

Proposed Material Amendments to the RSES 2019-2031 (EMRA)

Comments/Observations from Dublin City Council

Thank you for publishing proposed material amendments to the RSES and affording the opportunity to respond to such amendments. Dublin City Council is generally supportive of the changes proposed. The following are some brief comments/observations;

Amendment no. 10 New RPO seeking Quantitative Assessment of proposed land-use designations and transport infrastructure for Greenhouse Gases (GHGS).

Whilst quantitative assessment of land use designations and transport infrastructure for impact on GHGs is a positive step, it should perhaps be made clear as to which organisation(s) should carry out the assessment and assess these proposals against emission reduction targets, as is suggested. This would ensure a consistent approach.

Amendment no. 70 and also amendment no. 114 ; omission of 'Dublin South Port Access Route'

The proposed removal of this route from the list of projects 'to reflect national road projects' is noted. In relation to this, RPO no. 8.19 remains in place in the RSES, supporting improved road access to the port 'including the Southern Port Access'.

The current City Development Plan 2016-2022 supports the protection of this route however (see objective MTO32) and it is clearly referred to in the Poolbeg West Planning Scheme (recently approved). In regard to the latter, the Boards decision in fact includes a recommendation that DCC works with TII and the NTA '*to refine the route of the South Port Access/Eastern Bypass Corridor reservation*' (modification 8).

On this basis, perhaps the proposal to remove the route from the list of projects could be revisited or clarified, such that there is a consistent policy approach.

Amendment no. 73

This states that the determination of population targets for Local Authorities within the MASP (etc) is '*a matter for agreement in consultation with the MASP implementation group after the adoption of the RSES to inform the preparation of core strategies...*'

The above would suggest that the population tables provided in Appendix B are being removed. This would clearly have implications for housing strategy figures and land-use planning, and therefore it may be useful to provide a defined timescale for setting these population targets, such that delays at the research stage of future core strategies can be avoided (i.e. during Development Plan reviews).

I trust the above can be taken into account during the finalising of the strategy.

Regards,

John O'Hara