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**Introduction:**

The NTA have submitted a planning application to An Bord Pleanála for the **Lucan to City Centre Core Bus Corridor Scheme.**

**The documents submitted with this application include:**

**Proposed Design Drawings and supporting and statutory documentation including an:**

1. **Environmental Impact Assessment:**
2. **A Natura Impact Statement:**

In this report, SDCC will be making a formal submission to An Bord Pleanála as part of this consultation process.

The Proposed Scheme has an overall length of approximately 9.7km and commences at Junction 3 on the N4 Lucan Road / Lucan bypass. From the R136 Ballyowen Road junction with the R835 Lucan Road the Proposed Scheme will run east down the R835 Lucan Road to the roundabout serving the Lucan Retail Park and the N4 Lucan Road eastbound slip. The Proposed Scheme will continue via the N4 (passing the Liffey Valley Shopping Centre at Junction 2) as far as the M50 Junction 7 and then via the R148 along Palmerstown bypass, Chapelizod bypass, Con Colbert Road, St. John’s Road West, ending at Frank Sherwin Bridge, where it will join the prevailing traffic management regime on the South Quays.The route of the Proposed Scheme is presented in the Image below:

 

**Summary of SDCC Views on the Proposal:**

SDCC are broadly supportive of the proposal and are of the view that it aligns with the policies of the County Development Plan (2022 – 2028). The comments provided in this report are mainly focussed on the construction management controls and minor design details of the scheme. The vast majority of our concerns have been addressed through the extensive consultation process that has been conducted to date by the NTA with the various stakeholders in our Local Authority area.

The remaining aspects raised by the SDCC planning, Active Travel, Transport and Maintenance teams are:

1. SDCC continue to request that the proposed route be expanded westward to include Lucan Village.
2. The proposed scheme is broadly aligned with SDCC County Development Plan 2022-2028 policies and objectives in relation to sustainable movement within our county.
3. The SDCC Active Travel Team has raised some minor design details which we would like to be addressed if it is possible to do so.
4. The SDCC Maintenance Team requests that certain material selections are restricted where possible to aid future repairs and upkeep of the proposed infrastructure.
5. The required Construction Management and Traffic Management plans required for the continued safe and efficient operation of the roads network in the vicinity of the development.
6. SDCC would like an assurance that the delivery of this scheme will not negatively impact on timing of the delivery of the Lucan Luas extension.
7. Further discussion between NTA and SDCC on the exact parcels of land identified within the scheme is required to assist with the scheme

SDCC is supportive of the delivery of this project. This Bus Connects project represents a big step forward in the delivery of sustainable transport alternatives in the South Dublin Local Authority Area.

**SDCC Development Management Section Comments:**

The South Dublin County Development Plan 2022-2028 is generally in favour of the principle of the proposed scheme, with a supportive policy context as outlined below:

1. **South Dublin County Council County Development Plan 2022-2028 - Policy Context:**

**Policy SM1**:

*Promote ease of movement within, and access to South Dublin County, by integrating sustainable land-use planning with a high-quality sustainable transport and movement network for people and goods.*

**SM1 Objective 1:**

*To achieve and monitor a transition to more sustainable travel modes including walking, cycling and public transport over the lifetime of the County Development Plan, in line with the County mode share targets of 15% Walk; 10% Cycle; 20% Bus; 5% Rail; and 50% Private (Car / Van / HGV / Motorcycle).*

Policy SM3: Public Transport – General

*Promote a significant shift from car-based travel to public transport in line with County targets and facilitate the sustainable development of the County by supporting and guiding national agencies in delivering major improvements to the public transport network.*

**SM3 Objective 1:**

*To achieve and monitor a transition to the County mode share targets of 20% Bus and 5% Rail.*

* *A network of continuous bus priority and safe cycling facilities along 16 corridors;*
* *A redesigned more efficient bus network with high frequency spines, new orbital routes and increased bus services;*
* *More user-friendly and convenient ticketing and payment systems;*
* *Improved bus waiting facilities; and*
* *A transition to a low emissions bus fleet.*

