



# Chief Executive's Report on Draft Plan Consultation August 2023

**Volume II**

# **Draft Dundrum Local Area Plan 2023**

## **Chief Executive's Report on Draft Plan Consultation**

**August 2023**

### **Volume II**

## **Summary and List of Submissions / Observations Received**

In accordance with section 20 (3) (c) (ii) (I) and 20 (3) (c) (ii)(II) of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 (as amended), Volume II, Part 1 sets out a summary of all submissions / observations and Volume II, Part 2 includes a list of persons or bodies who made submissions or observations.



**Part 1: Summary of Submissions / Observations Received**

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0001</a></b>	<b>Person: Jane Moran</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Seeks the provision of more public transport amenities as part of the LAP.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b>		
Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0002</a></b>	<b>Person: James Matthews</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supportive of Draft LAP overall.</li> <li>Notes the strategic importance of ABTA proposals for local area.</li> <li>Supportive of traffic calming measures along Dundrum Road and the implementation of safer pedestrian and cycling routes, however, these should not encourage neighbouring developments being used as rat-runs.</li> <li>Suggests the implementation of modal filters or other traffic calming measures at strategic points which would help to implement policies and objectives set out in Chapter 3 of Draft LAP regarding placemaking and safer communities.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b>		
Chapters 1 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0003</a></b>	<b>Person: Stephen Staines</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Coordinates are provided to a bridge (located at Overend Avenue in vicinity of Balally Luas stop) which could be restored to serve as pedestrian route.</li> <li>Coordinates are provided highlighting that a 2-way cycle route (along Wyckham Way) currently terminates abruptly at the junction with Dundrum Bypass.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b>		
Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0004</a></b>	<b>Person: David Fitzgerald</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Considers that the Draft LAP is hard to understand, considers language is overly technical.</li> <li>Proposes that the LAP should be significantly shorter, more succinct and less technical.</li> <li>Considers that videos add nothing to the information being communicated.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b>		
Other Issues		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0005</a></b>	<b>Person: Niall Gantly</b>	<b>Organisation: Dundrum Travel</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission speaks as a business owner and for a number of businesses on Main Street.</li> <li>Objects to proposed changes to access arrangements onto Main Street due to limits on access to businesses in town centre. Highlights in particular limits on access from Ballinteer Road and Kilmacud Road Upper.</li> <li>Objects also to the existing one-way system on Main Street, noting that local business owners were informed it would be temporary measure when it was initially installed. Respondent states that businesses have been negatively impacted with consequent impacts to vibrancy of town centre.</li> </ul>		

- Respondent states there have been emergency access issues as a result of existing system.
- Requests meeting to discuss views.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 4, 6 and Other Issues

**DLR Submission**  
No: [B0006](#)

**Person:** Helen Gargan

**Organisation:**

**Summary of Submission / Observation:**

- Supportive of LAP and ABTA.
- Welcomes public realm and cycling improvements, in particular the route avoiding Dundrum Road.
- Considers this will benefit children accessing local facilities and schools, improve safety for elderly, will reduce congestion, improve air quality and contribute to climate action.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapter 1 and 4

**DLR Submission**  
No: [B0007](#)

**Person:** Margaret Mawhinney

**Organisation:**

**Summary of Submission / Observation:**

- Raises concerns regarding impacts of proposed restrictions to vehicular access around Dundrum, in particular to people with mobility issues.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapter 4

**DLR Submission**  
No: [B0008](#)

**Person:** Jonathan O'Grady

**Organisation:**

**Summary of Submission / Observation:**

- Identifies issues in Draft LAP for people who rely on wheelchair-accessible/adapted private vehicles.
- Only cursory references is set out for wheelchair parking in LAP.
- Considers more specific information regarding accessibility to transport infrastructure for wheelchair users should be included.
- States LAP should acknowledge dependance of some people on wheelchair accessible private vehicles. Notes this is more than a parking issue and that core infrastructure should be designed to ensure wheelchair user access to services and employment opportunities.
- Considers LAP should more specifically address pedestrian infrastructure improvement needs for wheelchair users including wider footpaths, lowered curbs, and accessible crossings.
- Notes the requirements for wider paths and dedicated spaces for accessible vehicles should be considered, including on roads for which cycle infrastructure is unsuitable due to width etc.
- Considers more detail should be provided regarding specific accessibility features at public transport stops, e.g. wheelchair ramps, elevators and designated waiting areas for wheelchair users.
- States that people who rely on wheelchair-accessible/adapted private vehicles should be more involved in consultation as part of the planning process, to ensure the issues affecting them are adequately addressed.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapter 4 and Other Issues

**DLR Submission**  
No: [B0009](#)

**Person:** Ronan Nally

**Organisation:**

**Summary of Submission / Observation:**

- Wants to see improved mobility / public transport connectivity between Dundrum / Sandyford / Ballinteer and the coast, particularly Blackrock.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Notes lack of public transport and safe cycle links between Dundrum and Stillorgan Village / Blackrock Village, seeks provision of this. Notes these connections is envisaged under BusConnects, but highlights lack of progress on same. Seeks progression of this under the LAP in the medium term (2-5 years).</li> </ul>
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0010</a></b>	<b>Person: Paulo Pierrondi</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strongly disagrees with the project and hopes that it does not go ahead.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 1		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0011</a></b>	<b>Person: Brian Shields</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Welcomes proposed traffic calming measures and improvements at Windy Arbour NC on Dundrum Road.</li> <li>Seeks surety parking for residents in area in front of shops will be protected as part of any upgrade works to streetscape.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4 and 6		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0012</a></b>	<b>Person: Paul Smith</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Praises 10-minute neighbourhood but notes importance of retaining infrastructure providing access into and out of plan area, to amenities including the sea, mountains and GAA clubs.</li> <li>Highlights poor walking environment on Ballinteer Road towards Dundrum Village (e.g from Lynwood to Holy Cross Church), in particular due to lack of footpath in parts. Considers proposed bus gate at Dundrum Cross would worsen this issue. States LAP does not address pedestrian access routes.</li> <li>Highlights dangerous/difficult conditions for cyclists on Bypass / Wyckham junction roundabout and along Overend Avenue. Considers clear/safe cycle routes from Ballinteer towards Overend Avenue are required.</li> <li>States public transport is inadequately considered in LAP, noting lack of clarity as to how proposals link in with Luas and BusConnects to provide access to and from Dundrum. Considers proposed active travel interventions will inhibit the free flow of traffic, including adversely affecting bus movement. Notes significant increase in journey times from Dundrum to Dún Laoghaire by bus since 2018 as example of this. Notes private car trips are less affected due to route options.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 2 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0013</a></b>	<b>Person: Laura Griffin</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Raises concerns regarding safe pedestrian routes to Holy Cross School. Proposes that a signalised pedestrian crossing for school children should be provided across Sydenham Road at junction with Kilmacud Road Upper.</li> <li>Considers that the Overend Avenue / Kilmacud Road Upper junction crossing is hazardous for pedestrians.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0014</a></b>	<b>Person: Elaine Cassells</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers LAP is ill thought out and will impact Dundrum and local businesses negatively.</li> <li>• States that cycle lanes on Grange Road are dangerous for cyclists and drivers.</li> <li>• Raises concerns regarding the prioritisation of cyclist access to Dundrum and the potential impacts to other road users.</li> <li>• Notes that many small businesses rely on traffic access.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, and 4 and 6		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0015</a></b>	<b>Person: Naoise Byrne</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers the LAP is a terrible idea.</li> <li>• Raises concerns regarding proposals to limit traffic access to Main Street, noting the existing significant traffic issues. Concerned the proposals will add to existing traffic pressure on the roads on the outskirts.</li> <li>• Concerned at the negative impacts to businesses as a result of these proposals, noting they have already been impacted by Covid-19 measures and anti-social behaviour.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 4 and 6		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0016</a></b>	<b>Person: Conall Mc Aonghusa</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In favour of proposed active travel and traffic measures at Taney Cross / Bypass, including the proposed pedestrian bridge over the Bypass and the bus gate at Dundrum Cross. Notes the benefits include reduced walking journey times (particularly benefiting the elderly) and improved cyclist safety.</li> <li>• Highlights in particular that the removal of slip lanes and provision of public space will make Taney Cross more inviting and safer. Considers the proposed changes would benefit businesses near the junction.</li> <li>• Considers Taney Cross KDA proposals and delivery of cultural facility at this location would improve attractiveness of area.</li> <li>• Considers bus gate at Dundrum Cross will improve bus commute times and enhance pedestrian safety at this junction. Questions need for cars in the town centre streets, given the presence of the Bypass.</li> <li>• Proposes that Bypass / Wyckham junction roundabout should be retained and changed to a Dutch-style roundabout. Considers this is more convenient to cyclists than signalised junction.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2 and 4 and 6		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0017</a></b>	<b>Person: Elisa Maya O'Hanlon</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Queries the need for LAP.</li> <li>• Objects to junction upgrades - traffic congestion.</li> <li>• Notes need for car parking facilities at shopping centre.</li> <li>• Notes current bus services do not meet submitter's travel needs.</li> <li>• Submission provides commentary on private cars and what are considered to be anti car views expressed in the plan. Submitter rejects anti car and anti parking views.</li> <li>• Submission provides commentary and expresses opinions on public servants and their actions.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0018</a></b>	<b>Person: Sean Goldrick</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission queries if dlr are trying to ruin the village</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 1		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0019</a></b>	<b>Person: Pat Larkin</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns re proposed traffic measures on Ballinteer Road and Dundrum Main Street. Notes difficulty proposals would present to respondent due to their impaired mobility and consequent reliance on car travel.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0020</a></b>	<b>Person: Michaela</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns re increased traffic as a result of LAP proposals.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0021</a></b>	<b>Person: Philip and Joan Duff</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wants bus terminus retained in current location.</li> <li>Notes Ulster Bank building would be suitable location for civic centre.</li> <li>Concerns traffic proposals will make it difficult to access Sweetmount Avenue.</li> <li>Notes recent traffic interventions in Dundrum town centre have created significant issues re access.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 2 and 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0022</a></b>	<b>Person: Elizabeth Hudson</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wants bus terminus retained in current location.</li> <li>Notes there are a number of suitable locations for civic centre within Dundrum.</li> <li>Notes significant traffic issues in Dundrum TC currently. Concerns these will be exacerbated as a result of proposals for Sweetmount Ave.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 2 and 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0023</a></b>	<b>Person: Jason Ennis</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supportive of LAP.</li> <li>Notes significant housing capacity of LAP lands due to location, accessibility and presence of old/decaying buildings. Highlights national and local importance of developing this housing.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1 and 3		



<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0024</a></b>	<b>Person: John Reade</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to removal of vehicular access from Ballinteer Road onto Main Street, as respondent uses this route weekly.</li> <li>• Respondent notes they have accepted previous vehicular restriction in the town centre which have affected them from Dundrum Cross to Kilmacud Road Upper including access to the Garda Station and National school.</li> <li>• Considers these proposals improve accessibility for occasional visitors to the town centre but inconvenience locals.</li> <li>• Highlights in particular the impacts on elderly members of the local community with potential mobility impairment.</li> <li>• Suggests that an alternative solution which facilitates local access could be considered.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0025</a></b>	<b>Person: Rachel Senior</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to vehicular access restrictions proposed in town centre and notes exiting bottleneck on Main Street.</li> <li>• Queries if any thought was given to parents who require regular vehicular access to local schools.</li> <li>• Notes that many car park illegally on Overend Way due to restricted access to schools.</li> <li>• Notes diverting access to the M50 from Kilmacud via Main street (a partially pedestrianized street) making it difficult for residents on Sydenham Villas Taney Road and Stoney Road. This will impact Garda access and create large detours for residents travelling to Sandyford.</li> <li>• Considers these proposals will increase congestion and emissions, and will not encourage a shift to cycling..</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0026</a></b>	<b>Person: Ben Grossman</b>	<b>Organisation: Retail</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers the LAP is unnecessary.</li> <li>• States that the town centre will be completely inaccessible other than cyclists.</li> <li>• States that proposals will diminish trade for many retailers.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 4 and 6		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0027</a></b>	<b>Person: Russell Lee</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to proposed restrictions on traffic accessing Main Street. States this will inhibit access to respondent's property by car and in the case of an emergency.</li> <li>• States that this objection is shared by local residents and businesses, noting the proposal hasn't been adequately communicated.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4 and Other Issues		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0028</u>	Person: Una O'Shea	Organisation: Roebuck Residents' Association
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supportive of LAP overall, noting in particular sustainability, 10-minute neighbourhood, active travel, open space measures and support for CCC as positives.</li> </ul> <p><b>Transport:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Welcomes ABTA and adoption of recommendations in Draft LAP.</li> <li>Notes large volume of non-local through trips of vehicles in Dundrum area. Considers this could be exacerbated by future large-scale developments.</li> <li>Suggests new objective could be included requiring provision of direct Dundrum-UCD walking/cycling route via CMH site.</li> <li>Supportive of Permeability Improvement Option P1 as set out in ABTA, however considers additional traffic impact assessment of the new schools proposed at the IGB site is needed to inform ABTA.</li> <li>Seeks additional consultation with local residents regarding Permeability Improvement Option P2 of ABTA (i.e Rosemount/Mount Carmel Avenue modal filter), due to current through traffic and permeability issues which may worsen.</li> <li>Welcomes proposed Dundrum-Dodder cycle link, highlighting in particular the new Taney Road pedestrian crossing point as positive improvement.</li> <li>Notes however difficulties of implementing Taney Park section of cycle link due to narrowness of route and consequent existing conflicts between different road users. Suggests uses of road markings to ensure pedestrian/cyclist priority.</li> <li>Requests accessibility improvements to pedestrian route under Luas station.</li> </ul> <p><b>CCC Building:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Welcomes Draft LAP support for provision of CCC building in Dundrum.</li> <li>Considers size of building should be increased to include other parts of Taney Cross site, i.e Waldemar Terrace, Ulster Bank building, Exchange building. Suggests purchase of these buildings by dlr. Considers there would be various benefits to enlarged CCC including architectural design, provision of sufficient facilities and visual impact.</li> </ul> <p><b>Town Edge:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Considers additional guidance and policy detail should be applied to 'Town Edge' lands north of Taney Cross.</li> <li>Notes the buildings in this area are generally of low quality/architectural value and that it is an uncomfortable pedestrian environment. Notes also the physical separation between town edge and main town centre, stating that the area's support to the main town centre may be important in the future to support large residential developments.</li> <li>Suggests that more restrictions on permissible commercial uses could be applied to town edge area and additional pedestrian route across Slang River towards Churchtown Road could be provided to improve area.</li> </ul> <p><b>Main Street:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supportive of proposed development frameworks for OSC, Main Street and Bypass, highlighting in particular new pedestrian street through OSC site and promotion of older persons' accommodation within site.</li> <li>Proposes that objective to provide a hotel with town centre could be strengthened, due to lack of suitable tourist accommodation in wider Dundrum area.</li> </ul> <p><b>Schools/Childcare:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States that the student enrollment figures for Gaelscoil na Fuinseoige provided in section 3.2.3.2 of Draft LAP are inaccurate. Notes the status and timeframe for the location of Goatstown Educate Together. Considers the photo of Goatstown Educate Together on pg 37 of Draft LAP is not appropriate given that the location is temporary.</li> </ul>		

- Welcomes objectives DLAP8, DLAP13 and DM3 regarding the provision of childcare facilities, and any additional wording that may be provided to strengthen these requirements. Notes importance of childcare provision (after/pre-school) as part of school facilities. Respondent does not consider Fernbank development is suitable location for childcare facility, stating that it is fully built.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 1, 2, 3 and 4

**DLR Submission**  
No: [B0029](#)

**Person:** Philippe Duval

**Organisation:**

**Summary of Submission / Observation:**

- Fully supportive of Draft LAP, in particular proposed traffic measures.
- Notes traffic congestion in and around Dundrum, expects it will worsen with new developments.
- Notes that an ambitious effort is required to reduce vehicular traffic.
- Looks forward to improved pedestrian/cyclist safety.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 1 and 4

**DLR Submission**  
No: [B0030](#)

**Person:** Teresa Gantly

**Organisation:** Dundrum Travel  
Landlord to TFI / Go Ahead Ireland bus  
company

**Summary of Submission / Observation:**

- Objects to traffic restriction from Ballinteer Road to Main Street. Respondent notes their tenants also object to this.
- Notes that Go Ahead operate many of the bus routes in and around Dublin and the local hub for bus crews being moved between bus routes is on Dundrum main street
- States that proposal will reduce the ability of Go Ahead staff accessing Dundrum bus terminus by car.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapter 4

**DLR Submission**  
No: [B0031](#)

**Person:** Lance Grossman

**Organisation:** Jewellery Shop

**Summary of Submission / Observation:**

- Objects to traffic proposals for town centre. Cites negative impacts to businesses and use of town centre, difficulty of access by elderly, mobility impaired and emergency services.
- States existing measures have been ineffective and have negatively impacted the village.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 4 and 6

**DLR Submission**  
No: [B0032](#)

**Person:** Patrick Egan

**Organisation:**

**Summary of Submission / Observation:**

- States there are major traffic and public transport capacity issues currently in Dundrum, which are being exacerbated by largescale residential developments along Luas Green Line. Notes that traffic issues have knock-on negative impact on pedestrian mobility.
- Urges PA to address issues highlighted.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapter 4

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0033</a></b>	<b>Person: Angela Brown</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to proposed restrictions on traffic accessing Main Street from Ballinteer Road. Notes this may affect the elderly in particular and will make access almost impossible at peak times.</li> <li>• Suggests that alternative solution should be considered, e.g. allowing one-way traffic as far as Campbell's corner.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0034</a></b>	<b>Person: Helen Donnelly</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to giving away of public land to international developers for BTR developments. Suggests there would be multiple benefits to introducing controls ensuring BTR apartments are affordable.</li> <li>• Considers that the concept of a village of Dundrum no longer exists, citing high rise developments, lack of community and local shops as evidence of this.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 3 and 6		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0035</a></b>	<b>Person: John Egan</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that there is too much housing with too few stakeholders.</li> <li>• Notes large short term rental landlords with, no services/amenities, community.</li> <li>• Seeks respect for the history of the area and to build family housing.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 3		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0036</a></b>	<b>Person: Jeremy</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States the idea of 10-min Dundrum is flawed due to the presence of shopping centre and proximity of M50.</li> <li>• Notes that a local can get around in 10 minutes, but people come from all over the country to the shopping centre.</li> <li>• States that the existing one-way system has exacerbated traffic issues, notes hazards at Wyckahm/Bypass junction roundabout, emergency access difficulties,</li> <li>• Notes Luas capacity issues.</li> <li>• States no issue to development of apartments but notes the issues with traffic in the area.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 3 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0037</a></b>	<b>Person: Michael Wilson</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of LAP.</li> <li>• Cites need for increased density and less reliance on cars noting this should be policy for Dublin if it is to grow.</li> <li>• Notes proximity of LAP lands to Luas.</li> <li>• Suggests that objectors are motivated by concerns regarding home value, however considers home value will increase with high density development.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 3, 4 and Other Issues		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0038</a></b>	<b>Person: Ruth Deveney</b>	<b>Organisation: Deveney's of Dundrum</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to LAP proposals for town centre area. Notes that issues have been caused by existing one-way system, which would be exacerbated by additional vehicular access restrictions now proposed. Considers convenient vehicular access to town centre, in addition to walking/cyclist access, is vital to viability of town centre businesses.</li> <li>• Suggests the one-way system is unnecessary as bypass has capacity to take traffic seeking to avoid the town centre.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4 and 6		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0039</a></b>	<b>Person: Liam Lysaght</b>	<b>Organisation: Deveney's of Dundrum</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to proposed restrictions to vehicular access to town centre (in particular restrictions on Ballinteer Road), citing negative impact on existing businesses.</li> <li>• States that feeder routes to town centre (e.g Sandyford Road) are at capacity at peak times.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4 and 6		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0040</a></b>	<b>Person: Terry Dunne</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to LAP proposals. Cites congestion on Sandyford Road, lack of infrastructure and public transport capacity to cater for planned developments in surrounding areas.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0041</a></b>	<b>Person: Tom Deveney</b>	<b>Organisation: Landlord</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to LAP proposals.</li> <li>• Considers that limiting access will negatively impact businesses and reduce property values.</li> <li>• States existing one-way system has already had negative impacts.</li> <li>• Suggests Dundrum By-pass sufficiently accommodates through traffic in Dundrum.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0042</a></b>	<b>Person: Eoin</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objects to existing one-way system, citing significant traffic congestion on Kilmacud Rd Upper (which is particularly acute at school finishing times), emergency service access difficulties, delivery drivers (including cyclists, motorbikes) disobeying road laws.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0043</a></b>	<b>Person: Jen Mulvey</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objects to vehicular access restrictions proposed for Dundrum under LAP. Considers this will negatively impact local business and community infrastructure. Cites in particular impacts to village shopping centre, including difficulties for shop staff travelling from far away. Notes impacts would be particularly bad for elderly.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0044</a></b>	<b>Person: Patricia Deveney</b>	<b>Organisation: Landlord</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objects to increased pedestrianisation of town centre. Appears to suggest particular challenges posed for elderly people with mobility issues. States Bypass has sufficient capacity to accommodate through traffic. Appears to suggest negative impacts to local businesses.</li> <li>Identifies Blackrock town centre as having well designed traffic and active travel access, suggesting similar system could be applied to Dundrum.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0045</a></b>	<b>Person: Kevin Cassidy</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States the LAP is excessive and unsuitable for local people and businesses.</li> <li>Suggests that transport proposals have not been informed by data analysis.</li> <li>Considers there is insufficient policy detail on how local businesses will be supported.</li> <li>Considers that access restriction proposals would predominantly affect elderly and should be reconsidered in final LAP.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0046</a></b>	<b>Person: Bobbi McDermott</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objects to LAP proposals, noting existing traffic congestion issues in the area as a result of current traffic measures and increased building. Considers proposals will exacerbate these issues.</li> <li>Considers proposals would negatively impact local businesses.</li> <li>States there is very little use of existing town centre cycle lanes.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4 and 6		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0047</a></b>	<b>Person: Jenny Chawke</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to LAP citing impacts to local business.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 1 and 6		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0048</a></b>	<b>Person: Rachel Freedman</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to LAP proposals re traffic access.</li> <li>• Considers vehicular access should be increased rather than restricted.</li> <li>• Suggests money is required to implement proposals could be used on other road improvements.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0049</a></b>	<b>Person: Alan Holohan</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to LAP.</li> <li>• Considers vehicular access to town centre should be increased rather than restricted.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1 and 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0050</a></b>	<b>Person: Eoin Deveney</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers pedestrianisation of Main Street would negatively impact local businesses and residents.</li> <li>• Questions need for pedestrianisation, noting existence of Bypass</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0051</a></b>	<b>Person: <i>Name not provided</i></b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to LAP citing existing traffic congestion issues, in particular on Main Street. States people are discouraged from using Main Street due to these issues.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0052</a></b>	<b>Person: Amanda Masterson</b>	<b>Organisation: The Grafton Barber</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned LAP will have negative effects on respondent's business due to removal of passing traffic</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4 and 6		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0053</a></b>	<b>Person: Andrew O'Carroll</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers LAP will have significant negative impact on Dundrum and surrounding areas. States there have already been significant impacts to this area.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 1		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0054</a></b>	<b>Person: Jack</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of high density housing being provided in Dundrum. Does not consider delivery of this would have significant impacts on character of Dundrum. Cites issues faced by younger people owning their own property. Cites accessibility of public transport and amenities in Dundrum.</li> <li>• States that LAP should serve national interest and that local residents have a responsibility to ensure amenities they have benefited from can be shared with others.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1 and 3		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0055</a></b>	<b>Person: Pamela Kavanagh</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to proposed traffic access restrictions on Ballinteer Road to town centre, due to impacts in particular on employees and business owners.</li> <li>• Notes existing long commute times, which would be exacerbated.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0056</a></b>	<b>Person: Sinead Doyle</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to LAP, in particular the major negative impacts to town centre businesses as a result of traffic access restrictions.</li> <li>• Cites affects to people with no option but to drive, including those with young children. Notes existing traffic congestion.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1 and 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0057</a></b>	<b>Person: Roisin O Regan</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This submission has no content.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> N/A		



<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0058</u></b>	<b>Person: Lynn Tolan</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objects to LAP, in particular traffic restrictions and increased cyclist infrastructure on Main Street. States that black curbs installed as part of existing measures are hazardous. Considers there will be significant negative impacts to town centre.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b>		
Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0059</u></b>	<b>Person: Sarah Blower</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objects to proposed new structure (not specified).</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b>		
Other Issues		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0060</u></b>	<b>Person: Michael MacAree</b>	<b>Organisation: National Transport Authority</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<b>Background:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is noted that the vision of the Draft LAP and the importance of the transport sector in enabling the 10-minute neighbourhood concept.</li> <li>It is noted that the population growth within the LAP and environs over the lifetime of the plan set against ambitious targets in the CAP for emission reductions, stating that <i>"it is imperative that the DLAP caters for the demand for travel as sustainably as possible."</i></li> <li>There is a requirement for the LAP to provide for the development of a high-quality, efficient movement network in the LAP, prioritizing active travel and public transport.</li> <li>It is acknowledged that provision for private cars will still be required given the function of Dundrum as a MTC at a regional level, however this must be managed to avoid conflict with the vision of the LAP.</li> <li>Submission states: <i>"A well-developed movement network that balances the needs of all modes will allow for the use of sustainable travel for journeys to local education, healthcare and other services, will support local businesses by increasing their accessibility, and will facilitate the consolidation of the built-up area in the longer term through the integration of transport and land use planning."</i></li> <li>The absence of such a network would be contrary to the policies and objectives of the NPF, RSES and the NTA's transport strategy, as it would exacerbate current congestion, would prevent appropriate density being achieved and would jeopardise the economic viability of the area.</li> <li>Submission states: <i>"The transport proposals in the Draft LAP accord with the provisions of the National Investment Framework for Transport in Ireland (NIFTI); in particular with the Modal Hierarchy, which prioritises investment in Active Travel over Public Transport and then private vehicles, and the Intervention Hierarchy, which supports investment in new infrastructure only when maintenance and optimization of existing assets are insufficient to meet an identified need"</i>.</li> <li>It is noted that the implementation of the policies and objectives in the Draft LAP would assist in achieving a number of NSOs set out in the NPF including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Compact Growth</li> <li>o Sustainable Mobility</li> <li>o A Strong Economy</li> <li>o Transition to a Low Carbon and Climate Resilient Society, and</li> <li>o Access to Services.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Area Based Transport Assessment (ABTA):</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is noted that the transport and movement policies and objectives in the Draft LAP were informed by an ABTA which was prepared through the collaboration of the NTA and the Council.</li> </ul>		

- The ABTA was a very effective means of assessing the current transport issues faced by Dundrum and measures to address these and future transport demands.
- Submission notes that the ABTA process is intended to be iterative noting that the emerging recommendations from the ABTA will be reviewed and finalised following the LAP public consultation.
- Submission notes that the final transport proposals in the LAP will set a baseline to inform future reviews of the LAP and CDP.
- Submission notes that the ABTA process envisages future iteration between statutory plans and transport studies would be informed by the monitoring and evaluation of the LAP, in particular with the development of high-capacity public transport schemes together with connected networks for active travel.

**Draft LAP Transport and Movement Proposals:**

- Submission states that the NTA broadly supports the transport policies and objectives in the Draft LAP which provides for:
  - The development of a connected cycle network serving key destinations including Active Travel schemes being developed.
  - The retention and enhancement of Covid-19 schemes.
  - Junction revisions to support sustainable transport modes.
  - Development of a transport interchange at Dundrum Luas Station.
  - Bus priority and infrastructure to facilitate BusConnects.
  - Traffic management that includes the migration of through-traffic onto the strategic road network.

The submission recommends the further strengthening of transport objectives as follows:

**Transport and Movement Objectives:**

**Objective T3:**

- It is noted that objective T3 supports the delivery of the elements of the DLR Connector scheme that fall within the LAP boundary which includes a proposed bus gate on Ballinteer Road.
- It is noted that the resulting reduction in traffic at this location presents an opportunity to review the requirement for a right-turn pocket to access the Dundrum Town Centre car park allowing for a redesign of this junction to improve safety.
- It is recommended that an objective be included to review the layout of the Dundrum Town Centre car park access on Ballinteer Road.

**Objective T6:**

- It is noted that objective T6 proposes the development of a mobility hub at the Dundrum Luas-Bus interchange. It is noted that there are proposals to develop a cultural and civic hub at this location.
- It is recommended that an examination of the potential to deliver the mobility hub as part of the Cultural and Civic Hub scheme should be provided for in Objective T6.

**Objective T14:**

- It is noted that the availability of destination cycle parking is a key determinant of cycle usage and that the lack of on-street cycle parking can result in casual parking.
- The NTA acknowledges that there is limited capacity within the existing public realm for cycle parking, however, an objective that seeks such parking where feasible would complement Objective T14. In addition, objective T14 should include the parking of non-standard cycles such as cargo bikes.
- It is recommended that:
  - An objective for the provision of on-street cycle parking is provided.
  - Objective T14 is reviewed, or a standalone objective is provided, for the parking of a range of cycles.

**Objective T18:**

- It is noted that Objective T18 relates to the development of a mobility hub at the Balally Luas Station and notes that supporting text states: “Under the NTA’s BusConnects programme, new bus services and bus stops are planned for Overend Avenue in close proximity to the Luas station.”
- It is noted that the NTA are considering the need for a bus terminus and layover facilities in the environs of this Luas station.
- It is recommended that Section 4.6.2.4 is revised to reference the NTA proposal to develop bus terminus/layover facilities at Balally Luas stop.

**KDA Objectives:**

**Objectives OSC2 and OSC3:**

- Objective OSC3 states that a bridge would only be considered if universal access cannot be achieved by an at grade crossing as required in objective OSC2, however, objective T11 with regard to the same requirement provide more flexibility and reflects the proposal as set out in the ABTA. It is noted that the requirements of OSC2 and OSC3 may be overly prescriptive and could constrain the development of feasible options.
- It is recommended that Objectives OSC2 and OSC3 should be reviewed to align with Objective T11.

**Objective OSC5:**

- It is noted that Objective OSC5 refers to the integration with public transport including the consideration of the location of bus stops in any redevelopment of the site.
- It is recommended that Objective OSC5 is revised to state “in consultation with the NTA.”

**Objective TC2:**

- It is noted that Objective TC2 refers to active travel at Taney Cross where any development ‘shall’ provide for shared access for pedestrians and cyclists across the civic space. It is noted that this requirement may be overly prescriptive in the event that alternative designs need to be considered.
- It is recommended that the word “shared” is removed from Objective TC2.

**Decarbonising Motor Transport:**

**Section 5.8:**

- It is noted that section 5.8 refers to the need to decarbonise motor transport which can be addressed through a shift to active travel and sustainable travel. This can also include the use of LEVs and EVs for the remaining essential car trips. It is noted that while this section seeks the provision of on-street charging point, there is no objective to support same.
- It is recommended to include an objective regarding provision of on-street charging infrastructure.

