians. 3. My other concerns regarding the Council's proposal are the lack of parking, the inability for cars to pass if there is an obstruction (eg. a delivery van or emergency vehicle), 4. the narrowness of the proposed one way system for entering and existing driveways and the fact that drivers speed when they perceive that the road is open and straight in front of them. 5. I have studied the proposal from the Residents' Group and I am happy that it addresses my concerns. They have taken on board the issues that local residents had with the original proposals and have come up with a plan that addresses all concerns while embracing the possibility of our road becoming a greenway. <p>Their proposal makes the pathway safe for pedestrians without danger of obstructing or colliding with a cyclist.</p> <p>It gives cyclists priority over the road space, making their journey along the road more time efficient. It provides for plenty of parking space, allows two-way traffic, discourages non-residents from using the road and requires residents to drive slowly through the use of traffic calming measures such as pinch points.</p> <p>Their proposal changes the road into an amenity very much in line with what we witnessed here during that first lockdown.</p> <p>Eilís Feehan</p>

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.
2. One of the main objectives of the scheme is to provide segregated cyclist facilities to ensure the safety of these users. Due to the existing layout and design of the road and traffic volumes at Dodder Road Lower, the safety of cyclists cannot be guaranteed if allow to use the road.

3. Enhance road markings and set down areas will be delivered as part of the works, and these will deter illegal parking and set down along the scheme. Illegal parking to be handle by Garda.
4. An Auto track analysis has been carried out on the design to ensure that such manoeuvres can be accommodated in the proposed design.
5. The submission made by the Residents has been reviewed and it is Noted.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.

Submission No. SD-C184-51 – Pat Loughnan
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Proposed 1 – way system would prove extremely difficult to get in & out of resident driveways. 2. Proposed 1-way system would make the road less safe for all non –vehicular traffic as traffic speeds are likely to increase rather than decrease. Evening time “rat-running” is not addressed. 3. Proposed 1-way system (no available parking) would mean that any visitors, deliveries, carers, and tradespeople will block the road when parked. No available on street parking would mean cars parking on grass verges. 4. Proposed 1-way would result in increased journey times (for residents) and increased carbon footprint for all motorised forms of transport. 5. It is not safe for pedestrians to be sharing a path with cyclists especially for young children/tootlers trying to navigate the pathway. 6. A filter traffic light is desperately needed for cars entering Lower Dodder Road from the junction of Dodder Park Road (Monument End). This situation is very dangerous with cars jumping the traffic lights. I feel it is only a matter of time before a serious incident/accident occurs. 7. Dodder Road Lower is long (distance) whereby residents need access from both ends. 8. I think “Access Only” for residents, cyclists, pedestrians is the way forward in creating a quiet, safe neighbourhood road instead of the fast, unsafe and mishmash system that is presently occurring. 9. The introduction of “Speed Cameras” to facilitate traffic calming with better enforcing of existing 30km/h speed limit.

Chief Executives Responses:

1. An Auto track analysis has been carried out on the design to ensure that such manoeuvres can be accommodated in the proposed design.
2. Traffic Calming measures will be put in place to deter “rat running” and speeding on the road.
3. Enhance road markings and set down areas will be delivered as part of the works, and these will deter illegal parking and set down along the scheme. Illegal parking to be handle by Garda.

4. This scheme seeks to deliver a key section of the Dodder Valley Greenway. A key objective of this project is to encourage more people to walk and cycle. The design of this scheme has carefully considered and balanced impacts on all road users including vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians. It seeks to create a more pleasant local environment along this key stretch of the Dodder Greenway. Commuting time for some residents will increase but the impact of this will be minimal taking account of the fact that local residents will no longer have to compete with transient traffic.
5. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.
6. Traffic volumes along Dodder Road Lower have proven to be too low to require the provision of a traffic light at Dodder Park Road/ Dodder Park Drive junction. Traffic analysis proved that current layout can accommodate the existing and proposed traffic flows.
7. Access on both ends cannot be provided as additional space is needed to accommodate the anticipated pedestrian/cyclist demand.
8. An 'Access Only' sign cannot be provided as Dodder Road Lower is a public road with public access.
9. Under GDPR legislation, the Council does not have the authority to collect and use data from a speed camera that will lead to a prosecution. This is a matter entirely for the Gardai.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.

<p>Submission No. SD-C184-52 – Stephen Finn</p> <p>Hi</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Whilst we are (Finn family) in favour of your overall plans for a Greenway along the Lower Dodder Road (LDR) there are some serious issues we would like you to consider. 2. Care: Share reads the signage in Bushy Park, yes that is appropriate to a parkland setting, but along the LDR there is no space to share and; care. Today it has become a cycle lane of speed as people travel to and from work, no caring and no sharing as they race to their destinations. 3. If we are to share then the cars should be asked to care and share the road with cyclists which would help reduce the fast track rat run it is. My family and I walk this area many times in one day and it has become totally unenjoyable as you cannot relax and walk. Luckily, we do not have young wandering children or prams to push. Can we ask you that the path remains a path and the cyclists and cars are given the road to use, many reports say it is totally unsafe for cyclists and pedestrians to share the same space. We are asked to keep a safe space between ourselves and others, in the park a 2 metre guide is on the footpath. If the 2m guide was painted on the footpath there would be no space for a cycle lane. Let's get our priorities right with safety first.

Submission No. SD-C184-52 – Stephen Finn

The world is changing to electric bikes, electric skate boards, electric scooters all going speed and are silent, you cannot hear them from behind, you step out to avoid a person or persons walking towards you...Bang, who's at fault, who has insurance for injuries?

4. Cycle lanes should be one direction, on the left and on the right, cycle lanes should be on the road (in a designated lane) similar to Braemor Road (excellent cycle lanes).

If the cycle lanes were on the road, the roadway would be narrowed and the speed reduced.

Please please review the cycle lane proposal. We live close to the city where electric powered forms of transport are growing and the pedestrians are been asked to share and care...!

At present the wild growth from the river banks are stretching onto the pedestrian area and we are having to walk further out from the railing and onto the cycle lane to avoid briars and nettles. Cyclists still speed past so close and call out abuse as they speed past.

Last evening I cycled the Dodder View road and was hit by overhanging branches and nearly came off the narrow cycle lane to avoid been caught by long briars. Had I come off the kerb in front of a car I would be today a statistic. Who maintains these areas after the planners are gone?

Sharing a wide path in the park is easy as you have lawn and open space to use. Trying to share a narrow pathway and a cycle lane with a railing on one side and a busy road on the other is a recipe for a disaster .

Thanking you for reading my submission

Stephen Finn

80 Lower Dodder Road

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Observation noted.
2. Observation noted.
3. One of the main objectives of the scheme is to provide segregated cyclist facilities to ensure the safety of these users. Due to the existing layout and design of the road and traffic volumes at Dodder Road Lower, the safety of cyclists cannot be guaranteed if allow to use the road.
4. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.

Submission No. SD-C184-53 – Linda Wheeler

1. I have read and carefully considered the SDCC proposal for the extension of the Greenway along Lower Dodder Road. I am in complete and active opposition to the proposal as it is proposed by SDCC.

2. The proposal does nothing to improve or enhance the beauty and amenity of this gorgeous stretch of river where we live (contrary to the SDCC Development Plan).

Submission No. SD-C184-53 – Linda Wheeler

The current SDCC proposal essentially just widens the existing footpath and makes the road one way, to the detriment of all who live on this road and all who walk along it. We pay significant taxes and monies to SDCC on an annual basis and the current plan is a good example of poor value for our money (the cost is c€3,300 per metre of road).

3. The existing plan will increase the danger to cyclists, walkers and residents due to the increased risk of serious collisions as pedestrians and cyclists are put on a common path.
4. The existing plan creates accessibility issues as well as access issues for residents. The existing plan will inconvenience all residents as they are forced to make longer journeys due to the proposed one-way system.
5. I would like to see the amenity and beauty of the road enhanced and made into something we can be proud of. I would like to see more trees being planted along the road to the West side of the weir and
6. the road being made access only to reduce traffic volumes.
7. I would like to see stone bollards being used to separate traffic and cyclists on the road from pedestrians on the path, these bollards could also act as seats.
8. I would like to see raised road surfaces and other attractive traffic calming measures as per the proposal put forward in Submission SD-C184-45.
9. I fully support the proposals put forward by residents in Submission SD-C184-45.

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Noted.
2. The proposed Greenway will enhance the amenity offer of the area.
3. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.
4. This scheme seeks to deliver a key section of the Dodder Valley Greenway. A key objective of this project is to encourage more people to walk and cycle. The design of this scheme has carefully considered and balanced impacts on all road users including vehicles, cyclists, and pedestrians. It seeks to create a more pleasant local environment along this key stretch of the Dodder Greenway. Commuting time for some residents will increase but the impact of this will be minimal taking account of the fact that local residents will no longer have to compete with transient traffic.
5. Noted. This will be consulted with the Landscape designer at detailed design stage.
6. An 'Access Only' sign cannot be provided as Dodder Road Lower is a public road with public access.
7. Noted. Segregation of facilities will be included on the design.
8. Traffic calming has been integrated within the amended design.
9. Noted. A comprehensive response to the residents' proposal has been provided within section 3.4 of this Report.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.

<p>Submission No. SD-C184-54 – Marion McDonald</p> <p>Dear Sir/Madam, I live on Lower Dodder Road. I am a keen cyclist and welcome the addition of a greenway near our house.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. However, I object to the plans to make the Road one way heading westward only from the Ely Arch. I live near the Ely Arch. Every day I drive eastwards to get to work in the HSE. I have to get on to the M50 at the Dundrum exit to get to work. The traffic along Braemor Road is very heavy and it will add a significant amount of extra time to my commute, if I have to drive all the way westwards down Lower Dodder Road and then try to get on the congested Dodder Park Road and be further back on the Braemor road traffic. This would increase my carbon footprint too. My children also go to school in a Churchtown school. They cycle as much as they can. However in winter they may need a lift. Instead of driving eastwards on a one way road we would get stuck in traffic on Lower Dodder Road, get stuck getting on to Dodder Park Road and then stuck on Braemor Road again adding significant time to that journey. These changes would make our daily lives very difficult and increase all of our carbon footprints.2. Our driveway is narrow and difficult to get cars into and out of currently. If the road was, as planned, reduced to one lane, it would be impossible to get cars in and out of our driveway. Our driveway would have to be widened. Would a driveway expansion that we would have to do as a result of the greenway be funded by the county council?3. As a keen cyclist, I do not like cycling on the same path as pedestrians. It is dangerous for the cyclist and pedestrians. I believe that cycling paths need to be separate (e.g. as in Dundrum where there is a path and a cycle path with a ledge between them). This is especially true for children's cyclists who you hope would get to enjoy the greenway too.4. I think it is essential to keep the two lanes on the road and think bollards (that can be removed for bin trucks etc) in the middle of the road would be the best solution to stop the road being a rat run;. This would give people at both ends of the road access to the closest exits of the road and not expose residents to longer commutes to work/ school.5. The road could be made quieter by (a) adding local access only signs at either end of the road to reduce traffic volumes and6. (b) effective traffic calming measures including pinch points at narrow points on the road to force vehicles to slow down in both directions and adhere to the existing 30km/h speed limit. <p>I hope the greenway is a positive addition to our beautiful neighbourhood and I sincerely hope your plans consider the points I have made above.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Marion McDonald</p>
--

Chief Executives Responses:

1. The Council does not believe that there will be a significant worsening of traffic and queuing on Dodder Park Road. However, should this happen, it will be possible for the Council to review and amend traffic light signals to mitigation this issue in the future. The objective of the project is modal change and reduce traffic on the road and reduce carbon footprint.
2. An Auto track analysis has been carried out on the design to ensure that such manoeuvres can be accommodated in the proposed design.
3. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.
4. It is not feasible to have retractable bollards on public road due to issues related to ownership and operation of such facilities on local residential streets.
5. An 'Access Only' sign cannot be provided as Dodder Road Lower is a public road with public access.
6. Traffic calming has been integrated within the amended design.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.