*It is anticipated that a planning application for the radial core bus corridor infrastructure will be submitted by the NTA to An Bord Pleanála with construction expected to take place within the lifetime of the plan.*

**Policy SM3: Public Transport – Bus**

**SM3 Objective 11:**

*To facilitate the delivery of the BusConnects Core Bus Corridors and seek additional bus corridor and orbital routes to serve the County by securing and maintaining any required route reservations and to ensure the BusConnects Corridors do not adversely affect the village life and livelihoods of any of our County Villages.*

**SM3 Objective 12:**

*To work with the NTA to secure the expansion of the bus network, including distinct new bus networks as necessary, to serve new development and regeneration areas within the South Dublin County area including Tallaght, City Edge, Adamstown, Clonburris, Fortunestown, Ballycullen and Newcastle.*

**SM3 Objective 17:**

*To work with the NTA and other state agencies to facilitate the delivery of the Kennelsfort Road-R148 grade separated junction or an equivalent solution to maximise the efficacy of the BusConnects Project.*

**SM3 Objective 18:**

*To liaise with bus service providers where new bus stop infrastructure is proposed in order to ensure facilities such as shelters and bins are included, where appropriate.*

1. **Specific Comments in Relation to the Proposed Scheme:**

**Du**

**blin County Development Plan 2022-2028 Policy Context:**

1. The Lucan to City Centre service is welcomed as it will support more efficient and intensive use of brownfield serviced urban sites, sustainable and vibrant communities, as well as housing delivery.
2. The specific proposals provide a good balance between servicing existing communities while not seriously and adversely effecting residential amenities, given its routing along existing major roadways and the limited land-take identified.
3. The proposals are also delivering on the wider remit of smarter travel given proposed improvements to walking and cycling infrastructure, as well as a general amelioration in quality of the public realm. Issues such as tree loss and the loss in carriageway width dedicated to cars are decisively outweighed by improved sustainable transport opportunities, enhancement of the public realm and knock-on increase in the scope to accommodate higher-density development in the vicinity of this service/route.

