

Comhairle Contae  
Fhine Gall  
Fingal County  
Council



# FINGAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN 2023-2029

**REPORT ON  
SUBMISSIONS TO DRAFT  
MINISTERIAL DIRECTION  
ON THE FINGAL  
DEVELOPMENT PLAN**



# **Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029**

## **Chief Executive's Report on Draft Ministerial Direction Public Consultation**

**30<sup>th</sup> May 2023**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
Draft Ministerial Direction on the Fingal Development Plan .....	1
Details of the Draft Ministerial Direction .....	1
Overview of Submissions / Observations Received .....	3
Format of this Chief Executive's Report .....	3
Next Steps .....	4
<b>Draft Direction Item 2(a)(i).....</b>	<b>6</b>
1. Summary of Views of any Person who made Submissions or Observations .....	6
2. Summary of Views of, and Recommendations made by the Elected Members .....	12
3. Recommendations in relation to the Best Manner in which to Give Effect to Draft Direction item 2(a)(i) .....	14
<b>Draft Direction Item 2(a)(ii).....</b>	<b>15</b>
1. Summary of Views of any Person who made Submissions or Observations .....	15
2. Summary of Views of, and Recommendations made by the Elected Members .....	18
3. Recommendations in relation to the Best Manner in which to Give Effect to Draft Direction Item 2(a)(ii) .....	18
<b>Draft Direction Item 2(a)(iii).....</b>	<b>19</b>
1. Summary of Views of any Person who made Submissions or Observations .....	19
2. Summary of Views of, and Recommendations made by the Elected Members .....	22
3. Recommendations in relation to the Best Manner in which to Give Effect to Draft Direction Item 2(a)(iii) .....	22
<b>Draft Direction Item 2(a)(iv).....</b>	<b>23</b>
1. Summary of Views of any Person who made Submissions or Observations .....	23
2. Summary of Views of, and Recommendations made by the Elected Members .....	27
3. Recommendations in relation to the Best Manner in which to Give Effect to Draft Direction Item 2(a)(iv) .....	27
<b>Draft Direction Item 2(b) .....</b>	<b>29</b>
1. Summary of Views of any Person who made Submissions or Observations .....	29
2. Summary of Views of, and Recommendations made by the Elected Members .....	29
3. Recommendations in relation to the Best Manner in which to Give Effect to Draft Direction Item 2(b) .....	29
<b>Draft Direction Item 2(c) .....</b>	<b>31</b>
1. Summary of Views of any Person who made Submissions or Observations .....	31
2. Summary of Views of, and Recommendations made by the Elected Members .....	37
3. Recommendations in relation to the Best Manner in which to Give Effect to Draft Direction Item 2(c).....	40
<b>Full List of Submissions / Observations Received.....</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>Appendix – Copy of Draft Ministerial Direction .....</b>	<b>50</b>

# PART 1

## Introduction

### Draft Ministerial Direction on the Fingal Development Plan

The Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029 was adopted by Elected Members on Wednesday 22nd February 2023, following the consideration of the material alterations in the context of Stage 3 of the plan process at a number of Special Council Meetings. The Development Plan came into effect on Wednesday 5th April 2023.

On 4th April 2023, the Minister of State at the Department of the Housing, Local Government and Heritage, consequent to a recommendation made to him by the Office of the Planning Regulator under section 31AM(8) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended), notified Fingal County Council of his intention to issue a Direction (a draft of which was included in the notice) to Fingal County Council to take certain measures specified in the notice in order to ensure that the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029 is in compliance with the requirements of the Act.

As per section 31(7) of the Act, the Planning Authority published a notice which set out the reasons for the draft direction and stated that a copy of the draft direction was published on public display and could be inspected for a period of 2 weeks from 18th April to 2nd May 2023 at Fingal County Council Offices in Swords, in the Civic Offices in Blanchardstown and also online.

Submissions or observations in respect of the Draft Direction could be made to the Council between 18th April and 2nd May 2023 online via the Council's Public Consultation Portal or in writing to the Development Plan Team at Fingal County Council.

### Details of the Draft Ministerial Direction

The Draft Ministerial Direction included a total of six different steps to be taken with regard to the Development Plan which can be identified as Items 2(a)(i), 2(a)(ii), 2(a)(iii), 2(a)(iv), 2(b) and 2(c). The text of each of these items as set out in the Draft Ministerial Direction is as follows:

- *2(a) Delete the following zoning objectives from the adopted Plan i.e. the subject land is unzoned:*
  - *(i) Land zoned General Employment in the adopted Plan to the east of Junction 2 on the M2 at St Margaret's which was zoned Greenbelt in the Fingal County Development Plan 2017-2023*
  - *(ii) Land zoned Food Park in the adopted Plan south of Coolquay village.*
  - *(iii) Land zoned Rural Business in the adopted Plan to the south of Coolquay village.*
  - *(iv) Land zoned General Employment in the adopted Plan to the south east of Junction 5 on the M1 at Hedgestown, Courtlough which was zoned Rural in the Fingal County Development Plan 2017-2023.*
- *2(b) Reinstate the Greenbelt zoning objective for lands PA SH 12.4 Newtown i.e. the subject lands revert to Greenbelt from General Employment consistent with the recommendation of the chief executive's report dated 15th January 2023.*
- *2 (c) Delete the amended and additional text inserted under PA CH 8.1 as modified, consistent with the recommendation of the chief executive's report dated 15th January 2023.*

# PART 1

The Statement of Reasons which formed part of the Draft Direction in included the following reasons for requested amendments to the Development Plan:

- I. *The Development Plan as made includes significant land zoned for General Employment, Rural Business, and Food Park outside of the Dublin City and suburbs boundary or any settlement boundary and at locations remote from high quality public transport and outside the designated strategic employment development areas identified in the RSES for the Dublin Metropolitan Area inconsistent with the National Strategic Outcomes for compact growth, sustainable mobility and transition to a low carbon and climate resilient society, NPO 62 to strengthen the value greenbelts and green spaces at a regional and city scale, as well as the sequential approach and planning for future development in a manner that facilitates sustainable transport patterns consistent with the Greater Dublin Area Transport Strategy 2022 - 2042 (Measure PLAN 4), Regional Policy Objectives 5.3, 5.6, and 8.4 in the RSES.*
- II. *The Development Plan as made includes land zoned for General Employment to the east of the M2 at Junction 2 at St Margaret's in close proximity to a Junction of the M2 national road network inconsistent with the Greater Dublin Area Transport Strategy 2022 - 2042 (Measure ROAD 2), and Regional Policy Objectives 8.3 and 8.4, and where the planning authority has not demonstrated that the rezoning satisfies the criteria in Section 2.7 of the Spatial Planning and National Roads Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2012) regarding development at national road interchanges or junctions.*
- III. *The Development Plan does not include a strategy for employment development to inform the zoning of further land for employment purposes at Junction 2 of the M2 at St Margaret's, lands located south of Coolquay village, lands south east of Junction 5 on the M1 at Courtlough south of Balbriggan, and lands at Newtown St Margaret's which fails to have regard to the Ministerial Guidelines issued under Section 28 of the Act, specifically the requirement that the evidence and rationale underpinning the zoning of land for employment purposes must be clear and strategic in nature under Section 6.2.5 (zoning for employment uses) in the Development Plans, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2022).*
- IV. *The Development Plan as made includes provisions that recognise the inadequacy of the proposed noise insulation scheme to protect the health of those affected by aircraft noise and that it is an objective to take measures including the expansion of noise insulation to ensure noise levels produced by aircraft during night time are reduced to below 40 dB Lnight, which matters are subject to a separate statutory code which includes the designation of a separate action planning authority, the Aircraft Noise Competent Authority, and the preparation of a Noise Action Plan. The inclusion of matters which should be determined through the appropriate statutory process, including the Noise Action Plan, is therefore inconsistent with NPO 65.*
- V. *No adequate reasons nor explanations relating to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area have been provided to explain why lands have been zoned in such a way and how this approach (involving a failure to demonstrate a strategic rationale to underpin the zoning of further land for employment purposes zoned lands and to a failure to have regard to the Development Plan Guidelines and to satisfy the criteria for development at national road interchanges or junctions) is consistent with an overall strategy for the proper and sustainable development of the area.*



# PART 1

- VI. *The Development Plan has not been made in a manner consistent with, and has failed to implement, the recommendations of the Office of the Planning Regulator under Section 31AM of the Act.*
- VII. *In light of the matters set out at I-VI above, the Minister is of the opinion that the Development Plan as made fails to set out an overall strategy for the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.*
- VIII. *In light of the matters set out at I to VI, above, the Development Plan is not in compliance with the requirements of the Act.*

For ease of reference, a copy of the Draft Ministerial Direction is provided as an appendix to this report.

## Overview of Submissions / Observations Received

A total of 172 submissions or observations were received in relation to the Draft Direction as described above.

Of these, 167 were received from members of the public, interested parties or public bodies and 5 were received from Elected Members of Fingal County Council.

No submission or observation was received from the Eastern and Midlands Regional Authority (EMRA) in relation to the Draft Direction.

In terms of the breakdown of submissions / observations by Draft Direction Item:

- 6 related to Item 2(a)(i) (Lands zoned GE east of Junction 2 on M2 at St. Margaret's);
- 3 related to Item 2(a)(ii) (Lands zoned FP south of Coolquay village);
- 2 related to Item 2(a)(iii) (Lands zoned RB south of Coolquay village);
- 1 related to Item 2(a)(iv) Lands zoned GE south-east of Junction 5 on the M1 at Hedgestown, Courtlough;
- 1 related to Item 2(b) PA SH 12.4 – Newtown: Reinstate GB zoning ; and
- 163 related to Item 2(c) Delete the amended and additional text inserted under PA CH 8.1 which relates to aircraft noise and noise insulation.

## Format of this Chief Executive's Report

Section 31(8) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) requires that, no later than 4 weeks after the expiry of the display period for the Draft Direction, the Chief Executive shall prepare a report on any submissions or observations received, and that this report shall be furnished to the Elected Members of the Planning Authority, the Office of the Planning Regulator and the Minister. Under Section 31(9) of the Act, this Chief Executive's Report is required to:

- (a) summarise the views of any person who made submissions or observations to the planning authority;
- (b) summarise the views of and recommendations (if any) made by the Elected Members of the planning authority;
- (c) summarise the views of and recommendations (if any) made by the regional assembly;
- (d) make recommendations in relation to the best manner in which to give effect to the draft direction.

# PART 1

This Chief Executive's Report consists of three parts namely this part, Part 1 which provides an Introduction, Part 2 which provides a summary of the submissions and observations received as well as the Chief Executive's recommendations, and finally Part 3 which lists all of the submissions and observations received by the Planning Authority.

In order to ensure fully compliance with these requirements Part 2 of the report addresses each of the six Draft Direction items under the following headings:

1. Summary of Views of any Person who made Submissions or Observations;
2. Summary of Views of, and Recommendations made by the Elected Members;
3. Recommendations in relation to the Best Manner in which to give Effect to the Draft Direction.

While Section 31(9) of the Act requires the Chief Executive to summarise any submission, observation or recommendation from the relevant regional authority, no submission or observation was received from the Eastern and Midlands Regional Authority (EMRA) in relation to the Draft Direction.

It should be noted that as required by the Act, a central purpose of this Chief Executive's Report is to provide summaries of submissions or observations received in relation to the Draft Ministerial Direction. However, as no summary can fully reproduce all of the detail contained in the submission or observation to which it relates, it is important to note that the full text of each submission or observation received is available online on Fingal County Council's website at: <https://consult.fingal.ie/en/consultation/draft-ministerial-direction-accordance-section-317-planning-development-act-2000-amended-making>.

In this regard, it should also be noted that in accordance with the provisions of Section 31(7)(c) of the Act, the contents of all submissions or observations made to the planning authority in respect of the Draft Direction shall be taken into consideration by the Office of the Planning Regulator before it makes a recommendation to the Minister on the matter.

## Next Steps

Section 31AN(4) of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 (as amended) sets out that on receipt of the Chief Executive's report, the Office of the Planning Regulator 'shall consider the report of the Chief Executive on the submissions, together with any submission made under section 31(10), and shall, no later than 3 weeks after receipt of that report

- (a) recommend to the Minister that he or she issue the direction with or without minor amendments, or
- (b) for stated reasons, where the Office is of the opinion that—
  - i. a material amendment to the draft direction may be required,
  - ii. further investigation is necessary in order to clarify any aspect of the report furnished or submissions made, or
  - iii. it is necessary for any reason, appoint a person to be an inspector.'

Following receipt of a report from the inspector (if required) the OPR shall recommend to the Minister to issue or not issue the direction. If the Minister agrees with the Recommendation, then he shall issue the Direction with or without minor amendments. Pursuant to Section 31(17)

# PART 1

---

of the Act, the direction issued by the Minister is deemed to have immediate effect and its terms are considered to be incorporated into the Plan, or, if appropriate, to constitute the plan.



# PART 2

## Draft Direction Item 2(a)(i)

- *2(a) Delete the following zoning objectives from the adopted Plan i.e. the subject land is unzoned:*
  - *(i) Land zoned General Employment in the adopted Plan to the east of Junction 2 on the M2 at St Margaret's which was zoned Greenbelt in the Fingal County Development Plan 2017-2023*

### 1. Summary of Views of any Person who made Submissions or Observations

#### List of Submissions/Observations Received

FIN-C568-077, FIN-C568-129, FIN-C568-130, FIN-C568-171

#### Summary of Main Issues Raised in Submissions/Observations

##### FIN-C568-077: Transport Infrastructure Ireland (TII)

The submission received from Transport Infrastructure Ireland (TII) ([FIN-C568-077](#)) expressed support for Draft Direction Item 2(a)(i).

Reference was made to NPO 74 and the alignment of the NPF and the NDP. The submission referred to the investment priority of the NDP to ensure that the existing extensive transport networks are maintained to a high level to ensure quality levels of service, accessibility, and connectivity to transport users.

The submission cited NSO 2 of the NPF which seeks to maintain the strategic capacity and safety of the national roads network, including planning for future capacity enhancements. The submission noted RPOs 8.1, 8.2 and 8.3 and also referenced the Transport Strategy for the Greater Dublin Area, specifically Measure ROAD2 – National Roads Requirements 1 and 3.

The submission stated that previous submissions by TII on the Draft Development Plan recommended the removal of the proposed GE lands at the subject location. It is stated that the policies and objectives cited above are aligned with the requirements of the Spatial Planning and National Roads Guidelines for Planning Authorities, which require that proposals for development of lands adjacent to national roads are only acceptable if it can be demonstrated that the road can continue to perform its strategic transport function into the future. In addition, it is stated that particular care is required at locations at, or close to junctions as additional traffic generated may lead to the premature and unacceptable reduction in the level of strategic transport service available to road users.