**Conclusion:**

- It is noted that statutory National and Regional policy context sets challenging targets for transport, and that an ambitious response is required from every local authority in order to meet these targets.
- The NTA fully supports the transport and related policies and objectives in the Draft LAP subject to the recommended amendments.
- If adopted, the suite of proposal will significantly contribute to the fulfilment of climate change, economic and other social goals in the Dundrum area and the wider county.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 2 under Section 2.2: Overview of the Main Issues Raised and Recommendations Made by the National Transport Authority (NTA)**

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0061</u></b>	<b>Person: <u>Oguz Kartoz</u></b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to LAP.</li> <li>• Notes restrictions on traffic access to Main Street and states that the plan will exacerbate existing traffic issues in town centre and displace traffic.</li> <li>• Considers proposed traffic measures will negatively impact local businesses.</li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers the measures will impact on the peaceful and nurturing environment of children growing up in the area.</li> </ul>
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 4 and 6

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0062</a>	<b>Person:</b> Sahil Sharma	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of LAP.</li> <li>• Considers the developments proposed in the town centre and the provision of a civic centre will bring new life to area.</li> <li>• Notes importance of building housing due to on-going housing crisis</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 2 and 3		

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0063</a>	<b>Person:</b> Danko Kozar	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strongly objects to provision of high-rise buildings in Dundrum town centre. Considers this would negatively affect unique character of Dundrum. Also cites landscape/visual and overshadowing impacts.</li> <li>• Considers high rise buildings would primarily accommodate IT professionals. States that this risks creating a demographic imbalance in Dundrum which will impact on the vibrancy of the town centre.</li> <li>• Considers that the housing needs and preferences of residents are essential.</li> <li>• Notes that the the practicality of commuting to areas outside of the 10-minute neighbourhood must be taken into account, stating that many IT professionals would rely on cars for their commute, noting existing pressure on transport infrastructure.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 3 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0064</a>	<b>Person:</b> Kellie	<b>Organisation:</b> Community Worker
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to Draft LAP.</li> <li>• Considers area should not be changed at all.</li> <li>• Notes in particular traffic congestion on Sandyford Road, which would be exacerbated by proposed measures.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0065</a>	<b>Person:</b> Aisling Meagher	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to LAP</li> <li>• Requests that roads and traffic are not made worse as this will prevent people from coming to the area.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0066</a></b>	<b>Person: Shane Dunne</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strongly objects to Draft LAP.</li> <li>• Acknowledged importance of urban development and planning but has a number of concerns.</li> <li>• Considers excessive commercialization and intensification of Dundrum Village would negatively impact character and local community through overdevelopment of town centre. States this will cause increased traffic congestion, loss of green spaces and impact quality of life for residents.</li> <li>• Notes existing traffic congestion at peak times. States that adequate measures to address existing/projected congestion aren't provided for in LAP.</li> <li>• A parking strategy is required in LAP to address scarcity of parking spaces in town centre.</li> <li>• States that the LAP should be accompanied by comprehensive assessment of impact on local infrastructure including schools, healthcare and utilities.</li> <li>• States the conservation/enhancement of character and architectural heritage of town centre is not adequately addressed in LAP. Requests inclusion of provisions to protect/enhance architectural and cultural heritage, including of historic buildings and landmarks.</li> <li>• Considers there has not been adequate community engagement as part of the LAP process.</li> <li>• Requests inclusion of comprehensive traffic impact assessment in LAP.</li> <li>• Requests additional public consultation events with local residents and groups.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8 and Other Issues.		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0067</a></b>	<b>Person: C. and D. Kinlan</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to more roads being closed, in particular access from Barton Road East.</li> <li>• Also objects to existing traffic measures on Main Street, including the one-way system and black blocks.</li> <li>• Cites negative impacts on character of town centre, lack of parking, difficulties for access by elderly, inconvenience for local residents.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0068</a></b>	<b>Person: Adam Connaughton</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strongly supportive of LAP.</li> <li>• States that current car centric planning has not served the area well and that current proposals will greatly improve safety and quality of life for locals.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1 and 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0069</a></b>	<b>Person: Jack Quinn</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of LAP.</li> <li>• Considers Dundrum has potential to be a major suburban hub.</li> <li>• Welcomes proposals to improve amenity and environment along bypass and around Taney Cross.</li> <li>• Highlights traffic issues in town centre and expects these to worsen as a result of future developments. Therefore supportive of LAP proposals to reduce vehicular access and encourage alternative modes of transport.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1 and 4.		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0070</a></b>	<b>Person: Terry James</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Notes existing traffic issues in town centre. Considers measures proposed under LAP and new residential developments will exacerbate problem. Suggests that increased accessibility to town centre by car and foot is needed, rather than prioritising bus accessibility.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0071</a></b>	<b>Person: Una O'Mahony</b>	<b>Organisation: Dom Marmion Society</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern expressed in relation to guiding principle for Dom Marmion which states "o address whether existing uses in Dom Marmion House may need to be facilitated in any new redevelopment on the site or elsewhere." Request that this be amended to include a reference, that any new proposed facility would be suitable to the needs of vulnerable members of the society.</li> <li>Submission provides comprehensive detail of ongoing negotiations with dlr in relation to a new lease for the society and the various conditions attached to the proposed new lease.</li> <li>A petition with over 40 pages and 442 signatures submitted to the Dundrum office is referenced.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 2 and Other Issues		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0072</a></b>	<b>Person: Gavin Clifford</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Notes difficulties for small businesses outside the area conducting business in and around Dundrum due to existing traffic access system.</li> <li>States that additional traffic restrictions (in particular expansion of one-way system) currently proposed under LAP will exacerbate this issue. Considers that negative impacts to local business and vibrancy of town centre will arise from this, however acknowledges need to provide outdoor recreation and seating areas in town centre.</li> <li>States that proposed cycle lanes would be under-utilised.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0073</a></b>	<b>Person: Teresa Skorzevska</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objects to Draft LAP. Respondent relies on car for school drop-off due to lack of direct bus link. Notes existing significant traffic issues and considers these will worsen due to new developments in Dundrum and Cherrywood, and proposed LAP traffic restrictions.</li> <li>States issues affect Dundrum residents and equally those commuting into Dundrum.</li> <li>Considers LAP should be abandoned due to bad design and lack of strategic thinking.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 1 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0074</a></b>	<b>Person: Courtney Raethorne</b>	<b>Organisation: WMI</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to Draft LAP. Notes negative impacts to Dundrum due to developments over a number of years. Notes significant traffic congestion issues.</li> <li>• Considers Dundrum to be over-populated and cannot accommodate further development.</li> <li>• Notes issues with road systems currently in place.</li> <li>• Considers proposals would be detrimental to business.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1 and 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0075</a></b>	<b>Person: John Foody</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commends the council for such a forward-thinking plan.</li> <li>• Approves of ABTA and the consideration given to control traffic in residential areas, including modal filters.</li> <li>• Approves of retention of temporary covid measures in Dundrum village and that this is being continued.</li> <li>• Supports walking and cycling prioritised properly in addition to public transport via a bus gate.</li> <li>• Supports junction upgrades.</li> <li>• Supports provision of Civic Centre to counterbalance the shopping centre.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 2, 3 and 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0076</a></b>	<b>Person: <i>Name not provided</i></b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission comments about an unnamed person</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> N/A		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0077</a></b>	<b>Person: Ruairi Browne</b>	<b>Organisation: DBFL Consulting Engineers</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fully supportive of LAP. Hopeful of its success and that similar such plans for the area can be brought forward.</li> <li>• Welcomes proposed traffic restrictions in town centre and general cyclist/pedestrian infrastructure improvement proposals. Notes success of similar suite of measures in Blackrock and Dun Laoghaire, stating that liveability of these areas has improved as a result.</li> <li>• Suggests the provision of a fully pedestrianised street in Dundrum, but notes this would likely be a longer term measure.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1 and 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0078</a></b>	<b>Person: Nicole</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to LAP.</li> <li>• Notes existing traffic congestion on residential roads in the area due to recent apartment developments and existing traffic restriction measures.</li> <li>• Objects to proposed bus gates, considers it will engender anti-social behaviour. Considers existing bus terminus works better than proposed arrangement.</li> </ul>		

- Considers proposed civic centre site is too small. Suggests civic centre could be delivered adjacent to Holy Cross NS.
- Appears to suggest that apartment blocks proposed on OSC site would block light access to respondent's property. Notes this compounds existing light access issues to overgrown vegetation. Also highlights issues of overlooking, prolonged construction noise/disturbance, drainage capacity issues, visual impact, pollution.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 1, 2 and 4

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0079</a></b>	<b>Person: Paul McDonnell</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This submission contains a photo of what appears to be Stoney Road. No supporting text has been included.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> N/A		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0080</a></b>	<b>Person: Shira Brady</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to proposed Main Street to Churchtown Road Upper bus gate/bus route, to general traffic access restrictions on Ballinteer Road at Dundrum Cross, and to removal of bus stop at Dundrum Church.</li> <li>• Considers proposed measures will negatively impact local residents. Highlights existing traffic issues as a result of current traffic restriction measures, considers these will be exacerbated by proposed measures.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0081</a></b>	<b>Person: John Fagan</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to everything that has been done to Dundrum town centre so far, including one-way traffic systems and cycle lanes. States these have negatively impacted the town. States more consideration needed of local residents and businesses.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0082</a></b>	<b>Person: Edel Murphy</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to proposed Main Street-Churchtown Rd Upper bus gate. Considers this will negatively impact valuable and well used public space in front of library and quiet residential environment of Sweetmount Ave.</li> <li>• Objects to proposed Ballinteer Rd bus gate at Dundrum Cross. Considers it will have undue negative impact on car access to the town centre.</li> <li>• Objects to removal of Main Street bus terminal from current location and provision of new bus bay on Churchtown Rd Upper. Considers this would negatively impact on use of Taney Cross by local residents, would cause pollution and would have wider impacts on community generally. Considers terminal is more useful in current location due to proximity to other transport links.</li> <li>• States that a Civic Centre is proposed at location of current terminus. Suggests this would be of more utility to local community if it were located on derelict site to rear of Carnegie Library.</li> </ul>		



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers that Draft LAP maps are difficult to read, suggests that 3D representations could be provided.</li> </ul>
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2, 4 and Other Issues.

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0083</a>	<b>Person:</b> Laura	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers proposed traffic access restrictions would have significant negative impacts for local residents by worsening traffic congestion. Notes difficulties accessing certain local roads due to existing measures, which have increased journey times for locals. Compounded by existing traffic congestion.</li> <li>• Suggests that undoing some existing measures would alleviate traffic congestion.</li> <li>• Highlights difficulties for elderly accessing amenities.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0084</a>	<b>Person:</b> Collette Mulligan	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to bus gate proposals at Main Street-Churchtown Rd Upper and Ballinteer Rd. Appears to suggest objection to a one-way system on Sweetmount Avenue.</li> <li>• Suggests that sole purpose of proposed bus gates is to facilitate re-development of OSC site for apartment use. Queries how DLR would benefit financially from this development.</li> <li>• Considers that measures objected to would increase journey times for local residents and traffic congestion. Notes concerns regarding elderly and emergency services access. Notes cycling and bus options aren't available to all locals.</li> <li>• Notes some locals rely on cars to access amenities, including schools and churches.</li> <li>• Notes hazards as a result of kerbs installed on Main Street as temporary Covid response measure.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4 and Other Issues		

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0085</a>	<b>Person:</b> Jenny and John McGarry	<b>Organisation:</b> Our Local Village
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to LAP, suggesting there have been significant negative impacts to town centre.</li> <li>• Considers impacts would worsen under proposed measures, in particular for local residents and businesses.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 1		

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0086</a>	<b>Person:</b> Alan Dunne	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of many aspects of LAP, in particular proposed cycling, walking and traffic restriction measures.</li> <li>• Objects to proposed Main Street-Churchtown Rd Upper bus route/bus gate. Considers this would exacerbate Bypass's severance of Dundrum and create safety issues for pedestrians/cyclists. Notes road has been closed to traffic for many years. Suggests buses could instead be routed through Taney Cross.</li> <li>• Considers bus route would contravene Objective GI8, by inhibiting wildlife connectivity along Slang River.</li> <li>• Supportive of Objective T1 (retention of one-way system on Main Street), however notes issues for cyclists and suggests removal of some car parking to facilitate improved two-way cycle movement.</li> </ul>		

- Notes support for Objectives T8, T9, GI10, GI11, T20, T21, all proposed cycling improvements in Section 4, 10-minute neighbourhood concept. Notes importance of Dodder-Dundrum pedestrian/cycle route due to hazardous nature of Dundrum Rd. Suggests linking this route with existing active travel routes/quiet streets in Milltown area.
- States that e-bikes result in steep gradients not being an issue for cyclists (with ref to Section 4.2.2.1).
- Highlights need to enforce bus lanes to ensure no use by cars.
- Concerned at increased traffic arising from future apartment developments. Suggests reduction in parking spaces on basis of accessibility of area.
- Supportive of increased height in line with Guidelines. States that apartments should be suitably sized in accordance with Objective H2.
- In favour of examination of opportunities to de-culvert Slang, noting it is a good environmental feature.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 1, 3, 4 and 5

<b>DLR Submission No: B0087</b>	<b>Person: Donal Courtney</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about impact on businesses on Main Street and traffic from Sandyford Road into Dundrum</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4 and 6		

<b>DLR Submission No: B0088</b>	<b>Person: Marc Evers</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of all proposed measures, stating they will allow people to move more freely, in particular cyclists and those with particular mobility needs.</li> <li>• Requests that all pedestrian crossings are level, kerbs are kept continuous at junctions and entrance kerbs are used at driveways/entrances (Dutch style).</li> <li>• Suggests reduced speed limit of 30km/h where possible, and approached from design perspective.</li> <li>• Supports removal of street clutter in the form of high numbers of street signs.</li> <li>• Highlights importance of enforcement in relation to illegal parking and driving of car/trucks (including at disabled parking spaces). States lack of Gardaí engagement on issue. Points to instances of illegally parked cars being reported but not ticketed.</li> <li>• Suggests that the silent majority supports the Draft LAP and high density developments.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 3 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: B0089</b>	<b>Person: Julie Mandal</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about proposed pedestrian/cycle route from Main Street to Sweetmount Park. Questions need for pedestrian access bridge. Notes existing direct (less than 5 mins) alternative access routes via Sweetmount Ave/Dundrum Library, and via Ballinteer Rd/Dom Marmion Bridge.</li> <li>• Considers proposed would link would only serve to increase footfall into residential area with no amenities of public interest/utility.</li> <li>• States that proposed route would lead to increased traffic in Sweetmount residential area to park/drop-off.</li> <li>• Considers that anti-social behaviour in Sweetmount Park area would worsen with proposed route, noting increased levels of such activity have been observed in the area in the last number of years.</li> <li>• States the route will lead to more litter in the area, noting this has increased in recent times and caused pollution in Slang. States litter dropped over Bypass could be traffic hazard.</li> <li>• Has security/safety concerns regarding increased activity in the area, highlighting those who live alone, the elderly and those with young children.</li> </ul>		

- Concerns re environmental impacts of increased human activity to remaining ecosystems in area.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapter 2

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0090</a>	Person: Karen Notley	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposes provision of Luas stop at Dom Marmion site, noting it would greatly benefit area. Notes existing Luas stops do not provide convenient/safe access to town centre. Notes re-development of Dom Marmion site affords opportunity to provide Luas link, underground car park and plaza.</li> <li>• States that Luas spur from Dundrum/Balally to Blackrock and Ballinteer should be examined. States there should be greater cycle and public transport connectivity between Dundrum and Blackrock.</li> <li>• Seeks provision of cycle track along Dundrum Road, noting this road and Taney Cross are currently hazardous for cyclists. Also suggests cycle track parallel to Luas track from Dundrum to Ranelagh.</li> <li>• Considers redeveloped OSC site should not include shops which can be found anywhere or high-rise apartments, should provide narrow lanes with shops, dwellings, different coloured buildings and types of structures.</li> <li>• Seeks provision of paid parking in Castlebrook estate. Notes a lot of use as parking for DTCSC employees/shoppers.</li> <li>• Requests provision of access gate (keypad activated) in steel fence between Castlebrook and Lynwood estates. States would improve accessibility for c. 300 residents (including elderly) to greenway.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2 and 4		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0091</a>	Person: Tara Spain	Organisation: TII
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Respondent's aim is to address the safety, capacity and strategic function of the national road network and Luas, in accordance with statutory functions and relevant policy guidance. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Highlights that this aim aligns with the transport strategy of the RSES, in particular RPOs 8.1, 8.2 and 8.3.</li> <li>◦ Also highlights that this aim is supported by the GDA Transport Strategy (2022-2040).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Noting the significant interaction between the LAP lands and Luas Green Line, and with reference to respondent's pre-draft stage submission in respect of the LAP, respondent seeks to highlight impacts of intended developments facilitated by the LAP on the Luas network.</li> <li>• Notes relatively costly and disruptive nature of any alterations to Luas infrastructure.</li> </ul>		
<b>ABTA:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcomes inclusion of ABTA in Draft LAP and incorporation as part of LAP process.</li> <li>• States there are inconsistencies between DLAP boundary as shown in ABTA (Figure 2.1) and Draft LAP (Figure 1.8); notes that Kilmacud Luas stop is included in ABTA study area boundary (Section 2.4.3 of ABTA). Requests that these matters are clarified/corrected as appropriate.</li> <li>• Raises concerns with identification in ABTA (Section 2.2.3) of severance of residential areas caused by Luas. Re-iterates costly and complex nature of alterations to Luas infrastructure, seeking the avoidance or amelioration of any changes to this infrastructure. Suggests that such changes would have practical implications for implementation of Draft LAP transport/movement objectives.</li> </ul>		
<b>Draft LAP Chapter 4:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notes that the majority of ABTA recommendations have been adopted as objectives in Chapter 4.</li> <li>• Identifies the following objectives as interacting with/impacting on the Luas network: T3, T4, T5, T6, T9, T17, T18.</li> </ul>		

<p><b>Interface with Luas:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Highlights need to ensure development in proximity to Luas does not adversely impact safety or operation.</li> <li>Notes technical guidance that must be observed in respect of all such developments, emphasizing that observation of this guidance can facilitate improvement of Luas interfaces and public realm.</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommendations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Respondent requests the inclusion of an additional Policy Objective in LAP (Objective DLAP 31), to ensure development objectives which interface with Luas have regard to and comply with relevant technical and design guidance, and consult with TII/Luas operator.</li> <li>Requests that ABTA maps and figures are reviewed to ensure consistency between Draft LAP and ABTA boundaries. Considers clarity on this matter will assist in differentiating development objectives of relevance to LAP lands, and recommendations with would require further analysis to be incorporated into any development objectives of this or future plans.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4</p>

<p><b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0092</a></p>	<p><b>Person:</b> Eanna Burke</p>	<p><b>Organisation:</b></p>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supportive of Draft LAP.</li> <li>Notes good public transport connectivity of Dundrum and considers measures proposed under LAP are all improvements to this.</li> <li>States there is 17% increase in road deaths this year, considers private vehicles should be removed from village for safety reasons.</li> <li>Proposes that traffic lanes could be narrowed on Barton Road East and bollards provided to bicycle lanes, in the interest of slowing traffic and improved safety. Considers speed bumps ineffective due to high volume of SUVs.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1 and 4</p>		

<p><b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0093</a></p>	<p><b>Person:</b> Vanessa</p>	<p><b>Organisation:</b></p>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This submission has no content</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> N/A</p>		

<p><b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0094</a></p>	<p><b>Person:</b> John Cahill</p>	<p><b>Organisation:</b></p>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Welcomes recognition of Slang River as wildlife amenity and proposed SUDS measures within its catchment.</li> <li>Proposes capacity of existing Slang bridges and culverts to withstand increasing volumes during flood events should be evaluated, noting projected increased frequency of events due to climate change.</li> <li>Notes Dundrum Road and Bird Avenue are important cycle connections. Proposes speeds should be reduced on these routes at parts where no separation of cycle and vehicular traffic is feasible.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4 and 5</p>		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0095</a></b>	<b>Person: Sharon Kinahan</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to Draft LAP, considers it is not in interests of needs of local residents.</li> <li>• Concerned that Dundrum will become a concrete borough with no infrastructure for its residential neighbourhood.</li> <li>• Concerns village and associated history will be destroyed.</li> <li>• States there is low occupancy level of apartments in Fernbank development.</li> <li>• Suggests more schools are needed in area.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1 and 3		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0096</a></b>	<b>Person: Bruce Campbell</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers Draft LAP is well thought out, welcoming in particular promotion of active travel.</li> <li>• Considers temporary traffic restriction and active travel measures implemented on Main Street have benefited the area. Proposes full pedestrianization of this street in future (in tandem with/post redevelopment of OSC site) would further enhance area.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1 and 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0097</a></b>	<b>Person: Terry Kinahan</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers proposals are unsuitable for a small village and will ruin character of Dundrum.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 1		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0098</a></b>	<b>Person: Elizabeth McCloskey</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to Draft LAP, in particular proposed bus gates (as set out in Section 4.6.1.8). Considers this will negatively impact respondent's ability to access local shops and Churchtown area.</li> <li>• Objects to a bridge connection to Sweetmount Park, citing anti-social behaviour as it will provide an escape route from town centre.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0099</a></b>	<b>Person: Brian Stafford</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers heights should not be restricted for new residential developments, noting need to address housing crisis.</li> <li>• Objects to requirements to reduce limit on proportion of 1-bed units in developments, citing figures stating these are most needed housing stock.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 3		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0100</a></b>	<b>Person: Gwen Adams</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Respondent is commenting in relation to vehicular access to Dundrum town centre and Bypass.</li> <li>• Notes increased traffic pressure and consequential impacts (including noise) at Taney Cross since closure of second traffic lane. Requests lane is re-opened.</li> <li>• Concerns regarding provision of bus terminus at Taney Cross. Requests this is instead provided on Taney Road or Churchtown Road.</li> <li>• States that traffic on Bypass has significantly increased since implementation of one-way system on Main Street.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0101</a></b>	<b>Person: Edmund Morris</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notes significant volume of projected apartment developments in Dundrum, considers these developments will generate significant additional traffic during construction and operation.</li> <li>• Considers ABTA does not assess impact of traffic movements in the GDA on Dundrum. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Notes 2 strategic traffic corridors intersecting Dundrum along Dundrum Road/Dundrum Bypass/Wyckham Way and along Churchtown Road Upper/Taney Road.</li> <li>◦ Notes that car parking volume and delivery / service movements at DTCS are not quantified in ABTA.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Identifies references in ABTA SWOT analysis (Table 2.3) to active travel challenges, traffic and public transport capacity issues in area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Suggests the recommendations in Chapter 4 of Draft LAP are not appropriate in light of these references.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Concerned in particular at proposed traffic restrictions at Taney Cross, considering these would lead to excessive traffic congestion, increased pollution / GHG emissions and longer travel times for all road users.</li> <li>• Considers therefore the proposed measures do not address needs of local residents or GDA residents.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 3 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0102</a></b>	<b>Person: Bryan O'Dowd</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers pedestrian access bridge from Sweetmount Park to OSC site is unnecessary, will exacerbate traffic, litter and safety issues.</li> <li>• States local residents are satisfied with existing access arrangements, states Sweetmount area is of no public interest.</li> <li>• States local residents have not requested the bridge and were not consulted about it.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 2		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0103</a></b>	<b>Person: Myles Tierney</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to any further reduction in accessibility to Main Street and surrounding streets.</li> <li>• Considers more access to Dundrum is needed, not less.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0104</u>	Person: Carina Folan	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highlights existing difficulties accessing village by car, concerns access will become impossible as a result of proposed measures.</li> <li>• Notes not everyone can cycle, challenging topography of area.</li> <li>• Notes drive times are significantly longer than necessary, will be exacerbated by proposed measures. Considers this would not be sustainable.</li> <li>• Considers village lacks mix of retail and leisure uses (compared with those at Blackrock) to attract footfall.</li> <li>• Considers village is too small to accommodate high rise buildings, noting proposed Civic Centre would appear to be high rise.</li> <li>• Notes absence of downsizing accommodation in area, due to apartments being built as BTR.</li> <li>• Considers cycle/pedestrian bridge from OSC to Sweetmount Park would create safety/security issues. States crime fell immediately when temporary walkway was removed previously.</li> <li>• Notes lack of green space in area and projects higher demand for same as a result of future developments.</li> <li>• Considers development proposed for Dom Marmion site would impact outdoor amenity of and accessibility to Holy Cross NS. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers new road layouts would limit transport options to the school, noting mobility issues of some pupils.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2, 3 and 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0105</u>	Person: Sarah McCarrick	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers Draft LAP is well thought out overall.</li> <li>• Proposes roundabout at Dundrum Bypass/Wyckham Way junction could be replaced with Dutch-style roundabout.</li> <li>• Welcomes proposed civic building, civic space and 'Village Green' at OSC site.</li> <li>• Welcomes proposed heights at village.</li> <li>• Considers retail should be retained along Main Street.</li> <li>• Welcomes traffic calming in Windy Arbour area and safe spaces for pedestrians.</li> <li>• Suggests a more direct cycle route from Windy Arbour to Dundrum village would be beneficial, but acknowledges constraints of Dundrum Road corridor. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Queries whether a pedestrian/cycle link could be provided along Slang River.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 2, 4.</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0106</u>	Person: Peter Reid	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcomes vision of Draft LAP, welcomes integrated nature proposals, biodiversity, SUDS, transport measures.</li> <li>• Supportive of existing traffic/active travel measures at Main Street. Considers it has helped return some degree of the character of the Village from the 1950s. Welcomes easier and calmer environment around Holy Cross Church. Notes on-street parking is available for pharmacy, GP and dentist. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Notes cycle infrastructure has enabled respondent and others to shop conveniently.</li> <li>○ Considers border of cycle lane should be painted more distinctively.</li> <li>○ Notes footpaths on Main Street are now safer for pedestrians, especially children; air is cleaner.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Supportive of additional measures to restrict traffic access to Village.</li> <li>• Considers civic area in front of library should be preserved.</li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Considers this can be achieved while also implementing bus gate. Notes buses will be electric, therefore cleaner and quieter.</li> <li>o Suggests re-designing square, maximising space (e.g. removing front boundary wall of library), include tree planting, widened pedestrian crossing from Sweetmount Avenue.</li> <li>o Would preserve vistas; states view of mountains will in any case be obstructed by OSC development.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of ten-minute neighbourhood concept.</li> </ul>
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1 and 4

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0107</a>	<b>Person:</b> Geraldine Browne	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about issues with bus service on Dundrum Road – this should be enhanced.</li> <li>• States Luas likely to be overcrowded due to planned developments.</li> <li>• Need for sufficient buses to/from city centre, Blackrock, Vincent’s Hospital.</li> <li>• Welcomes traffic calming and cycle lanes.</li> <li>• Notes importance of improved bus service for elderly.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0108</a>	<b>Person:</b> Mark Gilgallon	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States lack of consultation with local residents and from Elected Representatives.</li> <li>• Considers LAP proposals are not in keeping with village feel.</li> <li>• States rush hour traffic is at peak flow, notes no proposals to improve traffic access in and around area.</li> <li>• Considers property values in village, health and well-being of residents will be affected by construction works.</li> <li>• Considers LAP misses opportunity to transform Dundrum into modern urban area cognisant of local needs and in keeping with heights of surrounding area.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4 and Other Issues		

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0109</a>	<b>Person:</b> Claire Brennan	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns regarding restrictions on car access and increase in cycle facilities, noting projected significant population increase in area.</li> <li>• Queries data of on use of cycle lanes in area. Notes difficulties of cycling in area due to weather and topography, difficulties for elderly cycling.</li> <li>• States LAP does not account for additional populations resulting from developments proposed on Kilmacud Road Upper and at Sandyford Industrial Estate. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Considers these developments will contribute to congestion and pressure on services.</li> <li>o Queries whether units in these developments will be available to buy, or whether they are rent only and built by Vulture Funds.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Notes Airfield Farm is included in LAP boundary. Queries plans to develop Airfield, noting it is a valuable green amenity.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 3, 4 and 7		



DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0110</a>	Person: Conor Brennan	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcomes proposed walking and cycling infrastructure improvements, in particular proposed change of roundabouts to signalised junctions along Wyckham Way. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Notes there are insufficient pedestrian crossings along this route and junctions are dangerous for cyclists due to speed of cars.</li> <li>○ Welcomes changes to junction at Dundrum Town Centre in particular, noting no safe crossings for pedestrians currently.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Positive about changes to Dundrum village, hopeful of their implementation.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0111</a>	Person: Nigel Brennan	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about restrictions to car access from Barton Road East / Ballinteer Road to Main Street. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Notes particular impacts to elderly, including for access to Holy Cross Church and church car park.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0112</a>	Person: Paul Hawkins	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns with redevelopment of OSC site. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Out of character with unique form of village and older buildings.</li> <li>○ Concerned about resulting increased traffic in Dundrum.</li> <li>○ Opposes road closures to facilitate construction.</li> <li>○ Considers housing will be unaffordable, will not serve disadvantaged people.</li> <li>○ Notes recent significant developments at DTCSC, Sandyford, Ballinteer Road.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2 and 4		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0113</a>	Person: Timothy O'Neill	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Respondent considers LAP will have major negative impacts on their life, travel and on the village community.</li> <li>• Notes significant change to Dundrum in last c. 60 years. Considers area has been poorly served by DLR and neglected at the expense of other areas in the County. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ States no effort has been made to bring historical collection in Dún Laoghaire library to the western part of the County.</li> <li>○ States DLR has failed to use opportunities to provide green spaces in the Killmashogue area/western fringe of the County.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers Draft LAP is misleading, inaccurately presents the present situation and that future plans are fantastical, idealised and unrealistic. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Images of Bypass do not represent current situation, where significant congestion occurs.</li> <li>○ Images of Pembroke Cottages do not show level of existing advertising signage which detracts from character.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

- o Respondent notes they have objected to this and the commercial use of these cottages previously, but no action has been taken by DLR.
- o Highlights importance of these cottages to heritage of Dundrum – connection to Pembroke, Roebuck and Milltown estates.
- o Considers conservation objectives for these cottages are ineffective, rather seeking to justify their commercial use.
- o Compares with favourable treatment of similar cottages elsewhere (e.g Ballsbridge) by retaining residential use.
- o Concerned at prospect of future changes to accommodate commercial uses.
- o Considers use of these cottages should be restricted to residential, stating this would retain living centre for heart of village. Considers this would be in accordance with policy guidance provided in Section 8.4.2 of Draft LAP.
- Highlights that green space at The Laurels was given to Trustees in 1960s for use and enjoyment of local residents of The Laurels/Sweetmount estate. States green space was subsequently transferred to Local Authority in 1970s for care and maintenance.
  - o States this transfer was for benefit of local residents with several restrictive covenants attached, prohibiting development and parking.
  - o States part of land was transferred to a developer, in contravention of said restrictive covenants, and redeveloped as car park in town centre.
  - o Considers DLR are continuing to breach covenants.
  - o Objects to inclusion of Laurels and Sweetmount Park in town area, noting they are residential estates.
  - o Considers any change to this green space should only arise from consultation with residents of Sweetmount and Laurels estates.
  - o Considers a proposed pedestrian/cycle from OSC site would intrude on this green space and continue the pattern of diminishing it.
  - o Considers bridge/other pedestrian link would solely facilitate developer of OSC site, and would not be in interests of existing residents.
  - o Considers it would generally impact on residential amenity of existing residents.
- Objects to reference to Airfield as open space, noting public must pay to use.
  - o States Airfield was left to Local Authority as open farm, suggests DLR should accept running costs of Airfield and make it publicly available.
  - o States current use of Airfield should be assessed against original terms of transfer to Local Authority.
  - o Considers Airfield is needed for area due to adjacent high rise development.
  - o Considers its inclusion as green space would be akin to inclusion of Milltown Golf Club – which respondent suggests would also be inappropriate as access is private.
- Objects to reference to St. Nahi's cemetery as green space, noting the need to carefully preserve archaeological site there and consider archaeological excavation of site.
  - o States however that not all such sites should be excavated, may be more appropriate to do so in the future.
- Raises concerns with 10-minute neighbourhood concept, in light points made above about Pembroke Cottages.
  - o Highlights that concept only applies to walking, cycling and public transport, noting cycling in particular may not be suitable for elderly.
  - o States that many people are being encouraged/driven to cycle for whom it is not appropriate due to physical ability.
- States consideration of mobility for elderly is glaring oversight/omission from LAP.
  - o Highlights aging population of Dundrum and reliance of support from family members, highlighting increasing difficulty in family members visiting.
  - o Considers this difficulty would be exacerbated by proposed changes to road network.
  - o States there is a lack of reference in Draft LAP to care and concern for elderly.