**SDCC Active Travel Section Comments:**

Please note that on the attached GA drawing sheets there are notes (Yellow boxes) added and here is a summary of those notes in the Table below:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Comment Number** | **Sheet Number** | **Chainage** | **Location** | **Comment** |
| AT 01 | Sheet 01 | CH B 0 | Junction of westbound N4 off ramp and R136 | Same note re: left to go right across cycletrack |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| AT 02 | Sheet 01 | CH C 200 | General note re: two-way cycle tracks | For two-way cycle track, NCM recommends the lane going with the traffic is closest to the carriageway |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| AT 03 | Sheet 01 | CH B 50 | New ped/cyclist bridge | Why is S/B lane narrower than N/B? |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| AT 04 | Sheet 01 | CH B 50 | Junction of eastbound N4 off ramp and R136 | How does a cyclist at this location join the N/B or S/B cycle track? |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| AT 05 | Sheet 01 | CH B 150 | Along R136 | Could a planted verge / SUDS feature be used here? |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| AT 06 | Sheet 01 | CH B 250 | Junction of R136 and Lucan Road | Is a left to go right needed at this location? Would a straight through bypass/pass on left and a right turn ghost island be more appropriate. In current arrangement, right turning cyclist needs to cross N/B & S/B cyclists. Does approach for left to go right across traffic lanes need to be applied to crossing cycle tracks?Or better again, a widened S/B cycle track with no turning marks. |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| AT 07 | Sheet 01 | CH B 250 | General note re: two-way cycle tracks | For two-way cycle track, NCM recommends the lane going with the traffic is closest to the carriageway |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| AT 08 | Sheet 01 | CH B 250 | Junction of R136 and Lucan Road | As this is a signal controlled junction, can the bend in the cycle track crossing be removed. Is there a stop line on the island? Is this proposed as a two-stage crossing? There would appear to be limited stacking for cyclists on the island. |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| AT 09 | Sheet 01 |  | Hermitage Road (inset) | Junction radius should be tightened. |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| AT 10 | Sheet 01 | CH B 250 | Junction of R136 and Lucan Road (west side) | The crossing point for pedestrians is not on either desire line esp. to/from the south and will likely not be used. |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| AT 11 | Sheet 01 |  | Junction of Hermitage Road and R136 | For cyclists coming from Hermitage Road wanting to join the N/B two-way, is the design intent that the mount the ramp and join the shared area? Will this be intuitive to cyclists and drivers? Is road sufficiently narrowed to encourage turning cyclists to "hold the lane" and prevent drivers "squeezing past" cyclists waiting to turn? |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| AT 12 | Sheet 01 | CH B 150 | Junction of Hermitage Road and R136 | Should an additional protection island be installed at this locationDue to bend in road crossing, likely that cyclists headed for Hermitage Road will continue straight in layout shown. |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| AT 13 | Sheet 01 | CH B 150 | Junction of Hermitage Road and R136 | Is local widening needed at this location to allow all cycles to make 90deg corner? |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| AT 14 | Sheet 02 | CH C 268 | Junction of golf course road and roundabout | Same note re: cyclists turning off quiet street using ramp |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| AT 15 | Sheet 02 | CH C 268 | Junction of golf course road and roundabout | Should shared area/footpath be widened at this location as there is a high number of potential conflicts/movements. |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| AT 16 | Sheet 02 | CH C 268 | Junction of N4 on ramp and roundabout | Can a direct alignment be provided here to avoid an unnecessary 90 deg turn |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| AT 17 | Sheet 02 |  | Hermitage Road | Is existing width to be narrowed? Is the existing sufficiently narrow to work as a quiet street? |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| AT 18 | Sheet 02 | CH N 300 | Westbound N4 off ramp towards R136 | How will cyclists using the bus / cycle lane join the N/B & S/B cycle track? |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| AT 19 | Sheet 02 |  | Hermitage Road | Junction radii |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| AT 20 | Sheet 02 |  | Hermitage Road | Junction tightening |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| AT 21 | Sheet 03 | CH A 650 | N4 | Assume it is anticipated that cyclist numbers will be >>> pedestrian numbers along this section and