<p>Submission No. SD-C184-55 – Cathal O Doherty</p> <p>The proposed Dodder Road Lower Upgrade scheme is very well designed, and I fully support it.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. It however requires an Environmental Impact Assessment Report, the Environmental Impact Assessment Screening carried out is not sufficient, and it also requires An Bord Pleanála approval, and not Part 8 Local Authority approval. <p>The proposed development is a cycleway and accordingly is a proposed road development, defined as such in the Roads Act, 1993.</p> <p>Under Part 8 of the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001, the construction of a new road of 100 metres or more in an urban area is prescribed development for the purposes of Section 179(1) of the Planning and Development Act, 2000, as amended. However, for the very reason that it is a prescribed road development, (in this instance consisting of a new road of approximately 730 metres) the provisions of Section 50 (1) (a) of the Roads Act apply and South Dublin County Council, as a road authority, is obliged to prepare an Environmental Impact Assessment Report.</p> <p>Furthermore, Section 51(1) of the Roads Act 1993 provides that all proposed road developments (defined in the Roads Act as meaning, all developments in respect of which an environmental impact assessment is required under section 50), shall not be carried out unless An Bord Pleanála has approved it, or approved it with modifications.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">2. This application for approval for this road development should therefore be made to An Bord Pleanála under Section 51 of the Roads Act, 1993 and no development can be carried out without the prior approval of the Board.
--

Chief Executives Responses:

1. As outlined in the submission, Section 51(1) of the Roads Act 1993 applies to all developments in respect of which an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) is required

under Section 50. An EIA Screening Report was prepared for the proposed Dodder Greenway – Dodder Road Lower Upgrade and assessed the development under the mandatory EIA criteria set out under Section 50 of the Roads Act, 1993 (as amended). The assessment found that the proposed development does not exceed any of the thresholds listed under Section 50 of the Road Act and therefore does not require a mandatory Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). The proposed development is therefore a sub threshold development.

The EIA Screening Report established that the proposed development does not require an environmental impact assessment under Section 50 of the Roads Act as amended, or the EIA Directive and therefore, Section 51(1) of the Roads Act does not apply to the proposed development.

South Dublin County Council as the applicant are therefore making the planning application under Section 179 (1)(b) of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 (as amended) “where a local authority that is a planning authority proposes to carry out development”. Therefore, a Part 8 Planning Report has been prepared for the proposed development in accordance with the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended).

2. Observation noted.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. No changes proposed following the review of this submission.

Submission No. SD-C184-56 – Angela Crampton
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. There are already safety issues with pedestrians and cyclists sharing the same path. The existing footpath could be for pedestrians and cyclists could use an area marked on the road2. The proposed 1 way system would make the road less safe as traffic speeds are likely to increase with no risk of meeting other cars coming the other way and is already an issue with morning and evening traffic. Instead the road should be marked for local traffic; only. This will also allow cyclists to safely cycle on the road.3. The proposed 1 way system would make it impossible for some residents and difficult for others to turn into their driveways and would also mean that delivery vans, tradespeople etc would actually have to block the road when parked which isnt acceptable. Also it;s a very long road and its not reasonable to expect residents at one end to have to drive all the way around on Dodder Park road which is already a very busy traffic road which will also increase the carbon footprint and journey times.4. To summarise I suggest retaining the 2 way traffic system, making the road for local traffic only, putting a cycle path as part of the road itself, turning the existing cycle/pedestrian path into pedestrian only.

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.
2. Traffic Calming measures will be put in place to deter “rat running”. In the worst-case scenario, with these measures in place the volumes of transient traffic will remain as they are currently.
3. An Auto track analysis has been carried out on the design to ensure that such manoeuvres can be accommodated in the proposed design. Blocking of accesses/driveways is a parking offence and should be handled the Gardai.
4. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.

Submission No. SD-C184-57 – Colm Brophy TD
<p>1. The residents of the Lower Dodder Road have produced a comprehensive and detailed proposal to counter the original proposals laid down by the Council. It is my strong belief that the proposals made by the DRLactiongroup address many of the real day to day concerns that the residents have in a practical and sensible manner. I want to fully support their proposals and feel that they merit proper consideration and ultimately implementation. The work completed by this group of residents in preparing this proposal is not insignificant, real thought, expertise and detailed analysis is on clear display to anyone who reads this proposal. I want to thank the group for their work and their suggestions, if implemented, this will create a better public space for everyone and ensure that the area is preserved for future generations.</p>

Chief Executives Responses:

1. The proposal from the residents has been reviewed and is noted. A comprehensive response to the residents’ proposal has been provided within section 3.4 of this Report.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. No changes proposed following the review of this submission.

Submission No. SD-C184-58 – Inland Fisheries Ireland
<p>1. All construction should be in line with a detailed site specific Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). The CEMP should identify potential impacts and mitigating measures, it should provide a mechanism for ensuring compliance with environmental legislation and statutory consents. The CEMP should detail and ensure Best Construction Practices including measures to prevent and control the introduction of pollutants and deleterious matter to surface water and the River Dodder and measures to minimise the generation of sediment and silt.</p>

IFI recommend that the detailed design for the surface water layout for the operational stage would incorporate soft engineering options such as swales or bio-retention areas . We refer you to our recent publication Planning for watercourses in the urban environment available on our website www.fisheriesireland.ie . Please include us in any further detailed design aspects of this scheme.

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Noted. A CEMP will be prepared before the construction activities commence.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. No changes proposed following the review of this submission.

Submission No. SD-C184-59 – Ray Lund
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Arguments for a one-way street The road will have much reduced traffic.<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Significantly less pollution generated• At least one of the rat-runs will be totally eliminated• If the one-way system is westward (towards Rathfarnham bridge as proposed by SDCC) the egress is not easy, further reducing through traffic.• With reduced traffic, the road will become an even more pleasant place to live.• As a result, house prices and values will increase.• Residents will be slightly discommoded by the need to conform with the one-way system. However, the annual cost and time in doing this are likely to be minimal.

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Noted.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. No changes proposed following the review of this submission.

Submission No. SD-C184-60 – Cllr Yvonne Collins
Senior Engineer, NTA Schemes, LUPT, South Dublin County Council, Tallaght, Dublin 24. Re: Part 8 Lower Dodder Road - Dodder Greenway
Dear Sir, I would like to support the alternate plan submitted by the residents of the Lower Dodder Road in Rathfarnham, in relation to the above Part 8 public consultation process. I understand that it has been lodged with yourselves under the name of "DLRactiongroup" reference number SD-C184-45. The residents plan as submitted appears to represent a very reasonable and positive approach and I would ask that it be given careful consideration with a view to implementation.
Many thanks and kind regards. Yours faithfully,

Cllr. Yvonne Collins
Rathfarnham- Templeogue

Chief Executives Responses:

1. The submission of the "DLR action group is noted. A comprehensive response to the residents' proposal has been provided within section 3.4 of this Report.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. No changes proposed following the review of this submission.

Submission No. SD-C184-61 – Alex Williams

I am very much in favour of the Dodder Greenway coming down Dodder Road Lower. However, the current proposal by South Dublin County Council is deeply flawed and unacceptable to me as a resident of Dodder Road Lower for a number of reasons.

What's wrong with the current proposal from South Dublin County Council?

A single 3.5m wide carriageway going one-way from East to West.

1. All Residents would have to use the one-way road to leave and return to their house adding extra travel time for every resident. The council's own survey shows that this change will overload nearby junctions to enter and exit the road.
2. A 3.5m wide single carriageway will make it extremely difficult, perhaps impossible for residents to enter and exit driveways.
3. Any vehicles stopping on the 3.5m wide carriageway will block the whole road for all residents. The road will not be wide enough to allow cars to pass. All deliveries will be impossible as no vehicle can stop without blocking the road. Any emergency vehicles would block the whole road when stopped. Any random member of the public who decides to stop or park on our road would block the whole road for all residents. It is completely unworkable for residents.
4. Pedestrians and cyclists sharing the same space
 - Every resident on the road knows how badly the current shared path works. It does not work for pedestrians or cyclists with frequent incidents and altercations making it an unsafe and unpleasant place to walk or cycle. It does not work now and it will not work any better if they widen the shared space. It is a bad idea completely at odds with best design practise.
 - The widening of the shared pedestrian and cyclist pathway will be dangerous for pedestrians and is against best practise. The current configuration does not work for either pedestrians or cyclists. Widening it will not improve the situation, in fact there is every reason to believe that it will only make it worse. The current proposal does not address this fundamental flaw in how the road is currently configured to support pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles.
5. Traffic Speed
 - We already have a serious problem with cars speeding on the road. According to best design practise, the proposal to make the road one-way could actually 'Promote faster speeds as drivers are likely to drive faster when no risk is perceived from oncoming traffic'. The current proposal replicates the existing speed ramps which are ineffective and does not adhere to best design practise for traffic calming. This is a terrible design and it will make our road more unsafe and dangerous!
6. Residential Amenity

- The current proposal from South Dublin County Council lacks any improvement in visual and recreational amenity value for residents of Dodder Road Lower. It is wholly lacking in ambition and does not deliver a high quality solution for the Dodder Greenway on Dodder Road Lower that balances the needs of Residents, pedestrians and cyclists.

Parking

7. With double yellow lines proposed for both sides of the road for the full length of the road, and with only a 3.5m wide carriageway, no legal on street parking will be possible except in the small number of parking bays (approx. six) proposed at the west end of the road. This is not adequate for the needs of residents living on Dodder Road Lower. The vast majority of existing parking on Dodder Road lower takes place on the roadway and is done so legally. Some residents are elderly and require regular home care visits. In the case of my immediate neighbour, she requires daily visits by care workers to deal with her complex health care needs. Removing legal on street parking on the road through the introduction of a 3.5m wide carriageway and double yellow lines will make delivery of the home health care she needs much more challenging and will cause needless distress. The current proposal to remove parking is simply unacceptable.
8. Prior to commencement of the Part 8 consultation process Residents provided informal feedback to South Dublin County Council. In that feedback, the vast majority of residents opposed the introduction of a 3.5m wide carriageway going one-way. Yet South Dublin County Council chose to ignore that feedback and continue with a design that incorporates a 3.5m wide carriageway going one-way. This is not acceptable.
I support the joint submission made by the Dodder Greenway Residents Action Group which outlines a far better solution for accommodating the Dodder Greenway on Dodder Road Lower and which has the signed support of 80% of the residents on the road. The reference number of this submission is SD-C184-45.
9. In essence this involves the creation of a 'quiet neighbourhood road' which is achieved by local 'access only' signs at either end of the road to reduce traffic volumes
10. as well as much more effective traffic calming measures including pinch points at narrow points on the road to ensure that vehicles slow down in both directions and adhere to the existing 30km/h speed limit.
11. Through the introduction of these measures and by giving cyclists priority over vehicles on the road itself, it will be safe to cycle on the road rather than on a shared path with pedestrians.
12. By enhancing the visual and recreational amenity of the road (paving, seating, planting etc.) the road will look and feel more like a safe environment for both pedestrians and cyclists.
13. I urge the council to examine the details of the joint submission made by residents and adopt the alternative design that has been proposed.