TII contended that the evidence-based approach prescribed by national planning and transport policy does not appear adhered to in the rezoning of lands at Junction 2 of the M2 in St. Margaret's and is thus contrary to the provisions of the national and regional policies and objectives referred to in the submission. It is also contrary to TII's recommendation for omission of this proposal in the Chief Executive's Report at CE OPR SH12.1 on submissions to the Draft Plan prepared in July 2022.

## PART 2

In conclusion, the submission stated that TII supports the omission of GE lands at this location until such time as the evidence base has been developed in accordance with statutory guidelines, which is supported by national and regional policy.

### **FIN-C568-129 : National Transport Authority (NTA)**

This submission from the National Transport Authority (NTA) ([FIN-C568-129](#)) noted that the NTA can only support zoning objectives that permit trip intensive developments in locations served by existing or planned public transport services and that are located adjacent to existing or planned active travel networks. In this regard policies from the Transport Strategy for the Greater Dublin Area 2022-2042 were referenced including Measure PLAN4, Measure PLAN6 and Measure ROAD2.

The submission referred to Policy EEP2 of the Development Plan and expressed concern that employment and trip intensive uses could be permitted in peripheral locations, including those referenced in the Draft Direction, which are removed from public transport services and active travel infrastructure.

Support was expressed for Draft Direction 2(a)(i) and the submission stated that the NTA considers that the zoning of these lands for General Employment would not accord with the Transport Strategy for the Greater Dublin Area 2022-2042.

### **FIN-C568-130: Collen Group and Erigo Group**

This submission from the Collen Group and Erigo Group ([FIN-C568-130](#)) objected to Draft Direction Item 2(a)(i) which would result in the removal of lands located to the immediate east of the Cherryhound Interchange at the M2 motorway on lands bounded by the R135 and N2/N3/link road at Broghan, The Ward, Dublin 15 from the GE –General Employment land use zoning to GB –Greenbelt.

The submission expressed support for the decision of the Fingal County Council Elected Members to include these lands as GE –General Employment within the Fingal County Development Plan 2023-2029.

The submission noted the previous submissions made on each stage of the Draft Fingal County Development Plan 2023-2029, providing an evidence-based rationale to support the proposed zoning of the lands as GE - General Employment.

The submission cited the reasons set out under this Ministerial Direction relating to the subject lands and outlines a number of key considerations for the rejection of Draft Direction Item 2(a)(i) as follows.

The subject lands are ideally located to complement the surrounding activity of the Dublin Enterprise Zone to the west and Dublin Airport to the east, and a land use zoning of GE-General Employment in the final Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029 would best reflect the site's strategic location.

The submission contended that development of this site is appropriate for sequential expansion, given the extent of build out on existing GE land west of the N2 and it is imperative that the zoning allows for this, so that the economic driver of Fingal can be maintained and enhanced.

## PART 2

---

The submission noted that the subject lands are served by high quality existing and planned public transport corridors including bus and rail services and future Park and Ride. In this regard, this submission is supported by a report by Transport Insights. A site aerial map of the subject lands also supports this submission.

This submission provides a detailed outline of the Development Plan process relating to zoning of these lands. The submission noted that throughout the Development Plan process, the Elected Members of Fingal County Council have supported the zoning of the subject lands as GE–General Employment within the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029, consistent with submissions made on same and based on a strong planning rationale given its compliance with and contribution towards realising National and Regional policy objectives, and the economic demand for GE –General Employment zoned lands in this area.

This submission noted that the Draft Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029 was accompanied by an Economic and Employment Land Use Study when published for public display in February 2022 and which formed a key basis of the OPR submission on the subject lands during the plan making process. This submission respectfully submits that reliance on this document to direct the quantum of zoned GE land to serve the County over the lifetime of the Plan is an unsound approach and is flawed from the outset and the strict adherence to the conclusions of this Report by the OPR and the FCC Executive is to the detriment of the potential economic growth of the County. This submission demonstrates that the study should not be relied upon, as it does not accurately reflect the quantum or realistic availability of GE zoned lands within the County.

The submission noted there is an ever-increasing demand for zoned lands in the Greater Dublin Area to support employment related activities, which has not been given due consideration by the Council's Executive or OPR to date. It is noted that the industrial and logistics market is experiencing historically high levels of demand in Dublin and in Fingal, in particular.

The submission included supportive reports by Savills and Cushman and Wakefield, market experts in this regard and it is requested that these supporting reports should be given due consideration, having regard to the significance of de-zoning the subject lands and resulting negative economic implications for Fingal.

The submission contended that the substantive weight of informed commentary on this matter allows the OPR to recommend that the Draft Order is modified to retain the zoning of the subject site as GE, being the most suitable and sequentially appropriate site for such development over the lifetime of the Plan.

This submission noted that the inclusion of the subject lands within the land bank of GE–General Employment lands complies with and directly contributes towards the realisation of a number of key National and Regional policy objectives relating to investment and sustainable employment growth including supporting growth at Dublin Airport.

The submission noted that the zoning of the subject lands as GE –General Employment within the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029 will not prejudice the realisation of any roads objectives in the Greater Dublin Area. The submission contended that the conflicting and contradictory approach taken by TII in its assessment of matters related to the N2 junction is not in accordance with the principles of proper planning and for the TII commentary on the subject site to be given

## PART 2

defining weight in the balance of assessment. The submission requested the dismissal of TII grounds when making a determination on the rezoning issue.

The submission stated that that the subject lands zoning as GE –General Employment within the Fingal Development Plan will support National and Regional Policy objectives, demand for lands zoned for employment related activities, and not prejudice the proper planning and sustainable development of the subject lands and is in line with the relevant guiding principles as included within the Development Plan Guidelines for Planning Authorities. In conclusion, the submission requested that the Draft Ministerial Order be amended to reinstate the GE zoning designation for the subject lands.

### **FIN-C568-171: Joe McPeake**

This submission from Joe McPeake ([FIN-C568-171](#)) is opposed to the Draft Ministerial Direction 2(a)(i).

Reference is made to the draft Ministerial advice which states that 'where an evidence-based rationale consistent with the national and regional policy cannot be provided for these or any other employment zoning is, subject zoning should be removed from the Draft Plan'. The submission contended that this has been provided and supported by submissions for these lands during the Development Plan process and outlined in the various robust debates by the Elected Members.

Concerns are expressed that these evidence-based arguments have not been provided to the OPR, to allow determination by the OPR and Minister and therefore not in accordance with the legislative process.

Concerns are also expressed where the Economic Study was prepared without the input of relevant stakeholders. This submission referred to a number of issues, outlined below which were deemed to not have been communicated to the OPR during the Draft Development Plan.

The lands are sequential as they are located on the NE boundary of the Cherryhound roundabout/junction 2, which are adjacent to FCC owned lands and are separated by only the road in the area.

The inclusion of the lands within the land bank of the GE lands within Fingal County Council complies with national and regional policy, which are detailed in the submission. With regard to the NPF, it is stated that the zoning of the lands as GE directly supports the anticipated population growth in the eastern and midlands region, providing lands adjacent to the Dublin Enterprise Zone (DEZ) and Dublin Airport.

The lands are described as being circa 2km from major residential areas including Tyrrelstown, Hollystown, Mulhuddart and Blanchardstown. Reference is made to a recently permitted development for 500 residential units at Tyrrelstown where the increasing population will result in increased economic activity and it is submitted that the subject lands are ideally located in proximity to the DEZ, to provide and support employment related activities.

The submission referred to a number of key growth enablers from the NPF, including, relocating less-intensive uses outside the M50 ring, in particular from existing built up areas generally. The submission noted that a number of businesses are relocating from Dublin Port and sites within

## PART 2

the M50 to new locations (outside the M50), due to pressure on site size and expansion of business.

The submission also referred to the RSES relating to the spatial and economic strategy. It is stated that Dublin 15 is a strong economic hub for Fingal and the wider Dublin area, where there is a shortage of available lands to meet the requirements of the NPF. The submission referred to the success of the N2/N3 link as the majority of the lands are presently being developed, with FCC lands being the last remaining site that may come to the market, in an area with unprecedented demand. Reference is also made to the Metropolitan Plan and the shortage of lands for GE uses.

The submission noted a recently permitted planning application (FW22A/01674) for logistics and office use. It is stated that the development is at the same interchange as the subject lands where Fingal County Council deemed it acceptable and to which TII made no observation. It is submitted that the subject lands would have deemed to be compliant with the appropriate guidelines including the Fingal County Council owned lands.

The submission referred to the Development Plan Guidelines, with specific reference to section 1.7 relating to economic and population growth trends. It is stated that the zoning of the subject lands will contribute towards achievement of guiding principle 5 of the guidelines, providing land zoned for employment related activities to support projected economic and population growth and where the population of D15 is now approaching 100,000 persons.

The submission calls for the recommendation to be withdrawn and the lands to be zoned GE, where they can play a significant role in the economic prosperity of D15 and wider Dublin area into the future. A map showing the location of the subject lands has been submitted in support.

This submission is also accompanied by a previous submission to the Draft Plan (FIN-C453-1677), made by OCSC on behalf of Collen Group + Erigo Group. A feasibility report was also included in Appendix A of the submission. A summary of same is provided below:

The submission prepared by landscape, planning and engineering consultants seeks to support the proposed zoning of the subject lands (40.79ha.) from 'GB' to 'GE' on lands bounded by the R135 to the east, M2 motorway to the west and N2/N3/link road to the north and immediately contiguous with the existing 'GE' zoned lands immediately west of the M2 and requested its adoption accordingly in the final FDP 2023-2029. The submission welcomes the support by Elected Members for inclusion of this land in the Draft Development Plan.

The submission details the site's size and location, highlighting its proximity to the Airport and other GE zoned lands where these lands provide an ideal opportunity to provide for additional 'GE' zoned lands as part of the Cherryhound LAP and the Dublin Enterprise Zone, ensuring a viable 'GE' zoned core at a scale appropriate to the requirements of the expansion of Dublin Airport and strategically located west, of the former N2.

The submission also stated that the rezoning of the lands could address other issues facing the County during the next plan period including, the need to provide sufficient GE zoned land over the next 2-3 years and towards employment generation in D15, provision of serviced lands for FDI, achieving the vision and growth for Dublin Airport, fostering sustainable growth, support for community services, use of public transport, rates, positive branding' commercial spin-off activity and land take-up.

## PART 2

---

The submission stated that since mid-2014, there has been a very strong demand for employment generating land from pharma, ICT, logistics and services, in particular, all of which have specific requirements. It stated that the take-up of lands has been higher than expected potentially impacting economic activity and resulting in higher land values.

The submission stated that the subject land can promote and support both the Cherryhound LAP lands and the Dublin Enterprise Zone (having regard to issues such as proximity, transportation and services, roads access, lack of flood risk, visibility, labour force). The stated rationale for the development lands is to allow a gradual expansion of the existing GE zoned lands eastwards. An indicative masterplan layout is included.

The submission's 'Planning Report' provides detailed information in relation to the site's location, the planning policy context (including the NPF, NDP, National Aviation Policy, the RSES, the Dublin Enterprise Zone, the Dublin Airport Economic Impact Study, the Draft Development Plan and highlighting the growing demand for industrial and logistics demand, the Cherryhound LAP, the Dublin Airport LAP and the Dublin Airport Public Safety Zones).

In this regard, the submission contended that this policy supports the proposed rezoning having regard to considerations, including the need to promote economic growth in the GDA and Dublin Airport and provide for much needed additional GE zoned land and to support the DEZ and Cherryhound LAP.

The submission provides a detailed site analysis which addresses issues including natural heritage (archaeological heritage, topography, existing hedgerows), physical infrastructure (roads, bus services, waste-water treatment, surface water drainage, and water supply) and provides a map of existing land take-up. The submission acknowledges some potential physical constraints pertaining to the development of the lands where such constraints can be resolved through good planning, design and engineering solutions.

The submission details the overall vision and masterplan for future development proposals on the lands based on the characteristics of the site and proposed uses. It also provides CGI Images showing large scale logistics structures.

The vision referred to a number of strategic objectives including support for regional and national strategies and policies relating to sustainable development, the maximisation of existing and proposed public investment in roads and the Airport, complementing existing proposals by the daa and supporting the use of lands at the edge of Dublin city for employment use.

The design strategy for the lands described in the submission addresses primary design principles (parking, topography etc.), visual impact and movement and transport (road infrastructure, public transport, active transport etc.).

The submission contains Appendix A an Engineering Assessment, Services and Access Report prepared by OSCC which provides a detailed feasibility report for the site having regard to planning, zoning, services and accessibility (potable water, wastewater, storm water, flood risk and road access). This appendix also included an indicative junction drawing as well as an indicative masterplan layout. The report concludes by stating that the lands are suitable for development pending a detailed design.



# PART 2

## 2. Summary of Views of, and Recommendations made by the Elected Members

### Submissions/Observations Received

FIN-C568-152, FIN-C568-159

#### **FIN-C568-152: Cllr. Kieran Dennison**

This submission from Cllr. Kieran Dennison ([FIN-C568-152](#)) opposes Draft Direction 2(a)(i). It begins by citing the Minister's reason (I) relating to this Draft Direction (see page 2 of this report) and cited a number of counter reasons in response.

The submission stated that the location of the subject lands are sequential as evidenced by the map submitted in support of this submission and where the lands are located on the same junction as lands owned by Fingal County Council, between the old Ashbourne Road and the new N2 and surrounded by the new and existing road infrastructure. The submission noted that infill development occurs on the existing R135 whereby small businesses have evolved naturally, based on demand and many without planning permission.

The submission noted that the subject lands are capable of being fully serviced and noted a service report submitted in support, to confirm the availability of appropriate services.

In the context of the spatial planning and national roads guidelines for Planning Authorities, this submission cited a recent grant of planning permission (FW22A/01674) for 72,753 m<sup>2</sup> of logistics and associated office use on this interchange which was acceptable to the Transportation Department of Fingal County Council and to which the TII made no observations. On this basis, the submission contended that all lands at this interchange would have been deemed to be compliant with the appropriate guidelines including lands owned by Fingal County Council.

This submission included a report from Transport Insights consultants in support of this submission. The submission contended that these lands are better serviced and meet the standards which were appropriate for the above-mentioned planning application.

The submission noted that the zoning of the subject lands as GE-general employment will contribute towards the achievement of guiding principle five within the Fingal Development Plan by providing land zoned for employment-related activities to support the projected economic and population growth of Fingal.

The submission also cited guiding principle eight relating to 'alignment of place and investment' which states, *'For planned development objectives to be realised they need to be supported through public capital investment in infrastructure and services'*. The submission noted that the Development Plan is the key spatial framework in which the Local Authority's spatial development and investment priorities are identified and aligned.

The submission contended that the subject lands are ideally located for GE-general employment zoning, given their strategic location, immediately adjacent to the Dublin Enterprise Zone and a key economic driver for the greater Dublin region and served by major road infrastructure along with numerous bus routes. The submission stated that the Dublin Enterprise Zone is a major commerce and investment hub located in the Dublin 15 area of Fingal which includes Blanchardstown, Mulhuddart and Castleknock and supports 34,600 jobs and contributes €14.4 billion to national economic output, which continues to grow.