there benefit of footpath as a buffer for the cycle track outweigh concerns about peds between traffic lane and cycle track. |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| AT 22 | Sheet 03 | CH A 650 | Bus stop on N4 westbound service road | Would an inline bus stop and bus stop bypass be a better solution at this location. |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| AT 23 | Sheet 03 | CH A 700 | Junction of westbound N4 service road and Ballyowen Lane | How does a cyclist get from the shared path to the cycle track? As design stands, cyclist needs to: leave ped priority zone, cross an side road; join a cycle track (possibly by joining the side road and then joining the main road); leave a cycle track after c. 10 m; cross a bus stop and join a cycle track. Within approx 80 m. |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| AT 24 | Sheet 03 |  | Hermitage Park | What width is this shared path? |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| AT 25 | Sheet 04 | Ch A 1000 | Entrance to east of pedestrian overbridge | Why are there stop lines on the cycle track at a private entrance? |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| AT 26 | Sheet 04 | Ch A 1000 | Sureweld entrance | Is the table width < the cycle track width? Why are there stop lines on the cycle track at a private entrance? |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| AT 27 | Sheet 04 | Ch A 1110 | Bus stop on westbound N4 | What width is this shared use path which includes 2 no. bus shelters? |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| AT 28 | Sheet 04 | CH A 1150 | N4 to Saint Loman's Hospital junction | Do turning vehicles have priority over straight ahead cyclists? |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| AT 29 | Sheet 05 | CH E 250 | Eastbound N4 off ramp to Liffey Valley | Where is it anticipated people who use this bus stop will come from/to? Is the footpath between cycle track and bus lanes still preferred at this location? |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| AT 30 | Sheet 05 | CG A 1400 | Existing shared path converted to cycletrack | How will this be done in practice? |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| AT 31 | Sheet 06 | CH F 50 | N4 Liffey Valley roundabout | Are these new or existing trees? Could the cycle track approach to the crossing be reconfigured to remove the 90 deg turn? |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| AT 32 | Sheet 06 | CH F 50 | N4 Liffey Valley roundabout | Footpath could be reconfigured to reduce area of shared space. |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| AT 33 | Sheet 07 | CH G 300 | Old Lucan Road at the Deadmans etc. | How will parking/set-down on footpath and cycle track be prevented (see street-view satellite)? |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| AT 34 | Sheet 07 | CH G 250 | Old Lucan Road at the Deadmans etc. | Can entrance width be narrowed to align with existing pillars? |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| AT 35 | Sheet 08 | CH I 100 | N4 at existing ped overbridge | Can a direct link between cycle tracks to be provided for cyclists using bridge and Old Lucan Road. Significant detour as shown |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| AT 36 | Sheet 08 | CH A 2200 | N4 new over bridge | Are cyclists permitted on this bridge? Is 3.0m wide enough if so? |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| AT 37 | Sheet 09 | CH I 350 | Existing cycle track to cross M50 | Does cycle track narrow along this section? Should existing be widened? |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| AT 38 | Sheet 11 | CH I 750 | Existing cycle track to cross M50 | Is cycle track wide enough? |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| AT 39 | Sheet 12 | CH J 300 | Old Lucan Road and Hollyville Lawn | Can radius be tightened? If stop line is at road edge, who has priority? |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| AT 40 | Sheet 13 | CH J 600 | Old Lucan Road | Cycle track white line should break at crossing. |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| AT 41 | Sheet 14 | CH K 0 | Junction of Old Lucan Road and Kennelsfort Road Lwr | See previous note re: left to go right |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| AT 42 | Sheet 14 | CH K 150 | Junction of Old Lucan Road and Mill Lane | Significant sweep from kerb end to entrance. |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| AT 43 | Sheet 15 | CH K 275 | Old Lucan Road to The Oval | If this footpath is to serve as a shared path to link The Oval to the two way, it needs to be significantly wider. Could the western footpath be removed and the traffic lanes shifted west? Or the path widened into the green area.Can right left and straight ahead be from a single lane? |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| AT 44 | Sheet 15 | CH L 50 | Cycle track at end of Old Lucan Road | Is this an operating entrance? Can it be removed / the footpath continue through? |