Attachments (1)

Dodder Greenway Residents Action Group Part 8 submission.pdf

Chief Executives Responses:

1. This scheme seeks to deliver a key section of the Dodder Valley Greenway. A key objective of this project is to encourage more people to walk and cycle. The design of this scheme has carefully considered and balanced impacts on all road users including vehicles, cyclists, and pedestrians. It seeks to create a more pleasant local environment along this key stretch of the Dodder Greenway. Commuting time for some residents will increase but the impact of this will be minimal taking account of the fact that local residents will no longer have to compete with transient traffic.
2. An Auto track analysis has been carried out on the design to ensure that such manoeuvres can be accommodated in the proposed design. Blocking of accesses/driveways is a parking offence and should be handled the Gardai.
3. Access for emergency vehicles will be unobstructed. A road safety audit has been carried out to ensure that the design safely accommodate all users.
4. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.
5. Traffic Calming measures will be put in place to ensure speeds are kept at acceptable levels.
6. The proposed Greenway will enhance the amenity offer of the area.
7. Informal parking exists along the street, in most instances this is not being impacted.
8. Noted. A comprehensive response to the residents' proposal has been provided within section 3.4 of this Report.
9. An 'Access Only' sign cannot be provided as Dodder Road Lower is a public road with public access.
10. Traffic calming has been integrated within the revised design.
11. One of the main objectives of the scheme is to provide segregated cyclist facilities to ensure the safety of these users. Due to the existing layout and design of the road and traffic volumes at Dodder Road Lower, the safety of cyclists cannot be guaranteed if allow to use the road.
12. Where possible it can be provided as part of the landscaping.
13. The proposal from the residents is noted.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.
2. Additional improvements to the public realm such as seating, finishes etc., are included in amended design and can be further incorporated at detailed design stage.

Submission No. SD-C184-62 – John Meagher
I am a resident of Lower Dodder Road. While I am in agreement to the Greenway development I have concerns regarding the specific plans proposed for Lower Dodder Road Works and I am in agreement with the submission that the Residents Association have already sent the Council. In addition, I would add my own personal concerns and issues

Submission No. SD-C184-62 – John Meagher

1. The shared widen pathway for dual use by pedestrians and cyclists is I believe dangerous and will increase the risk of accidents on the road. I have witnessed incidents where pedestrians have unwittingly walked into the pathway of speeding cyclists. Children and the elderly are sometimes not being conscious and aware of cyclists in their periphery vision or can hear them until its too late! I submit that a designated cycle be introduced onto the road and not on the pathway

2. The reduction to a one way system will have a detrimental effect on accessibility for residents. With the levels of traffic going through the main Dodder Park Road route, the current traffic delays getting through the traffic lights at the Woodside/Braemore Road junction will only increase thus have an effect on how we can access our houses. I would also have a concern that this could present undue delays for emergency services, which could have serious repercussions particularly for our elderly neighbours. I submit that the road be left two way with speed reduction measures other than speed ramps.

3. It is planned that at the west end of the road where I live that there will a street parking zone outside our driveways. We already have issues with people parking in front of our driveways and by designating the area for parking will only encourage this more. Even if cars park at either side to our driveways, our ability to view oncoming traffic when trying to exit our properties will be dangerously restricted. Also, by reducing the width of roadway , the ability turn in or reverse into driveways will be significantly hampered especially when cars are parked outside our property. I submit the the proposed parking facility along the houses at the west end of the road be removed in its entirety

In the plans there did not appear to be much outline or promise of additional amenities for the local residents. The focus appears to be the transient cyclists while not taking into consideration what enhancements the residents may require as they have to live with the road changes. For example, development of the two green areas at either end of Lower Dodder Road & heightening and recladding of the river wall at the west end of the road from the weir. We have witnessed young children dangerously leaning over the wall and a serious accident is waiting to happen. The wall had been crumbling and maliciously damaged in the past and residents took it upon themselves to re-cement and patch repair were necessary after many failed requests to the SDCC to repair!

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.
2. Access for emergency vehicles will be unobstructed. Informal parking exists along the street, in most instances this is not being impacted. A road safety audit has been carried out to ensure that the design safely accommodate all users. Refuse and delivery trucks can be safely accommodated with current design.
3. Regarding Illegal parking comments: Enhanced Road markings will be delivered as part of the works, and these will deter illegal parking and set down along the scheme. Illegal parking to be handle by Garda.
4. Comments are noted.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.

<p>Submission No. SD-C184-63 – Maya Williams</p> <p>I am very much in favour of the Dodder Greenway coming down Dodder Road Lower. However, the current proposal by South Dublin County Council is very poor and unacceptable to me as a resident of Dodder Road Lower.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I support the joint submission made by the Dodder Greenway Residents Action Group which outlines a far better solution for accommodating the Dodder Greenway on Dodder Road Lower and which has the signed support of 80% of the residents on the road. The reference number of this submission is SD-C184-45. 2. In essence this involves the creation of a ‘quiet neighbourhood road’ which is achieved by local ‘access only’ signs at either end of the road to reduce traffic volumes 3. as well as much more effective traffic calming measures including pinch points at narrow points on the road to ensure that vehicles slowdown in both directions and adhere to the existing 30km/h speed limit. 4. Through the introduction of these measures and by giving cyclists priority over vehicles on the road itself, it will be safe to cycle on the road rather than on a shared path with pedestrians. 5. By enhancing the visual and recreational amenity of the road (paving, seating, planting etc.) the road will look and feel more like a safe environment for both pedestrians and cyclists. 6. I urge the council to examine the details of the joint submission made by residents and adopt the alternative design that has been proposed. <p>Attachments (1) Dodder Greenway Residents Action Group Part 8 submission.pdf</p>

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Noted. A comprehensive response to the residents’ proposal has been provided within section 3.4 of this Report.
2. An 'Access Only' sign cannot be provided as Dodder Road Lower is a public road with public access.
3. Traffic calming has been integrated within the revised design.
4. One of the main objectives of the scheme is to provide segregated cyclist facilities to ensure the safety of these users. Due to the existing layout and design of the road and traffic volumes at Dodder Road Lower, the safety of cyclists cannot be guaranteed if allow to use the road.
5. Where possible it can be provided as part of the landscaping.
6. The proposal from the residents is noted.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Additional improvements to the public realm such as changes to finishes, seating, etc., are included in amended design and can also be incorporated at detailed design stage.

As a resident on Lower Dodder Road, I am totally against the plans put forward by SDCC. It's extremely frustrating, when your everyday life could be impacted so much, and the first form of communication received is a video. This is supposed to be a resident consultation, but the video is purely focusing on the dodder green way scheme with little regard to the residents.

1. The concerns of residents are skimmed over as not a concern at all in this video and I am not aware of any conversations made or attempts between the residents and SDCC prior to the release of this video on 10Mar21. There were no fliers sent in the door, no representatives calling about feedback, absolutely nothing. I do understand recently there have been greater talks with representatives, but the first mention of this from SDCC was a sign posted on the road in March. What is more concerning is, I've watched this video about 5 times, and it only has a total of 19 views. It draws a massive concern, that there is insufficient communication and due process given to the residents on the road about these extreme plans.

I am genuinely concerned of the potential impact to the everyday life of the residents for the following reasons:

2. Practicality

It appears that no consideration was given to the practicality of this proposal for the residents, which would result in severe delays every day. Widening the road to 3.5m is insufficient room for cars to safely overtake on the road. Scenarios include getting stuck behind bin lorry collection's, deliveries, cars double parking. In addition, major disruptions would occur if any construction work was undertaken on a resident's home, which would stop the flow of traffic completely, these include delivery/removal of skips, building materials etc. In addition, any construction work undertaken on the road e.g., ESB, broadband services etc, would result in the road being closed.

3. Increased footfall

Lower Dodder Road is a beautiful quiet road. Why would residents want a dramatic increase in footfall on the road, it will take away from the character and peace of the road. You're talking about setting up seating areas directly across from the houses which I think could destroy the area with potential anti-social behaviour and rubbish left behind.

4. Parking

Parking is going to be a big issue on this road & is one of the biggest concerns. There is very little off-street parking for a large proportion of the residents & their visitors. Where do the CC propose they park? It's not realistic to expect residents to park 5/600 meters from their home. This will result in off-street parking onto busier roads with increase traffic flow, this is a recipe for disaster.

5. There's no consideration for the people who drop off/pick up their kids up from the High School use Orwell Park. The proposal might discourage people from using the park, but for others it will mean they will have to park further, increasing traffic flow for the surrounding areas. This could potentially increase pedestrian accidents as they would now have to cross busier roads to get to the park/school.

6. Lack of Contingency plan

There is no contingency plan put forward for possible road closures. The road by Ely Arch regularly gets flooded throughout the winter and is often closed. How are residents going to gain access? Dodder Park Road is more susceptible to flooding historically due to flooding from the Dargle, this will cut off all access for residents to their homes. This would also be the case in any circumstances which resulted in the closure of Dodder Park Road i.e. car crash. There would be no direct access to the road from West to East if the road was to close. This would result in the resident taking a long diversion to gain access to the road on the proposed one way east to west direction via Rathgar or Nutgrove. The proposed bus corridor could severely impact these routes. Have the residents on the Dodder Park Road been notified of these proposals as they will be greatly impacted by these proposed changes.

7. Cost

This is an extremely expensive proposal with little reward. We are heading towards another recession and in the middle of a pandemic. Money is being borrowed at unprecedented levels while there are other severe problems facing the country including a homeless crisis, a shortage of affordable homes, the underfunding of education & healthcare. This a very poor use of the public money and it should be spent on better causes than an overpriced walkway and a road that doesn't need changing.

The proposed changes to the road need to work for the residents and it doesn't. They are extreme changes being proposed, with negative impacts to everyday life. This green way realistically will only be used on the weekends and during times of good weather. It's not good value of taxpayer's money and I don't think the cost and impact to residents is justified.

There are several low-cost measures that could be carried out on the road that would improve the traffic flow while causing minimal disruptions to the residents.

I would recommend putting a no left-hand turn except local access only between 7 am and 10 am Monday to Friday coming from Dodder Park Road going west to east onto the Lower Dodder Road.

Another sign can also be put up on the Lower Dodder Road by the Ely's Arch going west to east stating no right hand turns between 4:30pm to 6:30 pm. This would significantly reduce the traffic flow on the road.

8. Streetlights could be installed along the current walkway that goes down the Dodder River. Orwell and Dodder Park are both in derelict conditions. Both these parks require serious funding. The current paths are covered in mud and silt from the river, other paths are damaged making it difficult and unenjoyable to walk along. Improving the park itself would be much more beneficial to the area. How can you address my concerns as resident.

Yours Sincerly, Rob Kelly

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Representatives of SDCC met with a representative of the Dodder Road Lower residents on November 11th 2021. The preliminary scheme was discussed in which concerns over the removal of existing parking arrangements were raised. These concerns were

addressed in the design as much as possible which allows for designated parking areas but also leaves the residents side of the road mainly unaltered.

2. Enhance road markings will be delivered as part of the works and these will deter illegal parking and set down along the scheme. Illegal parking to be handle by Garda.
3. The intention of the proposed Greenway is to attract more pedestrian and cycle users to the area and reduce the number of vehicles passing through the area. The scheme should therefore enhance the local environment.
4. Informal parking exists along the street, in most instances this is not being impacted.
5. The provision of a drop-off area for the High School is outside the extent of this part 8 plan due to constraints on available space caused by the existing parameters on Dodder Road Lower. This can be examined at a later stage.
6. Road closures will be dealt with through specific requests and appropriate temporary traffic management plans will be implemented to achieve same. Regarding concerns about flood events: These works will not impact on the local flooding that exists. On the event of limited access through the eastern end of Dodder Road Lower, appropriate temporary traffic management measures will be put in place by the relevant authority.
7. An 'Access Only' sign cannot be provided as Dodder Roadf Lower is a public road with public access.
8. This is outside the scheme extend.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Additional improvements to the public realm such as changes to finishes, seating, etc., are included in amended design and can also be incorporated at detailed design stage.

Submission No. SD-C184-65 – Maria-Mercedes Abengoza
Hi, I would like to object fully to the proposal put forward by SDCC to Dodder Road Lower Part 8 proposal. They do not work for the residents are not planned well. Its not a good use of public money. The road is perfect. Kind Regards, Maria-Mercedes Abegnoza

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Comments and objection noted.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. No changes proposed following the review of this submission.