- o Considers that elderly residents who arrived in 1960s established existing community and supported provision of a number of existing facilities, noting contribution of this cohort is now being ignored.
- Highlights traffic congestion on surrounding roads in area.
  - o States narrow carriageways create dangerous driving conditions, noting damage to cycle lane bollards.
  - o Concerned this will eventually lead to serious accident.
  - o Notes severe traffic congestion at Taney Cross
  - o Concerned this will be unsustainably exacerbated by implementation of dedicated bus lane.
  - o Concerned about environmental impacts of traffic congestion. States Old Rectory Park had highest level of pollution from cars in recent years due to traffic at Taney Cross.
- Considers DLR record on environment is increasingly hypocritical.
  - o Refers to landscaping works at Marlay Park golf course, noting inadequate response of Council to issues raised by respondent previously.
  - o Considers there is detrimental ecological impact, waste and noise pollution from concerts in Marlay Park
- Objects to proposed traffic restrictions from Barton Road East to Dundrum Cross.
  - o Respondent notes personal impacts of this for visiting family.
  - o Notes significant consequential increase in journey times and necessitating use of roads busy with rush hour traffic traveling to M50.
  - o Considers this compounds impacts to traffic and journey times that have resulted from traffic restrictions at Knocknashee estate, concerned this will be further exacerbated by new development on Kilmacud Road Upper.
- Highlights impacts to traders on Main Street of restrictions on vehicular access.
  - o Considers this would impose unreasonable journey times on respondent and other residents for making local shopping trips.
  - o States there is a lack of alternative bus or bicycle transport options.
- Objects generally to provision of bus gates as set out in Section 4.6.1.8, citing traffic impacts.
  - o Considers they will ultimately cause further deterioration of family and community interaction.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
 Chapters 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8 and Other Issues

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0114</a>	Person: Boylan Family	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Views DLR as incompetent and should not have power to make decisions with major impact on Dundrum and surrounds. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Suggests DLR are Implementing developments they previously opposed.</li> <li>◦ Critical of lack of openness/transparency/honesty from DLR, perceived lack of detail in Draft LAP and lack of public consultation; queries DLR's reluctance to engage with local community.</li> <li>◦ Critical of DLR planners' lack of connection to local area.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• States the draft plan is short on detail.</li> <li>• States that 'area where the building is proposed' is too small.</li> <li>• Critical of high rise buildings generally.</li> <li>• Considers proposed measures will diminish attractiveness of Dundrum.</li> <li>• States that Dundrum will look like Ballymun in 1965/Gotham City.</li> <li>• Considers LAP will negatively impact village.</li> <li>• Critical of proposed bus gate, noting negative impacts to village and skepticism about envisaged frequency of 4 minute bus service.</li> <li>• Notes particular impacts to church parishioners and residents on and around Barton Road East.</li> <li>• Critical of measures introduced by during Covid, noting issues including emergency access difficulties, trip hazards due to cycle lane kerbs.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4 and Other Issues.</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0115</a>	Person: Mark Gilgallon	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to LAP.</li> <li>• Highlights environmental impacts, including traffic congestion, noise pollution and overall sustainability of the neighbourhood.</li> <li>• Concerned regarding overdevelopment – scale and density out of character, community overcrowded/overburdened, loss of unique character.</li> <li>• Refers to infrastructure constraints and capacity issues (mentions local services, healthcare, schools, public transport).</li> <li>• Encroachment on green space and threat to biodiversity.</li> <li>• Lack of consideration of cultural/historical significance of area, noting importance of preserving/enhancing heritage of area.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4, 8 and Other Issues</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0116</a>	Person: Jeffrey Ryan	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of proposed pedestrian/cyclist access route from OSC site to Sweetmount Park. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Considers it will be safer and will minimise the need to interact with heavily trafficked roads.</li> <li>◦ Ease of access to Luas and Main Street.</li> <li>◦ Notes previous access at this location prior to construction of Bypass and temporary access during construction of Bypass, stating no negatives as a result of these.</li> <li>◦ Considers parking impact at Sweetmount Park will be minimal due to disc parking.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 2</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0117</a>	Person: Joe Lakes	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highlights opportunity presented by Draft LAP to create sustainable community/village.</li> <li>• Highlights need to provide downsizing accommodation, noting prevalence of 3/4 bed units and ‘empty nests’ in area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Considers apartments delivered by commercial entities are unsuitable for this purpose, proposing DLR should provide and/or design units.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Welcomes the sentiment in the Draft LAP to improve Main Street. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Notes challenge posed by dereliction on Main St, proposing public ownership to restore properties.</li> <li>◦ Queries lack of restaurants/small food stores.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Queries need to bring buses onto Sweetmount Ave. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Notes existing bus terminus beside Luas.</li> <li>◦ Concerned about future bus parking on Sweetmount Avenue.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Strongly in favour of additional cycling and walking routes, however notes mobility issues and car dependence for elderly. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Considers brighter colour for Main Street cycle lane kerb would be beneficial, as it is a trip hazard.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Concerned commercial-led development of Dundrum will destroy village. Notes opportunity of Draft LAP to deliver lively Main Street and high quality mix of accommodation for all ages.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 2, 3 and 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0118</a>	Person: Bernadette Donnelly	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to Draft LAP on basis of restricted vehicular access, road closures and restricted access generally.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0119</a>	Person: Anthony Kearney	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers replacement of roundabouts with signalised junctions can lead to an increase in safety issues, with regard to Section 4.6.2.1 ‘Wyckham Way Roundabout Upgrades’. Cites the following sources in support of this: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ E.U Commission (Mobility and Transport: Road Safety)</li> <li>◦ Road-safety.transport.ec.europe.eu</li> <li>◦ World Economic Forum</li> <li>◦ A study in Fortworth, Texas</li> <li>◦ The Florida Department of Transport</li> <li>◦ The Insurance Institute for Highway Safety</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Draws the following conclusions based on cited sources: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Roundabouts are safer/more efficient without (rather than with) traffic lights.</li> <li>◦ Roundabouts are safer for pedestrians/cyclists and better environmentally.</li> <li>◦ The proposed works to the junctions on Wyckham Way could leave DLR open to litigation due to increased safety issues.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4</p>		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0120</a></b>	<b>Person: Anne Smith</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identifies importance of retaining centre at Dom Marmion House which is central and accessible for older people.</li> <li>• Identifies need to upgrade roundabout at Dundrum Bypass / Wyckham Way junction due to safety issues.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0121</a></b>	<b>Person: Aidan Clancy</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers Draft LAP disregards needs of motorists and elderly / disabled in favour of cyclists and pedestrians. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ E.g existing heavy traffic pressure at Taney Cross has not been accounted for.</li> <li>○ States elderly on Barton Road East will not be able to drive / be dropped off at Holy Cross Church.</li> <li>○ Strongly submits that DLR 'obsession' with cycling should be abandoned and requirements of other road users should be further considered.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• States bus access to Dundrum Luas interchange has not been considered.</li> <li>• Concerned at major trip hazard on Main Street due to DLR measures, noting accidents have occurred for pedestrians.</li> <li>• Requests that DLR stop imposing what it believes is 'good for you'. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ States most citizens object to DLR approach.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0122</a></b>	<b>Person: Ruth Deveney</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very concerned about sustainability of Dundrum village and businesses in village due to existing/proposed traffic restriction measures.</li> <li>• Notes negative impacts on visitor numbers due to existing one-way system.</li> <li>• Considers proposals proposed additional vehicular access restrictions from Kilmacud Road and Ballinteer Road will exacerbate this issue. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ States this will cut off surrounding residential areas from village.</li> <li>○ States this will increase traffic on Sandyford Road.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers loss of shops and amenities will destroy local heritage and community, make village redundant.</li> <li>• Considers reduction in vehicles / pedestrians will create unsafe environment, noting increase in anti-social behaviour already as a result of existing measures.</li> <li>• Doubtful of use levels of cycle lanes; requests that this is surveyed.</li> <li>• Highlights delivery access issues and lack of customer parking as result of existing/proposed measures.</li> <li>• Considers area would also be unappealing to prospective new businesses.</li> <li>• Highlights that DLR do not control privately owner properties. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Respondent objects to removal of their property under 'guise of progress', they will not be bullied out of their property.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4, 6 and Other issues		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0123</u></b>	<b>Person: Derek Murray</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of Draft LAP, in particular proposed walking/cycling infrastructure improvements.</li> <li>• Approves of proposed removal of access from Ballinteer Road to Main Street as means to reduce traffic in area.</li> <li>• Highlights need for major actions to reduce car dependence, in particular due to volume of future developments planned.</li> <li>• Considers provision of sufficient cycling infrastructure / discouragement of car use may lead to similar levels of cycling/public transport use as seen in Netherlands. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Notes there was difficulty and significant public objections to achievements now in place in Netherlands.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0124</u></b>	<b>Person: Noel Gilmore</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers Dundrum has deteriorated over the years from community-based residential area to grid-locked, unattractive locality. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ States village no longer functions economically and socially; notes poor traffic and transport management.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Raises concerns at future of Dundrum, noting significant volumes of residential development in progress and envisioned within area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers roads and transport infrastructure do not have sufficient capacity to serve these developments.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Highlights difficulties for elderly (who cannot rely on walking/cycling) accessing local amenities.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0125</u></b>	<b>Person: Kieran Sutton</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to developments proposed in Draft LAP. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Critical of prospect of largescale residential developments solely for rent (e.g. Fernbank).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Notes congestion issues on Main Street / in town centre. Concerned this will be exacerbated by additional footfall on streets, use of public transport and cars.</li> <li>• Wants village rebuilt (possibly welcoming hotel).</li> <li>• Objects to high rise buildings the area.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2, 3, and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0126</u></b>	<b>Person: Shane Moriarty</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcomes opportunity of LAP to address traffic issues. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Highlights need for co-ordinated traffic management plan, noting significant additional population as result of projected developments in Dundrum and surrounding areas.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Highlights high through-traffic volumes on local residential streets (in particular at mornings and evenings), noting expected increase in same. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Notes safety issues for children cycling to school and playing outside along neighbourhood streets and other nearby/adjoining roads, due to high traffic volumes and on-street parking.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Welcomes reference in Draft LAP to traffic restrictions in areas used as rat-runs and to implementing Quiet Streets programme.</li> <li>• Attaches map appearing to identify sites of planned largescale developments in north DLAP lands/Goatstown area.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1 and 4</p>

<p><b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0127</u></b></p>	<p><b>Person: Maria Gillis</b></p>	<p><b>Organisation:</b></p>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to Draft LAP on basis of safety/accessibility issues it presents, specifically in relation to proposed alterations/upgrades to Sydenham Road.</li> <li>• Considers Sydenham Road is too narrow to safely accommodate bicycle lanes and single traffic lane.</li> <li>• Proposes maintaining two-way vehicular traffic on Sydenham Road and upgrading Stoney Road (noted as being a wider road) to accommodate two-way vehicular traffic and bicycle lanes.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Considers proposed arrangement would be safer, would preserve existing traffic access and maintain utility of existing drop-off facilities for Holy Cross NS.</li> <li>o Notes LAP boundary would need to be extended to include Stoney Road.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Objects to removal of slip roads at Dundrum Cross, stating that their removal would increase traffic congestion.</li> <li>• Considers existing cycle lane kerbs on Main Street pose risk to pedestrians/cyclists; requests this issue is addressed.</li> <li>• Requests that redevelopment of OSC is carried out in a manner which does not negatively impact local residents.</li> <li>• Requests that appropriate heights are adhered to in future developments within LAP lands, noting potential detrimental impacts of excessive heights on surrounding area.</li> <li>• Considers implementing solutions proposed by respondent would result in safer, more accessible and harmonious environment in Dundrum.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 2, 3 and 4</p>		

<p><b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0128</u></b></p>	<p><b>Person: Dorothy McMahon and Noel McMahon</b></p>	<p><b>Organisation:</b></p>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to proposed pedestrian/cyclists route connecting OSC site and Sweetmount Park, on the basis of the following:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Safety concerns, in particular for elderly residents.</li> <li>o Increase in litter.</li> <li>o Ecosystem impacts.</li> <li>o Car parking constraints in residential estate.</li> <li>o No necessity due to existing convenient alternative access routes.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 2</p>		

<p><b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0129</u></b></p>	<p><b>Person: Darragh O'Neill</b></p>	<p><b>Organisation:</b></p>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to proposed restrictions to vehicular access to village, noting in particular difficulties accessing Holy Cross NS.</li> <li>• Notes requirements for busy working families to drive, however acknowledges need to walk and take public transport more.</li> </ul>		



- Highlights increasing difficulty accessing parts of LAP lands and surrounds by car and inconvenient alternative access routes necessitated.
- States village is nice suburban thoroughfare, however considers it will never be focal point of area due to presence of shopping centre.
- Considers removing vehicular access to village imposes inconvenience for sake of principle.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapter 4

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0130</a></b>	<b>Person: Martin O'Brien</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to proposed vehicular access restrictions of Draft LAP.</li> <li>• Notes local reliance on access to much needed facilities, in particular elderly / mobility impaired.</li> <li>• Notes importance of access to local businesses. Considers LAP proposals will exacerbate issues faced by businesses.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4 and 6		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0131</a></b>	<b>Person: Lucia Bradford</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notes issues understanding LAP process. Considers insufficient time was afforded to public consultation.</li> <li>• Notes significant elderly population of Dundrum, significant size of LAP lands, large number of shops in area.</li> <li>• Concerned about negative impacts to character of Dundrum, impact on village.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 2 and Other Issues		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0132</a></b>	<b>Person: Stephen Kinahan</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to redevelopment of OSC site, citing the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Incongruity with surrounding area, noting in particular proximity to properties on Sweetmount Avenue.</li> <li>○ Excessive height/density.</li> <li>○ Considers heights of 11 to 16 storeys along Bypass would cause amenity impacts to neighbouring properties, including loss of light, overshadowing, overlooking, visual dominance, overdevelopment of site.</li> <li>○ Need for DLR to safeguard character of area, noting negative impacts on same of providing 1 and 2-bed units.</li> <li>○ Issues with residential units being solely for rent, inferring this model doesn't serve the local community.</li> <li>○ Excessive use of Sweetmount Park by future residents due to lack of amenity space provided in development.</li> <li>○ Considers more green space should be provided in area generally to address this.</li> <li>○ Notes DLR Planner's Report on OSC SHD application was critical of development, queries why DLR are now helping to develop site.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Notes excessive amount of shops in area with no other amenities.</li> <li>• Highlights issues with existing Fernbank development, including low occupancy rate, increase in anti-social/criminal behaviour in Finsbury Park. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Concerns similar issues will occur at Sweetmount Park.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highlights issues of traffic congestion and low parking availability.                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Concerned about increased parking pressure on local streets, increased through traffic, safety concerns caused by future residents of proposed developments, as well as traffic restrictions proposed for Dundrum.</li> <li>○ Considers proposed expansion of one-way systems will prolong journey times to local amenities.</li> <li>○ Highlights trip hazards presented by cycle lane kerbs in area.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Concerned at re-location of bus stops and increased bus traffic on Sweetmount Avenue as a result of development of Civic Centre.</li> <li>• Concerns at lack of information on height and size of civic centre.</li> <li>• Suggests alternative location for Civic Centre should be sought, e.g. Usher House, site to rear of Carnegie Library, within OSC site.</li> <li>• Queries need for Civic Centre generally.</li> <li>• Objects to proposed Main Street to Churchtown Road Upper bus gate, citing concerns about noise/air pollution, increased bus traffic, safety concerns for pedestrians.</li> <li>• Notes difficulty for some locals (in particular elderly) attending public consultation events, finding information on Draft LAP and making submissions.</li> <li>• Concerned at lack of information available to local elected representatives regarding developments in the area (including provision of new bus stops).</li> <li>• Concerned at volume of developments planned in DLAP lands and surrounding areas.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4, 6 and Other Issues</p>

<p><b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0133</a></b></p>	<p><b>Person: Jennifer</b></p>	<p><b>Organisation:</b></p>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Critical of LAP, cites impacts to residents of Dundrum/Ballinteer.</li> <li>• Notes large number of elderly residents who rely on car access for shopping etc.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1 and 4</p>		

<p><b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0134</a></b></p>	<p><b>Person: Tomas Breen</b></p>	<p><b>Organisation:</b></p>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of LAP.</li> <li>• Considers proposed cycle infrastructure together with existing public transport links will alleviate car reliance and facilitate increase in population.</li> <li>• Notes existing cycle infrastructure is good, but considers more integrated walking/cycling network is to facilitate older and younger residents travelling by these modes.</li> <li>• Highlights importance of permeability between residential developments, noting this allows for efficient movement.</li> <li>• Considers developments should include space to provide active travel links.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1 and 4</p>		

<p><b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0135</a></b></p>	<p><b>Person: Niall Sisson</b></p>	<p><b>Organisation:</b></p>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports LAP.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 1</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0136</a>	Person: Office of Public Works	Organisation: Office of Public Works
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission relates to flood risk management.</li> <li>• Notes further submissions may be made regarding other aspects of Draft LAP.</li> <li>• Welcomes acknowledgement of Flood Risk Guidelines and inclusion of SFRA. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Notes previous assessment of Dundrum under CDP SFRA.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Invites DLR to incorporate or reference Section 2.4 of the CDP SFRA (discussion of incorporation of climate change) in the DLAP.</li> <li>• Welcomes Policies DLAP32 and DLAP33 and Objectives GI7, GI8 and GI12 of the LAP (regarding SuDS / NBS).</li> <li>• Seeks inclusion of additional reference to the Best Practice Interim Guidance Document ‘Nature-based Solutions to the Management of Rainwater and Surface Water Runoff in Urban Areas’.</li> <li>• Highlights the following recommendations of the Guidelines in relation to the SFRA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Guidance on the likely applicability of different SuDS techniques for managing surface water run-off at key development sites should be provided.</li> <li>◦ Appropriate locations for integrated and area based provision of SuDS and GI (in order to avoid reliance on individual site by site solutions) should be identified.</li> <li>◦ Highlights that the Draft LAP identifies “a number of character areas, four key sites and ten opportunity sites” where integrated and area based provision of SuDS and GI may be appropriate.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Proposes that a flood event at Dundrum shopping centre (21<sup>st</sup> August 2021) should be included in Table of Historic Flooding Records (Section 1.6(iii) of SFRA). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Requests that DLR send OPW any reports they have of this flood event.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Welcomes review of SSFRAs undertaken as part of SFRA.</li> <li>• Invites DLR to contact OPW if further information needed.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5 and Appendix 1 (SFRA)</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0137</a>	Person: David McCarrick	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcomes the Dundrum to Dodder cycling link proposal.</li> <li>• Asks if a cycle boardwalk over the Slang River has been considered from the Dodder to the LUAS Bridge with the opinion that a bridge could take all cyclists off the Dundrum Road between the LUAS Bridge and Milltown.</li> <li>• States that vehicular traffic, particularly from commercial operations is extremely dangerous for pedestrians between the "American Golf" business centre and Joe Daly's and would welcome measures to improve this situation.</li> <li>• Suggests that the roundabout on the Wyckham Way at the Southern End of the Dundrum TC needs a curbed ramp for cyclists approaching from the North who are heading in the Ballinteer direction and are forced to ramp the curb after the roundabout to get onto the 'excellent bike lanes' on Wyckham Way.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0138</a>	Person: Laura Murphy	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <p><b>Draft LAP Process</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission notes that there has been a campaign of fear mongering regarding this LAP via facebook, that have spread rumours and lies as facts.</li> </ul>		

- Submission states that a public meeting was organised locally noting that anyone who voiced any support for the LAP was not permitted to voice their opinions and notes the demographic in the room as not representative of the population of this area.
- Submission hopes that the silent majority have read the LAP and makes their submissions based on facts.

**Planning**

- Submission states that Dundrum requires change, no change would be a disservice to future generations.
- Feels that the village of Dundrum is in need of rejuvenation to counter vacant and run-down retail units and believes that Landlords should not have been allowed to 'leave these units empty to rot'.
- Thinks Dundrum village has much potential, the LAP is an opportunity to make up for mistakes made in the past and generate a village for future generations to be proud of, noting Blackrock as an example of a vibrant village.
- Welcomes guidelines outlined in the LAP for any future development of the OSC site.
- Consideration should be given for guidelines on the provision of car spaces in future development as excellent public transport links mean car spaces should be limited.
- Welcomes guidelines around proposed heights along main street and up to 11 stories in various locations along the bypass.
- Ground floor units on main street side of the OSC site should be kept as retail.
- Welcomes recommendation of a public park being included in this development and the inclusion of a bridge to Sweetmount to remove the segregation the bypass created.
- Welcomes the provision of a civic space and civic building, noting that this space is currently a wasteland creating a very unattractive welcome to village.
- Adding a larger library to the civic space also would be excellent allowing for a more suitable children's section.

**Traffic/Transport**

- Commends council on improvements made to date regarding traffic and public realm including a reduction of traffic through the village and introduction of the one-way system.
- Widening of pedestrian spaces and the protected cycle track are very evident improvements.
- States that there no need for two-way traffic through Dundrum village as the bypass facilitates those journeys.
- Believes through road to Dundrum Town Centre has brought nothing to the village except traffic, fumes and an hostile environment for pedestrians and cyclists.
- Welcomes the tightening up of junctions in the proposed plan including removal of left slip lanes to provide a safer environment for pedestrians and cyclists and really welcomes the provision of a protected cycle lane through the bypass stating 'this cannot come soon enough'.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
 Chapters 1, 2, 4 and Other Issues

DLR Submission No: <u>B0139</u>	Person: Margaret Pierce Sheehy	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission states it is increasingly difficult to access local roads to care for a family member, proposed 'road blocks/closures/restrictions' will make this much more difficult and to respond to possible emergencies.</li> <li>• Does not approve of one-way system on Main Street, notes that the bicycle lane poses a danger to all. States that the high ridges pose a very serious health and safety issue to those walking/crossing the road.</li> <li>• Thinks that Public transport - apart from the LUAS service, is poor since the removal of the 48a bus service and the no.14 reconfigured to account for this, noting that the journey from Dundrum LUAS stop terminus to Beaumont hospital takes approximately 80 minutes.</li> <li>• States that the Dundrum Main Street should be reopened to two-way traffic as the bypass was built to take the heavy traffic from the village.</li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States that, in earlier eras, Ireland had 10/15-minute neighbourhoods and this facilitated workers living locally to work locally in addition to mothers conducting their daily business of walking children to school without any need for a second car. This no longer occurs due to 2 working parents, commuting by car requiring children to be dropped to school/child minders/creches.</li> <li>Submitter believes a complete rethink and review of the draft LAP is seriously needed and that a voice of reason needs to be heard and heeded.</li> </ul>
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1 and 4

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0140</a></b>	<b>Person: Jane Burke</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission support the Draft LAP as there is a need to provide alternatives to the car noting that it may be difficult to stand up against people who want to drive everywhere. This should not prevent the implantation of improved public transport, cycling and walking infrastructure.</li> <li>Recognises that it is important to listen to local businesses but those in Dundrum Village appear to be fundamentally against anything that doesn't prioritise people driving to the village.</li> <li>Believes the village is much more pleasant and vibrant than it once was, does not consider businesses to have interests of the wider community.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 4 and 6		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0141</a></b>	<b>Person: Eoin O'Neill</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission states that the further reduction of cars to Dundrum Village will have a detrimental effect on retail businesses that already struggle to compete with the Dundrum town Centre.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 6		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0142</a></b>	<b>Person: Kevin O'Byrne</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission states support for more housing locally.</li> <li>Support for priority for sustainable transport.</li> <li>Supports for climate and flood adaptation measures.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 3, 4 and 5		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0143</a></b>	<b>Person: Lisa McNamee</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission supports sustainable transport routes with priority for pedestrian and cycle routes.</li> <li>Support for climate adaptation works including flood risk minimisation works.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4 and 5		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0144</a></b>	<b>Person: Gabrielle Colleran</b>	<b>Organisation: IHCA</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission notes the importance in increasing local housing and to plan for sustainably with ample active transport options that makes cycling to work and school safe</li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notes benefits for the individual health, population health and climate health.</li> <li>• States that rhetoric steeped in fear cannot be allowed to influence decisions away from forward looking policies that improve the quality of life for citizens.</li> <li>• Believes that ample green spaces and active transport and public transport are key investments.</li> </ul>
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 3, 4, 5 and Other Issues

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0145</a></b>	<b>Person: George Dikker</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission states the need to mind green spaces and limit pollution.</li> <li>• Says NO to more cars in the area and YES to more space for pedestrians.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4 and 5		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0146</a></b>	<b>Person: Sean Parkes</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission supports more housing locally.</li> <li>• Supports making sustainable transport a priority.</li> <li>• Supports climate and flood adaptation measures.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 3, 4 and 5		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0147</a></b>	<b>Person: Stefan Hanrahan</b>	<b>Organisation: Private citizen</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter states they are a resident of Rockfield along with their partner and that the Draft LAP is very significant for their future here in Dundrum. Submitter is very impressed with the Draft LAP plans and has read it back-to-back saying 'Well done to all'.</li> <li>• Submission is in support of much more housing locally and expects that the 5000 or so future younger residents will be considered in all plans (unlike Brexit in UK).</li> <li>• Supports making a priority for cycling and sustainable transport including the bus gates and the one-way systems and the prevention of cars rat running through the village.</li> <li>• Submission is also in support of climate and flood protection measures.</li> <li>• States they would like to see the following public realm improvements in the form of a reinstatement with full refurbishment of the original buildings behind the following structures:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Daybreak, Irene's flower cabin- Havana.</li> <li>○ Best barber-Essence cafe-Lisney.</li> <li>○ Mulveys pharmacy- Xmas shop.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Submission believes these historical buildings are actually what will help preserve Dundrum village along with the Victorian and Edwardian heritage and bring more space to the sidewalks with lots of greening and seating for elderly/ young people.</li> <li>• Submitter hopes that the Ladbrokes shopfront can be improved.</li> <li>• Would like to see the courtyard behind Campbell's corner restored and put to good use perhaps with a farmers' market along with Maher's Terrace restoration and preservation.</li> <li>• Prefers that the paint be removed from the brick above Deveny's off licence (itself an attractive shop) and that perhaps the council could give a grant.</li> <li>• Considers that the Dom Marmion area could be given a new purpose.</li> <li>• Thinks that the cottages to the left of Ryan's Dundrum house need public realm improvements with a proper surface.</li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter believes that the playing fields at Rosemount need an upgrade along with more park-like planting, lots more native trees and to connect with the CMH site seamlessly and coherently all looking tied in and attractive.</li> <li>• Submits that the entire area between Balally LUAS at Rockfield and Riverdale and the Sandyford Road all needs a huge public realm improvement.</li> <li>• Believes the traffic on Overend Way moves too fast.</li> <li>• Believes the traffic at Kilmacud Road Upper is also moving too fast for a narrow road and is very intimidating for pedestrians so speed bumps and more traffic calming is needed there especially as hundreds of new residents will be coming to live in Green Acres.</li> <li>• Submitter requests that the footpath sets in the village to be better considered and that they should be of a high quality with a sandy colour rather than the grey sets as seen in the city. Preference would be for the use of golden granite to complement the historical brickwork in the village.</li> <li>• Thinks that the artisan cottages behind Deveny's, where the Grafton barber is located' should be preserved and restored with the paint removed from the historic brick.</li> <li>• Submission is in favour of high-rise apartments along the bypass and lower rise at the Main Street.</li> <li>• Submission is in favour of a new public realm around Dundrum LUAS and Dargan bridge as well as a landmark building for this location.</li> <li>• Submitter would like to see car parking removed from Sydenham Road along Taney National school and the whole area greened and made child friendly with native planting and calmed for cyclists.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 1, 2, 4, 5 and 8</p>