**SDCC Traffic and Transportation Section Comments:**

**Section 1: N4 Junction 3 to M50 Junction 7 – N4 Lucan Road**

The traffic Section request that the proposed scheme be extended westwards to include Lucan Village.

The traffic section supports the reinstatement of a right turn onto the western slip road onto the N4. This move has been justified by the modelling results which show significant demand for this vehicular movement.

SDCC support the removal of the left slip lanes at the junction of the R136 Ballyowen Road with the R835 Lucan Road.

SDCC welcomes the movement of the Bus Stops on the N4 near Liffey Valley Shopping centre some 150m further west, increasing the length of the bus laybys and segregating them from the adjacent N4 Lucan Road carriageway. This increases the distance from the proposed bus stops and the merging and diverging lane vehicular movements that occur near the Red Cow Interchange.

Extra weaving distance will be provided both eastbound and westbound on the western side of the Red Cow interchange. This will improve an existing problem which currently exists at this location.

SDCC welcomes new pedestrian only bridge is proposed adjacent to the new bus stop locations, some 200m further west from the existing foot / cycle bridge, which will be retained.

SDCC support the proposal for a segregated two-way cycle track on the northern side of the N4 between the entrance to the Hermitage Golf Club and Junction 2 of the N4.

This proposal requires land acquisition and appropriate mitigation measures for tree loss.

**Section 2: M50 Junction 7 to R148 Con Colbert Road – R148 Palmerstown bypass and Chapelizod bypass:**

SDCC supports the upgrade of the following junctions to provide bus priority and enhanced pedestrian and cyclist facilities and the following carriageway improvements to support Bus priority:

 • R148 Palmerstown bypass / Kennelsfort Road;

• Old Lucan Road / Kennelsfort Road Lower; and

• R148 Palmerstown bypass / The Oval.

Between the M50 junction and Kennelsfort Road junction, it is proposed to provide a continuous bus lane and two general traffic lanes in the eastbound direction.

In the westbound direction, a bus lane and two general traffic lanes are proposed, with the lane designation amended to separate earlier the general traffic heading toward the M50 and the N4 Lucan Road westbound. This arrangement will allow for a continuous westbound bus lane from the Kennelsfort Road junction and through the M50 interchange.

SDCC supports the removal of the left turning slip lanes and the removal of the left turn out of Kennelsfort road onto the R148 bypass to facilitate pedestrian and cycle movements and safer Bus stop operations at this location.

The required Construction Management and Traffic Management plans required for the continued safe and efficient operation of the roads network in the vicinity of the development.

SDCC would like an assurance that the delivery of this scheme will not negatively impact on timing of the delivery of the Lucan Luas extension.

Further discussion between NTA and SDCC on the exact parcels of land identified within the scheme is required to assist with the scheme

The Traffic and Transport Section of SDCC are supportive of this planning application. The proposals support the GDA Transport Strategy and many of the sustainable movement policies in our new County Development Plan. These proposals also support policies and help us move towards our targets set out in our Climate Action Plans.

**Construction Management Plans:**

The proposed Bus corridor route runs along one of SDCC’s very busy road networks. The location is follows (N4) National Road and crosses the (M50) motorway. It is important that the timing of this work does not clash with any other planned construction works.

The TII will be anxious that any construction plans ensure the continued safe and efficient operation of the N4 and M50 road network. SDCC also want to ensure that the surrounding road network is kept as free flowing as is practicable during the construction works.

Therefore, it is important that for each phase of the development in our Local Authority area, detailed Construction traffic management plans are agreed prior to commencement of that phase of work.

The Construction Traffic shall be managed in accordance and contain the elements listed below:

Construction traffic arising from the site shall be managed in accordance with a method statement for the management of the construction phase in accordance with an agreed site-specific Construction Traffic Management Plan that fully accords with requirements of the Council's Traffic Section.

In this regard within a maximum of two weeks from the date of any Commencement Notice within the meaning of Part II of the Building Control Regulations 1997 and prior to the commencement of works on site the applicant, owner or developer shall lodge with the Planning Authority:

(i) A site-specific Construction Traffic Management Plan that accords with the Council's Traffic Section requirements, and;

(ii) The written confirmation of the Council's Traffic Section of their agreement to the Construction Traffic Management Plan, and;

(iii) A written commitment from the developer to carry out the development in accordance with this Construction Traffic Management Plan, and;

(iv) These requirements have been acknowledged in writing as acceptable by the Planning Authority.

The required Construction Traffic Management Plan shall include:-

(i) Details of the agreed number, location and use of suitable facilities for vehicle cleansing and wheel washing provided on site prior to commencing of construction and a written commitment that such facilities will be maintained in a satisfactorily operational condition during all periods of construction, and;

(ii) Location of all on-site car parking facilities provided for site workers during the course of all construction activity, and;

(iii) Provision for dust suppression measures in periods of extended dry weather, and;

(iv) Provision for the flexible use of a road sweeper if an acute situation on the adjoining public road requires it, and;

(v) Location of materials compound and site huts, and;

(vi) Details of security fencing, and;

(vii) Name and contact details for site manager, and;

(viii) Methodology for the use and control of spoil on site during construction, and;

(ix)  Details of access arrangements/routes to be used by construction traffic, to include details of arrangements to manage potential conflicts with site specific issues i.e. schools, playing pitches etc.