## PART 2

---

The submission stated that the zoning of the lands as GE-General Employment does not prejudice proper planning and sustainable development and is in line with the relevant guiding principles included within the Development Plan guidelines for Planning Authorities.

The submission noted that in the making of the Development Plan, robust reasons for zoning of these lands were put forward by Elected Members with cross-party support acknowledging the serious economic value of these lands to Fingal and the continuation of an adequate land bank for economic activity into the future.

The submission stated that the land use map submitted in support shows the short supply of zoned GE land in this key economic hub of Dublin 15. The submission also noted the concerns raised by those involved in enterprise and the short supply of land in the area and the inability to purchase sites for business expansion for small and large-scale business enterprises in the area.

In conclusion, the submission noted that the site location map clearly shows that the subject lands are sequential and meets all criteria as set out in RSES for the Dublin Metropolitan area and with the national strategic outcomes for compact growth, sustainable mobility and transition to a low carbon and climate resilient society as well as the greater Dublin area Transport Strategy 2022-2042. In the context of the arguments outlined and the associated reports submitted in support of the submission, reconsideration of the recommendation is requested.

This submission included an appended Transport Insights consultants' report which details support for the proposed zoning of the subject lands which presents a unique opportunity for general enterprise and employment, having regard to the site location adjoining strategic road infrastructure and public transport nodes and corridors, its proximity to the Dublin Enterprise Zone in Dublin 15 and to Dublin Airport.

The relevant policy context as set out at national, regional and local level relating to investment and employment provision, the continued growth of Dublin Airport and sustainable transport provision was cited in support of the zoning as well as its alignment with strategic objectives of the Fingal Development Plan including,

- to support current regional and national strategies and policies (land-use and transportation), delivering sustainable development and development patterns and improving quality of life through the provision of employment and economic growth and reducing the need to travel,
- to maximise use of existing and proposed public investment, in particular the existing road infrastructure (M2/N2/N3 link road and M50) or the proposed MetroLink to Dublin Airport.
- to support and create a sustainable demand for air travel and international access to the services and goods in Ireland, creating a critical mass at Dublin Airport and complementing existing proposals by the daa to create an international business hub at Dublin Airport to allow the area and region to compete in a global market.
- to support the sustainable and beneficial use of lands at the edge of Dublin City for appropriate and much needed employment uses, without adverse impact on the environment, in that the lands are not identified as being of a character or quality that is visually or ecologically sensitive, is not intensively used for agriculture or horticulture and is not suitable for residential use.

# PART 2

## **FIN-C568-159: Submission from Cllr. Ann Graves**

The submission from Cllr. Ann Graves ([FIN-C568-159](#)) opposes Draft Direction 2(a)(i). The submission noted that the general employment zoning for lands at Junction 2 of M2 at St Margaret's, was agreed by an overwhelming majority of Elected Members following a long and engaged debate with cross party and local resident support, to provide much needed GE zoned land in this area, based on evidence put before Elected Members, local knowledge and the best possible option to deliver a Development Plan to meet the needs of the people of Fingal.

The submission cited the Ministers reason (V) relating to this zoning. The submission stated that it is unclear as to the information base that resulted in a decision by the Minister which is contrary to the outcome agreed by Elected Members.

The submission cited an external report which, according to the submission, outlines a considerable shortage of GE land in the short term. This submission also noted that during the meeting, Elected Members were made aware of the large number of businesses who were seeking lands in the area and the business lost to other countries, due to the lack of suitable and available land for development, resulting in a detrimental impact on business in Fingal, the second largest growing County in the state.

This submission requested that the Minister reconsiders the position in relation to these lands to ensure business growth in Fingal.

## **3. Recommendations in relation to the Best Manner in which to Give Effect to Draft Direction item 2(a)(i)**

### **Chief Executive's Recommendation**

Draft Direction Item 2(a)(i) requires the deletion of the following zoning objective from the adopted Plan, i.e. that the subject land is un-zoned:

- Land zoned General Employment in the adopted Plan to the east of Junction 2 on the M2 at St Margaret's which was zoned Greenbelt in the Fingal County Development Plan 2017-2023

Under Section 31(9) of the Act, this Chief Executive's Report is required to make recommendations in relation to the best manner in which to give effect to the Draft Direction.

To clarify, it is understood that the aim of the Draft Direction is to remove the GE – General Employment land use zoning from the lands in question. This would not result in the lands being 'un-zoned' as is stated in the Draft Direction, but would rather entail the lands in question reverting to their previous GB – Greenbelt zoning as per the 2017-2023 Development Plan.

Having regard to the above, the Chief Executive recommends that land use zoning of the lands in question to the east of Junction 2 on the M2 at St Margaret's, which were zoned GE-General Employment in the adopted Fingal County Development Plan 2023-2029, is amended to GB - Greenbelt as per the previous Fingal County Development Plan 2017-2023.

# PART 2

## Draft Direction Item 2(a)(ii)

- *2(a) Delete the following zoning objectives from the adopted Plan i.e. the subject land is unzoned:*
  - *(ii) Land zoned Food Park in the adopted Plan south of Coolquay village.*

### 1. Summary of Views of any Person who made Submissions or Observations

#### List of Submissions/Observations Received

FIN-C568-129, FIN-C568-146, FIN-C568-172

#### Summary of Main Issues Raised in Submissions/Observations

##### **FIN-C568-129: National Transport Authority (NTA)**

The submission from the National Transport Authority (NTA) ([FIN-C568-129](#)) noted that the Authority can only support zoning objectives that permit trip intensive developments in locations served by existing or planned public transport services and that are located adjacent to existing or planned active travel networks. In this regard policies from the Transport Strategy for the Greater Dublin Area 2022-2042 were referenced including Measure PLAN4, Measure PLAN6 and Measure ROAD2.

The submission referred to Policy EEP2 of the Development Plan and expressed concern that employment and trip intensive uses could be permitted in peripheral locations, including those referenced in the Draft Direction, which are removed from public transport services and active travel infrastructure.

Support was expressed for Draft Directions 2(a)(i), 2(a)(iv) and 2(b), and it is considered that the zoning of these lands for General Employment would not accord with the Transport Strategy. Reference is also made to Draft Directions 2(a)(ii) and 2(a)(iii). It is noted that given the extent of lands zoned, a specific rural need should be demonstrated and the scale and type of development strictly controlled. Employment and therefore trip intensive uses should not be permissible as this would embed reliance on private vehicles.

##### **FIN-C568-146: Timothy Fitzgerald**

The submission from Timothy Fitzgerald ([FIN-C568-146](#)) is opposed to Draft Direction Items 2(a)(ii) and 2(a)(iii).

The submission pointed out that the subject lands are currently zoned RB and FP and it was not sought to bring these zoning objectives in as new proposals under the adopted Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029, but rather to retain the zonings that have been included in previous Development Plans.

The submission specified that the subject lands were zoned RB and FP in 2011-2017 Development Plan and the FP lands were designated for the preparation of an LAP in the 2011 FDP, which was not completed by FCC. The submission noted that the LAP was not included in

## PART 2

---

the 2017-2023 FDP and an objective to carry out a masterplan on the lands was included, but that was not initiated by FCC.

The submission contended that it is reasonable to expect that any planning application submitted during this period would have been considered premature, without a masterplan in place. It is submitted that in both plans, there were constraints imposed on the lands in the form of the LAP and Masterplan, an important factor in explaining why the lands were not developed.

The submission referred to a Council meeting and CE Report that proposed the change of zoning to RU and GB and contended that the Executive did not explain that development of the land would have been premature as FCC did not implement its LAP and Masterplan. This was cited as a significant and serious omission and the submission contended that FCC failed to comply with its statutory obligations regarding the LAP and Masterplan.

The submission referred to the practical obstacles which prevented development on this land and stated that the OPR and Minister were not furnished with this information. Reference is made to OPR comments in relation to strategic decisions and the submission argues that FCC failed to take a strategic approach to the development of the subject lands. The importance of food production in the Fingal area was cited and the failure of the Council to put in place a strategic plan to enable the lands to be developed in accordance with their optimal use.

The submission referred to the OPR Recommendation 11 regarding the requirement to provide robust justification for the extent and location of employment zoned land. It is stated that the response of the Executive was to propose a removal of the existing zoning objectives for the subject lands for RB and FP and to rezone to RU and GB, despite the OPR seeking a robust justification for the zonings as set out in Recommendation 11.

The submission contended that the motion tabled by Cllr. Manton was accompanied by a robust justification during the meeting for retaining the zoning in the new Plan and that these reasons have not been included in the OPR letter to the Minister. It is stated that this justification received strong support from the majority of the other Elected Members and the motion was duly passed by a significant majority of Elected Members.

Regarding the OPR letter to the Minister the submission argued that it is incorrect and inaccurate representation or summary of the contributions made by Cllr. Manton regarding the retention of the RB and FP lands during the Council meeting.

Extracts from the CE Report were included in the submission with a response provided to same, including reference to other FP lands in Fingal and their locations that are not within or adjacent to residential areas and are not contiguous to rural villages. It was stated that Coolquay is well served by public transport.

The submission stated that as a consequence of the CE misstating the Elected Member's reasons for not following the OPR's recommendation, this non-specific reference to 'employment zoning' is continued in the OPR letter to the Minister. The submission contended that to describe the FP and RB zoning objectives in such general and simplistic terms as 'employment zoned lands' mischaracterises the underlying purpose of these zoning objectives. It was also stated that the OPR was led into this error by the failure of the CE to furnish the Elected Member's reasons for rejecting the recommendation of the OPR.

## PART 2

The submission goes on to state that the simplistic characterisation of the FP zoning objective as 'employment zoning', and the finding of 'no or no adequate reasons' i.e., justify it, fails to recognise the more nuanced and targeted aims and purposes of this zoning objective, which are reflected in the wording of the zoning objective itself.

The submission referred to previous court cases where similar questions came to the fore. It was stated that reasons have been provided and a rationale for these specific zoning objectives has been provided, even though as Humphreys J has pointed out in Killeland, such reasons were not required as the zoning objectives remained as they were under previous Development Plans.

Reference is made to the OPR comments that an evidence-based rationale consistent with national and regional policy cannot be provided for the retention of the zoning objectives FP and RB in respect of the subject lands.

This is not considered acceptable, and the submission sets out how the FP and RB zoned objectives for the subject site comply with national, regional and local planning policy. In this regard, NPO 15, RPO 4.79, 6.7, 7.28 are cited. It was submitted that at no time was it stated that these zonings were not compliant with the RSES policies, and therefore the zonings were included in the new Draft Plan, after Variation 2. The submission also referred to Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029 policies and objectives which support the zoning on these lands. Reference is also made to Food Wise 2025, Fingal Agri-Food Strategy 2019 – 2021.

The submission contended that the RB and FP zonings may be categorised in very general terms as employment related zonings, but they are completely different from other employment related zonings such as GE (General Enterprise) and that RB and FP are specifically related to the Agri-Food sector and should not be bracketed with zoning objectives such as GE (General Enterprise), WD (Warehouse Distribution) or DA (Dublin Airport).

It was stated that the conclusions set out by the Minister are not justified and are inconsistent with the NPF and RSES. The submission also noted that no other undeveloped land under the existing zonings of GE, DA or HT from previous Development Plans had been proposed to be downzoned or deemed incompatible with National or Regional planning policy in the FDP 2023 - 2029.

The submission noted that planning consultants have been engaged by the landowner and are currently in the process of preparing a pre-application request.

### **FIN-C568-172: Ben Hemeryck**

The submission from Ben Hemeryck ([FIN-C568-172](#)) expressed opposition to Draft Direction items 2(a)(ii) and 2(a)(iii) and advocates that the FP and RB zoned lands at Coolquay should be maintained.

The submission noted that the occupancy at the FP zoned lands at Food Central is increasing and the Coolquay FP/RB zoned lands are ideally located given their location proximate to Dublin Airport, Dublin Port, Dublin Inland Port (St. Margaret's) and nearby road networks. Contrary to comments from the OPR, the location is served with a good bus service while 2 NTA GDA cycle routes, an inter-urban route and a secondary cycle route to serve the area are identified in the new Fingal Development Plan.



# PART 2

---

The submission noted that the OPR comment where the lands are not contiguous to Coolquay village is not a relevant consideration. The submission indicates that given their landholding in the area, they are well placed to address this issue if necessary.

The submission contended that the absence of an LAP / Masterplan has stagnated the development potential of the lands north of the Ward River and the RB zoned lands south of the Ward River have been zoned for Industry since the mid-1980s.

The submission noted the need for RB/FP zoned lands at this location which is proven by development at Food Central.

## **2. Summary of Views of, and Recommendations made by the Elected Members**

No submissions were received from the Elected Members in relation to Draft Direction Item 2(a)(ii).

## **3. Recommendations in relation to the Best Manner in which to Give Effect to Draft Direction Item 2(a)(ii)**

### **Chief Executive's Recommendation**

Draft Direction Item 2(a)(ii) requires the deletion of the following zoning objective from the adopted Plan, i.e. that the subject land is un-zoned:

- Land zoned Food Park in the adopted Plan south of Coolquay village.

Under Section 31(9) of the Act, this Chief Executive's Report is required to make recommendations in relation to the best manner in which to give effect to the Draft Direction.

It would appear that the current wording of the Draft Direction, would, if adopted, result in the removal of the FP – Food Park zoning which would leave the subject lands 'unzoned'.

However, given that all lands in Fingal have been assigned a land use zoning, and having regard to the surrounding land use zonings in this rural part of Fingal as well as to the reasons for the Draft Direction provided by the Minister, the Chief Executive recommends that the FP zoned lands at this location are zoned RU, instead of being 'unzoned' completely.

It was submitted that this rezoning would reflect the existing land use zonings to the north and south of the Ward River in the surrounding area and would give effect to the overall aims of the Draft Direction which is to remove the FP Food Park zoning from the subject lands.

# PART 2

## Draft Direction Item 2(a)(iii)

- *2(a) Delete the following zoning objectives from the adopted Plan i.e. the subject land is unzoned:*
  - *(iii) Land zoned Rural Business in the adopted Plan to the south of Coolquay village.*

### 1. Summary of Views of any Person who made Submissions or Observations

#### List of Submissions/Observations Received

FIN-C568-129, FIN-C568-146, FIN-C568-172

#### Summary of Main Issues Raised in Submissions/Observations

##### **FIN-C568-129: National Transport Authority**

The submission from the National Transport Authority (NTA) ([FIN-C568-129](#)) noted that the Authority can only support zoning objectives that permit trip intensive developments in locations served by existing or planned public transport services and that are located adjacent to existing or planned active travel networks. In this regard policies from the Transport Strategy for the Greater Dublin Area 2022-2042 were referenced including Measure PLAN4, Measure PLAN6 and Measure ROAD2.