Submission No. SD-C184-66 – Colm Ryan
To whom it may concern, I am writing with regards to the proposed Greenway to be built on Lower Dodder Road. While improvements to the road are welcome, the suggested changes by the council are drastic and somewhat unnecessary, with the possibility of making residents day to day lives harder, particularly the many elderly people living on the road. For this reason, I am offering my support for the Residents counter proposal which has been submitted to you, with the hope you will listen to them and take this into account. Sincerely, Colm Ryan

Chief Executives Responses:

1. The proposal from the residents is noted. A comprehensive response to the residents' proposal has been provided within section 3.4 of this Report.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. No changes proposed following the review of this submission.

Submission No. SD-C184-67 – Fergal Ryan
<p>To Whom it Concerns.</p> <p>I wish to voive my strong objections to the Part 8 proposals which SDCC have made in respect of the Dodder Greenway on Lower Dodder Road, Dublin 14.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The plans are poorly conceived, would reduce the residential amenity for residents of Lower Dodder Road and2. would reduce safety levels for pedestriand and cyclists alike. Far from providing some idyllic environment for everyone to enjoy the river Dodder the SDCC proposals would dserve only to inconvenience and frustrate residents and provide a dangerous shared pathway for transient pedestrians and cyclists. The plans are lazy (just make what they're bigger and better) and lacking in any imagination and are in breach of best practice as set out in the NTA manuals on safe cycling. <p>I. along with the vast majority of residents on Lower Dodder Road, am very much in favour of any change which enhances the amenity of the neighbourhood and, in particular, which enhances the safe and enjoyable use of the road for pedestrians and cyclists, including the large cohorts of very young and very old who regularly use the road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">3. However, the current SDCC proposals do none of the above, as set out below. I am aware of an alternative proposal submitted by a group which I support &quot;The Dodder Road Lower Residents Action Group&quot; who have submitted a detailed proposal under submission number SD-C184-45 and I am FULLY IN SUPPORT OF THESE ALTERNATIVE PROPOSALS for the reasons set out below.<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Lower Dodder Road is zoned by SDCC for the retention or enhancement of residential amenity.4. In proposing the introduction of a narrow single one-way carriageway SDCC are causing 25 homes or more severe difficulty in accessing nd egressing their driveways. Regardless of any tool that SDCC or their contractors may have used to theoretically calculate teh ease of access or otherwise I understand that a practical exercise completed with locals has indicated that a 3.5m carriageway would negatively impact 25 or more homes on the road who, it has been demonstrated, would have to mount the proposed cycleway to get into and out of their driveways. This is an obvious reduction in amenity and in contravention of the SDCC county development plan. In addition, forcing residents to make a round-trip for every journey made by car or other vehicle will add tonnes of addition carbon polution each year and add to journey times - yet another reduction in amenity for residents. The SDCC Part 8 [roposal offers not one single enhancement for residential amenity and, as stated above, achieves precisely the opposite effect. Finally, on the subject of amenity, the SDCC proposal makes no allowance for parking which is laughable and pathetic.

5. With an increase in online grocery shopping, online purchases of all sorts, the need for elderly residents to receive care and family visits and for a host of other reasons (refuse collections, family visits, trades completing works in homes etc.) parking, coupled with 2-way access is essential. The SDCC proposals yet again propose to erode the residential amenity.

The NTA manuals on safe design for urban cycling clearly state that sharing a path between pedestrians and cyclists is not safe. This is evidenced on a regular basis on Lower Dodder Road where the surface is currently shared. ND Altercations between cyclists and pedestrians can frequently be seen. My own children were verbally abused by a cyclist who took offence that they had strayed from the designated pedestrian area to the cycling area. The abuse was extreme and only stopped when I said I was calling the Garda. This is not unusual and would become more widespread under the SDCC proposals.

6. It has been documented that one-way carriageways increase rather than reduce road speed. Accordingly the SDCC proposals would make Lower Dodder Road safe in the morning time, when traffic is normally travelling from West to East and would no longer be allowed to use the road. However, there is nothing in the SDCC proposals which addresses the evening rat running and, as stated above, the problem of high traffic volumes and high speeds is likely to be exacerbated by the introduction of a one-way system.

As mentioned above, there is an alternative proposal from residents which addresses the above issues comprehensively and offers a realistic, safe, resident-friendly option which I would encourage SDCC to consider very strongly.

7. I believe that the best way to develop the Dodder Greenway along Lower Dodder Road is to retain the existing pedestrian/cycle shared surface as pedestrian only, to stop rat running using a number of measures and to allow cyclists and vehicles to share a two-way carriageway with priority for cyclists. I believe that the common term for this approach is a quiet road; and this would work on a number of levels for Lower Dodder Road. All of the proposed measures are detailed in the alternative residents proposal referenced above.

- SAFETY - pedestrian safety is significantly improved by avoiding the risks of being snagged by handlebars or pedals of passing cyclists, by ensuring that the risk of straying into the path of a cyclist is reduced. Many cyclists already use the road surface rather than the dedicated cycle surface and this has never caused a problem. If anything, even as things stand, cycling on the road surface is safer and easier than cycling on the shared pathway.

- TRAFFIC VOLUME AND SPEED. By introducing additional ramps along with pinch points as set out in the alternative plan referenced above, prioritising cyclists and redesigning the junctions at the East and West ends of the roads, the speed of vehicles can be significantly reduced, while retaining two-way traffic and access for residents.

8. By adding clear signage at both ends of Lower Dodder Road to indicate that access is for residents only, and ENFORCING this measure, the large volumes of rat run traffic (especially High School drop-offs and work commuters) can be reduced to a trickle. In addition, the prospect of negotiating a roadway with prioritised cyclists on it, numerous pinch points and ramps will discourage many from using the road for any purpose other than accessing the homes along the road.

9. • AMENITY - There is an opportunity now for SDCC to make Lower Dodder Road a neighbourhood to be proud of. The addition of seating, meeting areas, paved areas and other valuable enhancements to the local amenities as set out in the residents' alternative proposal would make the area safer for children and the elderly, more pleasant for transient visitors and residents alike and would look and feel like an amenity for pleasure rather than just a through road with a few (very problematic) tweaks as is currently proposed by SDCC.
10. In summary, I reject the SDCC proposals and fully support the alternative residents' proposals as described above and for the reasons set out above.
- Failure to take citizens' opinions and strongly held views into consideration when attempting to provide for the 'greater good' can often go badly wrong and it is better to work together with the people most affected by these proposals to arrive at an acceptable, safe and enjoyable solution for all which provides the 'world class' greenway that SDCC aspires to while also significantly enhancing the amenity of the neighbourhood for residents. Nearly 80% of residents of Lower Dodder Road are actively behind the alternative proposals and must not be ignored.
- The residents of Sandymount have not been adequately consulted in regard to similar proposals there and the 'trial' is mired in debate and legal proceedings. It is better to determine a solution which is acceptable and agreeable to all and I would ask SDCC to consider the alternative proposals carefully.
- Yours Sincerely,
Fergal Ryan, 66 Lower Dodder Road

Chief Executives Responses:

1. The proposed Greenway will enhance the amenity offer of the area.
2. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.
This scheme seeks to deliver a key section of the Dodder Valley Greenway. A key objective of this project is to encourage more people to walk and cycle. The design of this scheme has carefully considered and balanced impacts on all road users including vehicles, cyclists, and pedestrians. It seeks to create a more pleasant local environment along this key stretch of the Dodder Greenway. Commuting time for some residents will increase but the impact of this will be minimal taking account of the fact that local residents will no longer have to compete with transient traffic.
3. The proposal from the residents is noted. A comprehensive response to the residents' proposal has been provided within section 3.4 of this Report.
4. An Auto track analysis has been carried out on the design to ensure that such vehicles can be accommodated in the proposed design. The results of this analysis showed that the proposed design will not present any challenges to the emergency services vehicles.
5. Traffic Calming measures will be put in place to ensure speeds are kept at acceptable levels.
6. One of the main objectives of the scheme is to provide segregated cyclist facilities to ensure the safety of these users. Due to the existing layout and design of the road and traffic volumes at Dodder Road Lower, the safety of cyclists cannot be guaranteed if allowed to use the road.

7. An 'Access Only' sign cannot be provided as Dodder Road Lower is a public road with public access.
8. Additional seating can be provided as part of the landscaping, where possible.
9. Noted.
10. Noted. A comprehensive response to the residents' proposal has been provided within section 3.4 of this Report.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.
2. Additional improvements to the public realm such as seating, finishes etc., are included in amended design and can be further incorporated at detailed design stage.

Submission No. SD-C184-68 – Patrick Kelly
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I am a resident on Lower Dodder Road and I would like to inform SDCC of my objection to the proposed changes on the Road. My main concern is the one way system - which I feel will not work in any way for the residents. 2. I feel a better option would be to keep the road 2 way but with local access between certain times in the morning and evening. Could you please address my concerns. Patrick Kelly 87 Lower Dodder Road Rathfarnham Dublin 14

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Noted.
2. An 'Access Only' sign cannot be provided as Dodder Road Lower is a public road with public access.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. No changes proposed following the review of this submission.

Submission No. SD-C184-69 – Shauna McGowan
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I am extremely dissatisfied with SDCC's greenway plan for Dodder Road Lower. Where they intend to widen the existing foot path and reduce the vehicle access to 3.5m with a one way system. The current plan will not be a safe space for all intended users; pedestrians, skateboarders, cyclists, electric scooters alike and the 3.5m wide one-way system will have a very negative impact on all residents trying to access their homes daily.

Submission No. SD-C184-69 – Shauna McGowan

I support the vision of the Dodder greenway. We need a plan that will be suitable for all users, that will be safe and function well for everyone. The right plan will enhance rather than detract from the natural beauty along the Dodder. With the right plan we have a great opportunity to showcase the amenity while ensuring everyone's safety.

2. I am an avid cyclist, pedestrian, courteous driver, and a resident. On too many occasions I have witnessed along Dodder Road Lower aggressive cyclists, speeding electric scooters & skateboarders whizzing past our young children, elderly pedestrians, photographers and pets without consideration for their care. On the other hand, I have also seen absent minded pedestrians, as they appreciate the natural beauty, totally oblivious to the dangers of cyclists, scooter users etc. and side step into their pathway without checking. Increasing the size of the current shared area will not work safely.

During lockdown, the pedestrian foot traffic increased 10-fold as locals came to appreciate the nature on the Dodder. Kingfishers, foxes, otters, badgers, herons and even deer to name but a few can be seen along Dodder Road Lower. The vehicle traffic was non-existent aside from residents, cyclists, scooters etc. switched to sharing a space with them rather than using the cycle path shared with pedestrians. Everyone co-existed in a very calm and safe environment. That safe environment is what we need to make the greenway work. The current SDCC plan will not provide that safe functioning environment.

3. That is why I support the joint submission made by the Dodder Greenway Residents Action Group which outlines a far better solution for accommodating the Dodder Greenway on Dodder Road Lower and which has the signed support of 80% of the residents on the road. The reference number of this submission is SD-C184-45.

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Noted. A comprehensive response to the residents' proposal has been provided within section 3.4 of this Report.
2. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.
3. Proposal from residents is note. A comprehensive response to the residents' proposal has been provided within section 3.4 of this Report.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.

Submission No. SD-C184-70 – Mary Agnew

Dodder Greenway Proposal for Lower Dodder Road.

1. I am a resident of Lower Dodder Road and have lived here, with my husband, for the past 30 years. As we have invested in making this our home, we are very concerned at

the proposal that you have designed for the road. You are proposing to change the entire fabric of the road that we call 'home'.

At the moment, we, and any person who walks or cycles along the road can enjoy the river, the wildlife and all that the surrounding areas have to offer. We have two pathways plus a cycle way and a boardwalk along the river bank. We have road parking for visitors, emergency vehicles and for delivery vans and trucks. We also have access for the waste services and for the gritting truck in winter. In other words, we have the necessary access to the basic services for living to-day. All this is to be either changed or removed in total.

As far as I can tell from your proposed plan, it is basically widen the pathway, narrow the roadway, remove all the parking facilities and reconfigure the traffic to move in one direction. In my opinion, it is a blunt instrument and has given little or no thought to the residents who actually 'live' here.