(x)  Measures to obviate queuing of construction traffic on the adjoining road network.   In this regard the applicant owner or developer shall consult with the Council's Traffic Section before any works are carried out, and;

(xi)  Details of measures to protect watercourses on or adjoining the site from the spillage of deposit of clay, rubble or other debris,

(xii) Alternative arrangements to be put in place for pedestrians and vehicles in the case of the closure of any public road or public footpath during the course of site development works;

The plan should also be informed by any Project Construction Waste and Demolition Management Plan required to be prepared and agreed that addresses intended construction waste management and any traffic issues that may arise from such a plan.

A record of daily checks that the works are being undertaken in accordance with the site- specific Construction Traffic Management Plan shall be kept for inspection by the Planning Authority.

Storage of construction materials is not permitted on any public road or footpath, unless agreed in writing with the Planning Authority, having regard to the prior reasonable justification and circumstances of any such storage.

**Timing of the Delivery of Lucan Luas:**

SDCC are concerned to ensure that this development does not impinge on the delivery of the proposed Lucan Luas extension. It is our understanding that the delivery of this Bus connects corridor will be supported by the delivery of the Lucan Luas extension. SDCC hope that the delivery of this Bus Scheme will not delay the delivery of the proposed Luas project.

**SDCC Roads Maintenance Section Comments:**

1. **The Use of Integrated Drainage Kerbs:**

The Council would like to request that no kerb integrated drainage is included in the scheme. This is because they are difficult to jet to keep clean and they are prone to cracking and are difficult to replace at isolated sections. This should be secured by planning condition.

1. **The Use of Coloured Bound Surfaces for Cycle Tracks and Shared Surfaces:**

Coloured bound surfacing is increasingly hard to procure in small quantities for maintenance repairs. Therefore, we respectively ask that these products are not used or used sparingly throughout the design. This should be secured by planning condition.

**SDCC Economic Development Section Comments:**

**SDCC Economic Development section comments:**

The Council has received the NTA’s proposed CPO land pack. This section is in favour of the project and will assist with any relevant land agreements and access permissions in relation to this scheme, however, further detailed discussion on the plots of land identified for inclusion in the scheme is required to assist with this.

The Council has provided comment below on each plot where the Council has been notified as potential interested party.

1020(1).1f & 1020(2).2f

The land is zoned Open Space in SDCC County Development Plan (2022 – 2028). Any loss of open space, green and blue infrastructure would have to be suitably mitigated.

The area is roadside verge and includes trees & shrubs.

The land has not been taken in-charge by the Council.

The land is registered to SDCC on Folio 73373F

1019(1).1c & 1019(2).2c

The land (outside of the public road and footpath) is zoned for Residential in SDCC County Development Plan (2022 – 2028).

The lands are registered to private parties. The path & private lands within the curtilage of the adjoining service station, the path is in-charge of the Council.

1018(1).1f

The land is zoned Open Space in SDCC County Development Plan (2022 – 2028). Any loss of open space, green and blue infrastructure would have to be suitably mitigated.

This is an area of grassed land with existing tree planting between the rear of Palmerstown Village & The Lucan Road

There is also an existing Architectural Conservation Area ‘Red Row Cottages’ immediately to the north of the site and so any changes to the use and layout and development of this site would need to respect this architectural feature.

Footpath at the eastern end of the plot is in-charge, the remainder is in maintenance of Public Realm

The land is registered to SDCC on Folio 73373F

The map provided has excluded the water feature at the northern boundary of the site which will remain in the ownership of The Council.

There are surface water services located within site that will need to be retained, re-provided.

1017(1).1f / 1017(2).1f / 1017(3).2f & 1017(4)2f

The land is zoned Open Space in SDCC County Development Plan (2022 – 2028). The plans propose the loss of existing open space and planting. There is existing water & possibly surface water services located within site.