The submission referred to Policy EEP2 of the Development Plan and expressed concern that employment and trip intensive uses could be permitted in peripheral locations, including those referenced in the Draft Direction, which are removed from public transport services and active travel infrastructure.

Support was expressed for Draft Directions 2(a)(i), 2(a)(iv) and 2(b), and it was considered that the zoning of these lands for General Employment would not accord with the Transport Strategy. Reference is also made to Draft Directions 2(a)(ii) and 2(a)(iii). It was noted that given the extent of lands zoned, a specific rural need should be demonstrated and the scale and type of development strictly controlled. Employment and therefore trip intensive uses should not be permissible as this would embed reliance on private vehicles.

##### **FIN-C568-146: Timothy Fitzgerald**

The submission from Timothy Fitzgerald ([FIN-C568-146](#)) is opposed to Draft Direction Items 2(a)(ii) and 2(a)(iii).

The submission points out that the subject lands are currently zoned RB and FP and it was not sought to bring these zoning objectives in as new proposals under the adopted Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029, but rather to retain the zonings that have been included in previous Development Plans.

The submission specifies that the subject lands were zoned RB and FP in 2011-2017 Development Plan and the FP lands were designated for the preparation of an LAP in the 2011

## PART 2

---

FDP, which was not completed by FCC. The submission noted that the LAP was not included in the 2017-2023 FDP and an objective to carry out a masterplan on the lands was included, but that was not initiated by FCC.

The submission contended that it is reasonable to expect that any planning application submitted during this period would have been considered premature, without a masterplan in place. It was submitted that in both plans, there were constraints imposed on the lands in the form of the LAP and Masterplan, an important factor in explaining why the lands were not developed.

The submission referred to a Council meeting and CE Report that proposed the change of zoning to RU and GB and contended that the Executive did not explain that development of the land would have been premature as FCC did not implement its LAP and Masterplan. This was cited as a significant and serious omission and the submission contended that FCC failed to comply with its statutory obligations regarding the LAP and Masterplan.

The submission referred to the practical obstacles which prevented development on this land and stated that the OPR and Minister were not furnished with this information. Reference is made to OPR comments in relation to strategic decisions and the submission argues that FCC failed to take a strategic approach to the development of the subject lands. The importance of food production in the Fingal area was cited and the failure of the Council to put in place a strategic plan to enable the lands to be developed in accordance with their optimal use.

The submission referred to the OPR Recommendation 11 regarding the requirement to provide robust justification for the extent and location of employment zoned land. It was stated that the response of the Executive was to propose a removal of the existing zoning objectives for the subject lands for RB and FP and to rezone to RU and GB, despite the OPR seeking a robust justification for the zonings as set out in Recommendation 11.

The submission contended that the motion tabled by Cllr. Manton was accompanied by a robust justification during the meeting for retaining the zoning in the new Plan and that these reasons have not been included in the OPR letter to the Minister. It was stated that this justification received strong support from the majority of the other Elected Members and the motion was duly passed by a significant majority of Elected Members.

Regarding the OPR letter to the Minister It was argued that it is incorrect and inaccurate representation or summary of the contributions made by Cllr. Manton regarding the retention of the RB and FP lands during the Council meeting.

Extracts from the CE Report have been included in the submission and a response to same provided, including reference to other FP lands in Fingal and their locations that are not within or adjacent to residential areas and are not contiguous to rural villages. It was stated that Coolquay is well served by public transport.

The submission stated that as a consequence of the CE misstating the Elected Member's reasons for not following the OPR's recommendation, this non-specific reference to 'employment zoning' is continued in the OPR letter to the Minister. The submission contended that to describe the FP and RB zoning objectives in such general and simplistic terms as 'employment zoned lands' mischaracterises the underlying purpose of these zoning objectives. It was also stated that the

## PART 2

OPR was led into this error by the failure of the CE to furnish the Elected Member's reasons for rejecting the recommendation of the OPR.

The submission goes on to state that the simplistic characterisation of the FP zoning objective as 'employment zoning', and the finding of 'no or no adequate reasons' i.e., justify it, fails to recognise the more nuanced and targeted aims and purposes of this zoning objective, which are reflected in the wording of the zoning objective itself.

The submission referred to previous court cases where similar questions came to the fore. It was stated that reasons have been provided and a rationale for these specific zoning objectives has been provided, even though as Humphreys J has pointed out in Killeland, such reasons were not required as the zoning objectives remained as they were under previous Development Plans.

Reference is made to the OPR comments that an evidence-based rationale consistent with national and regional policy cannot be provided for the retention of the zoning objectives FP and RB in respect of the subject lands.

This is not considered acceptable, and the submission sets out how the FP and RB zoned objectives for the subject site comply with national, regional and local planning policy. In this regard, NPO 15, RPO 4.79, 6.7, 7.28 are cited. It was submitted that at no time was it stated that these zonings were not compliant with the RSES policies, and therefore the zonings were included in the new Draft Plan, after Variation 2. The submission also referred to Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029 policies and objectives which support the zoning on these lands. Reference is also made to Food Wise 2025, Fingal Agri-Food Strategy 2019 – 2021.

The submission contended that the RB and FP zonings may be categorised in very general terms as employment related zonings, but they are completely different from other employment related zonings such as GE (General Enterprise) and that RB and FP are specifically related to the Agri-Food sector and should not be bracketed with zoning objectives such as GE (General Enterprise), WD (Warehouse Distribution) or DA (Dublin Airport).

It was stated that the conclusions set out by the Minister are not justified and are inconsistent with the NPF and RSES. The submission also noted that no other undeveloped land under the existing zonings of GE, DA or HT from previous Development Plans had been proposed to be downzoned or deemed incompatible with National or Regional planning policy in the FDP 2023 - 2029.

The submission noted that planning consultants have been engaged by the landowner and are currently in the process of preparing a pre-application request.

### **FIN-C568-172: Ben Hemeryck**

The submission from Ben Hemeryck ([FIN-C568-172](#)) expressed opposition to Draft Direction items 2(a)(ii) and 2(a)(iii) and advocates that the FP and RB zoned lands at Coolquay should be maintained.

The submission noted that the occupancy at the FP zoned lands at Food Central is increasing and the Coolquay FP/RB zoned lands are ideally located given their location proximate to Dublin Airport, Dublin Port, Dublin Inland Port (St. Margaret's) and nearby road networks. Contrary to comments from the OPR, the location is served with a good bus service while 2 NTA GDA cycle

# PART 2

routes, an inter-urban route and a secondary cycle route to serve the area are identified in the new Fingal Development Plan.

The submission noted that the OPR comment where the lands are not contiguous to Coolquay village is not a relevant consideration. The submission indicates that given their landholding in the area, they are well placed to address this issue if necessary.

The submission contended that the absence of an LAP / Masterplan has stagnated the development potential of the lands north of the Ward River and the RB zoned lands south of the Ward River have been zoned for Industry since the mid-1980s.

The submission noted the need for RB/FP zoned lands at this location which is proven by development at Food Central.

## 2. Summary of Views of, and Recommendations made by the Elected Members

No submissions were received from the Elected Members in relation to Draft Direction Item 2(a)(iii).

## 3. Recommendations in relation to the Best Manner in which to Give Effect to Draft Direction Item 2(a)(iii)

### Chief Executive's Recommendation

Draft Direction Item 2(a)(iii) requires the deletion of the following zoning objective from the adopted Plan, i.e. that the subject land is un-zoned:

- Land zoned Rural Business in the adopted Plan to the south of Coolquay village.

Under Section 31(9) of the Act, this Chief Executive's Report is required to make recommendations in relation to the best manner in which to give effect to the Draft Direction.

It would appear that the wording of the Draft Direction if adopted, would result in the removal of the RB – Food Park zoning which would leave the subject lands 'unzoned'.

However, given that all lands in Fingal have been assigned a land use zoning, and having regard to the surrounding land use zonings in this rural part of Fingal, as well as to the reasons for the Draft Direction given by the Minister, the Chief Executive recommends that instead of being 'unzoned' completely:

- the area of RB zoned lands at this location, to the north of the Ward River are zoned RU – Rural; and
- the area of RB zoned lands at this location, to the south of the Ward River are zoned GB – Greenbelt.

It was submitted that this rezoning would reflect the existing land use zonings to the north and south of the Ward River in the surrounding area and would give effect to the overall aims of the Draft Direction which is to remove the RB Rural Business zoning from the subject lands.

# PART 2

## Draft Direction Item 2(a)(iv)

- *2(a) Delete the following zoning objectives from the adopted Plan i.e. the subject land is unzoned:*
  - *(iv) Land zoned General Employment in the adopted Plan to the south east of Junction 5 on the M1 at Hedgestown, Courtlough which was zoned Rural in the Fingal County Development Plan 2017-2023.*

### 1. Summary of Views of any Person who made Submissions or Observations

#### List of Submissions/Observations Received

FIN-C568-123, FIN-C568-129

#### Summary of Main Issues Raised in Submissions/Observations

##### **FIN-C568-123: Blaine Cregan on behalf of Vida M1 Limited**

This submission from Blaine Cregan ([FIN-C568-123](#)) expressed opposition to Draft Direction Item 2(a) (iv).

The submission referred to the Notice of Intention issued by the Minister and the Section 12(5)(aa) Notice issued by FCC to the OPR and stated that the summary presented in the notice is just one of the points set out by the Elected Members in the rationale for the decision and omits a number of important aspects of the rationale for not accepting the recommendation of the CE, in relation to the additional area zoned GE (6.95ha).

The submission stated that the CE recommendation to revert the land to RU was the subject of two motions (Item 361 and 362) by Elected Members which were discussed at a Special Council meeting on 7/10/22. It was stated that the motions were supported by a detailed rationale submitted with the motions for the consideration of Elected Members and the Executive. A summary of the rationale presented by the Elected Members is provided in the submission which can be further summarised as follows:

- The lands should retain the GE designation assigned under the Draft FDP 2023-2029.
- The land are an extension of the M1 Business Park which has been developed over the past 20 years.
- M1 Business Park lands comprise lower density employment, high density space typology with excellent road access and utilities infrastructure.
- There is a current planning permission for additional infrastructure (a new wastewater pump station, F22A/0255) at M1 Business Park.
- The GE zoned lands represent a sequential development to the remaining M1 Business Park lands, compliant with GE vision, national, regional planning policy and Variation 2 to the FDP 2017-2023.
- Contrary to the CE response to the OPR recommendation, the GE site is compliant with the key objectives of the now previous and new Development Plan.



## PART 2

- M1 Business Park is serviced by public transport and private bus services are provided by the operator of the recently completed unit.
- There is an objective to deliver an inter urban cycle route along the R132 which would service the lands.
- No concerns have been raised by the NTA in respect of the zoning of the lands at M1 Business Park.
- There has been significant investment in infrastructure serving the M1 Business Park lands.
- Both motions rejected the Chief Executive's proposed material amendment (CE OPR SH 2.1) based on the rationales provided.

The submission expressed concerns that the planning policy basis by Elected Members was not documented in a complete manner in the Section 12(5)(aa) notice issued to the OPR. It was requested that the rationale for the zoning of the additional lands, as set out by the Elected Members in the motion rationale and at the meeting on the 7th October 2022, as well as the rationale set out in this submission, is issued in response to the Draft Direction.

The submission provides an account of the 'constraints on development of the lands'. It was noted that there was a discussion (at the above meeting) around the constraints on portions of the lands zoned in the previous FDP, in particular lands to the south-east of the junction.

It was stated that part of the lands were identified during the meeting as being at risk of flooding, and are subject to an ecological corridor objective, the combined effect was to significantly reduce the developable area of the zoned lands.

The submission also referred to the ecological corridor objective which, It was stated, further constrains the lands. A map showing the flood risk areas and ecological corridor is submitted in support where it was stated that the ecological corridor in combination with a landscape offset around the site results in a residual development area of 2.2 ha. It was noted that when this residual area is reviewed against the flood risk mapping, that entire portion of the south-eastern lands are undevelopable.

Reference is made to pre-planning consultations where it was stated that any flood mitigation strategy for development on GE lands must be delivered on GE lands. It was maintained that this would not allow RU lands to the south, which are subject to the Draft Direction, to be utilised for flood storage to facilitate development on the zoned lands.

The submission noted that the subject lands have been measured as 6.95 ha, which is stated as being less than the currently zoned 7.36 ha. It was stated that these constraints (above) were discussed by the Elected Members at the Council meeting and they considered the rationale put forward in support of the motions and it was on this rationale (and further reasons below) that the additional land was voted in favour.

It was also stated that the ecological corridor render the lands to the north east of the junction largely undevelopable and a map illustrating same has been provided.

The submission referred to the Fingal Economic and Land Use Study and expressed concern regarding the limitations of this study, where it does not accurately reflect a detailed account of development permitted, commenced, underway or completed since Q4 2020.

## PART 2

The submission goes on to provide a detailed rationale for the zoning of additional lands at the M1 Business Park. Details of the park have been provided. It was stated that there are approx. 300 people employed here, on 77 ha of land and 335,000m<sup>2</sup> with 9 occupiers and is considered an established employment area. A map showing the different sites within the landholding is shown. Reference is made to the recent significant investment made by Fyffes at this location.

The submission noted that permission was recently granted for additional infrastructure including the provision of a new wastewater pump station (Reg. Ref. F22A/0255) at M1 Business Park. The plans have been developed in close consultation with Fingal County Council and Irish Water and this infrastructure will represent an additional €2.5m investment by the park owners, Balmoral, and has been designed to cater for the future development of the entire M1 Business Park, Balbriggan. The bus services to this site were detailed in the submission and it was anticipated that future phases of the M1 Business Park will include specific proposals for cyclist friendly facilities. It was also stated that Fyffes currently runs a private service to and from Swords / Balbriggan and this can be further extended as required in future years.

The submission contended that there has been significant investment in infrastructure serving the M1 Business Park lands both east and west of the M1 to facilitate their development, including access roundabouts and junctions and water supply infrastructure.

The submission stated that the M1 Business Park lands meet all relevant criteria for logistics or warehousing and light industrial development, in that it is located directly at Junction 5 of the M1 motorway, avoiding impact on the local road network for essential warehousing, distribution, and logistics operations, which depend on the motorway network and will not introduce heavy goods vehicles into more central and higher populated areas. It was also stated that the lands are already serviced and are served by public transport. In this regard, reference is made to the Development Plan Guidelines, the FDP and Variation no. 2 of the 2017 to 2023 Fingal Development Plan.

The submission noted the location of the lands on the Dublin-Belfast Economic Corridor and stated that the positioning of logistics development proximate to these networks is fundamental to their efficient operation, particularly given the increase in demand for logistics services for both exports and imports which are a key component of the economy, particularly as Ireland is a consistent net exporter of goods.