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0148</a></b>	<b>Person: George Young</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission states they are a supporter of small business and object to all of the new (traffic management) system which is proposed for the area with regards to restrictions on disabled drivers.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4 and 6</p>		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0149</a></b>	<b>Person: Justin Smyth</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission supports increased housing capacity including a large portion of affordable and social housing</li> <li>• Submission supports the continued development of active travel pathways, cycle ways and public transport facilities including increased capacity.</li> <li>• Submitter would like an increase of EV charging points in current car parking facilities.</li> <li>• Submission does not support any increase or advancement in Car-friendly planning stating the need for less cars on the streets.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 3 and 4</p>		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0150</a></b>	<b>Person: Julia Vendrig</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission supports the inclusion of cycle lanes as they cycle in this area with their children and would like to feel safer doing so.</li> <li>• Knows from professional experience that a walkable infrastructure with lots of green space is essential for public health.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4 and 5</p>		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0151</a></b>	<b>Person: Michael Dwyer</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission broadly supports the Draft LAP and would prefer less cars, more public transport, LTNs and cycling infrastructure.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 1 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0152</a></b>	<b>Person: Conor Hurley</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission states that it is a really positive step to help Dundrum regenerate and grow, and improve the current traffic issues in the area.</li> <li>Submitter has avoided Dundrum in the past due to traffic, but the recent changes to the main street have made the atmosphere in the 'village' much better; less noisy and polluted.</li> <li>Prefers to now shop and eat in Dundrum than Stillorgan since it is much more pleasant and more improvement are welcome.</li> <li>Submitter notes that the OSC needs to be redeveloped as it is an ideal location for this with excellent public transport links, lots of shops/amenities.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2, 4 and 6		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0153</a></b>	<b>Person: David Kearney</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission fully supports measures to improve walking, cycling and public transport usage in the Dundrum area.</li> <li>States that it is necessary increase in housing locally.</li> <li>Submitter considers the one-way system on Main Street as an excellent change and advocates strongly for its retention as many local residents make car journeys of 1-2km in the area which could easily walked or cycled.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 3 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0154</a></b>	<b>Person: Kathryn O'Connell</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission states that the (Draft) DLAP is anti-resident, anti-people and not thought through by architects/engineers or anyone actually living in Dundrum.</li> <li>Considers traffic restrictions at Taney Cross, Sydenham Road, Ballinteer Road, Churchtown Road and the slip road to the M50 by the RSA building will cause more congestion.</li> <li>Does not agree with changes made during Covid, making Dundrum one way.</li> <li>Considers cycle wands introduced are a hindrance to cars and are an issue for people needing to access the M50.</li> <li>Notes that Balally estate has become a rat run for people trying to beat the long queue up Sandyford Road.</li> <li>Considers the cycle barriers on Main Street to be 'a death trap' and hopes DLR is sued by someone soon.</li> <li>Does not agree to a bus gate around Sweetmount.</li> <li>Considers that the LAP will destroy the village, is not needed or wanted while all the change in the last couple of years has just made everything worse.</li> <li>Notes that plan is no good to the elderly and will hinder everyone.</li> <li>Believes that the mindset that people will all be walking and cycling is bizarre.</li> </ul>		



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That the plan is contrary to inclusivity as it is forgetting the elderly, the Dom Marmion house, the children in Holy Cross and the access to the school.</li> <li>• States that not everyone can or wants to cycle as Dundrum noting the topography of the area.</li> <li>• Submitter considered that the LAP will not enhance lives or the village, that it will ruin the village and all the businesses will suffer because people will go elsewhere to go to the bank, church, shop, cafe/pub etc.</li> <li>• Strongly objects to the proposal noting that no one seems to be happy or agree to this plan based on the consultation meeting they attended.</li> <li>• States that the Council needs to go back to the drawing board and consult with the residents before implementing changes to the village and surrounding area they particularly assume that the people who actually drew up these plans don't live in Dundrum or are under 50.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 3, 4, 6 and Other Issues</p>

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0155</a></b>	<b>Person: Niall Mescall</b>	<b>Organisation: Reads Design and Print</b>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission states disappointment with the overall plan especially regarding access to Dundrum village and the old village centre.</li> <li>• Considers that businesses will not survive with this plan if it is not amended, or compromises are not discussed.</li> <li>• Thinks that ratepayers can't be expected to pay the rates for this sort of service and hindrance to their livelihoods.</li> <li>• Notes that businesses rely on footfall to survive and cars that can take stock and items home.</li> <li>• Thinks that the proposal for the bus gates 4.6.1.8 will not allow any reasonable access for cars to turn into Dundrum old village centre for access to shops.</li> <li>• Submitter urgently requests a rethink and consultation with the residents and businesses for amendments to the LAP.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 4, 6 and Other Issues</p>		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0156</a></b>	<b>Person: Ciara Franck</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States they enjoy and frequently walk in the village and use public transport, but that they avoid cycling due to traffic and the lack of appropriate (segregated) cycle paths.</li> <li>• Considers that the draft LAP is a well-thought-through plan that puts people and nature at the centre of the town, not just cars</li> <li>• Welcomes more urban greening, pocket forests, and planted buffer junctions to act as sinks for rain and potential floods.</li> <li>• Recommends that the LAP include shaded seating areas in the plan (tree preferable) to counter anticipated increases in rain and heat.</li> <li>• Supports the provision of more housing locally, making a priority for sustainable transport and the provision of climate and flood adaptation measures with thanks for all the work on this.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5</p>		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0157</a></b>	<b>Person: Maura Lane</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers that the character of Dundrum will be further impacted if the LAP is enacted.</li> <li>• Considers that the suggested height of the new buildings will dwarf the Victorian village.</li> </ul>		

- Considers the loss of access to the village for older people by car will further erode business in the village, not to mention access to the church and the library.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 1, 2 and 4

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0158</a></b>	<b>Person: Claire McGrath</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers LAP is anti-business, will negatively impact local businesses.</li> <li>• Concerns small retailers in village will be left behind and big shopping centre alone will remain.</li> <li>• States people want to drive through village and will not walk around it.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4 and 6		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0159</a></b>	<b>Person: Therese Herlihy</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports more local housing with emphasis on sustainability and affordability.</li> <li>• Supports priority for sustainable transport and shorter journeys.</li> <li>• Supports climate and flood adaptation measures.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 3, 4 and 5		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0160</a></b>	<b>Person: Dan Coffey</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of LAP promotion of compact growth.</li> <li>• Highlights high-quality public transport links, amenities, and employment and retail offerings in Dundrum, and proximity to city centre.</li> <li>• Highlights substantial housing/population growth projected for GDA, consequent pressure on housing stock and need for development/growth frameworks.</li> <li>• Highlights alignment of LAP policies with County and regional level policies.</li> <li>• States there is a need to increase intensity of land use in Dublin within existing urban fabric to prevent sprawl. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Highlights the need to do this sustainably and efficiently, while being sympathetic to existing population.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Commends LAP strategy for future growth, noting MTC, transport hub and location within Dublin.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1 and 3		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0161</a></b>	<b>Person: Ohad Lutzky</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports Draft LAP, in particular reduction of car dependence and ease of day-to-day human scale travel.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1 and 4		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0162</u>	Person: Alex Kinahan	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposes board of local residents should decide on how LAP is created.</li> <li>• Critical of LAP</li> <li>• Notes low occupancy levels of Fernbank apartments, concerns similar issues with OSC development.</li> <li>• Concerned at parking pressure on local roads due to lack of parking provision in new apartment developments.</li> <li>• States that new apartment developments are BTR.</li> <li>• Proposes heights of 2/3 storeys along Bypass, 4 storeys along Main Street, up to 6 storeys towards bridge, in order to match surrounding area.</li> <li>• Critical of proposed bus gate. Proposes bus station should be provided on land currently used as car park.</li> <li>• Considers proposed cycle lanes will not discourage people from driving.</li> </ul> <p>Objects to redevelopment of OSC site, citing the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incongruity with surrounding area, noting in particular proximity to properties on Sweetmount Avenue.</li> <li>• Excessive height/density. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers heights of 11 to 16 storeys along Bypass would cause amenity impacts to neighbouring properties, including loss of light, overshadowing, overlooking, visual dominance, overdevelopment of site.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Need for DLR to safeguard character of area, noting negative impacts on same of providing 1 and 2-bed units.</li> <li>• Issues with residential units being solely for rent, inferring this model doesn't serve the local community.</li> <li>• Excessive use of Sweetmount Park by future residents due to lack of amenity space provided in development. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers more green space should be provided in area generally to address this.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Notes DLR Planner's Report on OSC SHD application was critical of development, queries why DLR are now helping to develop site.</li> <li>• Notes excessive amount of shops in area with no other amenities.</li> <li>• Highlights perceived issues with existing Fernbank development, including low occupancy rate, increase in anti-social/criminal behaviour in Finsbury Park.</li> <li>• Concerns similar issues will occur at Sweetmount Park.</li> <li>• Highlights issues of traffic congestion and low parking availability.</li> <li>• Concerned about increased parking pressure on local streets, increased through traffic, safety concerns caused by future residents of proposed developments, as well as traffic restrictions proposed for Dundrum.</li> <li>• Considers proposed expansion of one-way systems will prolong journey times to local amenities.</li> <li>• Highlights trip hazards presented by cycle lane kerbs in area.</li> <li>• Concerned at re-location of bus stops and increased bus traffic on Sweetmount Avenue as a result of development of Civic Centre.</li> <li>• Concerns at lack of information on height and size of civic centre. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Suggests alternative location for Civic Centre should be sought, e.g. Usher House, site to rear of Carnegie Library, within OSC site.</li> <li>○ Queries need for Civic Centre generally.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Objects to proposed Main Street to Churchtown Road Upper bus gate, citing concerns about noise/air pollution, increased bus traffic, safety concerns for pedestrians.</li> <li>• Notes difficulty for some locals (in particular elderly) attending public consultation events, finding information on Draft LAP and making submissions.</li> <li>• Concerned at lack of information available to local elected representatives regarding developments in the area (including provision of new bus stops).</li> <li>• Concerned at volume of developments planned in DLAP lands and surrounding areas.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4, 6 and Other Issues</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0163</u>	Person: Jimmy Doyle	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers Dundrum village has decayed/deteriorated over many years due to lack of care/consideration by public representatives and planners.</li> <li>• Considers significant revisions needed to current Draft LAP.</li> <li>• Considers LAP discriminates against elderly.</li> <li>• Critical of bus gate on Ballinteer Road, noting many residents do not have access to car and rely on bus to travel to village. Considers these residents would not be served by pedestrian/cycle infrastructure.</li> <li>• Notes residents who drive to village will have to take detours, considering these do not make sense.</li> <li>• Respondent understands that car park used by churchgoers will be made unavailable - Queries what parking will be available to churchgoers.</li> <li>• Respondent understands that Dom Marmion Centre is to close - Queries what this says about DLR.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 2, 3 and 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0164</u>	Person: Leona	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports proposals for additional cycle paths and extending of green areas, highlighting benefits to safe school travel.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4 and 5</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0165</u>	Person: Fiona O'Connor	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States preference for lower rise buildings and more parking for new development, in order to avoid congestion.</li> <li>• Also states preference for more green spaces for community.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 3, 4 and 5</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0166</u>	Person: Ciarán Cuffe	Organisation: Member of European Parliament
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of LAP.</li> <li>• Highlights intensifying need for high quality public amenities in area due to future growth.</li> <li>• Reassured by increased emphasis on green space and pedestrian infrastructure.</li> <li>• Welcomes focus on opportunities for redevelopment, this could be more ambitious and suggests relaxing height restrictions by 2 storeys in close proximity to public transport stops, where no significant negative impacts arise.</li> <li>• Considers improved pedestrian permeability across Bypass could be complemented by improved active travel infrastructure at junctions surrounding town centre.</li> <li>• States this would ensure active travel within Dundrum is supplemented by active travel into Dundrum from surrounding areas.</li> <li>• Recommends greater emphasis on pedestrian infrastructure for wheelchair users, including provision of lowered, less street clutter, explicit accessibility pre-requisites for outdoor dining.</li> <li>• Recommends providing glossary and appendix listing specific policies and objectives, in order to improve clarity for reader.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 3, 4 and 5</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0167</a>	Person: Trevor Platt	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers proposed buildings are too high and out of place.</li> <li>• Concerned at capacity of roads in area to accommodate people using these buildings.</li> <li>• Considers proposed buildings are too close to Main Street and should be set back further to allow light access to street.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2 and 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0168</a>	Person: Anne Smith	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports elements of LAP, in particular proposals regarding community space.</li> <li>• Concerned about impacts of LAP on ease of access to village for local residents.</li> <li>• Considers proposed restrictions to car access to village from Barton Road East / Ballinteer Road will negatively impact local access to amenities (e.g. primary care, shopping) and direct them to access these services elsewhere.</li> <li>• Requests further consideration of impacts to elderly and on emergency service response times.</li> <li>• Considers there is already sufficient provision in area for active travel.</li> <li>• Identifies need to share access amongst cyclists, pedestrians and cars, and to support local businesses.</li> <li>• Considers proposals will add to congestion and direct local residents onto roads which are busy with commuter traffic.</li> <li>• Disputes assertion in Section 2.7 of Draft LAP that temporary public realm/mobility measures on Main Street have improved the pedestrian/cyclist environment.</li> <li>• Seeks removal of existing cycle lane kerbs due to safety issues.</li> <li>• Acknowledges contribution of DTCSC to area, however highlights need to have independent uses in village to secure its vibrancy, viability and liveability. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Highlights that this is a stated objective of Draft LAP (sections 1.6.3.1 and 6.4.2).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Objects to facilitation of heights up to 11 storeys along Bypass within OSC site (per Objective OSC 14), stating these heights are unsuitable due to impacts to residents in vicinity of Bypass.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2, 3, 4 and 6</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0169</a>	Person: Suzanne Boland	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Critical of lack of clarity and ease of accessing LAP.</li> <li>• States there are permission for significant residential developments and social housing in area.</li> <li>• Queries existing and projected population of Dundrum, noting projections in Draft LAP are based on Census 2016.</li> <li>• Concerns additional population will overcrowd Dundrum and overwhelm village.</li> <li>• Heavily critical of cycle lane in Dundrum. Considers it is confusing, unclear, misuse of valuable space, is badly designed and under-utilised.</li> <li>• States cycle lane is badly needed in Windy Arbour and on Milltown Road, noting current danger for cyclists in these areas.</li> <li>• Objects to cutting off of roads around Ballinteer Road. Highlights considerable impacts to elderly, queries whether this has been adequately considered.</li> <li>• Considers there are threats to businesses as a result of proposals, noting their importance to village history.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 4 and 6, Other Issues</p>		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0170</a></b>	<b>Person: Pat O'Doherty</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers Draft LAP does nothing for Dundrum.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b>		
Chapter 1		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0171</a></b>	<b>Person: Marie Ryan O'Brien</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Critical of Draft LAP, noting difficulties presented to elderly/mobility impaired accessing services and amenities in Dundrum. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Notes increase to journey times by car for locals.</li> <li>o Notes large elderly population in Dundrum.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b>		
Chapters 3 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0172</a></b>	<b>Person: Philip Nartey</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to proposed Main Street to Churchtown Road Upper bus gate. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Considers proposal would further segregate Sweetmount Avenue area from village.</li> <li>o Highlights difficulty navigating new bus corridor for those accessing library on daily basis, in particular young children, families and elderly.</li> <li>o Proposes buses can be given priority at Taney Cross junction alternative measure.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• In favour of pedestrian bridge from Sweetmount Park to village. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Notes improved access it would provide for pedestrians/cyclists to village.</li> <li>o Considers previous temporary bridge during construction of Bypass was great amenity.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• States preference for bus station to remain in existing location. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Highlights ease of access for public/private operators and advantage of access for all modes of public transport in same area.</li> <li>o Proposes using existing green area beneath William Dargan Luas bridge as expanded part of transport hub, noting existing poor condition of this area.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Suggests locating proposed Civic Centre on vacant site to rear of Carnegie Library. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Considers co-location of library and civic hub would provide new focal point to Dundrum.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Objects to proposed traffic access restrictions on Barton Road East / Ballinteer Road. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Considers will have significant detrimental impacts on village and will worsen traffic congestion through Sweetmount Avenue and The Laurels.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b>		
Chapters 2 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0173</a></b>	<b>Person: Michael and Margaret Purcell</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strongly opposed to proposed measures at Dundrum Cross, as set out in Section 4.6.1.1 of Draft LAP.</li> <li>• Highlights requirements of some older residents on car travel for essential shopping and use of local amenities.</li> <li>• Considers existing facilities at junction for all road users are adequate and do not require improvement.</li> <li>• Notes access from Kilmacud Road Upper to residential estates west of LAP lands will not be possible and will negatively impact local residents.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0174</a></b>	<b>Person: Ashling Keogh</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very supportive of improved walking/cycling/public transport infrastructure.</li> <li>• States that congestion is terrible and can only be resolved by reliable, frequent, clean, safe and cheap solutions.</li> <li>• States more houses are needed locally, balanced by good landscaping, green spaces, planting.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 3, 4 and 5		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0175</a></b>	<b>Person: Fergus McGrath</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highlights danger of cycle lane kerbs on Main Street, noting they are a trip hazard.</li> <li>• Notes people don't cross street at designated crossing points.</li> <li>• Suggests painting kerbs a different colour to stand out.</li> <li>• Alternatively, suggests removing kerbs and replacing with posts/bollards.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0176</a></b>	<b>Person: Sarah</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers cycle routes are essential for safe/sustainable living environment.</li> <li>• Considers pedestrianization benefits business and people generally (including elderly, children, students).</li> <li>• Considers provision of cycling routes encourages more cycling, which has environmental and safety benefits.</li> <li>• Notes issue of journeys being undertaken by car, which could be undertaken by cycling/walking.</li> <li>• Considers plan encouraging less car use benefits residents and businesses of Dundrum.</li> <li>• Notes there are many examples of pedestrianisation benefitting businesses.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4 and 6		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0177</a></b>	<b>Person: Trish Hayden-Murray</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned at increased traffic volumes on Sandyford Road as a result of new development on DTSC 'Building 5' site.</li> </ul>		

- Highlights that all traffic on Sandyford Road originates from junction with Overend Avenue / Wyckham Way.
- Notes existing traffic congestion due to one-way system.
- Considers cycle lane on Sandyford Road / Main Street is unnecessary.
- Notes difficulty accessing Sandyford Road from existing residential developments due to congestion.
- Considers further traffic restrictions proposed will exacerbate situation.
- Critical of provision of bus corridor into Sweetmount estate, noting the road is too small.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapter 4

DLR Submission No: <u>B0178</u>	Person: Gillian and David Lynch	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of redevelopment of OSC site to complement village and provide housing/amenities.</li> <li>• Objects to proposed traffic restrictions on Ballinteer Road / Barton Road East. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Highlights impacts of traffic restrictions to village for elderly, disabled, people shopping for heavy goods.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Notes that temporary Covid-19 traffic/public realm measures were introduced without public consultation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Highlights issues arising including difficulties accessing village and danger as a result of cycle lane kerbs.</li> <li>◦ Objects to further limitations.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers proposed Main Street to Churchtown Road Upper bus gate will turn quiet residential area into busy bus corridor. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Notes issues including noise, pollution, heavy footfall, increase in traffic.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers density proposed under current SHD application at OSC site is excessive for suburban location.</li> <li>• Considers proposed heights of up to 16 storeys are oppressive, overpowering and not in keeping with village/surrounds.</li> <li>• Considers there is a lack of provision of public amenities within proposed development. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Notes existing shops within development site are valuable amenities, for which space is not provided in proposed development.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Acknowledges proposed development would provide much needed housing.</li> <li>• Concerned at additional demand generated for Luas.</li> <li>• Concerned at low level of parking provided.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2, 4 and Other Issues.</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0179</u>	Person: Ray Greer	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States they are not against any development that is to the benefit of the community.</li> <li>• Considers the plan as not being thought through.</li> <li>• Concerned at the proposal of closing the Ballinteer and Barton Rd. East access to Dundrum Main St to private cars as this will prevent easy access for older residents who need services and businesses and rely on a private car to do so because of mobility issues.</li> <li>• Thinks the plan will result in businesses failing and subsequently closing.</li> <li>• Opposes bus gate on Sweetmount Ave together with revising the road layout at Dundrum cross and eliminating the left-hand filter lane at the RSA junction coming from Sandyford Rd</li> <li>• Considers the plan to be anti-people and as being totally concerned with subjecting the residents to cycling or walking-if able to do so.</li> </ul>		



- Believes that there is no demand or need for the plan as DLRCOCO have already destroyed the Main Street with the introduction of a one-way system and cycle lane kerbs which is resulting in injuries to persons.
- Plan will result in traffic chaos and total congestion with traffic snarled thus producing further unwanted CO2 emissions.
- Considers that if the Hammerson/Allianz proposed development for the OSC site goes ahead together with the LAP then Dundrum will become a ghetto with a population not being able to move freely.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 1, 4, 6 and Other Issues

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0180</a>	Person: Orna O'Brien	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questions Plan ref: 3.24 Cultural and Civic Centre - with no parking or access for the elderly queries why put it at the centre at the Luas Bridge?</li> <li>• Critical of part 4.4.26 Main Street in the plan saying that the temporary one way system, wider paths and cycle lanes have not worked and saying that whomever designed this section of the plan never cycled around Dundrum. Believes that cyclist are not seen on the main street or passing down or up Kilmacud Rd and thinks that people young and old are tripping over the large black kerbs.</li> <li>• Submits that cyclists use the green route behind the OSC as it's not a hilly route.</li> <li>• Asks whether the one way road, to facilitate the flow of people to the Dundrum town centre and the new builds going into the OSC are going to kill off what's left of Dundrum village for all the locals.</li> <li>• In reference to 3.2.3.1 Existing Community facilities- asks whether the council is going to help the Dom Marmion house stay open as they do a great service for locals, especially the elderly, but they don't own the land they are on.</li> <li>• Asks how emergency services fire service, ambulance and the Garda are going to service the community with all the road restrictions.</li> <li>• Opposes closing Dundrum to traffic from Barton road east, Ballinteer and other roads, asking how will locals and the elderly get to shops and services. Not everyone is able to walk or use bikes.</li> <li>• Submitter thinks this plan is without concern for the elderly in the area also stating the information used is 7 years out of date and that by the time it is completed it will need to be modified again.</li> <li>• Thinks that the Council has let the people of Dundrum and wider community down.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 2, 3 and 4		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0181</a>	Person: Dermot Ryan	Organisation: Private citizen
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Likes the proposal for the improved bus, walking and cycling infrastructure very much.</li> <li>• Thinks the plan acknowledges the need to have more residential units into Dublin to cater for population growth, without detracting from quality of life.</li> <li>• Knows that climate and flood adaptation measures are, unfortunately, absolutely necessary too.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 3, 4 and 5		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0182</a>	Person: Una Maguire	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers plan should be halted to allow for further consultation allowing them to digest and familiarise themselves with the full plan and the large volume of documentation prepared.</li> <li>• Questions how long it took the Council to prepare the Draft LAP.</li> <li>• Of the opinion that the plan will remove the village of Dundrum and access to the Church and various businesses</li> </ul>		

- The Council should be looking to rejuvenate the village.
- Proposed changes affect the quality of life for the elderly and young people who need and deserve community support.
- Timing of the launch of this plan is poor noting the holiday period - local residents could very easily miss the plan.
- Timing of consultation would appear to be a ploy adopted by the Council and is most unwelcome.
- Need to ensure that change is brought about in consultation with local residents and not just big businesses.
- Acknowledges that housing is needed but what is being proposed will not give a quality of life to families.
- States that the residents of Dundrum need their community and village to be an asset.
- Considers that local businesses are vital, the plan should support building Dundrum village and support businesses.
- Requests that residents are listened to and take into account the views of the people living and working in the area.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 1, 3, 4, 6 and Other Issues

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0183</a></b>	<b>Person: Patricia Kinsella</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not agree with high rise levels being put forward and considers that the density is outrageous.</li> <li>• Thinks that a bus depot outside the library and cars rerouted through a large housing estate are not well thought out ideas.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0184</a></b>	<b>Person: Grace Smyth O'Brien</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submits that young people need a space to be together and that provision should be made in the plan for a modern skate park.</li> <li>• Considers that the council provides nothing for our teenagers and young adults.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 3 and 5		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0185</a></b>	<b>Person: Kev Kinsella</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Endorses the plan for a 10/ 15-minute neighbourhood, which includes the promotion of active travel.</li> <li>• The council need to promote the development of the OSC to provide a mix of retail, housing and public space in a sustainable manner which would enhance the village.</li> <li>• Request that the council explore ways to bring the properties owned by the Dundrum shopping centre owners back into use which much neglected. These could provide the basis of a thriving Main Street.</li> <li>• Considers it important that the traffic measures are kept in place for the Main Street to thrive and live up to its potential.</li> <li>• Cites Blackrock as a fine example of what Dundrum Main St could look and feel like.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 2 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0186</u></b>	<b>Person: Agnese Eisaka</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports sustainable transport in Dundrum including cycle lane improvements.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b>		
Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0187</u></b>	<b>Person: Stan and Pam McHugh</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcomes the draft LAP yet regrets that it has taken so long to get to this stage.</li> <li>• Notes that the LAP includes the necessary detail to support the current CDP and provides the necessary guidance for private developers and the County Council itself.</li> <li>• Thinks many more and better facilitated community consultation processes should be included.</li> <li>• Supports the very strong evidence-base recommendations arising from the evidence through the ABTA report for the advancement of active travel throughout the area, for a better environment for pedestrians and cyclists, looks forward to their implementation, in conjunction with ongoing local consultation.</li> <li>• Believes that the Council should take the lead to persuade the public of the growing need for change in the context of climate change and the overall welfare of people of all ages in the area.</li> </ul>		
<b>Active Travel/Sustainable Transport</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notes that the introduction of cycle lanes has presented challenges for many road users as the raised black kerb blocks can be difficult to see and become trip hazards for some pedestrians.</li> <li>• In the future, busy roads will have to have cycle lanes that are separated from cars however, many roads are too narrow to facilitate all roads users adequately.</li> <li>• consideration should be given to obvious and continuous road markings that indicate that cyclists have priority, with lower speed limits, while allowing access to driveways for motorists.</li> <li>• Suggests that, as in some other major cities where roadways are narrow, alternate roads could be identified and marked to give priority to cyclists. This is particularly important on access routes to schools and sporting facilities to provide safer cycling for school children and thereby encourage more parents to leave the car at home.</li> <li>• Considers that the provision of public transport within the area needs further exploration, particularly around the Luas bridge.</li> <li>• Suggests that having buses travel past the Carnegie library and along Sweetmount Road does not sit well with this site. Offers as an alternative to the Churchtown “Busgate” the possibility of using the east side of the Luas Station, on Taney Drive, as a “Busgate” should be considered.</li> <li>• In the medium term, the Council should consider the introduction of a continuous electric bus or tram service along Main St to address the needs of those unable to cycle or walk. This could be extended to the roads which lead to the estates and centres outside the LAP area but which form the hinterland for Dundrum village.</li> <li>• Closing Ballinteer Road car access to Sandyford Road will reduce access to Dundrum village for a large part of the wider community resulting in increased carbon emissions - further consultation is needed to resolve this issue so the local communities can continue to feel part of Dundrum.</li> </ul>		
<b>Civic Centre / OSC</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcomes the Council’s proposal for the Civic Centre.</li> <li>• Believes the Centre should be positioned in the core of Dundrum village, incorporating a plaza to accommodate a space for events such as a farmers’ market, open air concerts and play areas.</li> <li>• Counters approval in that the Council’s idea for a location to the north, near the landmark bridge and on a restrictive site.</li> <li>• The Council should be proactive and purchase the Waldemar Terrace buildings and gym, the Eircom building and Usher House, obviating the need for excessive height (ie 6 stories maximum) and providing a suitable space for the desired plaza.</li> </ul>		

- Suggests that building over the Luas line and station should be considered in this regard.

#### OSC KDA

- Welcomes plans for development around the OSC site as this meets the requirements of its zoning in the CDP (MTC) and comments there should be a specification for the inclusion of a hotel here, as there is none in the area.
- Notes the need for permeability into and out of any new development on the site, along Main St and along the bypass, where high quality design should facilitate its successful integration with the local communities.
- Building heights along Main St should be restricted to 3 stories to enhance a village atmosphere on a human scale, while rising to greater heights as the site dips towards the bypass and an average height of 8 stories could be accommodated along the bypass.
- Height should be varied along the bypass to avoid it looking like a massive “wall”.
- Believes that there will be no need to pedestrianise Main St. if it is renewed in a way that is attractive to people. The starting point for the design of the OSC site should be Main Street.