Any loss of open space, green and blue infrastructure would have to be suitably mitigated.

The area is existing road, grassed area and is land that is part under an existing footbridge over the N4.

Road to the front of properties on Kennelsfort Road Upper is in-charge

All plots are registered to SDCC on Folios 73373F & 64825F.

1015(1).1c & 1015(2).2c

The land is zoned as Village Centre in SDCC County Development Plan (2022 – 2028).

Front garden / access to 22 Kennelsfort Road Upper

1015(1).1c registered to SDCC on Folio 152666F & leased (Licenced) back to occupier / 1015(2).2c is private ownership.

It should be noted that in 2020 planning permission was granted on this site (SDCC case number SD19A/0218) for a new 53-bedroom hotel that would replace the existing 29-bedroom guesthouse.

1014(1).1c & 1014(2).2c

The lands are zoned as Major Retail Centre in in SDCC County Development Plan (2022 – 2028).

The lands adjacent to Liffey Valley Office Complex / lands within Liffey Valley Shopping Centre & private roads within Liffey Valley Shopping Centre

A small sliver on the northern side was included in Plot 121.c of The M50 Upgrade Scheme. However, this does not appear to have been incorporated into the Road Scheme and is not recorded as being in-charge. The transfer of title to Plot 121.c has never been finalised, this will most likely involve a revision of the acquisition boundary.

None of these lands are recorded as in-charge & none can be considered to be in the ownership of The Council.

1013(1).1f

The land is zoned Open Space in SDCC County Development Plan (2022 – 2028).

Grassed are adjacent to the entrance to The Hermitage Medical Centre and adjacent to SDCC operational Salt Barn & Depot. In Q4 2022 the Council approved a new Part 8 planning application for the Salt Barn and Depot within the land owned by the Council and more information can be found at the following link [Proposed Development of Additional Salt Barn, New Mechanical Services Depot and 2no. New Diesel Pumps with Associated Underground Fuel Storage Tanks at the Existing Palmerstown Depot, Adjoining The Deadman's Inn, Old Lucan Road, Dublin 20. | South Dublin County Council's Online Consultation Portal (sdublincoco.ie)](https://consult.sdublincoco.ie/en/consultation/proposed-development-additional-salt-barn-new-mechanical-services-depot-and-2no-new-diesel-pumps)

The lands are unregistered lands which are not in The Council ownership nor shown to be in-charge.

This roundabout was not constructed as part of the N4 Upgrade, this roundabout (and adjoining lands) was constructed as part of the permission relating to the development of The Medical Centre. Title will most likely reside with both Marese Limited or The Hermitage Medical Centre, and Barkhill Limited or Dietacaron Limited.

1012(1).1f

Lands at the junction of The Lucan Road and The Ballyowen Road.

Plot is registered to The Council on Folio 55464F and to Luttrelstown Castle Unlimited Company on Folio 226383F.

A small portion of the site on eastern end is recorded as being in-charge

There appears to be both water & foul services within the site, public lighting & associated pillars traffic cameras & associated pillars, traffic signs and a name stone for Lucan Village. The bicycle storage facility is excluded. More information should be provided to set out any potential impact on the design or the operation of these services utilities both during construction and longer term.

This plot is also listed on Part IV of the Schedule. This Schedule relates to the acquisition of “Private Rights” effecting the lands. The lands in the ownership of Luttrelstown are heavily Burdened by Rights of Way and this may be a way of nullifying these Rights of Way. The Council lands are unaffected by These Burdens and yet are included in The Schedule.

Clarification is required in relation to the effect of the NTA acquiring “Private Rights” on the services located within the Council lands.

Drawing 1012 DEV shows the Council owned lands hatched red, in the context of the overall plot & the taken-in-charge details.

1010(1).1i & 1010(2)2i

The land is zoned High Amenity – Liffey Valley and has an objective to protect and preserve significant views in SDCC’s adopted County Development Plan (2022 – 2028).