The Development Plan settlement hierarchy is referred to in the submission with specific reference to Balbriggan. It was maintained that Balbriggan and its hinterland including established employment locations such as the M1 Business Park should be targeted for employment investment in accordance with the Development Plan Settlement Hierarchy, rather than removing such opportunities through zoning.

Reference is again made to the Fingal Economic and Employment Land Use Study and contended that this does not provide an accurate outlook of availability or demand for GE lands for Fingal. It was stated that there is a current undersupply of logistics and warehouse facilities which is stifling growth, including that of indigenous companies seeking to expand. The submission noted IDA's comments on the M1 Business Park.

It was also stated that there will be a need for relocation of existing businesses to facilitate key major regeneration projects e.g. Metro Economic Corridor in Fingal, City Edge in DCC and SDCC

## PART 2

---

and in Jamestown Road in Finglas This relocation will require available lands to provide new facilities and if such land is not available, these businesses will remain in their current locations preventing the development of underutilised lands or potentially move to other counties.

The submission provides a response to the 'statement of reasons' outlined in the Draft Direction as summarised below.

With regard to Reason (I), it was stated that the lands are located along the Dublin-Belfast Economic Corridor and therefore the lands do form part of a strategic area under the NPF, RSES and the FDP 2023-2029. It was submitted that the lands are contiguous to the existing zoned lands and are well serviced by public transport and water infrastructure, with upgrades planned for waste water and cycle routes. The bus services to the business park are detailed again and a number of NSOs and NPOs are quoted in response to reason (I) of the Draft Direction.

Reason (II) of the Draft Direction does not relate to the subject lands and there is no commentary on same.

In relation to Reason (III), it was stated that there was clear evidence and rationale put forward in Motions for the zoning of these lands for employment development in not accepting the CE Recommendation and as such the requirements of the Guidelines have been complied with. It was also stated that the rationale for the motion was not provided to the OPR in the Section 12 (5) (aa) notice.

The ecological corridor and flood risk constraints of the site are noted again. The submission contended that having regard to the site specific and locational qualities of the lands set out within, including the existing and planned infrastructure, the public transport accessibility, the current underperformance of Balbriggan's employment function, the recognition of the differing characteristics of space intensive enterprises in the Development Plan Guidelines and the strategic nature of the Dublin Belfast Economic Corridor, there is a clear and strategic rationale underpinning the zoning of the additional lands at this location.

Extracts from the Development Plan Guidelines have been included in the submission and in response to same, it was stated that the lands are already serviced by significant road and utility infrastructure, and that the lands meet all relevant criteria for logistics/ warehousing and light industrial development, in that it is located directly at Junction 5 of the M1 Motorway, avoiding impact on the local road network for essential warehousing, distribution, and logistics operations, which depend on the motorway network and will not introduce heavy goods vehicles into more central and higher populated areas.

The submission noted that Reason (IV) of the Draft Direction does not apply to the lands and with regard to Reason (V) It was noted that there was no objection from the NTA or TII in relation to the additional zoning at M1 Business Park.

With regard to Reason (VI), it was submitted that a robust justification for the zoning of the subject lands has been set out in this document and that the Section 12(5)(aa) notice issued by the FCC Executive did not comprehensively set out the rationale of the Elected Members for supporting the zoning of the additional lands, as is set out in this document, and therefore the OPR did not have a full and comprehensive understanding of the rationale in determining the basis for not complying with Recommendation 11.

# PART 2

In response to Reason (VII), it was stated that a response to items (I-VI) has been set out in the submission.

It was maintained that in response to Reason (VII), there is a clear and robust planning rationale for the zoning of additional lands at M1 Business Park and that the Elected Members took into account the proper planning and sustainable development of the area, the statutory obligations of the local authority and the relevant policies and objectives of the Government or Minister thereof.

This submission also contains details of the subject motions (Item 361 and 362) and the rationale presented with same. Correspondence from Frank Wright regarding the subject business park has also been included with this submission.

## **FIN-C568-129: National Transport Authority (NTA)**

This submission from the NTA noted that it can only support zoning objectives that permit trip intensive developments in locations served by existing or planned public transport services and that are located adjacent to existing or planned active travel networks. In this regard policies from the Transport Strategy for the Greater Dublin Area 2022-2042 were referenced including Measure PLAN4, Measure PLAN6 and Measure ROAD2.

The submission referred to Policy EEP2 of the Development Plan and expressed concern that employment and trip intensive uses could be permitted in peripheral locations, including those referenced in the Draft Direction, which are removed from public transport services and active travel infrastructure.

Support was expressed for Draft Direction 2(a)(iv) with the submission stating that the NTA considered that the zoning of these lands for General Employment would not accord with the Transport Strategy for the Greater Dublin Area 2022-2042.

## **2. Summary of Views of, and Recommendations made by the Elected Members**

No submissions were received from the Elected Members in relation to Draft Direction Item 2(a)(iv).

## **3. Recommendations in relation to the Best Manner in which to Give Effect to Draft Direction Item 2(a)(iv)**

### **Chief Executive's Recommendation**

Draft Direction 2(a)(iv) requires the deletion of the following zoning objective from the adopted Plan i.e. the subject land is unzoned:

- Land zoned General Employment in the adopted Plan to the south east of Junction 5 on the M1 at Hedgestown, Courtlough which was zoned Rural in the Fingal County Development Plan 2017-2023.

Under Section 31(9) of the Act, this Chief Executive's Report is required to make recommendations in relation to the best manner in which to give effect to the Draft Direction.

## PART 2

---

It would appear that the current wording of the Draft Direction, would, if adopted, result in the removal of the GE – General Employment zoning which would leave the subject lands ‘unzoned’.

However, given that all lands in Fingal have been assigned a land use zoning, and having regard to the surrounding land use zonings in this part of Fingal, as well as the reasons for the Draft Direction given by the Minister, the Chief Executive recommends that the GE – General Employment zoned lands at this location are instead zoned RU – Rural as per the previous Fingal Development Plan 2017-2023.

# PART 2

## Draft Direction Item 2(b)

- *2(b) Reinstate the Greenbelt zoning objective for lands PA SH 12.4 Newtown i.e. the subject lands revert to Greenbelt from General Employment consistent with the recommendation of the chief executive's report dated 15th January 2023.*

### 1. Summary of Views of any Person who made Submissions or Observations

#### List of Submissions/Observations Received

FIN-C568-129

#### Summary of Main Issues Raised in Submissions/Observations

##### FIN-C568-129: National Transport Authority ( NTA)

This submission from the National Transport Authority (NTA) ([FIN-C568-129](#)) noted that it can only support zoning objectives that permit trip intensive developments in locations served by existing or planned public transport services and that are located adjacent to existing or planned active travel networks. In this regard policies from the Transport Strategy for the Greater Dublin Area 2022-2042 were referenced including Measure PLAN4, Measure PLAN6 and Measure ROAD2.

The submission referred to Policy EEP2 of the Development Plan and expressed concern that employment and trip intensive uses could be permitted in peripheral locations, including those referenced in the Draft Direction, which are removed from public transport services and active travel infrastructure.

Support was expressed for Draft Direction 2(b) and It was considered that the zoning of these lands for General Employment would not accord with the Transport Strategy.

### 2. Summary of Views of, and Recommendations made by the Elected Members

No submissions were received from the Elected Members in relation to Draft Direction Item 2(b).

### 3. Recommendations in relation to the Best Manner in which to Give Effect to Draft Direction Item 2(b)

#### Chief Executive's Recommendation

Draft Direction Item 2(b) requires the Fingal Development Plan to be amended as follows:

- Reinstate the Greenbelt zoning objective for lands PA SH 12.4 Newtown i.e. the subject lands revert to Greenbelt from General Employment consistent with the recommendation of the chief executive's report dated 15th January 2023.



## PART 2

---

Under Section 31(9) of the Act, this Chief Executive's Report is required to make recommendations in relation to the best manner in which to give effect to the Draft Direction.

It should be noted that the Fingal Development Plan as adopted does not in fact provide for the zoning of the lands in question as GE – General Employment.

Instead, as the result of an amended motion passed by the Elected Members in the Special Council meetings on the Development Plan in February 2023 (Agenda Item 171, Motion Ref. 87950), it was decided by the Elected Members that the lands in question should revert back to their GB – Greenbelt zoning, but that the map based local objective regarding the upgrading of roads on the lands should be retained.

This resulted in the inclusion in the adopted Fingal County Development of the following map based local objective on GB – Greenbelt zoned subject lands:

*"Any general enterprise and employment type development of the lands identified by the site specific objective boundary at Newtown St. Margaret's shall be contingent on the widening and upgrading of Kilshane Road to the northern boundary of the site, including installation of Active Travel Infrastructure; the provision of a detailed landscaping plan for the lands and subject to restrictions on development arising from the Inner Public Safety Zone."*

It is considered that the fact that the lands in question are not in fact zoned GE – General Enterprise, but are instead zoned GB – Greenbelt, means that the primary aim of Draft Direction Item 2(b) has already been achieved and that its inclusion is therefore not necessary.

As a result, having regard to the reasons for this Draft Direction Item provided by the Minister, the Chief Executive Recommends that Draft Direction Item 2(b) is omitted from the final Ministerial Direction on the Fingal County Development Plan.

# PART 2

## Draft Direction Item 2(c)

- *2(c) Delete the amended and additional text inserted under PA CH 8.1 as modified, consistent with the recommendation of the chief executive's report dated 15th January 2023.*

### 1. Summary of Views of any Person who made Submissions or Observations

#### List of Submissions/Observations Received

FIN-C568-1, FIN-C568-2, FIN-C568-3, FIN-C568-4, FIN-C568-5, FIN-C568-6, FIN-C568-7, FIN-C568-8, FIN-C568-9, FIN-C568-10, FIN-C568-11, FIN-C568-12, FIN-C568-13, FIN-C568-14, FIN-C568-15, FIN-C568-16, FIN-C568-17, FIN-C568-18, FIN-C568-19, FIN-C568-20, FIN-C568-21, FIN-C568-22, FIN-C568-23, FIN-C568-24, FIN-C568-25, FIN-C568-26, FIN-C568-27, FIN-C568-28, FIN-C568-29, FIN-C568-30, FIN-C568-31, FIN-C568-32, FIN-C568-33, FIN-C568-34, FIN-C568-35, FIN-C568-36, FIN-C568-37, FIN-C568-38, FIN-C568-39, FIN-C568-40, FIN-C568-41, FIN-C568-42, FIN-C568-43, FIN-C568-44, FIN-C568-45, FIN-C568-46, FIN-C568-47, FIN-C568-48, FIN-C568-49, FIN-C568-50, FIN-C568-51, FIN-C568-52, FIN-C568-53, FIN-C568-54, FIN-C568-55, FIN-C568-56, FIN-C568-57, FIN-C568-58, FIN-C568-59, FIN-C568-60, FIN-C568-61, FIN-C568-62, FIN-C568-63, FIN-C568-64, FIN-C568-65, FIN-C568-66, FIN-C568-67, FIN-C568-68, FIN-C568-69, FIN-C568-70, FIN-C568-71, FIN-C568-72, FIN-C568-73, FIN-C568-74, FIN-C568-75, FIN-C568-76, FIN-C568-78, FIN-C568-79, FIN-C568-80, FIN-C568-81, FIN-C568-82, FIN-C568-83, FIN-C568-84, FIN-C568-85, FIN-C568-86, FIN-C568-87, FIN-C568-88, FIN-C568-89, FIN-C568-90, FIN-C568-91, FIN-C568-92, FIN-C568-93, FIN-C568-94, FIN-C568-95, FIN-C568-96, FIN-C568-97, FIN-C568-98, FIN-C568-99, FIN-C568-100, FIN-C568-101, FIN-C568-102, FIN-C568-103, FIN-C568-104, FIN-C568-105, FIN-C568-106, FIN-C568-107, FIN-C568-108, FIN-C568-109, FIN-C568-110, FIN-C568-111, FIN-C568-112, FIN-C568-113, FIN-C568-114, FIN-C568-115, FIN-C568-116, FIN-C568-117, FIN-C568-118, FIN-C568-119, FIN-C568-120, FIN-C568-121, FIN-C568-122, FIN-C568-124, FIN-C568-125, FIN-C568-126, FIN-C568-127, FIN-C568-128, FIN-C568-131, FIN-C568-132, FIN-C568-133, FIN-C568-134, FIN-C568-135, FIN-C568-136, FIN-C568-137, FIN-C568-138, FIN-C568-139, FIN-C568-140, FIN-C568-141, FIN-C568-142, FIN-C568-143, FIN-C568-144, FIN-C568-145, FIN-C568-147, FIN-C568-148, FIN-C568-149, FIN-C568-150, FIN-C568-151, FIN-C568-153, FIN-C568-154, FIN-C568-155, FIN-C568-156, FIN-C568-157, FIN-C568-158, FIN-C568-160, FIN-C568-161, FIN-C568-162, FIN-C568-163, FIN-C568-164, FIN-C568-165, FIN-C568-166, FIN-C568-167, FIN-C568-168, FIN-C568-169, FIN-C568-170

#### Summary of Main Issues Raised in the Submissions/Observations

A large volume of submissions covering a wide range of issues relating to this Draft Direction. Some more detailed than others, particular reference to submissions from Friends of the Irish Environment ([FIN-C568-074](#)), from SMTW Environmental DAC ([FIN-C568-124](#)) and from daa ([FIN-C568-131](#)).

It should be noted that 162 of the 163 submissions received in relation to Draft Direction Item 2(c) opposed the removal of the additional text in Section 8.5.7 Ensuring Environmental Protection and Sustainability, which is the subject of the Draft Direction.

# PART 2

It should also be noted that the full text of each submission is available to view online on the Fingal County Council website at: <https://consult.fingal.ie/en/consultation/draft-ministerial-direction-accordance-section-317-planning-development-act-2000-amended-making>

During the course of reviewing and summarising each individual submission, a number of common views or themes were identified which appeared repeatedly in submissions and observations received which expressed opposition to the removal of the section of text in question. These issues can be seen to relate to (in alphabetical order):

- Aircraft Noise;
- Aircraft Traffic, Flight Paths and Runway Permission for Dublin Airport;
- ANCA (Aircraft Noise Competent Authority);
- Health Impacts of Aircraft Noise and WHO Standards;
- Noise Insulation and Noise Protection Zones; and
- Procedural / Governance Issues.

Given the volume of submissions received, and given that many of the submissions in opposition to the requirement to remove text as specified by Draft Direction Item 2(c) were very similar, the following section will provide a summary of the key issues listed above.

This is in accordance with Section 31(9) of the Act, which states that this Chief Executive's Report is required, amongst other things, to summarise the views of any person who made submissions or observations to the planning authority.

## **Aircraft Noise**

As Draft Direction Item 2(c) relates to a section of the Development Plan which addresses aircraft noise, the large majority of submissions received opposing Draft Direction 2(c) highlighted aircraft noise as being an issue for people living in the vicinity of Dublin Airport.