#### Built Heritage:

- Commends the chapter on Heritage and Conservation as it rightly highlights the richness of Dundrum village in this regard, and the need to protect it.
- Any new development should be sympathetic to buildings already in the village, in terms of scale and design, and should enhance the impact of the ACA buildings.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 1, 2, 4, 8 and Other Issues

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0188</a></b>	<b>Person: Sean Barry</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thinks the Draft LAP looks great.</li> <li>• Supports the active travel public travel and accommodation measures which are badly needed.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0189</a></b>	<b>Person: Paul McDonnell</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter is very keen to see more active travel plans included in the plan stating that while there have been huge improvements in active travel in the area, a lot of the active travel routes are not linked up.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0190</a></b>	<b>Person: Matt Coughlan</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the cycling and other active travel initiatives proposed as part of this LAP.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0191</a></b>	<b>Person: No Name provided</b>	<b>Organisation: N/A</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thinks Dundrum is already backed up with long delays of traffic and that the plan will increase the congestion.</li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submits that the roads are not fit for purpose as when an ambulance or fire engine needs to access the Main Street because it is one way they have to dangerously drive on the cycle track.</li> </ul>
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0192</a></b>	<b>Person: James William Corboy</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission is in support of the draft LAP and agrees that denser housing should be the focus of the Plan.</li> <li>Thinks it is absolutely essential that a modal shift is facilitated from private motoring to sustainable transport means -- the area cannot sustain ever more motor vehicles, regardless of whether they are EVs.</li> <li>Concludes that cycling, walking, and efficient bus corridors are not only critical to Ireland's legally binding climate goals, they are also the prize of any forward-looking and healthy society.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 3 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0193</a></b>	<b>Person: Tomás O'Connell</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission supports the Dundrum draft LAP in particular the further development of cycling and pedestrian infrastructure.</li> <li>Notes that reducing congestion will facilitate a more vibrant street and support local businesses.</li> <li>States that these types of improvements have already been tried and tested in Dublin.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 4 and 6		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0194</a></b>	<b>Person: Brigid McCullagh</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States the current one-way system has caused injuries to some residents and restricts access for older residents who rely on their cars to access services on Main Street.</li> <li>Concerned that the LAP will further impede access to Dundrum Village causing unnecessary pollution and much longer journeys.</li> <li>Thinks that the route changes will cause increased congestion negatively impacting people's health and wellbeing.</li> <li>States that they are not inclined to cycle due to being fearful of a fall so increased cycle lanes will not be of any benefit.</li> <li>Does not think this proposal by the county council is age-friendly and opposes it strongly.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0195</a></b>	<b>Person: John Feehan</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Draft LAP is not well thought out and is seriously deficient in a number of regards.</li> <li>Seriously reduces connectivity to the village for all motorists and will lead to elderly and disabled people not having access to the village.</li> <li>There will be limited parking and questions how businesses will take deliveries etc. with the restrictions.</li> <li>Submits that all the benefits entirely favour cyclists which is theoretically good but believes the road is going to be too narrow to accommodate emergency vehicles.</li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notes that bicycles are not for many categories of local residents.</li> <li>• Planning decisions for areas from Milltown to Dundrum Rd will cause significant delays in the village and make it inaccessible.</li> <li>• Dundrum Rd is a main arterial road to travel to and from Dublin city and should never be a neighbourhood street.</li> <li>• Concludes that the LAP will destroy what is now a traditional great community village and just leave a high-rise ghetto.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 4 and 6</p>

<p><b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0196</u></b></p>	<p><b>Person: Patrick Concannon</b></p>	<p><b>Organisation:</b></p>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b> Thinks there are some positive aspects to the plan which are to be welcomed while other items are cause for concern:</p> <p><b>Timing and Communication of Plan</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter thinks there is a very short timeline to prepare submissions and contends that the timing of the presentations and timelines for submissions during June / July when people are away from home is not appropriate</li> <li>• Strongly suggests that extensions be granted to ensure appropriate feedback volumes are heard.</li> </ul> <p><b>Road Closures</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns about the proposed closure of access to Dundrum village from Ballinteer Road and Barton Road for motor vehicles believing it will result in much longer journeys and backup of traffic on routes such as the Bypass and Sandyford Road.</li> <li>• Understands that this will result in just two access points to Dundrum village via Kilmacud Road and Sandyford Rd and believe these to be insufficient.</li> <li>• Thinks that a number of left filter access points will be impacted / abolished eg. RSA crossroads which will further impact accessibility to the village.</li> </ul> <p><b>Bus Gates and Cycle Lanes</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcomes the positive environmental aspects of the plan and in particular the increase in public transport.</li> <li>• Does not agree with the volume of cycle lanes (through the village, via the bypass and another on Sydenham Rd)</li> <li>• Welcomes cycle lanes as being environmentally beneficial but thinks the population of Dundrum is ageing and generally not of the ability to utilise the volume of cycle lanes proposed.</li> <li>• Thinks that the proposed frequency of buses traversing the Bypass by the existing Library will result in further backlogs on the Dundrum Bypass.</li> </ul> <p><b>Car Parking</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that the removal of two car parks will worsen the current difficulties of public parking in the area.</li> <li>• Has particular concern regarding accessibility to Holy Cross School and other facilities such as Dom Marmion House and Holy Cross Church.</li> </ul> <p><b>Population Density</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not agree with the proposed high rise accommodation units included in the plan as believes sufficient services are not in place to meet the demands of the proposed population density.</li> </ul> <p><b>General</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thinks the plan focuses too much on walking / cycling with too little consideration for motorists who make up the majority of the local ageing population and will negatively impact on these people in carrying out their day-to-day activities such as shopping, banking, church visits, doctor / dentist visits etc.</li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Believes the plan will force people to do their business elsewhere thereby negatively impacting local businesses.</li> <li>• Concludes that the plan will negatively impact the community feel of the village.</li> </ul>
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4, 6 and Other Issues

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0197</a>	<b>Person:</b> Gordon Allen	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not enough thought has been given to the actual impact on local residents.</li> <li>• Believes the plan will destroy the commercial life of Dundrum village.</li> <li>• Objects to plans to restrict the movement of people both into and within the village by car - the bypass is working well to take through traffic away from the village.</li> <li>• Traffic restriction elements must be amended and allowance made for those whose only means of transport is a motor vehicle.</li> <li>• Submits that any building over the current height of the OSC is totally unacceptable.</li> <li>• States that any elimination of parking is unacceptable.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 2, 4 and 6		

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0198</a>	<b>Person:</b> Paul Gillard	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commends many aspects of the plan particularly provision of cycle lanes.</li> <li>• Does not support amendment of the junction of Churchtown Road Lower, Taney Road, Dundrum Bypass as it is a key junction for traffic bypassing Dundrum village.</li> <li>• There is adequate ability to control traffic through the pedestrian lights and secondary junctions. Reducing the number of lanes will result in congestion.</li> <li>• Considers that pedestrians and cyclists can cross this junction safely without the removal of lanes</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0199</a>	<b>Person:</b> Kieran Hannan	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requests that DLR publishes traffic flow models / simulations completed and alternate routes likely to be utilised by existing traffic levels and future 10-year projections resulting from the changes proposed in removal of left turns on all routes at Dargan Bridge intersection of R117 and R112.</li> <li>• Proposes that changes to this junction must contemplate and include a full impact assessment on surrounding residential areas and flow patterns.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0200</a>	<b>Person:</b> Ciaran Moulton	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of Draft LAP, in particular less car-centric, more sustainable policy shift.</li> <li>• Notes cycle lanes (in particular older ones) in area need to be upgraded. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Highlights that cycle lane along Bypass is dangerous due to bus stops and coming to sudden end approaching Wyckham Way junction.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0201</u></b>	<b>Person: Noreen Noonan</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned at proposed measures to restrict vehicular traffic movement in Draft Plan. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Highlights particular difficulties for elderly and mobility impaired.</li> <li>○ Notes longer journey times to access local amenities.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Objects to new bridge from Sweetmount Park across Bypass. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Highlights issues arising from previous temporary bridge across Bypass, including increases in noise pollution, anti-social behaviour, littering and crime.</li> <li>○ Considers there is no need for new bridge.</li> <li>○ Considers combined walking and cycling paths are unsafe for pedestrians.</li> <li>○ Proposes all residents of Sweetmount Park and The Laurels should be surveyed before a bridge is approved.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2 and 4</p>		
<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0202</u></b>	<b>Person: Petra O'Neill</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about impacts of bridge from Sweetmount Park to Main Street. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Contends bridge is unnecessary.</li> <li>○ Highlights expected issues including increased footfall and traffic in area, pressures on residential parking, increase in litter and anti-social behaviour.</li> <li>○ Highlights existing litter issues in river causing flooding.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 2</p>		
<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0203</u></b>	<b>Person: Fiona Lalor</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to Draft LAP due to traffic impacts. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Concerned proposed traffic measures will destroy village and result in closure of businesses.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Concerned at proposed one-way system and cycle lanes on Sydenham Road. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers safety issues will arise due to cars from houses on road now alighting onto single traffic lane, noting danger posed to school children who walk on this road daily.</li> <li>○ Considers accommodating single traffic lane and 2 cycle lanes will be challenging due to narrowness of road.</li> <li>○ Considers there is no requirement for cycle lanes on this road.</li> <li>○ Considers proposal would have significant impacts on ACA and Protected Structures, and would be contrary heritage and conservation policies of Draft LAP.</li> <li>○ Highlights that there are alternative roads in the area which could accommodate cycle lanes.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4</p>		



<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0204</a></b>	<b>Person: Natalia Silverio</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of provision of more cycle infrastructure. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Notes it incentivises more cycling.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Supports building of houses to address accommodation crisis.</li> <li>• Supports climate and flood adaptation measures.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4 and 5		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0205</a></b>	<b>Person: Donna Breen</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of Draft Plan on basis of cycling benefits and facilitating provision of more housing. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Highlights 'excellent' one-way system and cycle lanes in town currently.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0206</a></b>	<b>Person: Pat Monks</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identifies the following issues with proposed traffic restrictions on Ballinteer Road: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Longer journey times for residents on Barton Road East to access village, consequent increase in congestion.</li> <li>◦ Particular impacts to elderly accessing village businesses and amenities.</li> <li>◦ Negative impact on village leading to business closures and job losses.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers proposed Main Street to Churchtown Road Upper bus gate will cause severe traffic congestion at Taney Cross (compounding existing congestion).</li> <li>• Considers high rise apartments would not be in keeping with village. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Concerned at lack of green space.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0207</a></b>	<b>Person: Pamela Kirkham</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dismayed at lack of consideration for disabled and mobility impaired, noting need for inclusivity in LAP.</li> <li>• Considers proposed traffic access restrictions will worsen congestion on surrounding access roads. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Consequent impacts to independent village businesses due to lack of footfall.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers LAP predominantly benefits cyclists.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0208</a></b>	<b>Person: Ruvé Stewart</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned at a number of issues raised by the Draft LAP. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Notes considerable changes experienced by Dundrum due to developments in recent decades.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers prioritization of providing cycle lanes is to the detriment of other transport modes, in particular cars.</li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Highlights inconvenience to local residents, in particular disabled and elderly; noting large elderly contingent of population in Dundrum.</li> <li>o Considers cycling impractical for some due to topography of area.</li> <li>• Objects to proposed bus gate on Ballinteer Road. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Requests retention of two-way traffic on Ballinteer Road, and reinstatement of two-way traffic on Kilmacud Road Upper through Dundrum Cross.</li> <li>o Considers consequences of proposal will include increased journey times for locals and increased emissions.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Critical of proposed removal of slip roads at Taney Cross junction. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Considers this is retrograde, will increase traffic congestion and inhibit local access to village.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Objects to proposed Main Street to Churchtown Road Upper bus gate. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Considers proposal will cause traffic issues on Bypass and on section of Churchtown Road Upper adjacent to St. Nahi's Church/Cemetery and unreasonable disturbance to residents on Sweetmount Avenue.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Concerned at location and height of planned civic centre. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Considers access will be restrictive.</li> <li>o Considers it should be no more than 5 storeys, thereby keeping with surrounding structures.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers new residential development for Dundrum should cater to family needs, not exceed 5 storeys in height and be in keeping with the existing scale and heritage of Dundrum.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2, 3, 4,</p>

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0209</a>	<b>Person:</b> Emma Cahill	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States more connectivity and greater segregation of bicycle infrastructure is required</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0210</a>	<b>Person:</b> Patrick Schwanberg	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is happy with Draft LAP.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 1		

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0211</a>	<b>Person:</b> Robbie Mc Guinness	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fully supportive of Draft LAP.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 1		

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0212</a>	<b>Person:</b> Eamon Peregrine	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o public realm improvements</li> <li>o active travel measures (including improved cycle facilities and more pedestrianisation)</li> <li>o well-designed small-scale housing schemes in Dundrum which aren't developer-led</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o general reduction in car access throughout Dundrum (including removal of slip lanes/turning lanes and on-street parking)</li> <li>o climate and flood adaptation measures</li> <li>o more priority for sustainable transport</li> </ul>
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 3, 4 and 5

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0213</a>	<b>Person:</b> Marie Cronin	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of existing cycle lanes in Dundrum and retention of one-way system for traffic. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Notes system provides convenient access to Luas.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Raises concerns regarding protection of heritage of Dundrum, in particular Dundrum Castle. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Highlights castle's significance in relation to origins of Dundrum.</li> <li>o Notes difficulties of DLR intervention due to private ownership of castle.</li> <li>o Requests inclusion of measures to protect and conserve castle.</li> <li>o Suggests compulsory purchase of castle to facilitate OPW taking in charge.</li> <li>o Considers LAP may represent final opportunity to take action in this regard.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4 and 8		

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0214</a>	<b>Person:</b> Patrick Killalea	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned at overconcentration of cycle lanes in area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Notes underutilisation.</li> <li>o Notes safety issues due to raised kerbs and requests removal of these.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers bus corridors are overemphasised.</li> <li>• Requests reinstatement of two-way traffic system within village.</li> <li>• Concerned at proposed restriction of traffic access from Ballinteer Road into village.</li> <li>• Considers height of new buildings/structures should not exceed height of DLR office building in Dundrum.</li> <li>• Considers more social, cultural and leisure facilities should be provided.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 3 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0215</a>	<b>Person:</b> Joe and Carleen Lakes	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to access restrictions and removal of parking, noting existing difficulties of elderly/mobility impaired accessing amenities in village.</li> <li>• Considers planned civic centre and apartments will increase traffic and exacerbate overcrowding. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Highlights existing difficulties in local access due to traffic volumes.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2 and 4		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0216</u>	Person: Patricia Sheehy Skeffington	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generally supportive of LAP, however identifies some issues. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers that proposed measures for the expanded LAP lands at Dundrum Business Park/Windy Arbour and Fernbank/Notre Dame are less well thought out than other areas.</li> <li>○ Considers LAP could go further in discouraging car use and promoting active travel, with reference to policy direction of CAP 23.</li> <li>○ Highlights objective of CAP 23 to prioritise needs of pedestrians, cyclists and those who play on streets above needs of car users.</li> <li>○ Identifies Blackrock and Dún Laoghaire as examples of better active travel infrastructure.</li> <li>○ Notes provision is generally made for one main cycle track, rather than multiple cycle routes to reflect the various needs of cyclists/pedestrians.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Highlights need for housing and active travel provision in area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers in particular there is more scope within the LAP for active travel improvements around Fernbank and Windy Arbour.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Modal Shift:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highlights CAP 23 objective to improve relative attractiveness of sustainable travel modes in promotion of Avoid-Shift-Improve model. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Notes that CAP 23 transport policies are informed by studies undertaken by OECD and Irish Climate Change Advisory Council.</li> <li>○ Considers LAP should align with CAP 23 goal of achieving sustainable accessibility, as opposed to high mobility.</li> <li>○ Highlights various quantified car travel reduction targets of CAP 23.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers that objections to LAP on basis of its restrictions to private car use can be understood as evidence that policies to dissuade private car use have not hitherto been effective.</li> <li>• Considers that every street in LAP lands currently caters predominantly to cars. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Highlights that no route is proposed dedicated solely for active travel, other than elements of the envisaged Dodder to Dundrum pedestrian/cycle route.</li> <li>○ Does not therefore consider that Draft LAP adequately challenges legacy of hostile street environments for pedestrians and cyclists (with reference to objectives for same in CAP 23).</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Parking:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notes many residential streets in LAP lands have both on-street and private in-curtilage car parking spaces. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers these streets represent good opportunity to provide active travel routes and streetscape improvements in lieu of on-street parking (refers again to CAP 23 objective for same).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Approves of focus on provision of disabled/age appropriate car parking (ABTA Objective DAR13). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers young families do not have the same car parking requirements.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Requests inclusion of proposals to provide cargo bike infrastructure/parking.</li> </ul> <p><b>Safe School Routes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highlights CAP 23 promotion of providing cycle buses and safe routes to school as means of reducing car dependence. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ States there is enthusiasm for cycle buses in the Dundrum area, noting some already operate.</li> <li>○ Proposes that the Clonskeagh to Gaelscoil na Fuinseoige cycle bus route should be supported in LAP (map and description of route included in submission).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Supportive of 'Safe Routes to School' recommendation under ABTA Objective DAR4. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers that schools at Notre Dame campus should be included in 'Safe Routes to School' initiative.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

- o States that approximately half of students at Notre Dame campus travel to school to active travel means, however this proportion was much higher during 'Walk to School Week' in September 2022.
- o Presents this as evidence of willingness to reduce car use.

#### **Main Street / Village:**

- Welcomes existing cyclist access improvements to village, highlighting improved access to shops.
  - o Notes cycle access to DTCSC remains poor.
- Very supportive of proposals to further consolidate and facilitate active travel and public transport on Main Street, in particular as set out in objectives DAR 1 and DAR 2 of ABTA.
  - o Considers local businesses will benefit from additional cyclist and pedestrian traffic generated.
  - o Considers emergency services are best placed to advise on impacts of vehicular access restrictions to their operation.

#### **Fernbank / Notre Dame area:**

- Identifies inaccuracies in Draft LAP description of Notre Dame campus:
  - o Stated enrolment figures for Gaelscoil na Fuinseoige within Draft LAP note 90 students, whereas recent government figures note 268 students.
  - o States that LAP makes no mention of Goatstown Educate Together primary school, now located temporarily on site.
  - o Highlights no information is provided as to DoE's future plans for site once this school has moved to a permanent site.
  - o Considers this omission diminishes role of area as key locus for schools.
  - o Acknowledges LAP objective to retain educational facility at site.

#### **Taney Cross / Library / St. Nahi's:**

- Supports proposed removal of slip lanes and provision of priority cyclist infrastructure at Taney Cross.
  - o Considers the general use of this area as a bus terminus is logical.
- Generally supportive of proposed Main Street to Churchtown Road Upper bus gate (as set out in ABTA objectives DAR5 to DAR7).
  - o States further consideration is needed regarding the public realm in front of the library, which should be enhanced rather than detracted from.
  - o Considers access route from Churchtown Road Upper through Finsbury Park to Gaelscoil Na Fuinseoige needs to be preserved and enhanced.
  - o Notes it serves as key access point from school campus to library and towards village generally.
  - o Conflict between use of pedestrians/cyclists and buses must therefore be avoided.
  - o Raises concerns that Figure 6.5 of ABTA Report does not illustrate access from the cycle route on Churchtown Road Upper to the Finsbury Park route to the school campus.

#### **Southern LAP lands:**

- Generally supportive of cycle infrastructure proposals for southern LAP lands, as set out in objectives DAR10 to DAR12 of ABTA.
  - o Welcomes provision of pedestrian/cycle bridge from Sweetmount Park across Bypass, although considers it will be a long time before its implemented.
  - o Considers however greater active travel access/permeability from Fernbank/Notre Dame area needs to be provided.
- Welcomes proposals for upgrades to Wyckham Way (ABTA objectives DAR15 to DAR17).
  - o Highlights existing difficulties cycling from Dundrum to Ballinteer.
  - o Would support provision of Dutch-style roundabouts along this road.
- Notes poor condition of cycling infrastructure on Sandyford Road.
  - o Requests safe cycle route is provided.
- Supports upgrading of cycle infrastructure on Overend Avenue (ABTA objective DAR20).

**Dodder to Dundrum Cycle Route:**

- Considers proposed Dundrum to Dodder cycle route is somewhat circuitous and not sufficiently supported by parallel north-south cycle routes.
  - Considers as consequence proposal will only partially address movement needs of people in area.
  - Refers again to cycle bus routes for information on cycle traffic movements in area.
  - Suggests the following improvements to this route:
  - Suggests improving cycle infrastructure provision along north-south section of St. Columbanus Road parallel which runs to Luas line.
  - Considers this could become a 'Quiet Street', in addition to those proposed at Patrick Doyle Road and Farrenboley Park.
  - Notes large amount of on-street parking on this section of road, which could be removed in favour of pedestrian/public realm/cycle infrastructure.
  - Suggests improving cyclist access along Churchtown Road Lower and through Woodlawn estate.
- Highlights hazards to cyclists on Churchtown Road Lower due to barriers at Luas crossing and curves in road.
  - Notes high volume of cyclists crossing Luas line at this point on a daily basis.
  - Requests that DLR liaises with NTA/TII regarding issue of Luas crossing.
  - States that Luas crossing should be considered more in the LAP as a point of access across the Luas line, rather than just to access the Windy Arbour Luas stop.

**Windy Arbour area:**

- Very supportive of two-way cycle tracks proposed at Windy Arbour NC and along St. Columbanus Road.
  - Commends proposed safe school zone on St. Columbanus Road (ABTA objective DAR27 refers) and suggests it should be extended along Mulvey Park and Gledswood Park.
- Considers proposals to strengthen existing 'Quiet Streets' pedestrian/cycle route from Windy Arbour Luas stop to Clonskeagh / UCD (DAR28 refers) does not go far enough, noting on-street parking on this route which could be removed to provide cycle tracks.
- Proposes that some surface car park areas on and around St. Columbanus Road should be replaced with play space and active travel infrastructure, including secure bicycle storage facilities.

**Housing:**

- Highlights importance of providing socially mixed and inclusive housing.
- Considers LAP has given due consideration to height and scale of planned housing.
- Highlights importance of security of tenure and design quality, noting need to maintain and/or increase standards for vulnerable groups.
  - States that communal areas/facilities should be accessible to all residents within a development.

**Biodiversity:**

- Supportive of biodiversity proposals of LAP.
  - Highlights need to realise implementation of LAP policies, including hedgerow preservation and re-wilding opportunities.
  - Suggests requirement for rain-water harvesting should be included as condition of permissions for new developments.
  - Suggests that non-use of astroturf in ecologically sensitive areas should be considered.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0217</a></b>	<b>Person: Declan O'Shanahan</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This submission has no content.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b>		
N/A		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0218</a></b>	<b>Person: Patricia Deveney</b>	<b>Organisation: Deveney's Off Licence Main St Dundrum Dublin 14</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned about proposed traffic calming and public realm improvement works proposed on Dundrum Road (as set out in Section 4.6.3.1 of Draft LAP) and proposed restrictions to vehicular access to Main Street from Bypass, noting following potential issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased congestion</li> <li>Disruption to local business, facilities and residents</li> </ul> </li> <li>Concerned about proposed transport works to Taney Cross and Dundrum Cross junctions and environs (as set out in Sections 4.6.1.1 and 4.6.1.2). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Considers it will generate severe congestion in Churchtown area due to detour required.</li> <li>Considers it will make access to village impossible.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Considers LAP will negatively impact elderly who rely on car access in particular.</li> <li>Concerned Dundrum village will die because of LAP impacts.</li> <li>Identifies Blackrock village as model example of well-engineered plan including one-way system and cycle/pedestrian infrastructure.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b>		
Chapters 4 and 6		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0219</a></b>	<b>Person: Mark O'Brien</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned at certain key failings and detrimental proposals in Draft LAP, mainly in relation to transport and OSC redevelopment.</li> <li>Highlights current issues faced by village, including 'strategic dilapidation', loss/diminishment of business, high volume of non-local visitors to area (in particular to DTCSC). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Considers businesses faring poorly on Main Street due to traffic pressure, vehicular access difficulties, lack of parking, cycle lane trip hazards.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Objects to proposed transport active travel/vehicular traffic restriction measures at Dundrum Cross (as set out under Section 4.6.1.1). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned this will exacerbate congestion in and around town centre, particularly at busy times of year.</li> <li>Considers proposed cyclist priority measures will create safety issues for pedestrians, noting increased prevalence of e-scooters and e-bikes.</li> <li>Queries provision of deliveries access.</li> <li>Queries whether businesses were consulted about volume of customers who cycle.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Considers vehicular access restrictions proposed will conflict with employment access promoted under Policy DLAP28. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns proposals will not be eco-friendly due to increased traffic congestion.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Proposes bus / emobility hub could be provided in OSC site on Bypass side, noting this would free up 'valuable land resources' at Taney Cross and Balally Luas.</li> <li>Queries whether independent economic analysis was undertaken to inform Draft LAP.</li> <li>Concerns at impact on businesses on Dundrum Road due to restrictions on vehicular access for customers and deliveries, with reference to proposals under Objective T19.</li> </ul>		

- Concerns at proposed active travel infrastructure / one-way system on Sydenham Road (as set out under Objective T9), noting safety issues may arise due to restricted space on this road.
  - Highlights in particular dangers to cyclists and pedestrians from vehicles existing properties on the road.
  - Considers raised cycle lane kerb will need to be omitted.
- Proposes reinstatement of two-way vehicular traffic system on Main Street.
  - Considers this system brought vibrancy to area.
  - Considers introduction of time limits on car parking would improve traffic flow.
- Proposes DLAP process is paused pending more thorough review of proposals in Chapter 4.
  - Proposes review should include Origin and Destination Survey, Economic Viability Assessment for affected businesses and Cost / Benefit Analysis.
  - Proposes public consultation should not be held during summertime when many local residents may be unavailable.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 2, 4 and 6

DLR Submission No: <u>B0220</u>	Person: Darach Mac Lochlainn	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned at impact of Draft LAP and 10-minute neighbourhood concept.</li> <li>• Highlights           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ impacts of restricted vehicular access on people who rely on cars, including for work.</li> <li>○ increased journey times and congestion leading to increased emissions, conflicting with climate action policies of LAP.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers 10-minute neighbourhood concept is unrealistic as many have to travel for services outside the local area.           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Highlights the proposals would increase journey times for this travel.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Queries focus of Draft LAP on facilitating active travel/public transport in interests of reducing emissions, noting national government targets to increase provision of electric/hybrid cars.           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Notes lack of policy in Draft LAP to facilitate provision of electric/hybrid cars.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• States that, although Draft LAP appears to facilitate travel needs of c. 5,000 existing residents within DLAP lands, it neglects needs of c. 35,000 in surrounding areas.           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Highlights restrictions to vehicular traffic access to village for locals/deliveries due to proposed introduction of bus gates.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers proposed transport measures (including removal of slip lanes at Taney Cross junction) will reduce connectivity for vehicular traffic through/across DLAP lands.           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Highlights strategic importance of Taney Cross for regional distribution of traffic.</li> <li>○ Considers such journeys will become 2 or 3 times longer.</li> <li>○ Considers proposed restrictions to distributor roads such as Bypass conflict with objective to make Dundrum a neighbourhood village.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers Draft LAP measures discussed above also present issues for emergency services, by increasing journey times and restricting access.           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ States that existing measures (including cycle lane kerbs) in place in village have already created such issues.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers Draft LAP is ageist.           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Highlights mobility difficulties of many elderly people and their particular needs to access services and amenities in village by car.</li> <li>○ Concerns at impacts to elderly of removal of car parking at OSC and Dom Marmion sites as part of redevelopment.</li> <li>○ Considers objective in Draft LAP to provide car parking for elderly does not sufficiently account for number of elderly people in area.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers Draft LAP will destroy small businesses in village and result in job losses.</li> </ul>		



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o References vehicular access restrictions, loss of parking, previous impacts as a result of one-way system.</li> <li>o Notes increased vacancy as a result of traffic restrictions implemented in Dún Laoghaire.</li> <li>• Considers cycle lanes proposed under Draft LAP are excessive. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Queries whether survey of cyclist use informed Draft LAP.</li> <li>o Considers topography and age demographics of area restrict ability to cycle.</li> <li>o Considers additional cycle lanes will not increase number of cyclists.</li> <li>o Highlights trip hazard due to kerb on cycle lane on Main Street.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers safety issues will arise on Sydenham Road as a result of proposed active travel measures, in particular from residents alighting from driveways.</li> <li>• Considers heights of proposed apartments and of civic centre would be out of character with village. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Proposes maximum height restrictions of 4 storeys for developments in village.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Queries need for civic centre, noting Dom Marmion centre fulfils this function.</li> <li>• Considers infrastructure facilitating car travel in DLAP lands should generally be expanded rather than reduced.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6</p>

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0221</a>	Person: Kiernan	Organisation: Sweetmount Resident
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has a specific objection to the proposed footbridge linking Main Street with Sweetmount Park and The Laurels. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Notes current access routes from the town centre to Sweetmount and believes that no practical benefit will be gained by residents from a footbridge over the bypass at mid-point due to current low footfall into Sweetmount Park.</li> <li>o Visitors who park in Sweetmount already create issues by parking across driveways and causing obstructions.</li> <li>o A new bridge may cause the possibility for antisocial behaviour that currently does not exist.</li> <li>o Thinks that building a new bridge is a total waste of money.</li> <li>o Concludes that any visitor wanting to use the green spaces of Sweetmount can use the two routes already there to do so.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 2</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0222</a>	Person: James Robertson	Organisation: Private Citizen
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finds some of the proposed plans for Dundrum to be out of touch with the area.</li> <li>• Thinks restricting roads around Dundrum will create rat-running across Sweetmount Avenue which already has congestion during school term time.</li> <li>• Draft LAP isn't particularly friendly to elderly or disabled people reliant on using their cars to get to appointments in the area.</li> <li>• Concerned proposed bus gate will increase traffic congestion on Sweetmount Avenue at peak times in the morning.</li> <li>• Unsure how to object to buildings of significant height as there was no clear information available on the proposed height of the developments.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 3 and 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0223</u>	Person: Marie Harvey	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Believes that there is not enough infrastructure to support the proposed developments.</li> <li>• Thinks elderly accessing local amenities in the village, bank, GP, food shops, post office etc. has not been considered in the Draft plan.</li> <li>• Concerned that heritage buildings will be destroyed.</li> <li>• Concerned that the whole draft plan is geared towards cyclists and no consideration given to pedestrians.</li> <li>• New proposed layout will further increase excess traffic on Dundrum Road if the plan is passed.</li> <li>• Considers the proposal is more one of greed for money rather than what the people of the village and surrounding areas need.</li> <li>• Believes that the LAP will take people out of the businesses in Dundrum and send them elsewhere as access to the village will be near impossible and will result in several businesses closing down and people out of jobs.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4, 6 and 8</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0224</u>	Person: Kate Murray	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questions Plan ref: 3.24 Cultural and Civic Centre - with no parking or access for the elderly asks how they will use the centre.</li> <li>• Critical of path widening implemented during Covid thinking them for the benefit of Dundrum Town Centre rather than for local people.</li> <li>• Critical of part 4.4.26 Main Street in the draft plan saying that the one-way system, wider paths and cycle lanes have not worked and consulting more local people would have raised this issue.</li> <li>• Submits that cyclists don't travel through Dundrum because of the hills.</li> <li>• Asks how emergency services fire service, ambulance and the Garda are going to service the community with all the road restrictions.</li> <li>• Thinks that closing Dundrum to traffic from Barton Road east, Ballinteer and other roads, is crazy and will restrict access to services. Not everyone is able to walk or use bikes.</li> <li>• Questions whether the Council is going to help Dom Marmion house stay open as it is a great service for locals especially the elderly.</li> <li>• Submitter thinks this plan is without concern for the elderly in the area also stating the information used is 7 years out of date and will need to be modified again by the time it is completed.</li> <li>• Thinks that the Council has let the people of Dundrum and wider community down.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 2 and 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0225</u>	Person: Ann Rundle	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <p>Acknowledges that some areas of concern for local residents have been addressed in the Draft LAP such as including a new civic centre, sensitivity regarding buildings surrounding the church and along Main Street, retention and refurbishment of former post office, a park and potential wetland area.</p>		
<p><b>Transport and Proposed Bridge</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Believes that the current one-way traffic system has made a ghost town of the village.</li> <li>• Submits Dundrum has enough ring roads to avoid driving through the village so no need for a one-way system in the village itself.</li> <li>• The current one-way system doesn't work in the geographical context of Dundrum even though it works successfully in other villages within Dun Laoghaire Rathdown.</li> </ul>		

- Comments that further road restrictions (per section 4.6.1.1), particularly the Bus Gate on the old Ballinteer Road, would make access particularly difficult.
- Thinks proposed Bus Gate onto Sweetmount Avenue (4.6.1.8) is a particularly bad idea as this is one of the main access routes in/out of Dundrum for local residents.
- Critical of buses driving on a residential road, adding noise, pollution and making access to the Carnegie library/building difficult and dangerous.
- Is opposed to any pedestrian/cycle access route from the OSC site into Sweetmount Park (4.6.1.5).
- Thinks that opening up access to the Sweetmount green space to people who are not residents will lead to an increase in litter and anti-social behaviour, increased traffic, speed and haphazard parking in the neighbourhood which has been witnessed previously when a temporary footbridge was constructed during the building of the Dundrum by-pass.
- Concludes that local residents feel very connected to Dundrum village with access via Dom Marmion Bridge and Sweetmount Avenue therefore another bridge is absolutely unnecessary.