I have spoken to a number of people who both use Lower Dodder Road as pedestrians or as cyclists but who do not live along the road. I have found no one who has any problem with the facilities as they exist currently. When I outlined your proposal to them, they could not understand why this was happening as they felt the facility as it stands is very good.

2. I understand that basically, the Council wants to reduce the motorised traffic that uses Lower Dodder Road as a short cut. This seems to be the only reason for proposing these major changes to our everyday lives. Three speed reducing bumps were installed a number of years ago but no other traffic restricting methods have been trialled or suggested to see if that would have the desired effect. I see lots of 'No Access between specified times' signs plus 'Local Access Only' signs in many areas.
3. I have seen 'No Right/Left Turn between specified times' signs. These restrictive signs work otherwise they would not be used. Nothing like this has been suggested for this road.
4. I am a cyclist, a walker and a car owner so I use the road for all of these methods. I am totally in favour of making the road a safer place for all who use it by any of these means. I have seen the alternative proposal that the Resident's Group have drawn up. Again, in my opinion, it is a far more innovative, appealing and user-friendly approach to changing what is there currently
5. It includes social areas for people to sit and enjoy both the company and the river side, it increases the green aspect of the road, it discourages motor traffic by including 'pinch-points' to reduce speed but it acknowledges that the residents, who are the people who actually use the road every day are considered to be important. In my opinion, the Council are actually giving the people who use the road for recreational purposes greater consideration than anyone else.
6. I have read the Mission Statement for South Dublin County Council. It states:
'The Mission of South Dublin County Council is to serve the public through open, effective and participative local democratic processes enabling everyone to have a safe and fulfilling lifestyle within both their own local community and the wider community of the County.
The Notices for this proposal were erected in the middle of the worst pandemic that this country, and indeed the world, has experienced in recent times. The time frame for submissions was very short. Due to the Government restrictions, the residents were

Submission No. SD-C184-70 – Mary Agnew

unable to meet to discuss or to formulate a collective response. How can this be termed 'open, effective and participative local democratic processes? Because we have managed to individually call to each house, we have arrived at a democratic opinion that the current proposal is unacceptable to the majority of residents. Surely that means that in keeping with your Mission Statement - you cannot proceed with the plan as it currently stands?

I would be very interested to know what, if any, surveys were done along the road to monitor the usage by motorists, pedestrians and cyclists. As I live here, I can reliably tell you that the optimum time that motors use the road are between 7 a.m. and 9 a.m. on week-day mornings and between 4.30 p.m. and 6.30 p.m. in the evening. It is quite clear that this usage is caused by commuter and schools traffic. By removing this traffic, the road becomes a quiet way that is quite safe for the residents and for those who use it for recreational purposes. So why are South Dublin Co. Co. spending a large budget to attempt to reduce the through traffic? By making it a one-way track, the commuter and schools traffic will still use the shortcut. So the purpose of the changes will be largely ineffective. The desired effect of reducing the traffic could be solved with much less inconvenience to the residents and less cost to the Council. Perhaps the money saved could be used to provide much needed housing for families who cannot afford to buy a family home currently

In conclusion, I would like to state that I am totally against the plan as proposed by South Dublin County Council and I totally support the alternative proposal submitted by DLRAActiongroup, submission reference no. SD-C184-45. In my opinion, it is far superior with more thought and consideration given to all who use the road.

I await in anticipation to see if democracy really works as the majority of residents oppose this proposal.

Mary Agnew85 Lower Dodder Road, Rathfarnham, Dublin 14.

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Noted.
2. An 'Access Only' sign cannot be provided as Dodder Road Lower is a public road with public access.
3. Noted.
4. Traffic calming has been integrated within the revised design. Additional seating can be provided as part of the landscaping, where possible.
5. Noted.
6. All comments are noted and the proposal from residents is noted and will be taken into consideration for the revised design. A comprehensive response to the residents' proposal has been provided within section 3.4 of this Report.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Additional improvements to the public realm such as changes to finishes, seating, etc., are included in amended design and can also be incorporated at detailed design stage.

Submission No. SD-C184-71 – Luke O Toole

The Council's proposed plan for Dodder Road Lower is significantly flawed with major concerns arising, not alone in the area of inconvenience for residents, but more importantly in the areas of Health & Saftey and environmental concerns.

1. Perhaps the most dangerous element is the plan to continue the current situation where pedestrians and cyclists share the same space. Residents (who are familiar with collisions and near-collisions pretty much every day) know that, no matter what lines or markings are painted on the shared space, or what poles are erected, confusion will inevitably arise with cyclists straying into pedestrian areas and, much more frequently, pedestrians wandering into the cyclists space. I am a cyclist myself and, as people walk along what is a scenic road with a beautiful view of the river, their attention is not on the markings on the pathway. They are in a relaxed mode and will often meander as they take in the view, utterly unaware that cyclists can be coming from behind them at speeds of up to 30-40 kmph.

If the Council wishes to provide a clear cycleway along Dodder Road Lower, then they must provide a separate footpath for pedestrians. Ways in which this can be done are outlined in the alternative plan proposed by Dodder Road Lower Action Group.

2. The proposal to make the road one-way is not, as far as I'm concerned, a major issue in itself. The real difficulty comes in the significant narrowing of the road. This will make it extremely difficult for Emergency Service vehicles, Bin-Lorries and delivery trucks to navigate the road and engage properly with the residents needing these services.

It is naive to believe that cars will not park outside houses on occasion, half on the footpath and half on the road; this will absolutely inevitably happen and the consequences could be extremely serious if, for example, a Fire Brigade has difficulty gaining access. The Council needs to factor these very serious life and death issues into their planning, particularly as many people who are not residents park their cars on the road and go for a walk along the river or the tow-path for maybe 15-30 minutes. This happens every single day, particularly between April and October, and will not change just because the road is made narrower.

All of these Health & Safety concerns, allied to the significant inconvenience for residents in terms of getting in and out of driveways, and the environmental issues created by increased journey times and idling for cars driven by residents and non-residents alike, mean that the Council's proposal as it stands is simply not viable and will have to be revisited within a short period of time, at enormous additional cost to the taxpayer.

3. I would therefore ask the Council to give serious consideration to the alternative plan put forward by the Dodder Road Lower Action Group, which takes into account the views of residents (who know the issues around the road better than anyone) whilst also delivering on the Council's key objectives for an enhanced residential, pedestrian and cycling amenity on Dodder Road Lower.

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.

2. An Auto track analysis has been carried out on the design to ensure that such vehicles and manoeuvres can be accommodated in the proposed design. Additionally, Informal parking exists along the street, in most instances this is not being impacted.
3. Proposal from residents is noted. A comprehensive response to the residents' proposal has been provided within section 3.4 of this Report.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.

<p>Submission No. SD-C184-72 – Patrick I Keefe</p> <p>The proposed plan for Dodder Road Lower does not work for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is not safe for pedestrians or cyclists- sharing a path with cyclists and pedestrians is not safe 2. The proposal reduces the residential amenity of the area - it doesn't enhance it. 3. The proposed one-way system would make the road less safe for all non-vehicular traffic as traffic speeds are more likely to increase with a one way system. 4. The proposed one-way system would make it extremely difficult for residents to access their driveways. At least a third of households would be significantly impacted in this way. This is completely unacceptable and inherently unfair. 5. The proposed one-way system also means that any visitors, tradespeople, deliveries or carers will block the road when parked. This is unacceptable. Many of our residents rely on carers and to have this disrupted in any way is serious and unjustifiable. 6. This one-way system will encourage some to use it as a rat run and also will increase journey times. 7. Any increase in journey times increases air pollution, which is contrary to South Dublin County Council green vision. One way systems have been shown not to work time and time again. <p>A counter proposal put forward by the residents includes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 8. Enhance the visual and recreational amenity of the road by planting, seating and paving. This will make it look and feel more safe for all pedestrians and cyclists. Separate foot-path for pedestrians so as not to share with the cycle path. This is so dangerous, especially as e-scooters are also being used on the cycle path and travel at considerable speed. 9. Create a quiet neighbourhood road which is achieved by local access only signs either end of the road, pinch points at narrow parts of the road to force vehicles to slow down in both directions and adhere to the 30km speed limit. This creates a safer space for all users. 10. By creating this safer road, cyclists can then more safely share the road with vehicles and not have to share a path with pedestrians. Keep the road a 2 way system thus ensuring that residents will always have access to their driveways and that visitors, carers, tradespeople and deliveries can all park safely

Submission No. SD-C184-72 – Patrick I Keefe

without blocking the road. Many of our older residents rely on carers and anything that disrupts or causes difficulty with that is extremely serious and unjustifiable

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.
2. The proposed Greenway will enhance the amenity offer of the area.
3. Traffic Calming measures will be put in place to ensure speeds are kept at acceptable levels.
4. An Auto track analysis has been carried out on the design to ensure that such manoeuvres can be accommodated in the proposed design.
5. Enhance road markings will be delivered as part of the works and these will deter illegal parking and set down along the scheme. Illegal parking to be handled by Garda.
6. Traffic Calming measures will be put in place to deter “rat running”. In the worst-case scenario, with these measures in place the volumes of transient traffic will remain as they are currently.
7. This scheme seeks to deliver a key section of the Dodder Valley Greenway. A key objective of this project is to encourage more people to walk and cycle. The design of this scheme has carefully considered and balanced impacts on all road users including vehicles, cyclists, and pedestrians. It seeks to create a more pleasant local environment along this key stretch of the Dodder Greenway. Commuting time for some residents will increase but the impact of this will be minimal taking account of the fact that local residents will no longer have to compete with transient traffic.
8. Additional seating can be provided as part of the landscaping, where possible.
9. An 'Access Only' sign cannot be provided as Dodder Road Lower is a public road with public access.
10. One of the main objectives of the scheme is to provide segregated cyclist facilities to ensure the safety of these users. Due to the existing layout and design of the road and traffic volumes at Dodder Road Lower, the safety of cyclists cannot be guaranteed if allowed to use the road. Blocking of accesses/driveways is a parking offence and should be handled by the Gardaí.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.
2. Additional improvements to the public realm such as seating, finishes etc., are included in amended design and can be further incorporated at detailed design stage.

Submission No. SD-C184-73 – Daragh Anglim

To whom it may concern,
I am a resident on Dodder Road lower and I have some comments and concerns about the current plans for the proposed Greenway.

Submission No. SD-C184-73 – Daragh Anglim

Firstly let me say that I am fully supportive of the project in general terms and commend you on your vision and the speed at which you have built out a lot of the infrastructure for the greenway.

1. What I do note is that the current one way system and shared bike/walking path space does not make the most of the amenity and risks reducing its value to both residents and the wider public. I don't think the idea of bike and pedestrians sharing a space with a road on one side and the river on the other will work. They will be competing for the footpath and this will result in friction and confrontation. Far from giving both sets of users the pleasure of the journey by the Dodder it will do the opposite. An alternative suggestion would be for the road to be shared by cyclists and cars, leaving pedestrians on a wider segregated path and giving cyclists priority on the road.
2. The current proposal is for the introduction of a one way system. Already cars use this road as a rat run and tend to speed on it, only slowing down if another car is coming the opposite direction. I have 3 young children and my fear is that a one way system will mean speeding cars have no reason to slow down. I would prefer to see more done on reducing the opportunity to speed on this road and some measures to reduce the incentive to use it as a rat run at peak times.
3. I would include ideas such as having it sign posted locals access only shared road space with cyclists and giving cyclists priority on the road, along with traffic calming measures including pinch points and more effective enforcement of the 30km/h speed limit.
4. From a resident's point of view a one way system will obviously be more inconvenient for many people and will increase our journey times, I also have concerns that deliveries, tradespeople, carers, etc. will block the road when parked and cause issues and again more confrontation and frustration for residents and road users.
5. Dodder road lower is a beautiful, peaceful and unique stretch of the Dodder, opening it up for the enjoyment of a wider selection of users is a fantastic idea. What I don't want to see is that different types of users are put in a position where they are competing for space and don't have the opportunity to enjoy the natural beauty at the pace they want to. There are currently walkers, fishermen, photographers, runners, families and cyclists using the footpath, sometimes there are issues. Having more cyclists using the footpath stretch for recreational cycling and commuting will increase the chances of more confrontation and issues.
6. Placing cyclists on the road and then investing in infrastructure
7. and street furniture to allow people to dwell and appreciate the natural beauty of the place would be real enhancement of the area.