The lands are private and are adjacent to The N4, with a small access recess shown to be in-charge.

1009(1).1c & 1009(2).2c

The land is zoned High Amenity – Liffey Valley and has a Protected structure on the sute (Former Tram Depot & Power Station) in SDCC’s adopted County Development Plan (2022 – 2028). The impact on both development plan objectives would need to be assessed and mitigated.

The lands are private, they are adjacent to The N4 and are not in-charge

SDCC are included as there is an outstanding historical disposal to the occupier and the Council are still shown to have registered title.

1008(1).1f 1008(2)2f & 1008(3).2f

This is a Public Park called Hermitage Park and the land is zoned Open Space in SDCC County Development Plan (2022 – 2028).

Foul sewer located within the plot that would need to be protected.

Most of the land is registered to The Council on Folios 1269F & 1033F. There is a small sliver abutting The Hermitage Road which is not in charge and is still registered to Lark Developments Ltd. However, it is the Council’s understanding that Lark Developments are since Dissolved.

1007(1).1f & 1007(2).2f

The land is zoned High Amenity – Liffey Valley in SDCC’s adopted County Development Plan (2022 – 2028). There is a significant amount of planting and mature trees within this area and suitable mitigation will be required to protect / re-provide appropriate Green and Blue infrastructure.

The lands are privately owned adjacent to the N4 are not in charge of the Council and are not owned by the Council.

1006(1).1f & 1006(2).2f

The land is zoned High Amenity – Liffey Valley in SDCC’s adopted County Development Plan (2022 – 2028). This is part of the entrance to The Hermitage Golf Course.

The lands are not in-charge.

Registered to the Council on Folio 190958F & Trustees of The Club on Folio 192027F.

1006(1).1f is also listed on Part IV of the Schedule, this relates to “Private Rights” to be acquired in respect of this plot. This plot is inside the boundary wall at the pedestrian access / gate.

1005(1).1a

The land is zoned High Amenity – Liffey Valley in SDCC’s adopted County Development Plan (2022 – 2028). This is part of the entrance to The Hermitage Golf Course.

The lands are not in-charge.

Constructed as part of the accommodation works for the N4 Upgrade Scheme and registered to The Council on Folio 190958F

1005(1).1f is also listed on Part IV of the Schedule, this relates to “Private Rights” to be acquired in respect of this plot.

**END OF PRELIMINARY LAND ASSESSMENT REPORT**.

**Summary of SDCC Views on the Proposal:**

SDCC are broadly happy with the planning proposal and are of the view that the proposal aligns with the policies of the County Development Plan (2022 – 2028). The comments provided in this report are mainly focussed on the construction management controls and minor design details of the scheme. The vast majority of our concerns have been addressed through the extensive consultation process that has been conducted to date by the NTA with the various stakeholders in our Local Authority area.

The main aspects raised by the SDCC Planning, Traffic, Active Travel and Maintenance teams are:

1. SDCC continue to request that the proposed route be expanded westward to include Lucan Village.
2. The proposed scheme is aligned with all SDCC County Development Plan 2022-2028 policies and objectives in relation to sustainable movement within our county.
3. The SDCC Active Travel Team has raised some minor design details which we would like to be addressed if it is possible to do so.
4. The SDCC Maintenance Team requests that certain material selections are restricted where possible to aid future repairs and upkeep of the proposed infrastructure.
5. The required Construction Management and Traffic Management plans required for the continued safe and efficient operation of the roads network in the vicinity of the development.
6. SDCC would like an assurance that the delivery of this scheme will not negatively impact on timing of the delivery of the Lucan Luas extension.
7. Further discussion between NTA and SDCC on the exact parcels of land identified within the scheme is required to assist with the scheme

SDCC is supportive of the delivery of this project. This Bus Connects project represents a big step forward in the delivery of sustainable transport alternatives in the South Dublin Local Authority Area.