A large number of submissions specifically called for measures, including the expansion of the noise insulation scheme to ensure noise levels produced by aircraft during night time are reduced to below 40db Lnight to protect the health of communities impacted by aircraft noise.

A number of submissions described excessive airport noise as a constant, ongoing issue which impacts residents both day and night, with decibel levels exceeding 80 to 90 decibels in some instances during the daytime, and in excess of 40 decibels at night.

Submissions state that excessive, intrusive aircraft noise is hindering the enjoyment of residents of their properties both day and night and express concern at the exclusion of provisions from the Development Plan which relate to the control of aircraft noise in Fingal.

With regard to the compliance of the text to which Draft Direction Item 2(c) relates with national and regional planning policy, a number of submissions include a detailed discussion of how the text would appear to comply with policies such as NPO 65 of the NPF which relates to the proactive management of noise.

In this regard, some submissions pointed to the inclusion of other policies and objectives in the Development Plan which seek to protect people from the impact of noise (including airport noise), and query why these should not also be subject to a Draft Ministerial Direction. One submission noted the Development Plan's identification of the development process as being key to ensuring that the objectives of the Environmental Noise Regulations are given effect.

# PART 2

---

Submissions also argued that the existence of other regulatory systems relating to the control of aircraft noise, does not preclude the Development Plan from including policies relating to this issue and that in this regard, Elected Members have wide discretion as to what they consider relates to the proper planning and sustainable development of their area.

## **Aircraft Traffic, Flight Paths and Runway Permission for Dublin Airport**

A number of submissions which expressed opposition to Draft Ministerial Direction Item 2(c) make reference to perceived increases in the level of aircraft traffic, changes in aircraft flight paths as well as other issues that are associated with the permitting and operation of the new north runway at Dublin Airport.

Some submissions contended that requirements arising out of various planning permissions for the development of runways have not been adhered to and that this is resulting in a deviation from permitted flight paths and an overall increase in the levels of aircraft noise in the vicinity of Dublin Airport. Other submissions asserted that the operation of the new north runway has worsened led to an increase in aircraft noise in affected areas.

## **ANCA (Aircraft Noise Competent Authority)**

Several submissions raised reservations in relation to the role of the Aircraft Noise Competent Authority (ANCA) in the regulation of aircraft related noise associated with Dublin Airport. Some submissions called for a review of the governance structure associated with ANCA, others queried whether ANCA gives sufficient priority to protecting public health, while others queried specific decisions taken by the body in relation to noise issues.

A small number of submissions contended that the fact that ANCA's role is set out in legislation relating to airport noise which includes the power to impose operating restrictions on the airport, does not preclude the Development Plan from also including policies and objectives which specify mitigating measures relating to land-use planning measures.

## **Health Impacts of Aircraft Noise and WHO Standards**

A large proportion of the submissions received in opposition to Draft Direction Item 2(c) highlighted the negative health impacts associated with excessive aircraft noise. There are numerous submissions which provide first-hand accounts of the impact of aircraft noise on the physical and mental health and sleep quality of individuals and families, including young children.

References are made in several instances to detailed research from bodies such as the World Health Organisation, on the impacts of aircraft noise (particularly night time aircraft noise), on health with at least one submission providing estimates of the significant cost to the public healthcare system arising from the treatment of noise-related ill-health.

A number of submissions contended that the consideration of the human health impacts of aircraft noise does not appear to be the central consideration for relevant decision making bodies. From this they argue that such bodies appear to be more concerned with economic and financial matters associated with the operation of Dublin Airport than the health of Fingal's residents.

A considerable number of submission expressed concerns regarding the exclusion of provisions relating to aircraft noise from the Development Plan which is described as complying with

# PART 2

scientific, evidence-based WHO minimum noise standards (including the WHO's Environmental Noise guidelines for the European Region).

## **Noise Insulation Scheme and Noise Protection Zones**

Reflecting the wording of the reason IV set out in the Draft Direction, a considerable number of the submissions specifically expressed opposition to the removal or amendment of text from the Development Plan which recognises the inadequacy of the proposed noise insulation scheme to protect the health of those affected by aircraft noise and the objective to take measures including the expansion of noise insulation to ensure noise levels produced by aircraft during night time are reduced to below 40 dB Lnight.

With regard to noise protection zones, one submissions stated that the noise zones specified by the Development Plan are fully compatible with NPO 65 as they were designated with the ProPG Guidelines and BS 8233:2014. Additionally, a small number of other submissions requested the expansion of the noise protection zone to take in additional areas of the County that are stated as experiencing unacceptable levels of aircraft related noise.

## **Procedural / Governance Issues**

A high percentage of the submissions received pointed to the fact that the text which is the subject of Draft Direction Item 2(c), was unanimously agreed upon by a vote, and then was added to the Development Plan by the democratically by Elected Members of Fingal County Council. Submissions stated that as a result, that any attempt to remove this text would undermine the local democratic and development plan-making process.

A smaller number of submissions questioned the authority of the Minister and of the Office of the Planning Regulator to override the wishes of locally elected Council members. Other submissions rejected the assertion that the Elected Members are precluded from including provisions relating to aircraft noise in the County Development Plan and that the reasons given in the Draft Ministerial Direction are not valid or accurate in this regard.

A number of specific procedural issues relating to the issuing of the Draft Ministerial Direction were raised in detailed submissions received on behalf of environmental groups (see submission [FIN-C568-074](#) from Friends of the Irish Environment and [FIN-C568-124](#) from SMTW Environmental DAC). Points raised in these detailed submissions include the following:

- SEA screening was not carried out on the revised amendments;
- the consultation on the Draft Ministerial Direction is flawed as it fails to list the revised amendment for PA CH 8.1 and refers to the text of the old amendment and not the revised text as adopted by the Elected Members;
- the Elected Members took the views of the OPR on board and revised the text of the amendment to comply with NPO 65, and therefore this amendment should stand as voted on by the Councillors;
- the Draft Direction is contrary to and in breach of general principles of fair procedure, the Aarhus Convention and Article 6(2) of the SEA Directive which requires that the public must be given an early and effective opportunity within appropriate time frames to express their opinion;
- there is a lack of clarity associated with references in the Draft Direction to “matters that are the subject of other legislative provisions” due to the fact that a Development Plan naturally concerns matters that are the subject of other legislative provisions and policies (e.g. the Habitats Directive, the Water Framework Directive, the Floods Directive).

## PART 2

- the statement in the Draft Direction that the plan is not in compliance with the requirements of the 2000 Act is also unclear as no additional provisions of the 2000 Act have been identified other than those outlined previously in the submission and that this basis seems to be consequential on the other bases for the Minister's opinion.

### **Submission Expressing Support for Draft Ministerial Direction Item 2(c)**

As outlined above, of 163 submissions received by the Planning Authority in relation to Draft Direction Item 2(c), 162 submissions expressed their opposition to this item and expressed their support for the retention of the relevant text in the adopted Development Plan.

The remaining submission, which welcomed Draft Ministerial Direction Item 2(c) was a detailed submission from daa – Dublin Airport ([FIN-C568-131](#)) which unreservedly supported the removal of the relevant amended text relating to noise insulation and aircraft noise at Dublin Airport on the basis that its retention would present serious practical, commercial and technical implications for the future of Dublin Airport, and that there are serious policy implications of allowing the County Development Plan process to be used to circumvent separate regulatory processes. In this regard, the submission addressed a number of key issues including:

- planning policy conflict;
- regulatory conflict; and
- prohibitive practical and financial implications for Dublin Airport

The section of the submission which addressed the planning policy context stated that PA CH 8.1 is inconsistent with relevant national and regional planning policies for Dublin Airport, including the NPF and the EMRA RSES. The submission went on to state that PA CH 8.1 would entail a prohibitive financial burden, impacting the airport's ability to develop and deliver high-quality international connectivity in line with the NPF1 and the RSES2.

The section on the submission relating to regulatory conflict, stated that PA CH 8.1 conflicts with the Ministerial Planning Guidelines on Development Plans which advises that Development Plan objectives should not address matters that are the subject of other legislative provisions and also advised that while objectives may be provided to encourage particular formats or technical methods as appropriate, these should not be framed as mandatory or statutory requirements.

The submission went on to state that the amendment arising from PA CH 8.1 provides a policy objective concerning aviation noise which is governed by other legislative provisions including the Aircraft Noise (Dublin Airport) Regulation Act, 2019 and sections 34B and 34C of the Planning and Development Act. The submission maintained that retention of PA CH 8.1 in the Development Plan would create a conflict with these legislative provisions, in particular with the regulatory role of the Airport Noise Competent Authority (ANCA) including their role in setting the Noise Abatement Objective. In this regard, the submission referred to Section 3(7)(a) of the 2019 Act.

The submission further stated that PA CH 8.1 represents a noise mitigation measure, the regulation of which is the subject of a specific regime established by the 2019 Act. The submission contended that as a result, the Elected Members of Fingal County Council through the mechanism of the Development Plan have no jurisdiction to set noise mitigation measures in respect of Dublin Airport.

## PART 2

Furthermore, the submission stated that PA CH 8.1 is inconsistent with the Noise Action Plan for Dublin Airport 2019 – 2023 and purports to revise that plan other than in accordance with Article 12 of the European Communities (Environmental) Noise Regulations 2018 and that retention of PA CH 8.1 would fail to have proper regard to the International Civil Aviation Organisation's "A Balanced Approach to Aircraft Noise Management", to which Dublin Airport is subject.

The third section of the submission on the practical and financial implications for Dublin Airport noted that acoustic consultants Bickerdike Allen & Partners LLP were engaged to undertake a technical review of the implications of PA CH 8.1.

According to the submission, this analysis (which is included as an appendix to the submission) shows that the practical effect of the retaining Material Alteration PA CH 8.1 would be to extend the insulation scheme as proposed under the Relevant Action application to a far greater number of people than is required at present which could amount to circa €1.8 billion by 2025. The submission asserted that the administrative burden and cost of dealing with such a scheme would be prohibitive and directly impact on the further development of Dublin Airport.

The submission also stated that PA CH 8.1 is incorrect as it provides an unsubstantiated opinion in relation to the inadequacy of the proposed noise insulation scheme which is unsupported by any reasoned basis, assessment or verifiable evidence.

It went on to state that a proposed change from the 55 dB Lnight under the NAO, to 40 dB Lnight, would directly conflict with the proposed insulation scheme recently approved by ANCA, including Fingal County Council's own decision in the Relevant Action application currently on appeal to An Bord Pleanála and furthermore that BAP Consultants were not aware of 40 dB Lnight being used in any other jurisdiction in the UK or EU as a criterion for noise insulation.

The submission referred to the findings of the analysis by BAP that applying a comparable approach to road traffic noise would mean considering taking measures including noise insulation to benefit around 25% of the population of Dublin and that setting an arbitrary benchmark of 40 dB Lnight (as the level at which noise insulation may be required), has potential to provide a new and onerous precedent with potentially far-reaching consequences for government and private developers if it were to be applied equitably to all noise sources, including traffic and rail noise.

The submission concluded by stating that given the magnitude of the potential impacts on the future of Dublin Airport, the removal of Material Amendment PA CH 8.1 from the Development Plan is of strategic national importance.

It noted that PA CH 8.1 was adopted against the recommendations of both Fingal County Council's Chief Executive and the Office of the Planning Regulator, that it presents a conflict with respect to the existing regulatory regime governing the management of aircraft noise at Dublin Airport, specifically, the statutory role of ANCA and that if retained, it would entail prohibitive financial implications, requiring a circa €1.8bn insulation scheme by 2025 which would seriously impact on and prevent further development of Dublin Airport.

The submission stated that daa has sought leave to commence judicial review proceedings in respect of the Development Plan but are seeking a stay on those proceedings pending the outcome of the Draft Direction Process.



# PART 2

## 2. Summary of Views of, and Recommendations made by the Elected Members

### List of Submissions/Observations Received

FIN-C568-59, FIN-C568-94, FIN-C568-104

#### **FIN-C568-59: Cllr. Ian Carey, Cllr. Pamela Conroy, Cllr. David Healy, Cllr. Karen Power, Cllr Daniel Whooley – Green Party/Comhaontas Glas Members of Fingal County Council**

This submission from Green Party/Comhaontas Glas members of Fingal County Council ([FIN-C568-59](#)) stated that the members of Fingal County Council unanimously decided to include the text of the relevant objective as adopted during the Special Council meetings on the Development Plan in February 2023. The submission also cited reason (IV) as set out under the Ministerial Direction.

This submission noted that the noise levels referred to in the objective are in keeping with the recommendations from the World Health Organisation in “Environmental noise guidelines for the European Region” and in this regard, the recommendations are cited in support of this submission.

This submission cited NPO 65 of the National Planning Framework to “*Promote the pro-active management of noise where it is likely to have significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life and support the aims of the Environmental Noise Regulations through national planning guidance and Noise Action Plans*”.

In this regard, the submission noted there is no reference in the objective on noise insulation which is inconsistent with NPO 65 and is therefore considered entirely consistent, being the pro-active management of noise where it is likely to have significant adverse impacts on health and safety.

The submission noted that the Draft Direction identifies the inconsistency as being due to “*the inclusion of matters which should be determined through the appropriate statutory process*”. The submission noted that there is no legal barrier preventing Fingal County Council from addressing noise through the Development Plan. The submission contended that it is clear that the impact of noise on human health, including that of airport noise, is a consideration that the Council must take account of in its planning decisions and therefore, addressed in the Development Plan.

The submission stated that the implication in the Draft Direction is that NPO65 requires that noise insulation not be dealt with in the Development Plan. The submission stated that this is not apparent in the context of NPO65. The submission contended that NPO65 explicitly recognises the pro-active management of noise and the aims of the Environmental Noise Regulations can be achieved through national planning guidance, and therefore, implicitly, through the planning system.

Furthermore, the submission stated that the Plan contains a series of other objectives relating to noise, including airport noise and specifically relating to noise insulation, to protect against airport noise and cited objective SPQHO82, Table 8.1 objectives DAO11, DAO12, and DMSO45, Table 14.16, and objective DMSO105, that all explicitly cover noise insulation. The submission

## PART 2

contended that if this objective in the Draft Direction were contrary to NPO65, this would be the case for the other objectives.

The submission noted that there is no basis to suggest that it is consistent with NPO65 to include provisions requiring noise insulation but in consistent with NPO65 to specify the noise levels required to be reached by that insulation.

In conclusion, the submission noted the following:

- The objective has been formulated in accordance with the best scientific guidance to protect human health.
- Fingal County Council is acting within its powers in specifying the standard of noise insulation to be met.
- There is no basis for suggesting that this matter is not appropriate to the Fingal Development Plan.
- There is no basis for suggesting that this objective is contrary to NPO65 of the National Planning Framework.
- There is no legal basis or justification for the Draft Direction in relation to this objective.