Thank you for your time reading my submission and I look forward to seeing the revised plans.

Kindest regards

Daragh Anglim

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.
2. Traffic Calming measures will be put in place to deter "rat running" and regulate speed.

3. An 'Access Only' sign cannot be provided as Dodder Road Lower is a public road with public access/
4. This scheme seeks to deliver a key section of the Dodder Valley Greenway. A key objective of this project is to encourage more people to walk and cycle. The design of this scheme has carefully considered and balanced impacts on all road users including vehicles, cyclists, and pedestrians. It seeks to create a more pleasant local environment along this key stretch of the Dodder Greenway. Commuting time for some residents will increase but the impact of this will be minimal taking account of the fact that local residents will no longer have to compete with transient traffic. Blocking of accesses/driveways is a parking offence and should be handled the Gardai.
5. Noted.
6. One of the main objectives of the scheme is to provide segregated cyclist facilities to ensure the safety of these users. Due to the existing layout and design of the road and traffic volumes at Dodder Road Lower, the safety of cyclists cannot be guaranteed if allow to use the road.
7. Additional seating can be provided as part of the landscaping, where possible.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.
2. Additional improvements to the public realm such as seating, finishes etc., are included in amended design and can be further incorporated at detailed design stage.

<p>Submission No. SD-C184-74 – Stephen Finn</p> <p>1. Hi</p> <p>Further to my earlier submissions, I now need to ask the question &quot;Why 2 cycle ways?&quot;.</p> <p>We have a perfect cycle way which runs along Dodder Park Road in the same direction as the proposed Dodder Greenway along Lower Dodder Road (LDR).</p> <p>The clearly marked cycle way which shares the Dodder Park Road is safe, ample width and does not interfere with traffic or pedestrians, and it is already there.</p> <p>This current cycle way can be easily accessed from the Dodder View Road junction and instead of going down the busy narrow pedestrian path along the LDR the cyclists&#039;, electric scooters, skate boards and bikes can continue along the Dodder Park Road to the junction at Ely arch where they can join up with the Dublin City Council stretch of Greenway to Ringsend.</p> <p>This route is so logical and safe, keeping fast commuter cyclist and speedy electric forms of transport away from pedestrians.</p> <p>It is on a main road, which is well separated from pedestrian paths and runs in both directions on the corresponding lanes of traffic.</p> <p>The LDR is too narrow for your Greenway plan, the current path is sometimes filled with walkers, nature photographers, anglers and people meeting up and chatting. Today I saw a bicycle with a wide front which carried wheelchair coming along the cycle lane on the Templeville Road, it was taking up the whole width of the cycle lane.</p> <p>The cyclist had the space as he was sharing with the road, travelling in the same flow of traffic and not interfering with casual walkers.</p>
--

Submission No. SD-C184-74 – Stephen Finn

If he was to cycle along the narrow shared cycle lane on the LDR (which is for cyclists going both directions) he would be causing great tensions as he is too wide, pedestrians and others cyclist would be trapped on one side by a railing and on the side they would be forced to go onto the road, putting their lives in unnecessary danger of silent traffic. It has taken me time "to see the trees from the woods" as I have only concentrated on changing the LDR to adapt to your Greenway plan, but the answer is on the parallel road going in the same direction, meeting up with the DCC plans, it's so right.

Thank you for reading my submission.

Stephen Finn
80 Lower Dodder Road.

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided. The proposed scheme is a Greenway and is intended as a safe and coherent environment for all users therefore directing the scheme along a quieter street is the optimum route.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.

Submission No. SD-C184-75 – Faye Ross

1. By sending all the traffic up the main Dodder Park Road to turn onto the lower Dodder road to create a one-way system there will be an increased volume of cars thereby causing bottlenecks.
2. By creating a narrow single line of traffic it would be impossible for anybody to have a delivery of goods, or have workmen to do repairs or maintenance without causing holdups to follow up vehicles.
3. Additionally in an emergency, the services will be hampered in the event of an ambulance or fire brigade needing access.
4. Majority of households will have problems getting out of their driveways without creating a hazard and please note that you are now on record that if there is an accident due to this practice, this email will be produced as evidence.

Chief Executives Responses:

1. A traffic model has been created to ensure that surrounding junctions can accommodate the additional traffic.
2. An Auto track analysis has been carried out on the design to ensure that such vehicles can be accommodated in the proposed design. The results of this analysis showed that the proposed design will not present any challenges to the emergency services vehicles.

3. Access for emergency vehicles will be unobstructed. Informal parking exists along the street, in most instances this is not being impacted.
4. An Auto track analysis has been carried out on the design to ensure that such manoeuvres can be accommodated in the proposed design.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. No changes proposed following the review of this submission.

Submission No. SD-C184-76 – Cllr Laura Donaghy
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The entire Greenway project is hugely welcome. While preferable to the status quo, I note the proposal is for a shared surface intended to be used in by cyclists and pedestrians in both directions. If a fully segregated lane for bicycle users is not feasible, could the management comment on proposals by residents (DLR Action Group, SD-C184-45)? 2. This group is suggesting significant calming measures intended to reduce motor traffic to local access only, and I wonder if/how this impacts the balance of safety concerns for cyclists i.e. 3. could this make on-road cycling safe enough to avoid the need for a shared surface.

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.
2. An 'Access Only' sign cannot be provided as Dodder Road Lower is a public road with public access.
3. One of the main objectives of the scheme is to provide segregated cyclist facilities to ensure the safety of these users. Due to the existing layout and design of the road and traffic volumes at Dodder Road Lower, the safety of cyclists cannot be guaranteed if allow to use the road.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.

Submission No. SD-C184-77 –Lorna Callanan
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sharing surface between pedestrians and cyclists is unsuitable and segregation is essential This is a very busy pedestrian route used by walkers of all ages and abilities - sharing the surface is intimidating and dangerous for pedestrians. The lower pathway is an unsuitable alternative as it is unlit, narrow, frequently underwater and lacks passive surveillance. Suggestion:

Submission No. SD-C184-77 –Lorna Callanan

-maintain wide segregated pavement for pedestrians on river side of road.

2. Maintain 2-way traffic but restrict through traffic-access (using filtered permeability bollards) creating a quiet street/cul de sacs where cycles can safely share with local access whilst simultaneously limiting through traffic.
3. Limit on street parking to one side of street with indented spaces. Summary -essential to segregate pedestrians.

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.
2. Bollards cannot be accommodated due to issues with turning movements. One of the main objectives of the scheme is to provide segregated cyclist facilities to ensure the safety of these users. Due to the existing layout and design of the road and traffic volumes at Dodder Road Lower, the safety of cyclists cannot be guaranteed if allow to use the road.
3. Informal parking exists along the street, in most instances this is not being impacted.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.

Submission No. SD-C184-78 – Douglas Oldrey

- Amendment of the vehicle carriageway to one way

1. Issue here is limited parking for visitors' deliveries etc. Parked vehicles will block the roadway.
2. Traffic on Dodder park road is heavy and being forced to use for every journey will increase journey times and carbon footprint.
3. Accessing my driveway which is narrow requires using the other lane. Removing this and at the same time increasing the already limited space by increasing the cycle track will severely increase difficulty in entering my driveway.
4. Keeping 2 way traffic will keep parking and driveway access for residents , tradespeople, visitors and deliveries

Widening of the existing shared footpath and cycleway

5. Sharing a footpath does not work it is dangerous both for cyclist and pedestrians. Pedestrians are constantly forgetting and walking on cycle track. Much better to move cyclists to road and introduce "quiet neighbourhood road" with signs and pinch points to reduce both volumes and speed of traffic.

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Informal parking exists along the street, in most instances this is not being impacted. Enhance road markings will be delivered as part of the works and these will deter illegal parking and set down along the scheme. Illegal parking to be handle by Garda.
2. This scheme seeks to deliver a key section of the Dodder Valley Greenway. A key objective of this project is to encourage more people to walk and cycle. The design of this scheme has carefully considered and balanced impacts on all road users including vehicles, cyclists, and pedestrians. It seeks to create a more pleasant local environment along this key stretch of the Dodder Greenway. Commuting time for some residents will increase but the impact of this will be minimal taking account of the fact that local residents will no longer have to compete with transient traffic.
3. An Auto track analysis has been carried out on the design to ensure that such manoeuvres can be accommodated in the proposed design.
4. Informal parking exists along the street, in most instances this is not being impacted.
5. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.

Submission No. SD-C184-79 – Ray Lund
<p>The ideal road layout for the upgrade of Lower Dodder Road as part of the greenway project should incorporate the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Separation of bicycles and pedestrians. The existing combined pedestrian and cycle path is unsatisfactory for both pedestrians and cyclists. As a pedestrian one is concerned at the speed of the cyclists and their silent approach. One is constantly looking around to see if any are coming from either direction and near misses are very frequent. From the cyclists point of view, pedestrians are haphazard in their direction of travel and frequently step across the dividing line, The new arrangement should ensure that the cycles are at the lower level and the higher level is reserved for pedestrians only.2. Make the road one-way going west. There is no need for two-way traffic on this road, as it only becomes a rat-run at busy times. Dodder Park Road is more than adequate to carry all through traffic. One-way for vehicles should also allow two-way traffic for bicycles on the greenway.3. Maintain the existing carriageway width. Putting the cyclists at the road level requires an adequate road width for two-way cycle traffic and one way vehicular traffic. Parking as at present should still be allowed - why change what is already working? Adequate road width is necessary for deliveries, parking for tradesmen etc. without disrupting the cycleway.4. Introduce several further speed bumps, narrow road sections and dissuading signage to minimise through traffic and its speed. Introduction of one-way vehicular traffic will significantly reduce through traffic, particularly as egress at the western end is restricted. However, as backups occur on Dodder Park Road in the evenings, some rat-running still occurs and restrictions to at least reduce their speed are necessary.5. Create a plaza at the North side of Elys Arch. This would allow parking for non-residents who want to enjoy the greenway. It would also greatly facilitate parents who pick up their

Submission No. SD-C184-79 – Ray Lund

children from the back gate of The High School at the bridge. These drivers will continue to do this and it is better to give them a safe method of doing so.

6. Add a cycle lane from Elys Arch to the junction with Orwell Road. There are footpaths one both sides of this road, one of which could easily be sacrificed for a cycle lane

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.
2. An Origin-Destination Traffic Survey was undertaken, and it was determined that most of rat runners head Eastbound. Based on this it was decided that a westbound one-way will reduce the rat-running through the road.
3. Road safety audit has been carried out to ensure that the design safely accommodate all users. Refuse and delivery trucks can be safely accommodated with current design.
4. Traffic Calming measures will be put in place to deter “rat running”. In the worst-case scenario, with these measures in place the volumes of transient traffic will remain as they are currently.
5. Outside of extend of the project. Could be looked at a later date
6. Outside of extend of the project. Could be looked at a later date

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.

Submission No. SD-C184-80 – Louisa Walsh

65, Lower Dodder Road,
Rathfarnham
D14WY60
29th June 2021

Re: Proposed changes to Lower Dodder Road

To whom it may concern:

I am writing to ask you to reconsider SDCC proposals for the above road. I fear the proposals in their current format will not in any way enhance the lives of residents but will in fact have a negative impact. The proposals appear to be aimed at the throughput of drivers, cyclists and walkers, whose experience of the area is transitory in nature, perhaps a few hours per week at the most. I would sincerely ask that the residents, many of whom are elderly and in poor health, but have lived there for their entire adult lives, be granted equal consideration in this matter.