**Civic Centre**

- States that the view of the mountains on the approach from Windy Arbour, framed by the Luas Bridge, must be preserved. Any 11-storey building (3.3.5.2) would not be in keeping with the village character of Dundrum and would also be in competition with the Luas Bridge which is the landmark structure for Dundrum.
- Believes that the Civic Centre would be better placed within the OSC land and the Bus Terminus kept where it is with some adjustments to the road layout to allow buses to exit onto Taney Road.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 2 and 4

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0226</a>	Person: Eoin Farrell	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission states it is great to see the focus on the local community and the environment in the proposed DLAP.</li> <li>• Considers the active travel provision in the area to be very poor at the moment though having seen that pedestrians regularly outnumber cars at the Wyckham Way/Sandyford road junction yet the junction is clearly designed for cars to the lack of cycle connections and separated lanes in the area.</li> <li>• Welcomes plans to revitalise the town and introduce additional housing/apartment stock at the old town center and former mental health hospital as so many in this country are struggling to gather mortgage deposits due to the increased cost from the lack of supply.</li> <li>• Regarding any planning of cycle lanes submitter requests that DLRC tries to standardise on double lane cycle lanes on one side of the road vs 2 single lane cycle lanes as making cyclists change road side, then to have to change back a km later is not ideal.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 1, 3 and 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0227</a>	Person: Graham King	Organisation: Private resident
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b> Submission hopes that the Draft LAP includes a focus on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safe play/playground for children in the old Dundrum Village area.</li> <li>• Creche and school availability for future increased working parent population.</li> <li>• Safe travel (walk/bike) for parents and children in the area.</li> <li>• Increased car limitations/restricted access in the village.</li> <li>• Enlarged Luas station platforms at Dundrum and Windy Arbour for future increased commuting population.</li> <li>• Increased emphasis on community litter monitoring with increased bins, DLRCOCO collections, and community clean-up days.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 3, 4 and Other Issues</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0228</a>	Person: Tom Deveney	Organisation: Retailer in Dundrum Village
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submits that the new plan will destroy the village.</li> <li>• Considers the elderly population who are unable to cycle or walk to the village take a lift or drive because they have to.</li> <li>• Thinks the bypass built to reduce car traffic in the village already works while closing access from Barton road [4.6.1.1.] will hinder access to Taney school , the church etc. particularly without some parking on the Ballinteer side of the village</li> <li>• Has concerns whether there will be delivery access to the village.</li> <li>• Questions if fire tenders and ambulance service have easy access to the village.</li> <li>• Proposes that not enough thought has been put into the proposed plan and it seems to be an unnecessary spending of money, for very little gain, which will kill the village.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1 and 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0229</a>	Person: Lisa O'Neill	Organisation: Personal
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission expresses concern for the businesses and services in the village as a result of closing off southbound access from Dundrum Bypass to Main Street (Section 4.6.1.1).</li> <li>• Is also concerned about severe congestion that will be caused on the roads surrounding the village (4.6.3.1).</li> <li>• Believes there has been very little thought given to the businesses and the services that the village provides.</li> <li>• Thinks it will be extremely difficult for older people in particular to access the village.</li> <li>• Opines that this Plan will kill the village if it is implemented stating people will be forced to bring their business elsewhere and many of the businesses will become unviable.</li> <li>• Concludes that there is no need for this Plan.</li> <li>• Submits it is not looking to the future with regard to the increased amount of EVs that it is estimated will be on roads by 2030.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4</p>		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0230</u></b>	<b>Person: Gerard McAuliffe</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thinks there has not been enough consideration for the elderly and people with mobility issues.</li> <li>• Concerned regarding access to church, bank (could have to walk home with withdrawn cash feeling very vulnerable), and medical services.</li> <li>• Believes that cyclists as a rule do not obey rules of the road and don't PAY road tax.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b>		
Chapters 3 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0231</u></b>	<b>Person: Seán Kettle</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
Submission states that the Draft LAP of Dundrum is the right direction towards creating much needed people-friendly infrastructure in the Dundrum area and beyond.		
<b>Cycle Lanes</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submits that the biggest requirement in Dundrum is the creation of continuous segregated bicycle lanes as bike lanes are useless if they do not connect with other bike lanes. As painted white lines do not protect cyclists from motor vehicles there must be a physical barrier. This is important especially with the increase in young children cycling to school as well as teenagers.</li> <li>• Cycling is also an important means of transport for college students across Dublin especially for UCD and Trinity from the Dundrum area. A segregated bicycle lane encourages cycling as there is less stress in commuting by bicycle.</li> <li>• Counters experienced push back against the existing bike lane where some motorists are suggesting the bike lane is 'always empty' stating this is not the case. The cycle lane is always in use by cyclists moving through the village or travelling to the Dundrum area. Believes what the objecting motorists see is a highly efficient bike lane moving a high number of commuters through an area much more quickly than car lanes. Car lanes are sluggish with large vehicles while a bike lane can move many more cyclists through an area in less time. Therefore, any suggestions that this key piece of infrastructure should be removed are made under false information.</li> <li>• Bicycle lanes should be protected and continued.</li> </ul>		
<b>Bus Corridor</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not believe the bus corridor at the end of Ballinteer Road, flowing into Dundrum crossroads should be implemented.</li> <li>• Believes that restricting cars from passing the snippet of road that connects Ballinteer Road to the Dundrum Village is erroneous.</li> <li>• Motorists going to Dundrum Village from Lower Barton Road East would have to drive all the way to Wyckham Point and then down Sandyford Road creating more pollution.</li> <li>• Believes this tiny stretch of road will not remain car free as people will just disregard the 'Bus Only' signs and swing onto Dundrum Road and car-restrictions cannot be enforced for such a small section of road.</li> <li>• Has concerns about the bus corridor cutting past the Dundrum library as the implementation of the bus lane would remove the wonderful little area in front of the library with its greenery and benches.</li> <li>• Submits that there is no way to prevent cars from using this bus lane so it would just become a slipway for cars to get through to Sweetmount Avenue. Therefore, a civic space is removed for just another car lane and this part of the plan should be revised.</li> <li>• Concludes that Dundrum needs a serious infrastructure change towards more sustainable transport and people friendly spaces.</li> <li>• Has witnessed this being achieved somewhat with the widening of paths and the placement of chairs and benches along Dundrum Road.</li> <li>• However, cars still drive onto the pedestrian area in front of Dundrum Church to park or wait for people when there is a set down area already in place.</li> <li>• Is critical that there has not been an increase in bins even with an increase in people in Dundrum.</li> </ul>		

- Believes overall that the Draft DLAP is a push towards the right direction in creating a vibrant village that the community can enjoy.
- Submits that any decrease in business in the Dundrum area is not due to the change towards people-friendly infrastructure. Exorbitant high rents and derelict buildings are the cause of a declined village.
- Hopes that this plan injects life into Dundrum village and the surrounding areas.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 1, 4, 6 and Other Issues

**DLR Submission**  
No: [B0232](#)

**Person:** Karina Carroll

**Organisation:**

**Summary of Submission / Observation:**

- Wholeheartedly endorses the 10-minute city and would love to do away with their car.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapter 1

**DLR Submission**  
No: [B0233](#)

**Person:** Gerard Gorey

**Organisation:** of The Laurels/Sweetmount Park

**Summary of Submission / Observation:**

- Critical of the time frame allowed for the consultation period stating that there was not adequate publicity about the draft LAP nor enough time to review such a large document.
- Believes the whole draft plan needs to be reviewed and more time and consultation given to all the stakeholders involved.
- Critical of changes in relation to one-way systems, road closures, cycle pathways, expanded footpaths and thinks these were rushed through by DLRCCO during COVID and should be reversed.
- Submits that the Draft DLAP fails in creating “the vision for Dundrum is of a vibrant, inclusive, and attractive town which is connected to and supports surrounding neighbourhoods and functions as a place people can enjoy, to live in, work and visit” and fails when it states “To deliver on the ten minute neighbourhood concept and provide a network of connected neighbourhoods”.
- Thinks that the Draft DLAP is all about pedestrians and cyclists and completely forgets and disregards people who need cars and have mobility issues.
- Thinks that the plan discriminates against the elderly and people with mobility issues.
- Objects to the idea of buildings up to 11 stories for proposed schemes as this does not consider the existing character or scale of Dundrum.
- Considers the proposed civic centre will be in the wrong location and that this area should continue to be used as a bus hub as it is alongside the Luas. Suggests that DLRCCO should consider buying Usher House for the civic centre.
- Objects to the proposed pedestrian and cycle-link between Sweetmount Park and the Old Dundrum Village Shopping Centre as residents of Sweetmount Park/The Laurels objected to the proposed bridge in April 2021 for the following reasons:
  - The bridge is not necessary, anti-social behaviour, more traffic coming into a private estate and security issues for householders.
  - Submission provides commentary on CDP review process and contends that CE did not respond to issue on pedestrian bridge when raised as part of CDP review process.
  - Submission provides commentary on current SHD application and also earlier temporary pedestrian bridge. Submission raises issue with a letter of consent by the Director of Services of DLRCCO to Hammersons/Allianz to build a bridge over the bypass using the lands of Sweetmount Park which Hammersons/Allianz do not own and is a public open space for the use of the Residents who live in the area. This, if granted would effectively split the park in two.
  - Objects to all three Bus Gates particularly, Main Street to Churchtown Road Upper as this will bring buses into a private estate alongside Carnegie Library and Sweetmount Avenue.
  - Believes this will be dangerous for children and adults who will have to cross in front of it while entering and leaving the library.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o It will also clog up traffic on Sweetmount Avenue which is already heavily trafficked.</li> <li>o Thinks that the proposed Bus Gate at Dundrum Cross will disadvantage the motorist as they will no longer be able to drive from Ballinteer Road to Main Street.</li> <li>o There will be a requirement to substantially increase journeys for motorists which will increase carbon emissions rather than reduce them.</li> <li>o Thinks the plan is for pedestrians and cyclists and not for the motorist.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concludes that this is the wrong plan for Dundrum, will lead to an empty main street and make it more difficult for everyone to navigate the road system and lead to increased carbon emissions.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 2, 4, and Other Issues</p>

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0234</a>	Person: Matt McE	Organisation: UCD
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submits that the Draft DLAP aims to create people-friendly infrastructure, including segregated bicycle lanes and improvements to pedestrian spaces.</li> <li>• Recognises that the plan addresses the need for connected bike lanes, emphasizes the benefits of cycling, and highlights the importance of preserving civic spaces.</li> <li>• Supports the plan objectives to overcome car-centric attitudes and declining business, by promoting sustainable transport and community enjoyment.</li> <li>• Fully supports the plan as a positive step towards a vibrant and sustainable Dundrum.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1 and 6</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0235</a>	Person: Eithne Kennan	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submits there is absolutely no need for the plan.</li> <li>• Objects to any plan to further curtail access to Dundrum village and its amenities.</li> <li>• Thinks the plan will further cut residents off from social support.</li> <li>• Believes the cycle lanes are rarely used as Dundrum is very hilly.</li> <li>• Regarding Section 4.6.3.1, submits that access to Dundrum from Windy Arbour direction will be virtually non-existent as will access from the Churchtown direction (reference 4.6.1.2).</li> <li>• Thinks businesses will struggle to get deliveries and residents who will have difficulty accessing the services will simply take their business elsewhere.</li> <li>• Thinks Section 4.6.1.1 will negatively impact on residents of Meadow Grove and Barton Road East who will be off completely by long detours resulting in more emissions and delays from traffic coming from the Ballinteer area.</li> <li>• Considers that the transport of people and goods in and out of the area has been completely ignored.</li> <li>• Suggests that one road into the village and one road out of the village is simply not workable, bottle necks on the approach roads with Sandyford Road and Kilmacud Road will simply 'become car parks but with engines running'.</li> <li>• Concerned about access for emergency services due to road layout changes proposed.</li> <li>• Submits that the plan will be detrimental to Dundrum village and should be rejected.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1 and 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0236</u>	Person: Adrienne and Patrick Shannon	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submits that the draft Plan appears to only considers cyclists and pedestrians and not the older, disabled and vulnerable members of the community.</li> <li>• Responds that it is already a 'nightmare' to bring an elderly or disabled person to medical/hairdresser appointments, bank or church on the main street in Dundrum due to insufficient disabled parking spaces or provision to drop off or park for essential purposes.</li> <li>• Believes if further restrictions, as proposed in the LAP, are imposed then all other local businesses are likely to suffer.</li> <li>• Thinks that Dundrum main street will become a dead street and it will be impossible to achieve 'a well-rounded mix of local businesses to serve the local community' as referenced in the LAP.</li> <li>• Has concerns that closing access roads into Dundrum will force traffic into the surrounding residential housing areas, making them more dangerous, noisy and increasing air pollution.</li> <li>• Cars on essential journeys will now have to drive longer distances, taking more circuitous routes, encouraging 'rat-running', and increasing emissions. This is grossly unfair on the residents of the surrounding estates and is unacceptable.</li> <li>• Proposes that any road closure or alternation should only be for a trial period followed by an assessment and consultation with the communities impacted.</li> <li>• Suggests that, in advance of finalising the Plan, there should be a full impact assessment and CBA of the impact of the proposed changes on the residents, businesses and services.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 4 and 6</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0237</u>	Person: Leonard and Janet Fitzpatrick	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submits that the Draft Plan will add more traffic and reduce access to Sandymount Road by blocking off streets which is already difficult to navigate at current traffic levels.</li> <li>• Believes the plan does not take into account that not everyone cycles or would be able to cycle up and down hilly streets to gain access to the village.</li> <li>• Plan does not cater for elderly people who need lifts to church, post office, coffee shops, doctor/dentist, chemist, hairdresser etc. or for all people requiring access to the village for all uses.</li> <li>• Thinks Dundrum does not need more high-rise apartments with no amenities for all age groups.</li> <li>• States this will 'kill' the village centre.</li> <li>• Submits that blocking roads leads to closing businesses.</li> <li>• Rejects an inaccessible new "civic centre" at end of village.</li> <li>• Believes there will be too many bus lanes (with empty buses), double cycle lanes (not used) and that overly large footpaths with too narrow roads are not good plans for Dundrum and its environment.</li> <li>• Believes that the plan will not improve travel and the current double-decker buses are half empty while the Luas is above capacity at peak times.</li> <li>• Thinks that use of buses is not progressive or forward thinking and that the Luas needs to be more frequent and developed a lot further.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2, 3 and 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0238</u>	Person: Tatiana Vasiliuk	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submits they fail to see how any residents can benefit from the plan.</li> <li>• Dundrum is full of hills, therefore not conducive to cycling and thinks the proposal is all about pushing people to cycle and walk more.</li> <li>• New routes will lead more inconvenience for drivers and sees that there is no extra parking planned.</li> </ul>		



- Thinks changes to Sydenham Road, making it a one-way narrow road, plus two proposed cycle lanes on it, gives more space to cyclists than cars and makes no sense. It will be a disaster waiting to happen with increased traffic, buses delivery trucks and bikes.
- Suggests the width of the footpaths should be increased to counter danger posed by cars reversing out onto the road all the time making it dangerous for pedestrians.
- Thinks DLR representatives need to visit and see for themselves.
- Thinks the whole plan is wrong and anti-residents.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 1 and 4

DLR Submission No: <u>B0239</u>	Person: Teresa Hunt	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission strongly objects to proposed changes to traffic and plans for the village of Dundrum.</li> <li>• Submits that the blocking of Ballinteer Road to cars turning left onto Main Street will negatively impact on residents and increase traffic causing snarl-ups and an increase in gas emissions.</li> <li>• Believes the plan does not take into account that not everyone cycles or would be able to cycle up and down hilly streets to gain access to the village.</li> <li>• Plan does not cater for elderly people who need lifts to church, shopping medical or other services or for people requiring access to the village for all uses.</li> <li>• Thinks that works carried out on Main Street two years ago are most unsatisfactory and have ‘sucked a lot of heart and life out of the village’.</li> <li>• Thinks the cycle lane is used very little, is a serious safety risk and the dividers are a huge trip hazard which have caused serious injuries to people.</li> <li>• Critical of Covid measures and how they were implemented without any public consultations.</li> <li>• Suggests business and shops on Main Street have been very negatively impacted by this ‘one-way disaster’.</li> <li>• Restoring the two-way traffic will once again allow for quick access for emergency services badly impacted by the current one-way system.</li> <li>• Strongly objects to the provision of a pedestrian and cycle bridge over the Dundrum Bypass to Sweetmount Park as totally unnecessary and will very negatively affect the residents (Ref. 4.6.1.5). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Will lead to anti-social behaviour, an increase in traffic through the road by motorists dropping off and collecting people, an increase in litter and it will also act as a quick get-away for burglars.</li> <li>○ There are perfectly good pedestrian access routes to Main Street Dundrum via Sweetmount Avenue and Dundrum Library, or via Ballinteer Road and Dom Marmion Bridge, so this pedestrian bridge is totally unwarranted.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Has concerns regarding the proposed Bus Gate between Main Street/ Churchtown Road Upper and Sweetmount Avenue anticipating severe congestion and delays for motorists.</li> <li>• Submits a strong objection to the proposed extremely high-rise buildings along the Dundrum By-Pass [up to 11 storeys ref. Ch.2. OSC 14 ) which should not be allowed as they will ‘destroy the village and surroundings’.</li> <li>• Thinks that plans for Sydenham Road do not make sense where residents exiting their driveway will have to cross over a double cycle lane to enter the one-way traffic on the road. This will be extremely dangerous for both cyclists and motorists alike.</li> <li>• Believes that the 10-minute concept is totally unrealistic.</li> <li>• Thinks the plan is very anti-people and is almost totally concerned with walking, cycling and public transport ignoring real people’s needs, especially for the elderly, the infirm and the people who care for them.</li> <li>• Rejects this plan completely.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 1, 2 and 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0240</u>	Person: Ruth Deveney	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcomes the draft of the LAP and supports any investment in Dundrum Village.</li> <li>• Objects to proposals for Ballinteer Road and Barton Road Access as traders/ratepayers require residents to make businesses viable. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Restricting access would result in further economic casualties. and we do not interpret this as a means to 'Improve the public realm and support the vibrancy and liveability of the area'.</li> <li>○ Proposes restrictions of cars at Ballinteer Road approaching Dundrum be deleted from any further consideration.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Transport and Movement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submits that Dundrum Main Street be returned to a two-way system.</li> <li>• Dundrum by-pass has sufficiently large cycle lanes on both sides with access points to the village, sees very little requirement for both.</li> <li>• Considers the one-way system to have had a detrimental effect on the economic viability of the village.</li> </ul> <p><b>Submitter Requests</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An independent survey on the one-way system.</li> <li>• An independent traffic survey on the village and surrounding areas (thinks the one included in the LAP seems to be taken from other traffic surveys in Dublin)</li> <li>• An economic survey for the area.</li> <li>• An analysis of the one-way system and the impact it's had on the village.</li> <li>• A proper consultation for relevant Res. Assoc and Ratepayers to allow time for residents to consider a very detailed, complex LAP as the information presented was not sufficient.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4 and 6</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0241</u>	Person: Ciara Kennedy	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strongly objects to proposed pedestrian / cycle link from Main Street / OSC site to Sweetmount Park. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers there is no necessity for route as it doesn't provide useful access benefits.</li> <li>○ Concerns at increased vehicular traffic and footfall in area as a result of link.</li> <li>○ Notes that issues arose in area as a result of previous temporary access bridge in place during construction works for Bypass.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Critical of proposed alterations to Dundrum Cross, as set out under section 4.6.1.1 of Draft LAP. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Highlights impacts to shops, services and amenities in village as a result of existing restrictions arising from one-way system on Main Street.</li> <li>○ States that number of people using village amenities has decreased.</li> <li>○ States that cycle lanes on Main Street are barely used and poses trip hazard.</li> <li>○ Considers proposed measures will cause traffic congestion in surrounding area and prolonged journeys for local residents.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers proposed Main Street to Churchtown Road Lower bus gate will create safety issues for people trying to access Carnegie Library. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers it will generate a high level of pollution (including noise and litter).</li> <li>○ Considers road is not suitable to support a transport hub due to its residential nature.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Raises concerns with height, scale and density of proposal under current SHD application at OSC site. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Supportive of residential development at OSC site which provides suitable mix.</li> <li>○ Considers 1 and 2-bed units would not be appropriate for families or elderly people downsizing.</li> <li>○ Considers heights of up to 11 storeys along Bypass (as referred to in Draft LAP for OSC site) would be excessive.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

- Considers Civic Centre should be in suitable location and should provide amenities for all ages.
  - Considers delivery of a multi-storey facility on a small site adjacent to Bypass and bus gate would not be accessible.
- Considers there has been a lack of engagement with stakeholders as part of LAP process.
  - Highlights that consultation during Summer does not suit many.
- Considers promotion of active travel in Draft LAP is not suitable in Dundrum due to topography and demographic profile of area.
- Considers LAP ignores needs of local residents, in particular the elderly.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 2, 4 and Other Issues

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0242</a>	Person: Don McEntee	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highlights traffic congestion issues in Dundrum, noting they have prevailed over many years as Dublin has grown.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Notes year-on-year increase in traffic volumes and delays on Sandyford Road, Dundrum Bypass and junctions associate with both, due to recent and new developments between Dundrum and Enniskerry.</li> <li>◦ Notes particular issues of congestion on Sandyford Road due to cars queueing to enter DTCSC car park.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• States that the existing pedestrian crossing arrangement at the junction of Sandyford Road / Overend Avenue / Wyckham Way works well with general traffic movements.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ States that the traffic lights at this junction operate on the basis of a SCATS system, which handles the flow of daytime traffic in an acceptable manner, noting that the system monitors traffic flows and adjusts light times accordingly.</li> <li>◦ Notes that traffic at this junction coming from Overend Avenue is sometimes backed up as far as Kilmacud Road Upper.</li> <li>◦ Notes similar traffic congestion at junction along Sandyford Road, noting traffic occasionally backed up as far as Clonard Road.</li> <li>◦ Highlights consequent congestion in residential estates as a result of this, as traffic diverts through Balally.</li> <li>◦ Notes that SCATS system fails to move this traffic through junction effectively at times of severe congestion.</li> <li>◦ Considers that slip lanes at this junction should be retained.</li> <li>◦ Highlights safety issue that results from traffic congestion on Sandyford Road due to cars driving on wrong side of road at speed to turn right onto Overend Avenue.</li> <li>◦ Notes this can be hazardous for drivers alighting from Ardglass estate and turning right onto Sandyford Road.</li> <li>◦ Proposes provision of bollards along centre of Sandyford Road to address this issue.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Proposes the undertaking of a detailed traffic study of the road network in and around Dundrum as part of the LAP, in order to improve traffic conditions on Sandyford Road.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Proposes consultation should take place with the DTCSC owners to determine how to increase flows of traffic into the car park.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Highlights safety issues for school children cycling/walking on Slang River greenway due to traffic at Sandyford Road.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Proposes installing barriers at Sandyford Road / entrance to Ardglass estate to mitigate this.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0243</u>	Person: Eithne Kennan	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers Draft LAP proposals have not sufficiently considered needs of local residents and traders.</li> <li>• Commends principle of promoting active travel, states however it should not negatively impact on those who cannot rely on active travel means. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Highlights perceived low levels of use of cycle lanes, issues posed to cyclists by topography of area.</li> <li>○ Highlights issues of emergency service and delivery access to village.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Concerned that proposed traffic access restrictions at Dundrum Cross (as proposed in Section 4.6.1.1) will inhibit local residents (in particular elderly and mobility impaired) accessing services and amenities in village. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers this would lead to closure of businesses.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Concerned that proposed removal of slip lanes and bus priority measures at Taney Cross (as proposed in Section 4.6.1.2) will exacerbate traffic congestion. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers this will inhibit access to the proposed civic centre (in particular for elderly and mobility impaired), stating that this conflicts with promotion of inclusivity.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Concerned that proposed traffic calming and public realm improvement measures on Dundrum Road (as proposed in Section 4.6.3.1) will exacerbate traffic congestion at Windy Arbour and will further inhibit access to services/amenities in Dundrum village. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Notes consequent prolonged journey times, detours, increase in emissions</li> <li>○ Highlights needs of people who do shift work and therefore can't rely on public transport.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0244</u>	Person: Daniel M Collins	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers Draft LAP does not serve residents of area or visitors to area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers there is no demand for LAP.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Highlights existing difficulties accessing village from Churchtown Road Upper due to traffic congestion at Taney Cross. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers difficulties will be worsened by removal of slip lanes at junction as proposed in section 4.6.1.2 of Draft LAP.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Critical at proposed removal of bus terminus at Waldemar Terrace and provision of bus bay on Churchtown Road Upper. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers this will further exacerbate traffic congestion at Taney Cross.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• States that existing cycle lanes on Main Street are underutilised and present safety issues for pedestrians and cyclists.</li> <li>• Considers one-way traffic system on Main Street is a retrograde step, noting longer journeys to and difficulty accessing services and amenities in village. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers cyclists have been prioritised at the expense of car users.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers redevelopment of OSC and Dom Marmion sites will further inhibit access due to removal of substantial areas of car parking.</li> <li>• Concerned at potential impacts to businesses, service provides and community life in village as a result of various measures limiting vehicular access.</li> <li>• Considers proposed civic centre may be positive addition to area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Concerned however at viability of civic centre due to lack of parking.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Highlights difficulties of cycling in Dundrum due to topography and large elderly contingent for whom cycling is not possible.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 4 and 6</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0245</a>	Person: Patrick Griffin	Organisation: Deveney's of Dundrum
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcomes the draft of the LAP and supports any investment in Dundrum Village.</li> <li>• Objects to proposals for Ballinteer Road and Barton Road Access as traders/ratepayers require residents to make businesses viable. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Restricting access would result in further economic casualties. and we do not interpret this as a means to 'Improve the public realm and support the vibrancy and liveability of the area'.</li> <li>◦ Proposes restrictions of cars at Ballinteer Road approaching Dundrum be deleted from any further consideration.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Transport and Movement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submits that Dundrum Main Street be returned to a two-way system.</li> <li>• Dundrum by-pass has sufficiently large cycle lanes on both sides with access points to the village, we see very little requirement for both. Considers the one-way system to have had a detrimental effect on the economic viability of the village</li> </ul> <p><b>Requests</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An independent survey on the one-way system.</li> <li>• An independent traffic survey on the village and surrounding areas (thinks the one included in the LAP seems to be taken from other traffic surveys in Dublin)</li> <li>• An economic survey for the area.</li> <li>• An analysis of the one-way system</li> <li>• A proper consultation for relevant Res. Assoc and Ratepayers to allow time for residents to consider a very detailed, complex LAP as the information presented was not sufficient.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4 and 6</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0246</a>	Person: Donal O'Shea	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports proposed traffic calming measures and additional public transport / active travel infrastructure.</li> <li>• Seeks further restriction on use of residential estates as rat runs for car traffic.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0247</a>	Person: Michael and Janet O'Sullivan	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to vehicular traffic access restrictions proposed on Ballinteer Road at Dundrum Cross. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Considers this will generate significant traffic congestion in village and on Sandyford Road and Wyckham Way.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Objects to proposed one-way vehicular traffic system on Sydenham Road. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Considers this will create safety issues due to vehicles alighting from driveways through a cycle lane.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Objects of removal of right turn from Churchtown Road Upper to Dundrum Bypass at Taney Cross junction.</li> <li>• Queries need for bus gate, noting existing bus terminus functions well.</li> <li>• Considers that proposed measures referenced will create significant traffic congestion throughout the area, cause an increase in emissions and prolong journey times.</li> <li>• Unhappy with height of proposed buildings due to overshadowing impacts to village and surrounding area.</li> </ul>		

o Considers heights of to 3 or 4 storeys would retain character of village.
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 3 and 4

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0248</a>	<b>Person:</b> Ken Waller	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to LAP.</li> <li>• Critical of proposed restrictions to vehicular traffic access to Main Street from Ballinteer Road. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Considers this is unnecessary, inhibits access for elderly to various amenities/services in village, will necessitate unreasonable detours and will exacerbate congestion at Wyckham Way / Sandyford Road junction.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers lack of parking in village prevents access to certain services/amenities.</li> <li>• Queries need for cycle lanes in village, noting existing cycle lanes on Bypass, low use of village by cyclists, challenging topography of area and high proportion of elderly people.</li> <li>• Critical of scale of development proposed at OSC site <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Accepts need for more residential development.</li> <li>o Suggests height restrictions of 4 storeys would be suitable.</li> <li>o Concerned at overshadowing impacts on village.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Objects to proposed Main Street to Churchtown Road Upper bus gate.</li> <li>• Objects to closing of Dom Marmion Centre, stating it is a much needed facility for local area.</li> <li>• Requests that LAP process is put on hold to allow for review/revision with greater input from local residents.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 2, 4, and Other Issues		

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0249</a>	<b>Person:</b> Dympna Murray	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcomes Draft LAP, however considers public consultation period was too brief considering complexity and detail of LAP.</li> <li>• Concerned that the development of Development Opportunity Sites nos 1 to 7 (as identified in Figure 2.4 of Draft LAP) will aggravate traffic management issues in the area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Highlights that CMH and Frankfort Castle sites are not identified as Development Opportunity Sites in the figure.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Concerned at proposed redevelopment of Dom Marmion KDA, noting the existing Dom Marmion Centre located there is of significant value to elderly people in the local community. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Proposes inclusion of an objective to provide a similar facility on an alternative, easily accessible site within the village, as term of development of site.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Highlights benefit provision of civic centre will provide for local arts groups for whom rehearsal space is lacking. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Requests inclusion of flexible classrooms / rehearsal space in this building.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• States Sydenham Road provides essential vehicular access for parents/guardians to local schools. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Considers the proposed one-way vehicular system on this road will present difficulties in this regard.</li> <li>o Queries need for 2 cycle lanes, noting topography of this road and adjoining roads.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• With reference to Section 4.6.1.6, highlights need to provide suitable and adequate car parking for Holy Cross Church, noting loss of current parking with redevelopment of OSC site.</li> <li>• Considers traffic movement into and around village needs to be addressed prior to consideration of residential or commercial development. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Highlights significant increase in car journey times for some trips as a result of traffic restrictions currently in place.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Notes issue of carbon emissions as a result of this.</li> <li>o Proposes up-to-date traffic surveys including cyclists and pedestrians should be undertaken, with access requirements for community to be extrapolated from same.</li> <li>o Considers existing restrictions introduced as temporary measures in response to pandemic have ‘destroyed’ character of Dundrum.</li> <li>o Have also fostered issues including litter, anti-social behaviour and safety issues arising from cycle lane kerbs.</li> <li>o Considers public realm landscaping and furniture is unattractive/poor quality.</li> <li>o Considers that kerbside bus stops on Main Street contribute to congestion, noting there is sufficient space at Holy Cross Church to provide a bus bay.</li> <li>• Concerned at effect of proposed Ballinteer Road bus gate on traffic access to village.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Considers proposal will inhibit delivery and emergency access to village/surrounding areas.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Welcomes wildlife and biodiversity proposals along Slang River as set out under Section 5.3.1 of Draft LAP.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Notes it will prevent future development near the river at the identified Development Opportunity Sites.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Highlights need to provide traffic lights at junctions intersecting Windy Arbour NC to ensure pedestrian safety at these during construction works at CMH site.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2, 3, 4, 5 and Other Issues</p>

