

From: [REDACTED]
To: [RSES](#)
Subject: RSES - Online submission
Date: 14 April 2019 01:16:52

From: Roy Harford [REDACTED]
Organisation: UCD Planning Student

Message Body:

I have serious concerns with some of the proposed amendments relating to transport infrastructure (particularly amendments no. 69 and 113). Some of these amendments appear to have been included without any real thought, and advocate for projects which are completely unrealistic and unfeasible. I believe the inclusion of these amendments in their current form would significantly undermine the strategic nature of this Regional Spatial & Economic Strategy, and would significantly damage its overall credibility.

In particular, I have issues with the following parts of amendments no. 69 and 113:

"Complete construction of Metrolink from Swords to Sandyford, including underground extensions to UCD and Knocklyon from Charlemont." - This is calling for a Metro line from Swords which then splits into 3 separate branches south of Charlemont, with all 3 branches in very close proximity to each other. No business case could justify the cost of 3 Metro lines within such close proximity to each other, and as they would be combined north of Charlemont, each of these branches could only operate at one third of its design capacity, which is absurd. This proposal is never going to happen.

"Undertake appraisal, planning and design of LUAS network expansion to Bray, Finglas, Lucan, Poolbeg, Hazelhatch, Booterstown and Blessington." - Where are the Hazelhatch, Booterstown and Blessington LUAS extensions coming from? There have been no previous proposals for these, so there is no basis for specifying these particular extensions within the Strategy. This sentence should instead be amended to read "Undertake appraisal, planning and design of LUAS network expansion to Bray, Finglas, Lucan, Poolbeg, and on other corridors where the demand for a light rail line can be justified."

It would appear to me that the only reason that these particular amendments have been included is because local elections are coming up shortly, and whoever proposed these particular amendments has likely proposed them for political gain, because they might "sound" good to potential voters. Making amendments as specific as these, without any proper consideration of them, is politicising the strategic planning process, and it simply bad planning. I would honestly question whether the inclusion of these amendments in their current form would necessitate an investigation by the Office of the Planning Regulator, into the preparation of this strategy.

Thank you for your consideration.

--

This e-mail was sent from a submission form on Eastern & Midland Regional Assembly (<http://emra.ie>)