



An
Bord
Pleanála

Record of 9th Meeting ABP-310268-21

| | | | |
|--|---|-------------------|------------|
| Case Reference / Description | Development of port lands on Poolbeg Peninsula, construction of a Southern Port Access Route comprising of a new bridge across the river Liffey | | |
| Case Type | Pre-application consultation | | |
| 1st / 2nd / 3rd etc. Meeting | 9 th | | |
| Date | 25/03/24 | Start Time | 11:00 a.m. |
| Location | Virtually | End Time | 11:35 a.m. |

| | | |
|--|----------------------|------------|
| Representing An Bord Pleanála | | |
| Ciara Kellett, Director of Planning (Chair) | | |
| Pauline Fitzpatrick, Senior Planning Inspector | | |
| Eimear Reilly, Executive Officer | e.reilly@pleanala.ie | 01-8737184 |
| Representing the Prospective Applicant | | |
| Barry O'Connell, Chief Executive, Dublin Port Company | | |
| Brendan Considine, Capital Programme Director, Dublin Port Company | | |
| Cormac Kennedy, Head of Property, Dublin Port Company | | |
| Garett Fennell, Project Manager, Fennell Public Affairs | | |
| Alan Barr, EIA Coordinator, RPS | | |
| Helena Gavin, Planning Manager, RPS | | |

Introduction

The Board's representatives referred to the previous meeting with the applicant, which was held on 7th December 2023, and to the record of this meeting. The Board enquired as to whether the prospective applicant had any comments to make on the record of this meeting. The prospective applicant replied that it did not.

Presentation made by the prospective applicant:

The prospective applicant began its presentation by outlining a revised general arrangement for the proposed development. It shared a drawing of the arrangement and highlighted the changes made in relation to Area L stating that the area did not previously form part of the original plans for the proposed development. It referred to the Dublin Port Masterplan 2040, noting that Area L was stated to support a range of bulk commodities with low growth potential and a future life that is likely to be shorter than the duration of the Masterplan. The Masterplan states that Dublin Port had intended to consider any opportunities that may arise to redevelop Area L for more intensive cargo handling activities.

The prospective applicant explained that while Area L was originally part of the South Port, with plans to develop this post-2030, it has changed this plan since the previous meeting. It explained that while Area O was originally designated for Lo-Lo, it has chosen to alter this plan so that Area L will now facilitate Lo-Lo instead. It explained that its decision to do so is in response to feedback arising from public consultation.

It proposes to leave Ecocem in situ at Area L while the remainder of Area L is proposed to be developed for Lo-Lo. It noted that Area L can accommodate the same Lo-Lo capacity as Area O as the height of the Lo-Lo stacks can be increased at Area L. It also clarified that Area L would operate in tandem with Area N and that Area O would be used for unaccompanied, single height, Ro-Ro freight trailers. Further to this, it noted that the change of location from Area O to Area L also resolved issues regarding restrictions to activity at Area O at night.

It stated that Area K would remain as a Ro-Ro unaccompanied freight trailer terminal and the two Ro-Ro ramps at area K would support both Area K and Area O. It also stated that the additional Ro-Ro capacity at Area O would partially compensate for the permanent loss of Ro-Ro capacity at the North Port.

The prospective applicant outlined other minor changes to the proposed general arrangement, stating that it proposes to combine the port park and wildflower meadow area surrounding Area O as one single entity. This, combined with the coastal park south of Area O, equates to approximately 5.2 hectares. It also noted that the move allowed for better opportunities for biodiversity gain through integrating the wildflower meadow with the port park. It stated that the Poolbeg West SDZ requires port park to be 1.9 hectares and that this change provides for approximately 5.2 hectares.

In relation to this, it also noted that it has had discussions with Dublin City Council regarding its proposed District Heating Scheme. Its repositioning to the east side of Area O is the preferred location for Dublin City Council.

It stated that the areas shown in purple on the general arrangement drawing are the site for the Codling Wind Park substation and the District Heating Scheme and it was clarified that neither project is included as part of the proposed development.

The prospective applicant stated that all changes to the general arrangement will be outlined in the EIAR in detail in the Alternatives chapter and that all ecological surveys will be updated prior to submission of any planning application.

Discussion:

The following matters were discussed:

- The Board's representatives sought clarity regarding the initial use of Area O as a site compound before being used for Ro-Ro. In response, the prospective applicant clarified the sequence of the general arrangement and confirmed that it proposes to use Area O as a site compound at first along with various other operators such as Codling Wind Park, ESB, and Uisce Éireann who require use of part of the land at Area O. It stated that it has

been in contact with the various operators and has compiled a plan for use of the area for the next few years in response to their needs.

- The Board's representatives sought clarity as to whether Area O would be subdivided into construction compounds for specific operators. The prospective applicant replied that its use as a construction compound and its ultimate use for Ro-Ro trailers would be identified within the application.
- The Board's representatives requested that the prospective applicant submit a red line boundary for the proposed development prior to or along with any subsequent request to close the pre-application consultation process and emphasised the importance of this. The prospective applicant agreed to provide this but stated that the final red line boundary might be altered slightly before the application is submitted. The Board's representatives emphasised the importance of submitting a red line boundary that is as close to the final version as possible.
- When asked by the Board's representatives, the prospective applicant confirmed that it has consulted with Irish Rail since the last meeting about the development of the freight yard at the North Port and has indicated its support for the proposed development.
- When asked by the Board's representatives, the prospective applicant confirmed that it has consulted with Dublin City Council since the last meeting in order to outline the recent changes to the general arrangement for the proposed development. It stated that the changes were received positively by the local authority. Further to this, the Board's representatives asked if Dublin City Council had made the applicant aware of the proposed works to the Tom Clarke Bridge/Point Bridge, to which the prospective applicant had confirmed that it had been made aware and has had various consultations with the local authority in relation to proposed pedestrian links from the south docks to the north docks.
- The prospective applicant indicated that the instant meeting would likely be the final meeting in relation to the proposed development and sought clarity

on some procedural matters. In response to these procedural questions the Board's representatives advised that, in the event of receiving notice from the Board that the proposed development would likely constitute strategic infrastructure development, the prospective applicant may submit a draft newspaper notice to the Board's SIDs/LAPs section via email to review before the notice is published of any subsequent planning application. The Board's representatives also advised that that the Board's SIDs/LAPs section be consulted by phone or email regarding any further procedural queries that the prospective applicant may have.

- When asked, the Board's representatives advised that, following receipt of a formal closure request, the Inspector's report and recommendation will be discharged to the Board for decision as soon as is practicable.
- The prospective applicant stated its intention to submit a formal closure request soon, and its intention to submit the planning application in July 2024.

Conclusion:

The Board's representatives advised that the onus is on the prospective applicant to either request a further meeting or formal closure of the instant pre-application consultation process. The Board's representatives advised that the record of the instant meeting will issue in the meantime and the prospective applicant can submit any comments it may have in writing or alternatively bring any comments for discussion at the time of any further meeting.

 10/4/24

Ciara Kellett

~~Assistant~~ Director of Planning