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0250</a>	Person: Fiona Garvey	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Critical of proposed vehicular traffic access restriction measures proposed on Ballinteer Road at Dundrum Cross.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Concerned at environmental impacts resulting from diverted traffic and prolonged journey times.</li> <li>o Notes negative impact to parents/guardians of school children who need to rely on car.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Criticises monetary and practical consideration that informed the decisions regarding the existing layout of the village.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Notes negative impacts to village as a result of existing one-way system.</li> <li>o Notes safety issues for cyclists and pedestrians due to cycle lane kerbs on Main Street.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Critical of lack of public engagement as part of LAP process, noting in particular lack of involvement by mothers, drivers and women.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4 and Other Issues</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0251</a>	Person: Gerry Hendley	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers proposed high rises detract from village.</li> <li>• Considers proposed measures to amend road layouts will impinge on all local residents and will exacerbate traffic congestion.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Considers measures will reduce number of visitors to village, leaving it a ‘bland no-go area’.</li> <li>o Highlights particular impacts to elderly.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 3 and 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0252</a>	Person: Jeremy Fornasiero	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcomes Draft LAP and investment in village.</li> <li>• Requests removal of measures from Draft LAP which restrict car access to village on Ballinteer Road, noting importance of this access to village. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers proposed restrictions to this access would have negative economic impacts and would conflict with the objective (as stated in Section 4.6.1.1) to 'Improve the public realm and support the vibrancy and livability of the area'.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Requests removal of temporary Covid-19 active travel/public realm measures on Main Street and reinstatement of two-way vehicular traffic system. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers Bypass has sufficient cyclist infrastructure to accommodate cyclist traffic, therefore Main Street cycle lanes are not required.</li> <li>○ States one-way system has had detrimental effect on economic viability of village, stating there has been a 20% drop in turnover for some businesses.</li> <li>○ Requests independent analysis and review of one-way system.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Requests the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Consultation between DLR and resident associations/rate payers in Dundrum.</li> <li>○ Independent traffic analysis of the village and surrounding areas.</li> <li>○ Economic survey of Dundrum.</li> <li>○ Review of impact of DTCS owners on Dundrum village, noting that a UK-based corporation controlling a significant part of the village is not in the interests of the community.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4 and 6</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0253</a>	Person: Agnieszka Plewa	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notes positive and negative changes to Dundrum in recent years.</li> <li>• Concerned at proposed restrictions to vehicular traffic access to village. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Notes significant curtailment to access of services/amenities for residents coming from Milltown direction due to Dundrum Road traffic calming and public realm improvements as set out in Section 4.6.3.1.</li> <li>○ Notes similar curtailment to access due to proposed measures at Taney Cross and environs (as set out in Section 4.6.1.2), highlighting particular impacts to mobility impaired.</li> <li>○ Concerned at access restrictions from Bypass to Main Street and proposed access restrictions on Ballinteer Road at Dundrum Cross (as set out in Section 4.6.1.1).</li> <li>○ Highlights impact of these measures on emergency service access.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• States that proposed measures present particular difficulties for elderly residents.</li> <li>• States there are prevailing mental health issues amongst community due to being cut off socially and otherwise during Covid-19 lockdowns.</li> <li>• Considers proposed cycle lanes are not necessary, noting underutilisation of existing cycle lanes.</li> <li>• Considers Draft LAP discriminates against mobility impaired.</li> <li>• Predicts negative impacts to local businesses.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4 and 6</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0254</a>	Person: Aidan Dowling	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Critical of lack of consideration of elderly in Draft LAP, noting they are main users of village.</li> </ul>		



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o References increase in journey times and detours along heavily trafficked roads as a result of proposed vehicular traffic restrictions.</li> <li>o Considers this will discourage elderly from leaving homes.</li> <li>• Considers village cannot be supported only by those who can walk/cycle to it within 10 minutes.</li> <li>• Proposed Bypass would have sufficient capacity to accommodate through traffic, however acknowledges congestion at Bypass / Wyckham Way junction roundabout. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Proposes underground access from DTCSC to Wyckham Way could be provided.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Queries whether underground route from Balally Luas stop to DTCSC could be provided.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 1 and 4</p>

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0255</a>	Person: Linda Feehan	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highlights large volume of proposed developments along Dundrum Road between Milltown Bridge and village. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Concerned at additional pressure on road and public transport infrastructure as a result of these.</li> <li>o Notes that Dundrum road functions as main route to city centre and considers it therefore cannot function as neighbourhood street.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers Draft LAP will not improve connectivity in area/access to village for locals. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Highlights need to have easy access to essential services/amenities.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers Draft LAP excludes elderly, disabled and parents of young children. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Notes higher proportion of elderly, for whom cycling is unsafe/impossible.</li> <li>o Considers LAP prioritises cyclists over all other road users, including pedestrians.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Highlights necessity of providing parking for local business, schools and community services for both deliveries and custom.</li> <li>• Considers proposed development at OSC site is excessive in scale and height. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Considers it will dominate Main Street and negatively impact heritage, in particular Pembroke Cottages.</li> <li>o Considers it does not maintain the village atmosphere or sense of community.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2, 3, 4,</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0256</a>	Person: Gillian Fischer	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Raises concerns with proposed restrictions to access on Ballinteer Road at Dundrum Cross (as set out in Section 4.6.1.1). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Considers proposed measures will cause long delays and detours for residents seeking to access local services and amenities, as well as commuting to city.</li> <li>o Suggests additional issues in this regard will be cause by proposed measures on Sandyford Road as set out in Section 4.6.1.3.</li> <li>o Considers measures will disproportionately impact elderly/disabled/mobility impaired/parents.</li> <li>o Suggests congestion and delays will be exacerbated by proposed measures at Taney Cross and environs as set out in Section 4.6.1.2.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0257</a>	Person: Gerry Furlong	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcomes proposals to redevelop OSC site and provide residential development in area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers residential units should be for individual purchase and not rented out to large companies.</li> <li>○ Notes units are needed in particular for first time buyers and downsizers.</li> <li>○ Considers this will foster long-term as opposed to transient community.</li> <li>○ Considers it will provide more footfall and passive security at evening time.</li> <li>○ Highlights existing run down nature and poor frontage provided by OSC.</li> <li>○ Welcomes height limit of 10/11 storeys along Bypass.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2 and 3</p>		
DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0258</a>	Person: <i>Name not provided</i>	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of Draft LAP overall.</li> <li>• Proposes the Bypass / Wyckham Way junction roundabout be changed to Dutch-style roundabout.</li> <li>• Welcomes proposed civic centre development, proposed village green at OSC site, proposed heights along Bypass/Main Street at OSC site.</li> <li>• Considers retention of retail presence on Main Street is important.</li> <li>• Welcomes proposed traffic calming measures in Windy Arbour area.</li> <li>• Suggests provision of more direct cycle route from Windy Arbour to village, however acknowledges constraints of Dundrum Road corridor. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Queries possibility of providing pedestrian/cycle route along Slang River.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 2 and 4</p>		
DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0259</a>	Person: Maria Campbell	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Critical of 10-minute neighbourhood concept's reliance on 'high-quality public transport' (as referred to in Section 1.2 of Draft LAP). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers concept is impractical.</li> <li>○ Highlights existing overcrowding on Luas and considers it has insufficient capacity to accommodate significant projected volume of development (e.g. at Carrickmines).</li> <li>○ Suggests this matter should be addressed before LAP is implemented.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers proposed traffic restrictions on Ballinteer Road will impact on quality of life of residents of Barton Road East. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers it will conflict with Age Friendly goals.</li> <li>○ Considers proposal discriminates against elderly (noting in particular access to Holy Cross Church) and mobility impaired.</li> <li>○ Notes challenges of walking to village posed by weather and topography.</li> <li>○ Highlights increased journey times for parents dropping children to/from school and commuting.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Concerns at future lack of parking due to redevelopment of OSC site. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers parking at shopping centre is not feasible due to parking charges.</li> <li>○ Suggests it would make sense to hold off publishing LAP until ABP have decided on current SHD application.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

- Considers proposed restrictions on access to village conflict with objective to provide a ‘vibrant and active place’ in the village, as stated in Section 8.5.
  - Queries future of red-brick cottages in village.
  - Predicts major negative impacts to village.
  - Suggests drawing on examples globally of projects which have revitalized city villages.
- Raises concerns with accessibility and lack of clarity around height of proposed civic hub.
  - Suggests the civic hub could be delivered through re-use of existing buildings (e.g. Ulster Bank building).
- Proposes more recent figures for age demographics would be more suitable, noting figures in Draft LAP are drawn from 2016 Census.
- Highlights safety issues for pedestrians with kerbs of cycle lanes on Main Street, due to trip hazard, contraflow system, poor visibility.
- Considers proposed one-way system and cycle lanes on Sydenham Road has not been adequately risk assessed.
- Objects to proposed transition of Dundrum Road to neighbourhood street, noting its current use as main traffic artery to city and that it will serve as sole vehicular access for CMH development.
- Concerned at lack of clarity, increased frequency and safety issues posed by proposed bus services.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 1, 2, 4 and Other Issues

DLR Submission No: <u>B0260</u>	Person: Mary Johnston	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to proposed pedestrian and cycle link between Sweetmount Park and the old Dundrum Shopping Centre citing lack of need and unwelcome footfall into the area.</li> <li>• Submits that any proposed changes to traffic flow, road amendments, cycle lanes etc would negatively impact on access to residential areas and the town centre services causing immense disruption adding extra journey time and cost to drivers.</li> <li>• Submits that the proposed Bus Gate at Sweetmount Avenue is not a suitable location for a Bus Gate or any kind of hub for buses to park and the suggested exit route for buses up the hill leading from Sweetmount Avenue to Churchtown Road is not feasible.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2 and 4</p>		
DLR Submission No: <u>B0261</u>	Person: Darragh Rogan	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers the draft plan to be a very comprehensive vision and supports the objectives proposed.</li> <li>• Advocates creating a district heat link from new town centre to feed CMH development along Dundrum Road and also some other smaller apartment developments on that road which can benefit from surplus heat produced by the new town centre.</li> <li>• Suggest putting a condition on both the OSC planning application and the CMH one that the heat flow and return pipes be presented facing north, / west with space in the development to accommodate pumping to adjacent network users be provided. Codema can give good advice on this topic.</li> <li>• Suggests the provision of bus recharging facilities at bus stops around Taney (incl. the private operator to airport) which could be supported by ESB infrastructure in the area.</li> <li>• Suggests including spaces designated for rental scooter parking and loading bays for recharging vans. Submission provides link to video on how Helsinki is accommodating: <a href="https://youtu.be/OuXTa-SgZ80">https://youtu.be/OuXTa-SgZ80</a></li> <li>• Welcomes the provision of bus gates, both at Dundrum Cross and at Sweetmount. Suggests provision of automated bollards and/or similar enforcement technology (i.e. cameras) for bus gates at Dundrum cross + to Sweetmount from bypass to counter individuals inclined to circumvent.</li> <li>• Suggests the provision of a pedestrian crossing from south to north at Jamie’s restaurant to accommodate pedestrian flow from Barton Road East into the town centre rather than requiring them to walk further.</li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that all junctions include traffic counting facilities and traffic camera monitoring,</li> <li>• Suggests space to the north of Taney cross under Luas bridge (adjacent the new bus lay-by shown) be used for kids to play.</li> <li>• On OSC site redevelopment, suggest that the condition OSC15 be modified to absolutely include for creche space without an opt out (no “and/or” business) - very congested locally to find creche spaces.</li> <li>• Commends the recognition of the increase in prominence of cycling for Saint Columbanus Road with school and development at CMH. Clarifies that the “Connection to Dodder to Dundrum Cycle Route” as shown is a secluded, undesirable path to go down and shouldn’t be considered for active use and that it hasn’t been well signposted.</li> <li>• Suggests indicating that the cycle route on SCR is continuous (including across the tarmac’d section that people park on presently) and include a request button proximate to cyclists to join Dundrum Road (as motorists maintain a good pace at that section of Dundrum Road.)</li> <li>• Suggests removal of the pinch point that causes conflict between cyclists with pedestrians at the Luas stop.</li> <li>• Suggests provision of seating in well-lit areas older people and teenagers.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1,2,3,4, 5 and Other Issues</p>

<p><b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0262</a></p>	<p><b>Person:</b> Deirdre Blake</p>	<p><b>Organisation:</b></p>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Likes the plan and the 10-minute walk concept in supports of bikes and pedestrians.</li> <li>• Thinks the big junction under the Luas bridge divides the area, is very pedestrian and cyclist unfriendly and is ugly.</li> <li>• Likes the idea of a community core area with the library at its heart</li> <li>• Considers it very important that the library is not cut off with much potential in having the library there helping to visually improve the location.</li> <li>• Contribution’s intent to counter the ‘very vocal pro-car lobby and reenforce that there is a lot of support for cycling and walking infrastructure.</li> <li>• Thinks car dependency contributes to ill health, pollution and climate change and is very unfriendly to nature and children.</li> <li>• Acknowledges some requirements for cars by certain members of the community yet believes improved social infrastructure, public transport and overall improvement in the public environment also benefits disabled people and people with poor mobility.</li> <li>• Supports the LAP and efforts to counter climate change as necessary for the future.</li> <li>• Thinks society must plan for a local-based culture for everyone rather than just for people who can afford to run a car.</li> <li>• Supports increasing housing.</li> <li>• Appreciates the opportunity to contribute and ‘the enormous amount of work and care that has gone into the plan’.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 2,4 and 5</p>		

<p><b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0263</a></p>	<p><b>Person:</b> Priscilla Lawrence Launois</p>	<p><b>Organisation:</b></p>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <p><b>Traffic and Transport Changes</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strongly opposes proposed pedestrian bridge to Sweetmount citing lack of need due to two other access routes and queries whether a cost-benefit analysis has been conducted regarding same.</li> <li>• Proposes that the provision of a new bridge to Sweetmount will lead to increased non-residential car-parking and more anti-social behaviour.</li> <li>• Submits that the bus gate from Ballinteer Road/Dom Marmion Bridge to Dundrum Main Street will close off access for thousands of people living to the east and southeast of Dundrum.</li> </ul>		

- Considers that a bus corridor from Main Street to Sweetmount Avenue will increase the bottleneck up Sweetmount Avenue and to the bypass.
- Cites potential for backlog of traffic if removal of left-turn filter lane occurs at Taney Cross.
- Questions safety risk of implementing a one-way southbound traffic and two-way cycle lanes on Sydenham Road.

**High-rise and high-density developments**

- Thinks the proposed scale of the Civic building is not in keeping with a village feel and that Usher House should be considered for the Civic Building.
- Questions process of Hammerson’s development application.

**General observations**

- Thinks draft plan lacks consideration for the elderly and people with mobility issues and that most of the proposed measures relate to walking and cycling.
- Believes proposed changes will negatively impact on access to medical and religious services.
- Thinks proposals for Main Street pose a serious danger for Ambulances/Fire Brigades to attend emergencies.
- Questions timing of consultation period happening in the summer when people are on holidays.
- Believes plan should not be progressed without a thorough review is particularly in regard to the Transport and Movement Section.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
 Chapters 2, 3, 4 and Other Issues

DLR Submission No: <u>B0264</u>	Person: Lynda Slattery	Organisation: Balally Resident's Association
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>                      Chairperson of the Balally Residents Association.                      Committee acknowledges and appreciates the extensive public consultation period provided by DLRCoCo in relation to this Plan.</p>		
<p><b>Infrastructure development</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Believes the height of Usher House should be considered as a benchmark height for future development on the main street.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Green space and Civic amenities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcomes proposed expansion of green spaces, including the greenway to/from Dundrum to the Dodder Park Greenway and the addition of a Civic Centre.</li> <li>• Notes that easy access to the Civic Centre will be paramount to its use and value to the greater Dundrum community.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Traffic proposals</b>                      Has significant concerns around proposed traffic changes regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sandyford Road congestion during numerous peak periods.</li> <li>• Balally estate being used as a ‘rat run’ and the impact on safety for children attending the National School in Balally as volumes of traffic often speed through the estate to avoid congestion on Sandyford Road.</li> <li>• The existing traffic congestion adversely impacts on many residents' ability to exit their homes with the pinch point heading south out of the estate.</li> <li>• Recognises Active Travel intentions while thinking that current public transport options are insufficient to change modal mindset.</li> <li>• Thinks LAP expectation of modal shift from car to bicycle use is the unrealistic due to Balally/Dundrum older demographic.</li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cites ‘significant and evolving younger family’ demographic of Balally demographic as unlikely to convert to cycling based on resident feedback.</li> <li>• Strongly opposed to proposed removal of the left filter slip road heading South on Sandyford Road at the RSA junction</li> <li>• Opposed to the left turn from Barton Road into Dundrum Village becoming a bus only turn.</li> <li>• Stresses a need to reconsider the transport chapter in particular anticipating longer journey times, increased congestion, higher emissions, and a reduced quality of life for the people of Dundrum.</li> </ul> <p><b>Economic Impacts</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that no economic impact assessment has been conducted to reflect how proposed changes may reduce prosperity in the business community.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2,3, 4 and Other Issues</p>

<p><b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0265</u></b></p>	<p><b>Person: Raphael King and Alan King</b></p>	<p><b>Organisation:</b></p>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submits approval for DLRCOCO’s efforts to improve the Dundrum area for everyone to enjoy the amenities available in the village.</li> <li>• Critical of plans for Dundrum Road anticipating higher traffic volumes and restrictions of access to the village and use of Luas in the future.</li> <li>• Submission believes more negative impacts will arise from change to a one-way system on various approach roads to the town centre including Ballinteer Rd near Main St and traffic lights at Ballinteer Avenue/Wyckham Way roundabout stating the two sets of pedestrian lights as ‘very safe for all’.</li> <li>• Believes the intent to encourage people to walk or cycle and not use their car is unrealistic citing the aging demographic.</li> <li>• Hopes the Council will take concerns seriously and reconsider the LAP proposals.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4</p>		

<p><b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0266</u></b></p>	<p><b>Person: Jack and Germaine Morrissey</b></p>	<p><b>Organisation: s</b></p>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission is concerned that the Draft LAP concentrates on cycling and walking and ignores the fact that most elderly people will be unable to cycle or walk on the very steep access routes into Dundrum village.</li> <li>• Submission criticises the Draft LAP as showing no parking facilities for the church or proposed new Civic Centre and Library making it impossible for the frail and elderly to use these.</li> <li>• Has concerns about proposals for Ballinteer Road (near Main Street) restricting access to the village services and medical facilities.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2 and 4</p>		

<p><b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0267</u></b></p>	<p><b>Person: Suzanne Boland</b></p>	<p><b>Organisation:</b></p>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Critical of Hammerson’s proposal for the OSC comparing it to the Ballymun flats.</li> <li>• Objects to one-way road access proposals to the village centre.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4 and Other issues</p>		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0268</a></b>	<b>Person: William Kedroff</b>	<b>Organisation: Private Citizen</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to some of the Road Changes proposed in the DLAP including bus gates and access via Barton Rd. East.</li> <li>• Submits changes will make access to shops and RC Church in Dundrum will be made very difficult with journeys to Stillorgan Village, Vincent's Hospital and beyond greatly impacted.</li> <li>• Considers restrictions on cars to be anti-older people who have reduced mobility.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0269</a></b>	<b>Person: Sylvia Roddie</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submits the draft plan is anti-people, especially the elderly.</li> <li>• Critical of cycle-lane provision suggesting current lanes are unused and the aging population will not convert transport mode from cars.</li> <li>• Believes the one-way system is causing people to avoid Dundrum village so local businesses are suffering and the two way system should be reinstated.</li> <li>• Critical of losing filter lanes at Taney junction and the impact on traffic journey times and more access difficulties.</li> <li>• Believes the civic hub will be inaccessible to many users if there is nowhere to park their cars and an inability to walk or cycle to it.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2, 3, 4 and 6		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0270</a></b>	<b>Person: Louise Whelan</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Critical of proposals for Barton Road East which experience congestion already.</li> <li>• Thinks the main artery into the village should be via the Sandyford Road to accommodate anticipated residential growth.</li> <li>• Objects to traffic restrictions at the large junction at the library.</li> <li>• Objects to changes at the Taney Churchtown Road junction.</li> <li>• Believes the focus of this draft plan is prioritising bus transport and pedestrians.</li> <li>• Considers the draft LAP to be ageist.</li> <li>• Thinks a transition from car to bus is not a feasible option for most of the community residents due to aging population and hills.</li> <li>• Questions what provision has been made for promoting safe used of the new upgrades and the legal enforcement when these upgrades are not followed by any road user either cyclist or motorists.</li> <li>• Cites a need for educational information sessions to encourage different road cohort users to use the facilities as they are intended.</li> <li>• Thinks that priority has been given to bus, bicycle and pedestrians to the detriment of the motorist-ignoring citizens with mobility access issues or physical disabilities.</li> <li>• Fears plan may contribute to the isolation of the elderly in the community due to access restrictions.</li> <li>• Convinced that the plan will impede footfall in the village if accepted.</li> <li>• Suggests a hop on hop off local loop bus as a counter to restrictions in support of older folk and folk with physical mobility issues in our community.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4 and 6		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0271</a></b>	<b>Person: Tony Kelly</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submits that traffic proposals in section 4 of the draft LAP will have a negative effect on Dundrum residents and community.</li> <li>• Considers that the proposed benefits are unlikely to materialise.</li> <li>• Critical that proposals for public transport will result in any benefits and sees the plan as an excuse for pushing motorists off the road.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4</p>		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0272</a></b>	<b>Person: Eamon O'Doherty</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission questions traffic and pedestrian assessment process.</li> <li>• Challenges proposal of bicycle use by older members of Dundrum as unrealistic.</li> <li>• Questions the professionalism and abilities of planners involved in the draft LAP development.</li> <li>• Challenges the pre-draft consultation process including observers and options considered.</li> <li>• Considers that a complete revision of the draft plan is critical.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4 and Other Issues</p>		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0273</a></b>	<b>Person: Mark Kavanagh</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers the one-way system in Dundrum is causing major problems for people doing basic business in the village.</li> <li>• Queries number of cyclists to justify giving space to. Critical of 12 storey proposals for Hammerson's site. States more public consultation is required of residents and close by residents who use the village.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4 and Other Issues</p>		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0274</a></b>	<b>Person: Bernie Gaskin</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcomes the draft of the LAP and supports any investment in Dundrum Village.</li> <li>• Believes proposed route restrictions will negatively impact on local traders and businesses.</li> <li>• Proposes that restrictions of cars at Ballinteer Road approaching Dundrum be deleted from any further consideration.</li> <li>• Submits that Dundrum Main Street should be returned to a two-way system.</li> <li>• Requests the removal of the cycle path from Dundrum Village as it's superfluous to need.</li> <li>• Thinks the one-way system has had a detrimental effect on the economic viability of Dundrum village.</li> <li>• Requests an independent economic assessment of the one-way system.</li> <li>• Requests a proper consultation with relevant resident associations and the Rate payers of Dundrum with DLR and their planners including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ An independent traffic analysis.</li> <li>○ An Economic survey specific to Dundrum.</li> <li>○ An analysis of the one-way system.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4 and 6</p>		



DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0275</a>	Person: Sean Gaskin	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcomes the draft of the LAP and supports any investment in Dundrum Village.</li> <li>• Believes proposed route restrictions will negatively impact on local traders and businesses.</li> <li>• Proposes that restrictions of cars at Ballinteer Road approaching Dundrum be deleted from any further consideration.</li> <li>• Submits that Dundrum Main Street should be returned to a two-way system.</li> <li>• Requests the removal of the cycle path from Dundrum Village as it's superfluous to need.</li> <li>• Thinks the one-way system has had a detrimental effect on the economic viability of Dundrum village.</li> <li>• Requests an independent economic assessment of the one-way system.</li> <li>• Requests a proper consultation with relevant resident associations and the Rate payers of Dundrum with DLR and their planners including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ An independent traffic analysis.</li> <li>○ An Economic survey specific to Dundrum.</li> <li>○ An analysis of the one-way system.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4 and 6</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0276</a>	Person: Brian Manners	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposes that the new Civic Centre/Library be called "The Electron" in honour of former Dundrum resident George Johnstone Stoney (1826-1911) after whom Stoney Road in Dundrum is named. Stoney was the scientist who named and identified the Electron.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 2</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0277</a>	Person: Gerald Caulfield	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission objects to the proposed barrier on Ballinteer Road which will prevent entry to Dundrum at Dundrum Cross restricting access businesses and services in the village for older people and those with a disability.</li> <li>• Notes these people are not capable of walking such distances or cycling.</li> <li>• Submits this proposal will frustrate many people causing them to go elsewhere for services and supplies further damaging the village.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0278</a>	Person: Mary Caulfield	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission objects to the proposed barrier on Ballinteer Road which will prevent entry to Dundrum at Dundrum Cross restricting access businesses and services in the village for older people and those with a disability.</li> <li>• Notes these people are not capable of walking such distances or cycling.</li> <li>• Submits this proposal will frustrate many people causing them to go elsewhere for services and supplies further damaging the village.</li> <li>• Queries whether a site inspection of Dundrum was carried out before preparing the draft plan.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4</p>		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0279</u></b>	<b>Person: Mary O'Farrell</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to Dundrum Village being pedestrianised as restrictions on parking in the Old Dundrum Shopping Centre would reduce ability to visit and shop in the village.</li> <li>• Concerned for businesses in Dundrum village if Main St. is pedestrianised.</li> <li>• Notes Dundrum has a large older population that drive to the village who will be impacted by pedestrianisation.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4 and 6		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0280</u></b>	<b>Person: Kevin and Geraldine O'Sullivan</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that traffic congestion on Upper and Lower Churchtown Road area will be compounded due to inability to complete a right turn onto Dundrum By-pass.</li> <li>• Submits that building a bus depot on one of the busiest roads in Dublin is out of scale in this location.</li> <li>• Submits that buses turning on the slip road beside St Nathi's Church every four minutes will negatively impact on the congested traffic on Upper Churchtown Road.</li> <li>• Considers a proposal to build a high-rise civic centre (lacking in design) is superfluous to need and a waste of public funds.</li> <li>• Submits the draft plan does not provide for adequate parking in the Dundrum area.</li> <li>• Objects to the Hammerson proposal to build a high-rise development in the old Dundrum SC.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2, 4 and Other Issues		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0281</u></b>	<b>Person: Katie Hackett</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that community is a core element of the heritage of Dundrum.</li> <li>• Very supportive of 10-minute neighbourhood concept. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Highlights Dundrum's relative advantage of having a wide variety of services, amenities, public spaces and places of employment within a 10-minute walk of each other.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers car traffic on Main Street is the main detraction from Dundrum currently.</li> <li>• Supportive of measures introduced on Main Street to provide cycle infrastructure and restrict car traffic. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Supports retention of cycle lanes and proposes further restrictions to vehicular traffic at peak business hours to improve bus mobility.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Highlights current impacts to bus journey times due to prevalence of car traffic. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Considers improving frequency and destinations of buses and providing a Luas service that runs later will alleviate car dependency.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Highlights importance of discouraging car use and encouraging public transport use amongst residents of future developments in order to avoid future transport issues. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Considers affordable pricing of new residential units contributes to achieving this.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Equates reduced volume of single occupancy cars (in particular SUVs) and increased bicycle and bus trips with thriving local community.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1 and 4		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0282</u>	Person: Jonathan Parkes	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highlights the decline of local businesses in the town centre since the construction of DTCS and considers this decline has accelerated since advent of one-way system on Main Street. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Proposes consideration of alternative traffic calming measures which allow for reinstatement of two-way system, while still supporting vibrant neighbourhood and access to shops/amenities.</li> <li>○ Raises concerns regarding the viability of the village if locals cannot readily access key businesses and facilities.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers Sydenham Road is too narrow to accommodate two-way cycle lanes and single vehicular traffic lane, as proposed under Draft LAP. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Notes safety issues for pedestrians/cyclists due to cars alighting from driveways.</li> <li>○ Proposes that an alternative cycle route could be considered along Stoney Road or Birches Lane.</li> <li>○ Queries requirement of proposed cycle route, noting availability of cycle routes on Overend Avenue and Taney Road.</li> <li>○ Notes Sydenham Road provides key access to local schools, noting that cycling to school is not feasible for some.</li> <li>○ Considers one-way system would give rise to traffic issues during times of high school traffic volumes.</li> <li>○ Queries impacts to emergency services access.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4 and 6</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0283</u>	Person: Elfie Eminova	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to proposed pedestrian/cycle bridge from Sweetmount Park to OSC site. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Queries necessity of bridge given easy availability of alternative access routes.</li> <li>○ States there are no amenities of public interest in area.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Objects to proposed Main Street to Churchtown Road Upper bus gate. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers this is unnecessary due to existing availability of buses adjacent to Luas bridge and on Churchtown Road Upper.</li> <li>○ Considers it would diminish accessibility to Carnegie Library, therefore negatively impacting community.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2 and 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0284</u>	Person: Dudley Dolan	Organisation: Taney Parish Primary School
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers measures proposed under Draft LAP would be disruptive to pupils, parents and staff of Taney Parish Primary School.</li> <li>• Requests inclusion of north arrows on all diagrams in Chapter 4 of LAP.</li> <li>• Highlights various terms used to refer to Taney Parish Primary School in LAP and requests use of uniform term (i.e 'Taney Parish Primary School') in interests of consistency.</li> <li>• Considers proposed one-way vehicular traffic systems will create difficulties accessing school. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Highlights on-going needs for parents of infants and children with special needs to bring children to/from school by car.</li> <li>○ States that cars travelling from Overend Avenue will be required to detour along heavily trafficked route on Birches Lane.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o States that cars travelling from Kilmacud Road Upper will need to detour along heavily trafficked route Drummartin Road / Taney Road junction.</li> <li>o States that cars exiting Sydenham Villas will have to divert through village or via Overend Avenue.</li> <li>o Highlights that school drop-off is not permitted on Overend Avenue and that there is no school warden operating on this road.</li> <li>o Considers proposed one-way systems will consequently disrupt education of children.</li> <li>• Requests consultation with school's Board of Management before any arrangements put in place. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Seeks consultation before implementing any proposed changes to parking and turnabout facilities on Sydenham Villas, as referred to in Chapter 8 of Draft LAP.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4 and Other Issues</p>