### **FIN-C568-94: Cllr. Joe Newman**

This submission from Councillor Joe Newman ([FIN-C568-94](#)) expressed opposition to the Ministerial Direction relating to the deletion of additional text inserted under PA CH 8.1 and contended that the material alteration was consistent with the reserved function of elected representatives.

The submission stated that the Development Plan includes provisions that recognise the inadequacy of the proposed noise insulation scheme to protect the health of those impacted by aircraft noise and that it is an objective to take measures including the expansion of noise insulation to ensure noise levels produced by aircraft during night time are reduced to below 40db, as was voted overwhelmingly by elected representatives of Fingal County Council to protect the health of communities impacted by aircraft noise.

This submission noted the large number of complaints from local communities in recent times regarding excessive noise associated with aircraft departing and arriving at Dublin Airport and the increase in such complaints since the opening of the North Runway. The submission contended that the taxiing and take off from the North Runway is also a major contributing factor to noise and air pollution effecting residents of Boraimhe and Ridgewood estates. The submission expressed concern regarding deviation from previous flight paths that were prepared to inform local community groups of projected noise contours associated with the new North Runway.

Concern was also expressed regarding the unconstrained development of Dublin Airport, to the detriment of sustainable development and serious health implications for communities. In this regard, the submission noted that the motion requiring insulation for communities subject to night-time aircraft noise over 40 decibels was widely supported.

The submission noted a solution to avoid insulating/soundproofing homes in the wider area, by ensuring the 2007 planning permission conditions 3d and 5 as applied by an Bord Pleanála are

## PART 2

adhered to. The submission referred to the WHO guidelines on aircraft noise which describe the negative health issues associated with the disturbance of sleep at night.

In conclusion, the submission stated that the decision taken by Elected Members requiring the expansion of insulation of homes to offset excessive noise associated with night-flights, is within their powers as members of Fingal County Council and is therefore valid.

**FIN-C568-104: Cllr. Ann Graves on behalf of Sinn Féin Councillors and TDs in Fingal including Cllr. Ann Graves, Cllr. Angela Donnelly, Cllr. Breda Hanaphy, Cllr. Natalie Treacy, Louise O'Reilly TD and Paul Donnelly TD**

This submission from Councillor Graves ([FIN-C568-104](#)) referred to the text the motion as agreed by Councillors in the Special Council meetings on the Development Plan in February 2023.

The submission noted that the Draft decision relates to a superseded objective that differs to the one passed by the Elected Members and therefore should be included in the Development Plan as it has not been subject to objection by the Minister.

This submission noted that following a long and engaged debate, the motion was agreed unanimously by Elected Members based on a consensus by both the FCC executive and Elected Members that the health and safety of residents in Fingal has a place in the Development Plan.

The submission noted that during the discussion relating to this motion, Elected Members recognised the injustice to residents affected by aircraft noise which has been exacerbated since the opening of the North Runway in August 2022.

This submission noted that the Development Plan needs to recognise the inadequacy of the proposed noise insulation scheme, albeit, that the daa needs to reconsider the noise zones. The submission stated that in view of the breaches in relation to planning conditions, it is vital that the Development Plan includes protection for Fingal residents and their health from the serious impacts of aircraft noise including those in neighbouring counties.

The submission stated that it is an objective to take measures including the expansion of noise insulation schemes operated by daa to include all areas exposed to 40dB Lnight or higher as produced by night-time aircraft. The submission noted that the guidelines outlined in the motion are designed to ensure that internal noise levels are in keeping with internationally accepted standards on sound insulation and noise reduction for buildings as referenced in Chapter 14 Development Management Standards of the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029.

The submission stated that this approach is in response to the knowledge that night-time aircraft noise above these levels is associated with adverse effects including increased mortality, stress, high blood pressure and a deterioration in cardiovascular health. In this regard, this submission noted that details are available from research carried out in this area.

This submission also stated that Dublin Airport is in the heart of the Fingal community and that it is incumbent that the residents that are affected by aircraft noise are protected by relevant parties including Fingal County Council, in the interests of health and wellbeing. In this regard, the submission noted that such protection is required in the Development Plan, to ensure that insulation schemes are adequate to suit their needs.

# PART 2

This submission stated that the motion ensures that both this text and PA CH 8.3: Section 8.5.7 and Objective DA013 agree and meet the objectives of the Development Plan. The submission noted that there was no objection to the inclusion of section 8.5.7, where the Elected Members acting on behalf of the citizens of Fingal agreed to its inclusion. The submission noted that with the inclusion of Section 8.5.7, there is no difference between those objectives and those associated with this motion.

The submission expressed concerns regarding the information sources on which the Minister and the OPR based their determination and noted that Elected Members considered in great detail, the impacts on residents, the content of the motion, the necessity and appropriateness of protections for residents, before making their informed decision and unanimously voting to protect the interests of the residents, who are currently and may in the future, be affected by aircraft noise.

The submission concluded by stating that the Development Plan should represent the interests of Fingal residents and the objective as voted for unanimously by the Elected Members should be included in the final Development Plan.

## 3. Recommendations in relation to the Best Manner in which to Give Effect to Draft Direction Item 2(c)

### Chief Executive's Recommendation

Draft Direction Item 2(c) requires the Fingal Development Plan to be amended as follows:

- Delete the amended and additional text inserted under PA CH 8.1 as modified, consistent with the recommendation of the chief executive's report dated 15th January 2023.

It is noted that (as set out in numerous submissions received in relation to this Draft Direction Item) the original text of PA CH 8.1 included in the Chief Executive's Report on Public Consultation on Proposed Material Amendments was amended before being adopted in the Development Plan at the Special Council Meetings on the Development Plan in February 2023 (see Agenda Item 84, Motion Ref. 87943). For the avoidance of doubt, the text of the adopted amendment as agreed by the Elected Members is provided below:

#### **PA CH 8.1 AS MODIFIED: Section 8.5.7 Ensuring Environmental Protection and Sustainability, page 309**

Include the following text as a final paragraph on page 309:

***That the Development Plan recognises the inadequacy of the proposed noise insulation scheme to protect the health of those affected by aircraft noise and that in view of the increasing knowledge and scientific evidence of the serious health impact of aircraft noise on the physical health of Fingal residents that it is an objective to take measures including the expansion of noise insulation schemes operated by DAA to include all areas exposed to 40dB Lnight or higher as produced by aircraft during night time. The insulation schemes should be designed to ensure that internal noise levels are in keeping with BSI Standards Publication BS 8233:2014 Guidance on sound insulation and noise reduction for buildings, table 4: Indoor ambient noise levels for dwellings, as referenced in Chapter 14: Development Management Standards of the Development Plan 2023-2029. This approach is in response to the knowledge that night-time***

## PART 2

---

*aircraft noise above this level is associated with adverse effects including increased mortality, stress, high blood pressure and a deterioration in cardiovascular health.*

Under Section 31(9) of the Act, this Chief Executive's Report is required to make recommendations in relation to the best manner in which to give effect to the Draft Direction. Having regard to this requirement the Chief Executive's recommendation is for the text in green above to be deleted from Section 8.5.7 of the Fingal Development Plan.

# PART 2

## Full List of Submissions / Observations Received

URN	Author	URL
FIN-C568-001	Mark Graham	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-1#obs-13335">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-1#obs-13335</a>
FIN-C568-002	Barbara Brady	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-2#obs-13336">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-2#obs-13336</a>
FIN-C568-003	Mark Levins	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-3#obs-13337">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-3#obs-13337</a>
FIN-C568-004	David Peyton	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-4#obs-13338">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-4#obs-13338</a>
FIN-C568-005	Verena Lassus	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-5#obs-13339">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-5#obs-13339</a>
FIN-C568-006	Claire McCarville	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-6#obs-13353">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-6#obs-13353</a>
FIN-C568-007	Niall Nolan	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-7#obs-13354">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-7#obs-13354</a>
FIN-C568-008	Joe Cummins	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-8#obs-13358">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-8#obs-13358</a>
FIN-C568-009	Eugen Dumitras	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-9#obs-13359">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-9#obs-13359</a>
FIN-C568-010	Charles Bobbett	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-10#obs-13360">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-10#obs-13360</a>
FIN-C568-011	Philip Davis	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-11#obs-13361">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-11#obs-13361</a>
FIN-C568-012	Sinead McMahon	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-12#obs-13363">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-12#obs-13363</a>
FIN-C568-013	Theresa McGuinness	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-13#obs-13364">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-13#obs-13364</a>
FIN-C568-014	Derek Hanlon	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-14#obs-13362">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-14#obs-13362</a>
FIN-C568-015	Billy Colgan	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-15#obs-13365">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-15#obs-13365</a>
FIN-C568-016	Darragh O Driscoll	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-16#obs-13367">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-16#obs-13367</a>
FIN-C568-017	Bill Reilly	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-17#obs-13366">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-17#obs-13366</a>
FIN-C568-018	Conor Kennedy	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-18#obs-13371">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-18#obs-13371</a>
FIN-C568-019	Tony McCabe	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-19#obs-13376">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-19#obs-13376</a>
FIN-C568-020	Alan Lynch	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-20#obs-13379">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-20#obs-13379</a>
FIN-C568-021	Eithna Ratcliffe	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-21#obs-13380">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-21#obs-13380</a>
FIN-C568-022	Davide Casinelli	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-22#obs-13383">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-22#obs-13383</a>

## PART 2

URN	Author	URL
FIN-C568-023	Nick Egan	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-23#obs-13384">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-23#obs-13384</a>
FIN-C568-024	Liam Doyle	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-24#obs-13385">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-24#obs-13385</a>
FIN-C568-025	Bernie Egan	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-25#obs-13386">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-25#obs-13386</a>
FIN-C568-026	Jane O Shea	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-26#obs-13388">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-26#obs-13388</a>
FIN-C568-027	Catherine Ratcliffe	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-27#obs-13390">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-27#obs-13390</a>
FIN-C568-028	Colm Ratcliffe	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-28#obs-13391">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-28#obs-13391</a>
FIN-C568-029	Robert Henry	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-29#obs-13392">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-29#obs-13392</a>
FIN-C568-030	Niall Farrell	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-30#obs-13393">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-30#obs-13393</a>
FIN-C568-031	Edward Cassidy	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-31#obs-13395">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-31#obs-13395</a>
FIN-C568-032	Bernie Lawless	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-32#obs-13399">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-32#obs-13399</a>
FIN-C568-033	Maurice O'Donnell	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-33#obs-13403">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-33#obs-13403</a>
FIN-C568-034	Ballyboughal Community Council	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-34#obs-13412">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-34#obs-13412</a>
FIN-C568-035	Patricia Duffy	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-35#obs-13414">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-35#obs-13414</a>
FIN-C568-036	Adrian Kavanagh	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-36#obs-13415">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-36#obs-13415</a>
FIN-C568-037	Maebh Gogarty	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-37#obs-13416">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-37#obs-13416</a>
FIN-C568-038	Eilis O'Friel	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-38#obs-13418">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-38#obs-13418</a>
FIN-C568-039	Michelle Queally	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-39#obs-13419">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-39#obs-13419</a>
FIN-C568-040	Orla Power	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-40#obs-13420">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-40#obs-13420</a>
FIN-C568-041	Teresa O Dowd	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-41#obs-13421">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-41#obs-13421</a>
FIN-C568-042	Tomas Fee	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-42#obs-13422">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-42#obs-13422</a>
FIN-C568-043	Mairead O'Keeffe	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-43#obs-13425">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-43#obs-13425</a>
FIN-C568-044	Philomena Beary	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-44#obs-13427">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-44#obs-13427</a>
FIN-C568-045	Rachel King	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-45#obs-13428">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-45#obs-13428</a>
FIN-C568-046	Albert Rattigan	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-46#obs-13429">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-46#obs-13429</a>



# PART 2

URN	Author	URL
FIN-C568-047	Terry Quinlan	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-47#obs-13431">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-47#obs-13431</a>
FIN-C568-048	Angela Martin	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-48#obs-13432">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-48#obs-13432</a>
FIN-C568-049	Michael Bannon	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-49#obs-13434">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-49#obs-13434</a>
FIN-C568-050	Peter O' Neill	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-50#obs-13435">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-50#obs-13435</a>
FIN-C568-051	Caitriona Hoey	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-51#obs-13441">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-51#obs-13441</a>
FIN-C568-052	Karen O'Driscoll	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-52#obs-13444">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-52#obs-13444</a>
FIN-C568-053	Jacqui Madden	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-53#obs-13445">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-53#obs-13445</a>
FIN-C568-054	Katrina Hanlon	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-54#obs-13447">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-54#obs-13447</a>
FIN-C568-055	Kieran McGrath	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-55#obs-13449">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-55#obs-13449</a>
FIN-C568-056	Emmett Currie	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-56#obs-13450">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-56#obs-13450</a>
FIN-C568-057	Ronan Scott	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-57#obs-13456">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-57#obs-13456</a>
FIN-C568-058	Edward Stevenson	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-58#obs-13467">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-58#obs-13467</a>
FIN-C568-059	David Healy	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-59#obs-13468">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-59#obs-13468</a>
FIN-C568-060	Scott Wright	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-60#obs-13470">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-60#obs-13470</a>
FIN-C568-061	Darren Maguire	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-61#obs-13471">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-61#obs-13471</a>
FIN-C568-062	Edel Flood	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-62#obs-13472">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-62#obs-13472</a>
FIN-C568-063	Barrie Law	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-63#obs-13473">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-63#obs-13473</a>
FIN-C568-064	Teresa Sweeney	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-64#obs-13474">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-64#obs-13474</a>
FIN-C568-065	Martin Godwin	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-65#obs-13475">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-65#obs-13475</a>
FIN-C568-066	Naul Community Council	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-66#obs-13476">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-66#obs-13476</a>
FIN-C568-067	Kate O Donovan	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-67#obs-13477">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-67#obs-13477</a>
FIN-C568-068	Siobhan O Rourke	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-68#obs-13478">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-68#obs-13478</a>
FIN-C568-069	Breffni Conaty	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-69#obs-13479">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-69#obs-13479</a>
FIN-C568-070	Carly Crawford	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-70#obs-13480">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-70#obs-13480</a>