1. Paths

From a safety viewpoint there are many studies which confirm the sharing of pathways by cyclists and pedestrians is dangerous. Some of the most obvious objections include:

- The sharing of one space between people and objects moving at great speed makes no sense under road safety legislation.
- Painting boundary lines on a footpath is meaningless to a child who simply wants to run or cycle a bike without restrictions..

- Families with buggies, children, dogs on leads simply cannot watch everyone and everything to stop infringements .
- Bells or horns do not seem to be a standard part of bikes anymore. It's very easy not to hear a cyclist approaching from the rear.
- The advent of motorised scooters on pathways is a new problem and will need further consideration.

2. One Way System

It is my belief a one way system will only encourage more speeding and more rat running. Every resident on LDR knows the current system with two speed ramps is abused. Many drivers drive at great speed up to the first ramp, break hard, bump over the ramp and repeat the process coming to the second one.

The current difficulties of exiting the road onto Dodder Park Road are extremely frustrating. The Yellow Box systems at both ends of the road are quite simply ignored. The queues, particularly at peak times, are never ending, and this is with two exits/entrances, how would a single exit/entrance work?

3. On road parking by delivery drivers, tradesmen, visitors, carers calling several times a day to elderly residents all present further problems. We are constantly being bombarded about the negative impact our actions are having on the environment. Are SDCC advocating we dig up and pave our front gardens as our family and friends can no longer find any parking nearby? This surely goes against Government plans and I, for one, have neither the finances nor the desire to do so.

4. In addition to these issues are the regular non residents who park on the road to use the local parks and parents of The High School children who drop and collect their children during school terms. Where are these people expected to park? The few proposed lay-bys are not an answer.

Simply trying to exit our houses will become harder. Very few approaching drivers will slow down to allow facilitate this.

5. I strongly urge SDCC to consider the counter proposals put forward by the residents. I believe they will enhance the area both for the local community and passing visitors alike. These include:

- Separate foot and cycle paths
- A very attractive seating and planting proposal. Having lived abroad for a few years one of the things I noticed was the provision of seating areas everywhere from large cities to small villages. They are particularly popular with older retired people who just enjoy a sit down and a chat. I believe that anything which adds to a sense of community is worthwhile.
- The River Dodder is teeming with wonderful wildlife. It has become so popular with photographers, fishermen, nature lovers etc. Seating and rubbish bins would greatly enhance their experiences.
- Traffic calming 'pinch points' would not only slow down drivers but would deter non residents from rat running.. They can also be very attractive in design.

6. River Walkway

While there may not be funding available at present I would encourage you to consider improvements to the lower riverside walk. This is a beautiful but underused amenity.

Submission No. SD-C184-80 – Louisa Walsh

It is currently in a poor condition both from a visual and safety perspective which does little to encourage walkers. I am aware there are some ecological issues along the bank but it is surely worth a discussion. It could become a wonderful nature learning hub for adults and children alike and would be an asset to local schools.

I do believe with a little 'thinking outside the box' this road could become a template for other areas. This has been a difficult year for everyone and hopefully we've learnt how important the outside world is to each and every one of us.

I am aware of an alternative proposal submitted on behalf of residents and I am fully in favour of the provisions contained in this proposal, which has the unique submission reference SD-C184-45 in respect of this Part 8 proposal for the Dodder Greenway on Lower Dodder Road.

Let us enhance what nature has given us. Please do not cement it over.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Yours Sincerely,

Louisa Curtis Walsh.

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.
2. Traffic Calming measures will be put in place to deter "rat running". In the worst-case scenario, with these measures in place the volumes of transient traffic will remain as they are currently
3. Informal parking exists along the street, in most instances this is not being impacted.
4. The provision of a drop-off area for the High School is outside the extent of this part 8 plan due to constraints on available space caused by the existing parameters on Dodder Road Lower. This can be examined at a later stage.
5. Proposal from residents is noted. A comprehensive response to the residents' proposal has been provided within section 3.4 of this Report.
6. Outside of extend of the project. Could be looked at a later date

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.
2. Additional improvements to the public realm such as seating, finishes etc., are included in amended design and can be further incorporated at detailed design stage.

Submission No. SD-C184-81 – Sara Kilbride

1. I would like to fully support the Lower Dodder Road Residents group. The submission they have made for the road to be left 2way is essential.
we do not want a one-way system. We do not want the road closed off as a Cul De Sac. as residents I feel we should have a say as we are the ones who live here and will be most affected.

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Proposal from residents is noted. A comprehensive response to the residents’ proposal has been provided within section 3.4 of this Report.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. No changes proposed following the review of this submission.

<p>Submission No. SD-C184-82 – Pdraig Dunne</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I am contacting you as a person who grew up on Dodder Road and whose parents, both over 90 years of age, still live there, in number 69. My parents both need support & care every day, both from family & professional carers. The family arrive daily and travel by car. The carers arrive twice daily and often travel by car. For my parents, as for many residents on the road, car parking is a key issue. The removal of this would hugely impact our ability to care for our parents. 2. I have seen details of the proposal from Dublin South CoCo and I believe that having bicycles and pedestrians on the same level is a dangerous setting for both. An alternative should be considered in this regard also. 3. I am aware of an alternative proposal submitted on behalf of residents and I am fully in favour of the provisions contained in this proposal, which has the unique submission reference SD-C184-45 in respect of this Part 8 proposal for the Dodder Greenway on Lower Dodder Road. <p>In general, I am supportive, as are my parents, of the provision of enhanced pedestrian and cycle infrastructure along the Dodder Valley. Thank you for reading my submission. Pdraig Dunne</p>

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Regarding parking comments: Informal parking exists along the street; in most instances this is not being impacted.
2. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.
3. Proposal from residents is noted. A comprehensive response to the residents’ proposal has been provided within section 3.4 of this Report.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.

<p>Submission No. SD-C184-83 – Derek Kirwan</p> <p>I Derek Kirwan of 53 Lower Dodder Road which to request that the proposed alterations to the Lower Dodder Road be reviewed on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. That the proposed single route traffic direction be removed. An alternative traffic calming measure be installed at both ends of the entry points to lower dodder road.
--

4. This should be for local access only. A one directional traffic proposal would result in irregular parking and obstructions for ambulances/carers/deliveries.
 5. That a proper cycle lane be introduced to segregate walkers from cyclists. This can be done on the existing wide footpath at present.
 6. That the road remains a two lane road, however, volume can be reduced to local access only. The creation of a bottle neck at both ends would discourage the Rat-run which exists at present.
- Kind regards
Derek Kirwan

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Traffic calming has been integrated within the revised design.
2. An 'Access Only' sign cannot be provided as Dodder Road Lower is a public road with public access. Regarding Illegal parking comments: Enhanced Road markings will be delivered as part of the works, and these will deter illegal parking and set down along the scheme. Illegal parking to be handle by Garda.
3. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.
4. Traffic Calming measures will be put in place to deter “rat running”. In the worst-case scenario, with these measures in place the volumes of transient traffic will remain as they are currently

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.

Submission No. SD-C184-84 – John Lahart TD
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I wish to support wholeheartedly the submission made on behalf of the residents of Lower Dodder Road - this submission is timely, very well-considered and thought out and has the calibre and quality of a professional consultant’s submission in its detail and clarity. 2. It also makes a lot of sense and has some incredibly innovative ideas in respect of incorporating the Ely Arch as an amenity space along the greenway - with hospitality such as coffee available at this location and a plaza area. The submission is also very dynamic and creative when it comes to the snakll local shopping area at the west end of the Lower Dodder Road. I would urge the planners to incorporate its objectives and ideas wholeheartedly and completely.

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Noted. A comprehensive response to the residents’ proposal has been provided within section 3.4 of this Report.
2. Outside of extend of the project. Could be looked at a later date

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. No changes proposed following the review of this submission.

Submission No. SD-C184-85 – John Shanahan
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Shared space is bad for people cycling, walking. It is especially so for those who are young, old or disabled wheterh they are cycling, wheeling or walking. It needlessly creates an uncomfortable environment for both modes in areas of high usage, which this is. A two-segrated cycleway and a separate footway would be the optimum solution. Ideally separated from the road by kerbs and vegetation. 2. The cycleway must be protected from illegal parking. With the current Part 8 design the greenway will be used for pulling in and parking, including for drop offs, delivery drviers etc. Using kerbs and low hedging it would be possible to protect the cycleway while adding some greenery to the street. 3. I ask the street includes as much greenery as possible in order to make the street even more attractive to cycle/walk on. 4. I welcome the reallocation of roadspace from motor traffic to more sustainable modes. As someone who sometimes drives and uses this road to avoid congestion on Dodder Park Rd, I note that the proposals will not stop rat-running from east to west. A modal filter could achieve that however its location would need to be carefully chosen to avoid the road still being used by drivers to drop off at the school. No amount of traffic calming on its own will deter the rat running as the street will always be a more enticing option to drivers than sitting in stagnant congestion on Dodder Park Rd. 5. Perhaps a retractable bollard would be a good addition with a modal filter, as this would enable residents to retain access (they could be given access fobs) while removing the rat running.

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.
2. A Road safety audit has been carried out to ensure that the design safely accommodate all users. Refuse and delivery trucks can be safely accommodated with current design.
3. Verge/Vegetation between road and greenway: Where possible it can be provided as part of the landscaping. Regarding Illegal parking comments: Enhanced Road markings will be delivered as part of the works, and these will deter illegal parking and set down along the scheme. Illegal parking to be handle by Garda.
4. Noted.
5. Traffic Calming measures will be put in place to deter “rat running”. In the worst-case scenario, with these measures in place the volumes of transient traffic will remain as

they are currently. Bollards cannot be accommodated due to issues with turning movements.

6. It is not feasible to have retractable bollards on public road due to issues related to ownership and operation of such facilities on local residential streets.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.

<p>Submission No. SD-C184-86 –Lorraine Brunnell</p> <p>In relation to the proposal concerning the Dodder Greenway on Dodder Road Lower, I hereby object to the proposal on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The sharing of a path with pedestrians is totally unsafe. Cyclists can easily sway over to the pedestrian area and pedestrians passing each other can easily walk onto the cycle lane resulting in accidents and altercations.2. The proposed one-way system is not workable, and additional traffic such as deliveries, visitors and other callers will block the road while parked.3. Emergency vehicles will block the whole road while responding to a call.4. One-way systems create “rat runs” with cars attempting to beat traffic during rush hour.5. The proposed system will reduce the parking facilities for members of my household.6. The proposal to reduce the road to a width of 3.5m will create difficulty in accessing my driveway.7. Surrounding junctions will be overloaded due to build-up of traffic created by the one-way system. <ol style="list-style-type: none">8. The residents have formulated a counterproposal which I fully support and is titled DLReactiongroup Reference number SC-C184-45 and include some of the following:<ol style="list-style-type: none">8.1. A separate footpath for pedestrians not shared with cyclists.8.2 Creation of a “quiet neighbourhood road” which is achieved by :<ol style="list-style-type: none">a. local access only signs at either end of the road to reduce traffic volumes andb. effective traffic calming measures including pinch points at narrow points on the road to force vehicles to slow down in both directions and adhere to the existing 30km/h limit.8.3. By creating a quiet road, cyclists will be able to cycle safely on the road and not on a shared footpath thus reducing accidents.8.4. Maintaining a 2-way system will allow residents to continue to access their houses as normal.8.5. Maintaining a 2-way system will allow deliveries, visitors, and other callers to park outside houses without blocking the road. <p>I would be grateful if you would consider my proposal. Kind Regards, Lorraine Brunnell</p>

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.

2. A Road safety audit has been carried out to ensure that the design safely accommodate all users. Refuse and delivery trucks can be safely accommodated with current design. Blocking of accesses/driveways is a parking offence and should be handled the Gardai.
3. Access for emergency vehicles will be unobstructed. Informal parking exists along the street, in most instances this is not being impacted.
4. Traffic Calming measures will be put in place to deter “rat running”. In the worst-case scenario, with these measures in place the volumes of transient traffic will remain as they are currently.
5. Informal parking exists along the street, in most instances this is not being impacted.
6. An Auto track analysis has been carried out on the design to ensure that such manoeuvres can be accommodated in the proposed design.
7. A traffic model has been created to ensure that surrounding junctions can accommodate the additional traffic
8. The proposal is noted.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.

Submission No. SD-C184-87– Sheila Kilbride
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I WOULD LIKE TO SUPPORT THE RESIDENTS PLAN OF KEEPING OUR ROAD 2 WAY. WE ARE NOT BEING GIVEN DUE CONSIDERATION, YET VISITORS TO THE AREA ARE. 2. We are very happy that the greenway is coming through LDR , HOWEVER SAFETY seems to have been abandoned. Surely we can have the safety of Cyclists pedestrians and residents taken into account by keeping the road 2 way. 3. Segregating the cyclists and pedestrians would be the safest according to all the best practice. 4. i am calling for th road to be deemed 'local access only' which will cut down on the volumes and speed of traffic.

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Noted. A comprehensive response to the residents’ proposal has been provided within section 3.4 of this Report.
2. A Road safety audit has been carried out to ensure that the design safely accommodate all users.
3. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.
4. An 'Access Only' sign cannot be provided as Dodder Road Lower is a public road with public access.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.

Submission No. SD-C184-88– Earle Waghorne	
	<p>I write in connection with the proposed “Greenway” development on Lower Dodder Road.</p>
1.	<p>Let me first say that I recognize that this is part of the much larger Dodder Development and I support parts of the overall development, such as the much-needed foot bridge across the Dodder at Bushy Park.</p> <p>After 40 years living on Lower Dodder Road, I also recognize its amenity value. Indeed, I was secretary to the Dodder Resident’s Association when we wrote requesting the entrance at the waterfall end of the tow path to make this more accessible, and safer, for pedestrians. This entrance has improved that amenity.</p> <p>However, the development along Lower Dodder Road differs from many Greenways, for example, that along the Royal Canal, recently featured on Nationwide, which in large part, do not front directly on housing.</p> <p>However this development proceeds, it will affect both those who wish to cycle or walk through the area and those that live there. In this context, I find it disquieting that none of the 12 objectives listed in section 1.5 of the Clifton Scannell Emerson report of February 2021 even refers to the residents.</p> <p>The proposal largely comprises three components, widened paths to be shared by pedestrians and cyclists, making the road one-way, from east to west, and largely or entirely removing on street parking.</p> <p>Let me consider first the inter-related issues of removing on-street parking and making the road one way. Both introduce problems for the residents.</p>
2.	<p>Making the road one-way lengthens all journeys made by residents by around 0.6 km and so, ironically for a “green” development, will increase annual CO2 emissions in the area by several tons[1]. Of course, the same is true for many one-way systems.</p> <p>However, the inconvenience to residents is likely offset by any reduction in traffic on the road.</p>
3.	<p>Removing on-street parking is, to my mind, a much more serious issue for residents. There are a wide range of activities that necessitate on-street parking. These range from simple deliveries, of furniture or large domestic appliances for example, having repairs or renovations carried out on local houses or gardens, moving house or simply entertaining friends and family.</p> <p>There is a model green universe, in which we all cycle and the car is a thing of the past, but this isn’t reality. My daughter and her husband aren’t going to cycle from Killiney with their baby and two-year-old, nor are my friends, many like myself in their seventies,</p>

going to cycle from Clontarf, Deans Grange or Glen of the Downs when it is our turn to host our reading group.

Few of the cyclists and pedestrians who will benefit from this development will have similar difficulties with deliveries or entertaining and I believe that they would not support its development at the cost of depriving local residents of these rights.

Clearly, widening the footpaths, having on-street parking and retaining the road as two way is a practical impossibility.

However, making the roadway one-way releases one carriageway that could be used to provide on-street parking along most of the road and, to me, this seems to be the solution that causes the least inconvenience to the residents and allows development of the amenities for both residents and those coming to or passing through the area. This can be accommodated over much of the road if the rather extravagant footpaths envisioned are reduced.

Some support for this comes from the South Dublin Branch of the Dublin Cycling Campaign, who suggest that the walking and cycling path is moved closer to the river to facilitate parents dropping off or collecting pupils of the High School.

Why not move the walking and cycling path closer to the river and provide parking facilities for the residents as well as the parents of students of the High School.

4. I see that the South Dublin Branch of the Dublin Cycling Campaign also suggested that it was preferable to segregate pedestrians and cyclists. Having cycled throughout the area for many years I understand the logic but this needs care. In Vienna, which I know fairly well, this segregation is commonly nothing more than colours on the pavement but cyclists often take this as license to bully pedestrians who encroach on the cycle part of the pavement.

I've cycled on both shared and segregated cycle paths; both work as long as everyone behaves sensibly. There must be studies of best practice in this regard and it makes sense to have this evidence led.

44 Lower Dodder Road, Rathfarnham

[1] The distance between the two entrances to Lower Dodder Road, by my odometer, is 0.6 km. There are 90 houses on the road. If each of these make two trips a day and their cars consume 6 L of fuel per 100 km, the resulting CO₂ produced in one year is 5.68 tons (5679 kg).

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Noted.
2. Regarding the CO₂ emission noted: The intention of the proposed Greenway is to attract more pedestrian and cycle users to the area and reduce the number of vehicles passing through the area. The scheme should therefore enhance the local environment. (Modal shift).
3. Regarding the removal of on street parking: Informal parking exists along the street, in most instances this is not being impacted. The proposed Greenway will enhance the amenity offer of the area.
4. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided. General comments are noted.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.

<p>Submission No. SD-C184-89 – Denis Haverty</p> <p>Sir/ Madam,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As a resident of this road for 30 years, wish to object in the strongest possible terms to your proposal for change. <p>My objections are as follow:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. There is no separate clearly defined cycle and walking track. The two different functions should be clearly marked with a physical barrier, or someone is going to get killed. 3. The plan will make my daily life much more difficult because I cannot get in nor out of my home because of the one-way traffic which will use the road, which your proposal wishes to keep completely clear of parked cars, like Mondello. For several hours, each day, I will be effectively a prisoner in my own home. 4. The proposal for no parking outside our own homes is outrageous and not workable. What if we need work done in our house? Where are those people to park? What about utilities, who are not working on any particular house, where do they park? What if I need an ambulance, a carer, or a doctor? Where are they to park? 5. I object strongly and feel the only way to make this a pleasant environment for both residents and visitors, walkers, and cyclists is to stop through traffic altogether.
--

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Noted.
2. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.
3. Traffic Calming measures will be put in place to ensure speeds are kept at acceptable levels. Adjustment to the Dodder Park Drive/ Dodder Park Road junction layout will be considered to ease traffic flows.
4. Informal parking exists along the street, in most instances this is not being impacted.
5. An 'Access Only' sign cannot be provided as Dodder Road Lower is a public road with public access.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.

Submission No. SD-C184-90– Terry Reddy

A chara,

1. I wish to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposed changes to the Lower Dodder Road. I have lived on this road since August 1991 and during that time have endured the speeds at which rat-running traffic have gone during the morning and evening peak hours.

I wish to object on the following grounds:

2. The proposal to make the road one-way will effectively make residents prisoners in their own homes during evening commuting periods.
The total omission of proper speed restricting measures means that the road will become a racetrack from 4 pm as motorists try to avoid Dodder Park Road and make a quick get away up Lower Dodder. I will not be able to get my car out during these hours because of the aggression of these people. This is completely unacceptable to me, especially as I age and am slower to get in and out.
3. In your current proposal, there is no indication of traffic lights at the Rathfarnham bridge end of the road/ This an appalling oversight in the light of the increased traffic in the area as a result of BusConnects proposal to stop cars going into Terenure. How are we expected to exit our own street?
4. I also object to the proposal of no parking on Lower Dodder Road. Where are visitors, carers, tradespeople to park? Where is an ambulance to park? This is a totally ridiculous proposal and involves 'improving' the area for visitors at the expense of people who have lived our lives here for years. At the moment, the only hope we have of slowing speeding traffic down is to park outside our homes to try to halt their gallop.
5. This road should be made a high amenity, environmental road by stopping all traffic except local access.

Chief Executives Responses:

1. Noted.
2. Traffic Calming measures will be put in place to ensure speeds are kept at acceptable levels. Adjustment to the Dodder Park Drive/ Dodder Park Road junction layout will be considered to ease traffic flows.
3. The Council does not believe that there will be a significant worsening of traffic and queuing on Dodder Park Road. However, should this happen, it will be possible for the Council to review and amend traffic light signals to mitigate this issue in the future.
4. Informal parking exists along the street, in most instances this is not being impacted. Set down areas will also be provided with the scheme.
5. Following review of the scheme, segregation of pedestrians and cyclists should be provided.
6. An 'Access Only' sign cannot be provided as Dodder Road Lower is a public road with public access.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. Pedestrian and cycling segregation has been incorporated into the amended Part 8 layout following review of this submission, as per drawings 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1431, 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1432, and 18_123C-CSE-GEN-XX-DR-C-1433.

Submission No. SD-C184-91 – Cllr Lynn McCrave
To whom it may concern
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. I wish to support the proposals made in the submission by Dodder Road Lower Action Group. Their detailed suggestions merit full consideration and positive outcome as they have been developed thoughtfully and with due diligence by the residents who will be most impacted by the Greenway at this location. The proposals made by the residents group provide viable solutions to create a public amenity that everyone will be able to enjoy.
Kindest regards
Lynn Cllr. Lynn McCrave

Chief Executives Responses:

1. The submission of the Dodder Road Lower Residents Group is Noted and has been reviewed. A comprehensive response to the residents’ proposal has been provided within section 3.4 of this Report.

Chief Executives Recommendations:

1. No changes proposed following the review of this submission.

3.4 Summary of Low Trafficked Neighbourhood Proposal Submitted by Dodder Road Lower Residents Action Group and Response

Proposal Summary

During the Public Consultation period, a proposal was submitted by the Dodder Road Lower Residents Action Group setting out a design they envision for the area around Dodder Road Lower. The main items included in this proposal were the following:

- Maintain a two-way carriage way where vehicles can continue to pass.
- Introduce effective traffic calming measures to better enforce the existing 30km/h speed limit.
- Dodder Road Lower to be design as a cyclist priority road which will allow cyclists to share the carriageway with vehicles.

- Complete segregation of pedestrians and cyclists.
- The retention of the two-way carriageway.
- Retention of existing road width.
- Retention of legal on-street parking on the southern edge of the road.
- 'Access Only' signage to be placed on both ends Dodder Road Lower.
- Improvements to the residential amenities, such as landscaping and street furniture

Chief Executives Responses and Recommendations:

- This option was considered by SDCC at preliminary design (low trafficked neighbourhood)
- The key principle for a low trafficked neighbourhood to work is that there are sufficiently low traffic volumes and low vehicle speeds.
- At the preliminary design stage the Council carried out traffic counts that identified approximately 1,400 vehicle movements a day along this road. This number of movements may not ensure a sufficiently safe environment for cyclists as the number of movements are likely be too high to be acceptable. As such this option was not progressed.
- However, in considering the proposal submitted by the residents, a traffic calming intervention that retains a level of two-way vehicle movement along the road, but that significantly reduces vehicle speeds and actively discourages through vehicle with a subsequent reduction in vehicle movements could achieve an acceptably safe outcome for cyclists.
- Separate to any decision on this Part 8 planning application. The Council is prepared to trial a traffic calming design along the Dodder Lower Road that retains some level of two-way vehicle movement and as part of the trial will assess if that does result in a sufficiently safe environment for cyclists. That trial will be progressed separately to determination on this Part 8 planning application.

4. Chief Executive Recommendations

4.1 Recommendations

Following consideration of the submissions the Chief Executive is of the view that the issues raised by way of the submissions can be satisfactorily addressed as outlined in the foregoing report.

The report recommended the following:

1. Segregation of pedestrians and cyclists.
2. Additional improvements to the public realm such as seating, planting and finishes.