## PART 2

URN	Author	URL
FIN-C568-071	Sean Costello	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-71#obs-13482">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-71#obs-13482</a>
FIN-C568-072	Joan Kavanagh	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-72#obs-13483">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-72#obs-13483</a>
FIN-C568-073	Pearse Sutton	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-73#obs-13484">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-73#obs-13484</a>
FIN-C568-074	Friends of the Irish Environment	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-74#obs-13485">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-74#obs-13485</a>
FIN-C568-075	Thomas Keeley	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-75#obs-13486">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-75#obs-13486</a>
FIN-C568-076	Patricia Hurley	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-76#obs-13487">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-76#obs-13487</a>
FIN-C568-077	Transport Infrastructure Ireland	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-77#obs-13489">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-77#obs-13489</a>
FIN-C568-078	Maurice Gleeson	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-78#obs-13490">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-78#obs-13490</a>
FIN-C568-079	Donall O'Donoghue	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-79#obs-13491">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-79#obs-13491</a>
FIN-C568-080	Michael Walsh	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-80#obs-13492">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-80#obs-13492</a>
FIN-C568-081	Renee Barnett	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-81#obs-13493">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-81#obs-13493</a>
FIN-C568-082	Marie Murtagh	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-82#obs-13494">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-82#obs-13494</a>
FIN-C568-083	John McFadden	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-83#obs-13495">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-83#obs-13495</a>
FIN-C568-084	Aisling Doran	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-84#obs-13496">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-84#obs-13496</a>
FIN-C568-085	Josephine Moloney	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-85#obs-13497">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-85#obs-13497</a>
FIN-C568-086	Louise Kelly	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-86#obs-13498">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-86#obs-13498</a>
FIN-C568-087	Bartholomew Glover	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-87#obs-13499">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-87#obs-13499</a>
FIN-C568-088	Steven Glover	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-88#obs-13500">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-88#obs-13500</a>
FIN-C568-089	Forrest Little Residents Association	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-89#obs-13501">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-89#obs-13501</a>
FIN-C568-090	Barry Glover	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-90#obs-13502">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-90#obs-13502</a>
FIN-C568-091	Noel Wilson	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-91#obs-13503">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-91#obs-13503</a>
FIN-C568-092	Grainne McFadden	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-92#obs-13504">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-92#obs-13504</a>
FIN-C568-093	John & Cathy Ryan	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-93#obs-13506">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-93#obs-13506</a>
FIN-C568-094	Joe Newman	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-94#obs-13508">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-94#obs-13508</a>

# PART 2

URN	Author	URL
FIN-C568-095	Maria Sweeney	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-95#obs-13509">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-95#obs-13509</a>
FIN-C568-096	Celine Hughes	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-96#obs-13510">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-96#obs-13510</a>
FIN-C568-097	Marisa Cassidy	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-97#obs-13511">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-97#obs-13511</a>
FIN-C568-098	Lisa Kennedy Byrne	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-98#obs-13513">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-98#obs-13513</a>
FIN-C568-099	Claire Gubbins	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-99#obs-13514">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-99#obs-13514</a>
FIN-C568-100	Brian Griffin	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-100#obs-13515">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-100#obs-13515</a>
FIN-C568-101	Robert Kennedy	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-101#obs-13516">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-101#obs-13516</a>
FIN-C568-102	Joseph Sweeney	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-102#obs-13518">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-102#obs-13518</a>
FIN-C568-103	Bettina Rabbitte	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-103#obs-13512">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-103#obs-13512</a>
FIN-C568-104	Ann Graves	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-104#obs-13520">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-104#obs-13520</a>
FIN-C568-105	Mary Bryllert	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-105#obs-13522">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-105#obs-13522</a>
FIN-C568-106	Mary Kiernan	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-106#obs-13523">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-106#obs-13523</a>
FIN-C568-107	Therese Mulpeter	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-107#obs-13524">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-107#obs-13524</a>
FIN-C568-108	Jeanne East	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-108#obs-13525">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-108#obs-13525</a>
FIN-C568-109	Karl Cassidy	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-109#obs-13526">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-109#obs-13526</a>
FIN-C568-110	Dylan Cassidy	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-110#obs-13527">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-110#obs-13527</a>
FIN-C568-111	John Dennehy	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-111#obs-13528">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-111#obs-13528</a>
FIN-C568-112	Ciara Mooney	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-112#obs-13529">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-112#obs-13529</a>
FIN-C568-113	Deirdre Wynter	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-113#obs-13530">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-113#obs-13530</a>
FIN-C568-114	Georgina Gaughan	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-114#obs-13533">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-114#obs-13533</a>
FIN-C568-115	Judit Moreno	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-115#obs-13534">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-115#obs-13534</a>
FIN-C568-116	Francisco Beltran	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-116#obs-13535">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-116#obs-13535</a>
FIN-C568-117	Claire Smith	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-117#obs-13536">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-117#obs-13536</a>
FIN-C568-118	Ronan Menton	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-118#obs-13537">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-118#obs-13537</a>

## PART 2

URN	Author	URL
FIN-C568-119	Gillian Menton	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-119#obs-13538">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-119#obs-13538</a>
FIN-C568-120	Róisín Gray	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-120#obs-13541">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-120#obs-13541</a>
FIN-C568-121	Serena Taylor	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-121#obs-13543">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-121#obs-13543</a>
FIN-C568-122	Gerard Dunne	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-122#obs-13549">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-122#obs-13549</a>
FIN-C568-123	Blaine Cregan	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-123#obs-13550">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-123#obs-13550</a>
FIN-C568-124	Liam O'Gradaigh	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-124#obs-13551">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-124#obs-13551</a>
FIN-C568-125	Ivan Taylor	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-125#obs-13552">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-125#obs-13552</a>
FIN-C568-126	Michael McFadden	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-126#obs-13553">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-126#obs-13553</a>
FIN-C568-127	Deleicia Taylor	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-127#obs-13554">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-127#obs-13554</a>
FIN-C568-128	Jim Isdale	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-128#obs-13555">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-128#obs-13555</a>
FIN-C568-129	National Transport Authority	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-129#obs-13556">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-129#obs-13556</a>
FIN-C568-130	Collen Group + Erigo Group	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-130#obs-13559">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-130#obs-13559</a>
FIN-C568-131	daa - Dublin Airport	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-131#obs-13560">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-131#obs-13560</a>
FIN-C568-132	Michael O Connor	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-132#obs-13561">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-132#obs-13561</a>
FIN-C568-133	Stephen Smyth	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-133#obs-13562">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-133#obs-13562</a>
FIN-C568-134	Mary O Connor	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-134#obs-13563">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-134#obs-13563</a>
FIN-C568-135	Andrew Nixon	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-135#obs-13564">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-135#obs-13564</a>
FIN-C568-136	Orla Roche	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-136#obs-13565">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-136#obs-13565</a>
FIN-C568-137	Olive Dunne	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-137#obs-13566">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-137#obs-13566</a>
FIN-C568-138	Grainne Redmond	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-138#obs-13567">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-138#obs-13567</a>
FIN-C568-139	Grainne Redmond	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-139#obs-13568">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-139#obs-13568</a>
FIN-C568-140	Aoife O'Grady	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-140#obs-13569">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-140#obs-13569</a>
FIN-C568-141	Sheena Duffy	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-141#obs-13570">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-141#obs-13570</a>
FIN-C568-142	Mary Grogan	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-142#obs-13571">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-142#obs-13571</a>

# PART 2

URN	Author	URL
FIN-C568-143	Liam O'Gradaigh	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-143#obs-13572">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-143#obs-13572</a>
FIN-C568-144	Liam O'Gradaigh	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-144#obs-13573">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-144#obs-13573</a>
FIN-C568-145	HSE Environmental Health	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-145#obs-13574">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-145#obs-13574</a>
FIN-C568-146	Timothy Fitzgerald	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-146#obs-13575">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-146#obs-13575</a>
FIN-C568-147	Annette Cashell	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-147#obs-13576">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-147#obs-13576</a>
FIN-C568-148	Michael O Rourke	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-148#obs-13577">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-148#obs-13577</a>
FIN-C568-149	Neil Cashell	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-149#obs-13578">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-149#obs-13578</a>
FIN-C568-150	Niamh Maher	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-150#obs-13579">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-150#obs-13579</a>
FIN-C568-151	James O'Connor	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-151#obs-13580">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-151#obs-13580</a>
FIN-C568-152	Kieran Dennison	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-152#obs-13581">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-152#obs-13581</a>
FIN-C568-153	Michael Conneally	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-153#obs-13582">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-153#obs-13582</a>
FIN-C568-154	Orla Conaty	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-154#obs-13583">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-154#obs-13583</a>
FIN-C568-155	Bernadette Conaty-Beyer	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-155#obs-13584">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-155#obs-13584</a>
FIN-C568-156	David Gowing	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-156#obs-13585">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-156#obs-13585</a>
FIN-C568-157	David Hanratty	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-157#obs-13586">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-157#obs-13586</a>
FIN-C568-158	Robert Beyer	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-158#obs-13587">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-158#obs-13587</a>
FIN-C568-159	Ann Graves	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-159#obs-13588">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-159#obs-13588</a>
FIN-C568-160	D Conaty	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-160#obs-13589">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-160#obs-13589</a>
FIN-C568-161	Tom Conaty	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-161#obs-13590">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-161#obs-13590</a>
FIN-C568-162	Darren Core	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-162#obs-13591">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-162#obs-13591</a>
FIN-C568-163	Sabrina Joyce	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-163#obs-13592">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-163#obs-13592</a>
FIN-C568-164	Brian Murphy	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-164#obs-13593">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-164#obs-13593</a>
FIN-C568-165	John Harris	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-165#obs-13599">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-165#obs-13599</a>
FIN-C568-166	Pauline McGuinness	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-166#obs-13600">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-166#obs-13600</a>

## PART 2

URN	Author	URL
FIN-C568-167	Christopher Ratcliff	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-167#obs-13601">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-167#obs-13601</a>
FIN-C568-168	Kevin Ratcliffe	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-168#obs-13602">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-168#obs-13602</a>
FIN-C568-169	Vanessa Harford	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-169#obs-13603">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-169#obs-13603</a>
FIN-C568-170	Joseph Bonner	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-170#obs-13604">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-170#obs-13604</a>
FIN-C568-171	Joe McPeake	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-171#obs-13605">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-171#obs-13605</a>
FIN-C568-172	Ben Hemeryck	<a href="https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-172">https://consult.fingal.ie/en/submission/fin-c568-172</a>

# APPENDIX

---

## Appendix – Copy of Draft Ministerial Direction



**DRAFT DIRECTION IN THE MATTER OF SECTION 31**  
**OF THE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT 2000 (as amended)**

**Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029**

“Development Plan” means the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029

“Planning Authority” means Fingal County Council

The Minister of State at the Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage in exercise of the powers conferred on him by section 31 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (No.30 of 2000) and the Housing, Local Government and Heritage (Delegation of Ministerial Functions) Order 2023 (S.I. No. 116 of 2023), and consequent to a recommendation made to him by the Office of the Planning Regulator, hereby directs as follows:

1. This Direction may be cited as the Planning and Development (Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029) Direction 2023.
2. The Planning Authority is hereby directed to take the following steps with regard to the Development Plan:
  - (a) Delete the following zoning objectives from the adopted Plan i.e. the subject land is unzoned:
    - (i) Land zoned General Employment in the adopted Plan to the east of Junction 2 on the M2 at St Margaret’s which was zoned Greenbelt in the Fingal County Development Plan 2017-2023.

- (ii) Land zoned Food Park in the adopted Plan south of Coolquay village.
  - (iii) Land zoned Rural Business in the adopted Plan to the south of Coolquay village.
  - (iv) Land zoned General Employment in the adopted Plan to the south east of Junction 5 on the M1 at Hedgestown, Courtlough which was zoned Rural in the Fingal County Development Plan 2017-2023.
- (b) Reinstate the Greenbelt zoning objective for lands PA SH 12.4 Newtown i.e. the subject lands revert to Greenbelt from General Employment consistent with the recommendation of the chief executive's report dated 15<sup>th</sup> January 2023.
  - (c) Delete the amended and additional text inserted under PA CH 8.1 as modified, consistent with the recommendation of the chief executive's report dated 15<sup>th</sup> January 2023.

## **STATEMENT OF REASONS**

- I. The Development Plan as made includes significant land zoned for General Employment, Rural Business, and Food Park outside of the Dublin City and suburbs boundary or any settlement boundary and at locations remote from high quality public transport and outside the designated strategic employment development areas identified in the RSES for the Dublin Metropolitan Area inconsistent with the National Strategic Outcomes for compact growth, sustainable mobility and transition to a low carbon and climate resilient society, NPO 62 to strengthen the value greenbelts and green spaces at a regional and city scale, as well as the sequential approach and planning for future development in a manner that facilitates sustainable transport patterns consistent with the Greater Dublin Area Transport Strategy 2022 - 2042 (Measure PLAN 4), Regional Policy Objectives 5.3, 5.6, and 8.4 in the RSES.

- II. The Development Plan as made includes land zoned for General Employment to the east of the M2 at Junction 2 at St Margaret's in close proximity to a Junction of the M2 national road network inconsistent with the Greater Dublin Area Transport Strategy 2022 - 2042 (Measure ROAD 2), and Regional Policy Objectives 8.3 and 8.4, and where the planning authority has not demonstrated that the rezoning satisfies the criteria in Section 2.7 of the *Spatial Planning and National Roads Guidelines for Planning Authorities* (2012) regarding development at national road interchanges or junctions.
- III. The Development Plan does not include a strategy for employment development to inform the zoning of further land for employment purposes at Junction 2 of the M2 at St Margaret's, lands located south of Coolquay village, lands south east of Junction 5 on the M1 at Courtlough south of Balbriggan, and lands at Newtown St Margaret's which fails to have regard to the Ministerial Guidelines issued under Section 28 of the Act, specifically the requirement that the evidence and rationale underpinning the zoning of land for employment purposes must be clear and strategic in nature under Section 6.2.5 (zoning for employment uses) in the *Development Plans, Guidelines for Planning Authorities* (2022).
- IV. The Development Plan as made includes provisions that recognise the inadequacy of the proposed noise insulation scheme to protect the health of those affected by aircraft noise and that it is an objective to take measures including the expansion of noise insulation to ensure noise levels produced by aircraft during night time are reduced to below 40 dB Lnight, which matters are subject to a separate statutory code which includes the designation of a separate action planning authority, the Aircraft Noise Competent Authority, and the preparation of a Noise Action Plan. The inclusion of matters which should be determined through the appropriate statutory process, including the Noise Action Plan, is therefore inconsistent with NPO 65.

- V. No adequate reasons nor explanations relating to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area have been provided to explain why lands have been zoned in such a way and how this approach (involving a failure to demonstrate a strategic rationale to underpin the zoning of further land for employment purposes zoned lands and to a failure to have regard to the Development Plan Guidelines and to satisfy the criteria for development at national road interchanges or junctions) is consistent with an overall strategy for the proper and sustainable development of the area.
- VI The Development Plan has not been made in a manner consistent with, and has failed to implement, the recommendations of the Office of the Planning Regulator under Section 31AM of the Act.
- VII In light of the matters set out at I-VI above, the Minister is of the opinion that the Development Plan as made fails to set out an overall strategy for the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
- VIII In light of the matters set out at I to VI, above, the Development Plan is not in compliance with the requirements of the Act.

GIVEN under my hand,

Minister of State with responsibility for Local Government and Planning

day of Month, year.