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0285</u></b>	<b>Person: Elfie Eminova</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposes that access to pedestrian bridge from Sweetmount Park to OSC should be restricted to access only by residents of The Laurels and Sweetmount residential areas on the basis that <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Other members of the public would not require access.</li> <li>o There are no amenities of public interest in the area.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers however that an additional access route from Sweetmount Park to Main Street is not required by residents of The Laurels/Sweetmount.</li> <li>• Concerns that proposed bridge would lead to increased litter, increased footfall and ecosystem impacts in the The Laurels/Sweetmount area.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 2</p>		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0286</u></b>	<b>Person: Dudley Dolan</b>	<b>Organisation: Taney Parish Primary School</b>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers measures proposed under Draft LAP would be disruptive to pupils, parents and staff of Taney Parish Primary School.</li> <li>• Requests inclusion of north arrows on all diagrams in Chapter 4 of LAP.</li> <li>• Highlights various terms used to refer to Taney Parish Primary School in LAP and requests use of uniform term (i.e 'Taney Parish Primary School') in interests of consistency.</li> <li>• Considers proposed one-way vehicular traffic systems will create difficulties accessing school. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Highlights on-going needs for parents of infants and children with special needs to bring children to/from school by car.</li> <li>o States that cars travelling from Overend Avenue will be required to detour along heavily trafficked route on Birches Lane.</li> <li>o States that cars travelling from Kilmacud Road Upper will need to detour along heavily trafficked route Drummartin Road / Taney Road junction.</li> <li>o States that cars existing Sydenham Villas will have to divert through village or via Overend Avenue.</li> <li>o Highlights that school drop-off is not permitted on Overend Avenue and that there is no school warden operating on this road.</li> <li>o Considers proposed one-way systems will consequently disrupt education of children.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Requests consultation with school's Board of Management before any arrangements put in place. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Seeks consultation before implementing any proposed changes to parking and turnabout facilities on Sydenham Villas, as referred to in Chapter 8 of Draft LAP.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4 and Other Issues</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0287</u>	Person: Finbar O'Foghlú	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of redevelopment of OSC site, however notes a number of issues with development framework for this site in Draft LAP. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers there was lack of public consultation regarding this aspect of Draft LAP.</li> <li>○ Considers Draft LAP proposals have been influenced by current SHD application at site.</li> <li>○ Considers the proposed heights of up to 11 storeys along Bypass (as referred to in Urban Design Report) represents massive overdevelopment of site, would be visually intrusive/overbearing.</li> <li>○ Considers scale disconnects residents from village.</li> <li>○ Proposes there should be limits to allowable proportion of residential development for MTC sites, highlighting need to provide civic/cultural/community/entertainment/business uses.</li> <li>○ Considers residential units should cater to families and should be for purchase by owner-occupiers only.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Highlights Ashgrove Terrace as example of recent sympathetic development by owners of OSC site. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Queries whether similar approach could be adopted along Main Street, with 2-storey buildings on east side.</li> <li>○ Considers such harmonious development is more appropriate for this ACA.</li> <li>○ Highlights that original facades are retained on many buildings on west side of street.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Proposes removal of temporary Covid-19 public realm/streetscape measures on Main Street/Dundrum Cross and reinstatement of two-way vehicular traffic system, noting importance of Main Street for access to and through area.</li> <li>• Proposes access restrictions (left in / left out only, complete closure of entrance on Ballinteer Road) for entrances to DTCSC car parks. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Notes existing access through surface car park to rear of Holy Cross Church.</li> <li>○ Considers proposed restrictions would reduce traffic congestion during peak commuter/shopping periods.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Concerned proposed vehicular traffic restrictions at Taney Cross would generate significant traffic congestion at junction. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers proposed Dodder to Dundrum pedestrian/cycle route will in any case remove pedestrians/cyclists from this junction.</li> <li>○ Suggests provision of a pedestrian/cyclists overbridge at this junction instead.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Skeptical of 15-minute neighbourhood concept, noting prevailing need for car to visit family/friends farther afield.</li> <li>• Considers a Dutch-style roundabout at junction of Barton Road East / Ballinteer Road would be unnecessary due to relatively low volume of cyclists in Ireland, challenging topography of area.</li> <li>• Considers a cycle/pedestrian bridge from Sweetmount Park to OSC site would be unnecessary. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Highlights convenient alternative access routes to Main Street, concerns at increased prevalence in residential area of loitering, littering, traffic volumes, parking and safety/security issues.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4 and Other Issues</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0288</u>	Person: Gerry and Geraldine Hume	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned at impacts of proposed roads and traffic measures, noting issues with previous such measures implemented by DLR. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Notes existing significant traffic management issues at Taney Cross junction.</li> <li>○ Considers measures will cause delays on traffic accessing village from all sides.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers complete revision of LAP is necessary. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers also the LAP is unnecessary.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

- States LAP does not consider community, noting curtailment of access to local amenities/services as a result of proposed measures.
  - Highlights particular impacts to elderly/mobility impaired.
- Considers LAP does not account for future prevalence of EVs and impact of same on reducing emissions.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapter 3, 4

DLR Submission No: <u>B0289</u>	Person: Eithne Ui Fhoghlu	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive to some extent of redevelopment of OSC site.</li> <li>• Considers however that current SHD application at site is ill considered and would have negative impacts on village.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Critical of lack of consultation regarding application.</li> <li>◦ Notes proposed heights of up to 16 storeys would be visually intrusive</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Concerned at impacts of pedestrian/cyclists bridge from The Laurels / Sweetmount Avenue including increased footfall, litter and anti-social behaviour.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Notes statement in Draft LAP that some pre-draft submissions called for improved permeability between OSC site and Sweetmount Park.</li> <li>◦ Considers these submissions did not come from residents most affected by bridge.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Queries need for proposed vehicular access restrictions on roads and increased cycle infrastructure.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Considers existing cycle lanes on Dundrum Bypass are preferable than Main Street to cyclists due to topography.</li> <li>◦ Concerned at impacts to residents who rely on car, e.g. travelling outside of Dublin to visit family, those making short local journeys, elderly people accessing services/amenities.</li> <li>◦ Concerned at environmental impacts of increased journey times.</li> <li>◦ Highlights aging population in Dundrum.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4 and Other Issues</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0290</u>	Person: Eric Roche	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned at traffic congestion impacts as a result of proposed Dundrum Road traffic calming and public realm improvements (as set out in Section 4.6.3.1 of Draft LAP), in particular due to redevelopment of CMH site and other residential developments.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Suggests improved pedestrian walkways and crossings would be sufficient.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Highlights utility/safety issues with cycle lanes in area due to breaks in continuity.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Considers dedicated cycle lanes needed throughout the area.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers there is need to develop park and ride facilities outside Dundrum area (e.g. at M50) with links to public transport.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0291</u>	Person: Ciara Kennedy	Organisation: Laurel and Sweetmount Residents' Association
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strongly objects to pedestrian/cycle route across Bypass from Sweetmount Park to OSC site / Main Street, primarily with reference to impact on Sweetmount/Laurels residential area.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Questions need for route, disputing statement in Section 2.9.2.4 of Draft LAP that there is "severance of the community to the west from Main Street".</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Notes convenient availability of 2 alternative pedestrian/cyclist access links from the residential area to Main Street.</li> <li>o Considers there are no amenities of public interest in the residential area.</li> <li>o Considers proposed route would cause increased car traffic/on-street parking in the residential area from visitors seeking to access town centre.</li> <li>o Considers this poses safety risk to children/elderly/mobility impaired.</li> <li>o Concerns that increased footfall would lead to increase in anti-social behaviour/loitering, stating that this has observed in Sweetmount Park in recent years.</li> <li>o Concerned at increase in litter, in particular in Slang River or onto Bypass (noting safety issue with litter).</li> <li>o Again notes increase in litter has been observed in recent years.</li> <li>o Considers proposed route presents safety/security issues due to improved access, noting prevalence of elderly, families with young children and single occupancy households in residential area.</li> <li>o Concerned at impacts to ecosystems.</li> <li>o States that all issues raised arose previously when temporary pedestrian bridge was provided during construction of Bypass.</li> <li>o Believes local Gardaí will echo concerns raised in this submission with reference to previous issues arising from temporary bridge.</li> <li>o Skeptical of statement in Section 2.2 of Draft LAP that some submissions called for improved pedestrian permeability between OSC site and Sweetmount Park.</li> <li>o Requests to see submissions in question.</li> <li>• Raises concerns with proposed transport measures at Dundrum Cross as set out in Section 4.6.1.1. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Notes issues with access to services/amenities of village/Main Street have arisen as a result of existing one-way system in place.</li> <li>o Highlights issues with existing cycle lane on Main Street including underutilisation, trip hazard of cycle lane kerbs, disruption to traffic flow and access of properties on street.</li> <li>o Calls for reinstatement of two-way vehicular traffic on Main Street and retention of two-way vehicular traffic access to Dundrum Cross from Ballinteer Road.</li> <li>o Concerns regarding increased car journey times and distances for residents of Sweetmount Park/Laurels residential area travelling to/from village and surrounding areas.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Calls for retention of two-way vehicular traffic on Sydenham Road due to traffic disruption concerns.</li> <li>• Critical of delivery of civic centre at Taney Cross KDA. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Considers site is too small and will require too many storeys for facility to be effective.</li> <li>o Recommends locating civic centre on more central site on or near Main Street with suitable access.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Concerned at prospect of high-density, high-rise development at OSC site. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Objects to 10/11 storey height limits suggested along Bypass.</li> <li>o Concerned at logistical, social and environmental impacts, negative impacts to village.</li> <li>o Supports redevelopment of OSC site in consultation with local residents.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Objects to proposed Main Street to Churchtown Road Upper bus gate as set out in Section 4.6.1.8, referencing safety, access, noise and pollution issues.</li> <li>• Requests more meaningful and robust consultation with local residents as part of decision-making in future.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2, 4 and Other Issues</p>

DLR Submission No: <u>B0292</u>	Person: Kieran O'Farrell	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to Draft LAP on basis of traffic impacts on roads providing access to Woodlawn Park.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0293</a>	Person: Pascal Launois	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers new apartment developments in Dundrum will likely be BTR, based on development trends and objectives of Draft LAP. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Considers due to this tenure there will be increased commuting into Dundrum and from Dundrum to city centre.</li> <li>o Concerned at carbon footprint impact of this, noting relatively low renewable energy use nationally.</li> <li>o Requests provision of policy in LAP prohibiting BTR.</li> <li>o Considers BTR developments are not suitable for families and negatively impact community spirit.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Appears to question whether building heights of 11 storeys are sensitive to prevailing heights of area.</li> <li>• Appears to raise concerns regarding Sweetmount Park to Main Street pedestrian/cycle bridge, noting cost benefit of bridge, safety issues for cyclists, increase in crime.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2 and 3</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0294</a>	Person: Al O'Tuathaigh	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highlights challenges to cycling due to topography of area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Proposes considering provision of subsidised e-bike schemes.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Requests enhancement of linkages between Sandyford village and Dundrum.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0295</a>	Person: Brian Caulfield	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of measures promoting safer and greener mobility in area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Considers that these measures in local area have had and will have various benefits including reductions in emissions, better air quality and safer urban realm.</li> <li>o Highlights research the these types of measures are beneficial to local businesses in the majority of cases.</li> <li>o Would like to see existing active travel/public realm measures in area retained.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 4 and 6</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0296</a>	Person: Jack Slattery	Organisation: Deveney's Dundrum
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcomes and supports any investment in Dundrum Village, however objects to Draft LAP due to a number of concerns.</li> <li>• Objects to proposals to restrict vehicular access from Ballinteer Road to Dundrum Cross, stating that restricting car access to local business will negatively impact vibrancy and liveability of area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submits that Dundrum Main Street be returned to a two-way traffic system, noting negative impacts to local businesses as a result of current one-way system.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Requests</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An independent survey on the one-way system.</li> <li>• An independent traffic survey on the village and surrounding areas</li> <li>• An economic survey for the area.</li> <li>• An analysis of the one-way system</li> </ul>		



- A proper consultation for relevant Res. Assoc and Ratepayers to allow time for residents to consider LAP as the information presented was not sufficient.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 4, 6 and 7

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0297</a>	Person: Stephen Barrett	Organisation: Tom Phillips + Associates
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission relates to a c.0.34 ha site at Uncle Tom’s Cabin, Dundrum Road, comprising a 2-storey stone/red-brick building (in uses as public house/coffee shop), ancillary storage sheds and surface car park.</li> <li>• Submission supports the Development Opportunity Site designation (Site No. 6 as identified in Figure 2.4) applied to part of this site in the Draft LAP. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Highlights site’s strategic location close to major roads, public transport and wide variety of services/amenities in town centre.</li> <li>○ Notes that designation appears to apply specifically to the lands to the north of the main building at the site (i.e the lands currently in use as a surface car park).</li> <li>○ Requests description/extent of Development Opportunity Site is amended to also include the main building.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Submission makes following points in support of request to extend Development Opportunity Site boundary to include the main building: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The building is zoned MTC under current CDP and represents and underutilisation of this zoning.</li> <li>○ It is the landowners’ intent that this building would be included in the future overall redevelopment of the site.</li> <li>○ It will allow for the creation of an enhanced street frontage as part of the future site redevelopment.</li> <li>○ It will allow for the provision of a greater range of uses throughout the site, which could contribute positively to the use mix in the area.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 2</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0298</a>	Person: Fionnuala Callan	Organisation: Member of Orwell Cycling Club
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of Draft LAP, in particular 10-minute city concept.</li> <li>• Supportive of Main Street to Churchtown Road Upper bus gate. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Queries whether smaller, single decker buses could be provided for this route.</li> <li>○ Highlights particular benefits to elderly and those who can’t walk/cycle.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Supportive of proposed cycle infrastructure. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Highlights cycling history / heritage associated with Dundrum.</li> <li>○ Suggests incorporation of this into public realm/placemaking proposals, e.g. providing a plaque / information boards / permanent bicycle tool stand / cyclist shelter area.</li> <li>○ Suggests considering provision of meeting area for cyclists/cycling clubs, noting that the existing OSC car park serves this function for some.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Suggests height limits of 6-8 storeys for new apartment developments. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers higher than this would be overly impersonal.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Requests provision of larger apartments with more storage and communal space, in order to facilitate liveability.</li> <li>• Highlights importance of access to nature for apartment residents.</li> <li>• Seeks provision of safeguards to ensure some new apartments are available to buy.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 3, 4 and 8</p>		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0299</u></b>	<b>Person: Finian Meehan</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests access issues that have arisen as a result of one-way vehicular traffic system on Main Street have dissuaded some from visiting village.</li> <li>• Concerned at further negative impacts to village as a result of measures proposed in Draft LAP.</li> <li>• Proposed reinstatement of two-way vehicular traffic system on Main Street.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b>		
Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0300</u></b>	<b>Person: Justin Carton</b>	<b>Organisation: The Concerned Residents of Old Frankfort CLG</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers existing infrastructure in area has been inadequate to serve existing developments since 2000.</li> <li>• States that junction and road upgrade works in Frankfort area have not been delivered, despite commitments to do so by DLR.</li> <li>• Considers existing traffic management issues on Dundrum Road and public transport congestion will be aggravated by possible development of identified Development Opportunity Sites along this road (as set out in Section 2.5 of Draft LAP).</li> <li>• Notes that other potential development sites including CMH site, Frankfort Castle, Frankfort Centre and Eir Data Centre (Sommerville) are not identified in Development Opportunity Site list, but may also contribute to issues.</li> <li>• Suggests that additional significant developments in Cherrywood area could also contribute to these issue.</li> <li>• Concerned at proposed redevelopment of Dom Marmion KDA, noting the existing Dom Marmion Centre located there is of significant value to elderly people in the local community.</li> <li>• Proposes inclusion of an objective to provide a similar facility on an alternative, easily accessible site within the village, as term of development of site.</li> <li>• Highlights benefit provision of civic centre will provide for local arts groups for whom rehearsal space is lacking.</li> <li>• Requests inclusion of flexible classrooms / rehearsal space in this building.</li> <li>• States Sydenham Road provides essential vehicular access for parents/guardians to local schools.</li> <li>• Considers the proposed one-way vehicular system on this road will present difficulties in this regard.</li> <li>• Queries need for 2 cycle lanes, noting topography of this road and adjoining roads.</li> <li>• With reference to Section 4.6.1.6, highlights need to provide suitable and adequate car parking for Holy Cross Church, noting loss of current parking with redevelopment of OSC site.</li> <li>• Considers traffic movement into and around village needs to be addressed prior to consideration of residential or commercial development.</li> <li>• Highlights significant increase in car journey times for some trips as a result of traffic restrictions currently in place.</li> <li>• Notes issue of carbon emissions as a result of this.</li> <li>• Proposes up-to-date traffic surveys including cyclists and pedestrians should be undertaken, with access requirements for community to be extrapolated from same.</li> <li>• Considers existing restrictions introduced as temporary measures in response to pandemic have 'destroyed' character of Dundrum.</li> <li>• Have also fostered issues including litter, anti-social behaviour and safety issues arising from cycle lane kerbs.</li> <li>• Considers public realm landscaping and furniture is unattractive/poor quality.</li> <li>• Considers that kerbside bus stops on Main Street contribute to congestion, noting there is sufficient space at Holy Cross Church to provide a bus bay.</li> <li>• Concerned at effect of proposed Ballinteer Road bus gate on traffic access to village.</li> <li>• Considers proposal will inhibit delivery and emergency access to village/surrounding areas.</li> </ul>		

- Welcomes wildlife and biodiversity proposals along Slang River as set out under Section 5.3.1 of Draft LAP.
- Notes it will prevent future development near the river at the identified Development Opportunity Sites.
- Considers greenway along river needs to be amended to ensure proper provision for habitats and water soakaways.
- Highlights need to provide traffic lights at junctions intersecting Windy Arbour NC to ensure pedestrian safety at these during construction works at CMH site.
- Considers LAP preparation process should be slower in order to sufficiently consider all interests and allow a more balanced approach.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 2, 3, 4, 5 and Other Issues

DLR Submission No: <u>B0301</u>	Person: Tom	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strongly opposes the proposed plan.</li> <li>• Notes traffic issues in Dundrum due to making the main street one-way. The LAP will worsen this and displace more traffic onto the already overcrowded outskirts.</li> <li>• The LAP will have a negative impact on local businesses located along the Main Street with regards to various proposals for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Windy Arbour (section 4.6.3.1), the Dundrum Bypass to Wyckham Way along Sandyford Road as far as Main Street (section 4.6.1.1), southbound access from Dundrum bypass to Main Street (section 4.6.1.1) Taney Cross (section 4.6.1.2) and Sandyford Road (Northern part) as far as Main Street (section 4.6.1.3).</li> <li>○ Believes there will be an increase in severe congestion and unnecessary delays as a result of Bus priority and the elimination of all left-turn lanes passing through Taney Cross (section 4.6.1.2).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Thinks there is no need for the plan.</li> <li>• States plan is very anti-people and only concerned with walking and cycling.</li> <li>• Thinks the plan takes no account that most people will be unable to cycle on steep slopes in and around Dundrum.</li> <li>• Believes the plan will force people to do business elsewhere which will result in local business closures and taking the life out of the village.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 4 and 6</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0302</u>	Person: Philomena Hanratty	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Critical of plan's potential and believes it a waste of time.</li> <li>• Believes the main Street in Dundrum should be reinstated as a two-way route.</li> <li>• States that various proposed route alterations will only have a negative impact on residents and their ability to access the village businesses.</li> <li>• Thinks the route changes will increase GHG emissions.</li> <li>• Submits the one-way system has caused problems with access for emergency services.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 4 and 6</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0303</u>	Person: Aine	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strongly opposes the proposed plan.</li> <li>• Cites current situation with bad traffic issues in Dundrum due to making the main street one-way.</li> </ul>		

- Thinks implementing the draft LAP will only worsen the problem by displacing more traffic onto the already overcrowded outskirts.
- Believes the plan will have a significantly negative impact on local businesses located along the Main Street with regards to various proposals for:
  - Windy Arbour (section 4.6.3.1), the Dundrum Bypass to Wyckham Way along Sandyford Road as far as Main Street (section 4.6.1.1), southbound access from Dundrum bypass to Main Street (section 4.6.1.1) Taney Cross (section 4.6.1.2) and Sandyford Road (Northern part) as far as Main Street (section 4.6.1.3).
  - Believes there will be an increase in severe congestion and unnecessary delays as a result of Bus priority and the elimination of all left-turn lanes passing through Taney Cross (section 4.6.1.2).
- Thinks there is no need for the plan.
- States plan is very anti-people and only concerned with walking and cycling.
- Thinks the plan takes no account that most people will be unable to cycle on steep slopes in and around Dundrum.
- Believes the plan will force people to do business elsewhere which will result in local business closures and taking the life out of the village.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 1, 4 and 6

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0304</a>	Person: Fergus Madden	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thinks the plan is out of proportion for the area.</li> <li>• The LAP will cause Dundrum to lose its village feeling and become more like the inner city.</li> <li>• Recent traffic restrictions have made access extremely difficult and these plans will make things worse.</li> <li>• Apartment developments should be in scale with the local area and not seen to crowd out everything else.</li> <li>• Submits that the plan for Dundrum should be more akin to the villages of Rathfarnham, Terenure and Rathgar.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 2 and 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0305</a>	Person: Deirdre OBoyle	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission outlines concerns with various changes to routes around Dundrum.</li> <li>• Cites potential for increase in emissions from congested traffic flows and longer routes to the town centre.</li> <li>• Believes the plan is only concerned with walking and cycling and does not take the ageing population of Dundrum into account.</li> <li>• Wonders where all the electric cars will go when they come on stream in 2030.</li> <li>• Submits that the plan will change the dynamics of Dundrum to be a deserted village.</li> <li>• Concludes that there is no need or demand for this plan and that it is anti-people.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1 and 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0306</a>	Person: Ronan Stewart	Organisation: s Association
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submits the LAP should be community-based and informed by the community.</li> <li>• Thinks current traffic problems are a result of previous planning.</li> <li>• Requires a working body of work from the new Bus routes before any LAP implementations.</li> </ul>		

- Believes the draft plan does not appear to have the required consultation or a clear on-going plan for Dundrum village taking into account the demographics of the population and local businesses.
- Submits that changes already actioned have caused a sharp disconnect between businesses/services and the core of the community.
- Believes the heart of the village will be lost under the proposed LAP as the population ages.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 1, 4, 6 and Other Issues

**DLR Submission**  
No: B0307

**Person:** Emma Morton

**Organisation:**

**Summary of Submission / Observation:**

- Submits that the bus gate proposed by section 4.6.1.2 Taney Cross and Environs will create noise and air pollution and negatively impact on the quality of submitter's family's life.
- Believes that the site for Dundrum Community and Cultural Civic Centre is not suitable for such a large building and the height of the building will negatively impact on the landscape of Dundrum and overshadow the residential area ref. 2.9.3 Taney Cross KDA (TC).

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 2 and 4

**DLR Submission**  
No: B0308

**Person:** Hugh McBryan

**Organisation:**

**Summary of Submission / Observation:**

**LAP Process**

- Submitter is an active walker, cyclist and EV driver.
- Critical of communication of the Plan and states timing of the public consultation phase is too short and inappropriate. (Submitter says they were oblivious to the earlier Pre-Draft Consultation).
- Refers to residents' associations as having too little time to review the draft plan and make informed submissions due to the holiday period.
- Thinks the 6-week public consultation period at this time of year is clearly inadequate.
- Submits that residents' associations (and other representative organisations) should have been involved prior to the public consultation phase to allow them to prepare their members for what was coming down the line.

**Population (Section 1.8)**

- Critical of focus on population within the DLAP area while neglecting the fact that the outlying populations are who predominantly use, or should be using, the facilities which the Town offers.
- Believes planning for Dundrum should fully embrace the population of the much wider neighbourhoods.
- Acknowledges the future increases of a much younger demographic within the surrounding area while citing that existing population of neighbouring estates are likely to continue to be significantly older and will be badly restricted in the future under the draft LAP.
- Considers that housing prices are likely to maintain a higher aging population in outlying estates who won't move to more expensive accommodation.
- Appreciates the idea of a compact town but says Dundrum needs to continue to serve a population living beyond the LAP boundaries who will not be fit to always walk or cycle to avail of what the Town has to offer.

**Landmark Building (TC KDA 2.9.3):**

- Believes that 11 storeys in this location would be an eyesore, not a landmark.
- Suggests that the height of the current Usher Building should be taken as a general limit for any development.
- Acknowledges that a sizeable Civic Centre would be a great asset to the Town.
- Thinks several objectives of the proposal could be readily achieved by a building at this location if it spans the Bypass (and perhaps also the lower end of Main St. to create a real landmark.

- Submits the civic building should incorporate the Public Transport Hub (TC3) as well as public spaces (TC5). Thinks that with permanently open lifts, user-friendly traffic-free access could be achieved between both sides of the Bypass, the Buses and the Luas (directly onto the platform).

**Transport:**

- Questions why connectivity for pedestrians between the Luas and Dundrum Town Centre wasn't considered at development stage.
- Submits that Active Travel has not been adequately addressed.
- Thinks the emphasis on walking and cycling within the DLAP pays scant regard to this aging aspect of the community progression.
- Feels that the proposal for Dundrum Cross (Junction Main St. Ballinteer Rd. 4.6.1.1) is included purely to force residents on this side of the Town to use the Town Centre Carparks every time they visit the village. Thinks the access and egress points to the Centre's carparks is an inappropriate location.
- Is critical of proposed changes to Ballinteer Road.
- Thinks restricting access to Main St. from Ballinteer Rd. would add unnecessarily to traffic circulating around the Town Centre.
- Submits that removal of left-turn slip lanes will be clearly detrimental to traffic flows at Taney Cross junction while removal of right-turns would do much more to improve the efficiency of this, or any, junction.
- Opposes a Bus Gate in front of the existing Library.
- Cites there is no mention in the Environmental section of the draft plan of what will become of the tree outside the Library should this progress.
- Thinks that the Balally Luas Station Mobility Hub (4.6.2.4) will be a welcome addition but that the Hub that will be very isolated.
- Questions what benefit has been achieved by the provision of cycle lanes on Main Street and by the significant disruption to standard routes that have resulted.
- Submits that the safety and encouragement of cyclists in the town could have been readily achieved by traffic calming measures and a 25kph speed limit.
- Critical of the Bus Connects plan thinking it doesn't include new connections to other modes of transport.
- Suggests that DLR should ensure that implementation of the Bus Connects plan will include some bus connections to the Windy Arbor Luas Station.
- Supports the proposal for an at-grade pedestrian/cycle bridge from Sweetmount Ave. to the redeveloped OSC area as it will avoid having to drop to the lowest point of Dundrum just to cross the busy Bypass.
- Thinks that the Draft Plan tends to ignore the topography of Dundrum and that it is important every opportunity should be seized to 'level the playing field' for everyone.

**Vibrancy:**

- Suggests that much of what is currently wrong with Dundrum as a town relates to a very high level of dereliction among key buildings in the centre and has not noticed anything in the Draft Plan that will ensure that this sort of persistent dereliction will be finally eliminated.
- Welcomes the Draft Plan and admires its quality but finds the use of acronyms and abbreviations without and easily accessible glossary to be confusing (OSC ODSC KDA TC DM ABTA etc.).
- Believes that many readers may be put off trying to understand the report and its structure.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
 Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4 and Other Issues

<b>DLR Submission No:</b> <a href="#">B0309</a>	<b>Person:</b> John Mullins	<b>Organisation:</b>
---	-----------------------------	----------------------

<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter believes that elderly residents have not been considered properly as there is no question regarding submitters' ages on the consultation page.</li> <li>• Submitter notes that they cannot cycle and has difficulty walking even a short distance.</li> </ul>

- Considers that the draft LAP proposals will negatively impact on people who will experience restrictions to their mobility and car use which they need to visit the dentist, village pharmacy and Holy Cross church regularly.
- Notes that access is already difficult with current transport arrangements and will be even more so if the LAP is carried out.
- The LAP will not be helpful to senior citizens in the area, and they should be shown more consideration as a group which needs easy access and convenient parking.
- Objects to the plan further restricting this access and requests that the plan be reconsidered for the many seniors that do need to use personal transport to get out on a regular basis.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 3, 4 and Other Issues

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0310</a>	Person: Audrey O'Neill	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to car access being taken away for all traffic coming from Barton Road east as it will prevent elderly residents from having easy access to essential services in the village.</li> <li>• Restricting access to the village has already caused difficulty to emergency services with the existing one-way system which will be further compounded by the proposed LAP.</li> <li>• States that restrictions to accessing the church will have extremely negative impacts on older residents' social interactions.</li> <li>• Believes that existing changes made to Main Street Dundrum with cycleway dividing blocks is causing many accidents from bikes and falls and is a health and safety issue.</li> <li>• Raises concerns about the potential scarcity of parking spaces reflected in the draft plan which will likely cause further congestion.</li> <li>• Believes the proposal draft doesn't include preserving the old with the new and ignores the very character that local residents and businesses have spent many years building.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4 and 8		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0311</a>	Person: Anne McCoy	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that the one way system in the village have severely impacted public transport choices due to mobility issues.</li> <li>• Requests that public transport is accessible for all residents in the new developments and don't impact on the needs of current residents.</li> <li>• Requests that the plan ensures there are accessible green spaces as Marley Park is too far to walk to citing the need for large green spaces with facilities.</li> <li>• Notes the need for places for young people, citing that Balally Luas station is now a "hangout" for young people and is a threatening place to use at night.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 3, 4 and 5		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0312</a>	Person: Stuart Dawson	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter notes that they are a motorist, cyclist and walker.</li> <li>• Believes their ability to move will be fundamentally impacted by the ABTA proposals.</li> <li>• Understands the objective to improve walking and cycling capabilities and facilities but cannot accept the negative impact many of the proposals will have on private car and public transport drive times in their neighbourhood.</li> </ul>		

- Believes the plan will result in even worse congestion and DLRCoCo has an obligation to ensure traffic flows efficiently.
- Objects to the removal of the left turns at Sandyford Rd/Blackthorn Rd junction (DAR19) and Sandyford Rd/Wyckham Way (DAR17) as both left turn lanes at these junctions help the traffic flow.
- Submits that the two stage crossing at a left turn lane is actually comforting to pedestrians.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapter 4

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0313</a>	Person: Thomas Gorey	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers that previous changes have ruined the entire character and accessibility of Dundrum village for no gain and should be reversed.</li> <li>• Objects to the proposed Bus Gates believing that proposed from main street to Churchtown Road Upper will be dangerous for children and adults who use Carnegie library and will also bring more traffic into a private estate.</li> <li>• The plan gives priority to pedestrians and cyclists who benefit and use minimally and discriminates against the motorist and people with mobility issues.</li> <li>• Believes the plan will increase travel times for motorists getting around the Dundrum Area and carbon emissions will increase as a result.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0314</a>	Person: John O'Donnell	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Asks how they will access services and church in the village if no parking is allowed stating funerals will be even more problematic.</li> <li>• Critical of lack of information circulated about the draft plan or the process involved.</li> <li>• Thinks DLR should have communicated directly with residents.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4 and Other Issues		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0315</a>	Person: Cillian McDowell	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter thanks the council for developing the draft plans and the effort involved.</li> <li>• Thinks the plans are great.</li> <li>• Submits there is a clear need for more housing.</li> <li>• Strongly supports the prioritisation of public transport and walking and cycling in Dundrum.</li> <li>• Is sure there will be disruptions to traffic as a result and, although a car driver, submitter recognizes that public and active transport are currently disrupted as a result of cars (which does not always suit them when they cycle).</li> <li>• Believes finding a balance between the two is important and thinks the proposed plans do that well.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 3 and 4		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0316</a>	Person: Jonathan Hickey	Organisation: Macenas Ltd (Board of Directors of the Frankfort Centre)
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
Submission notifies of their ownership of the northern plot on Dundrum Road of the Frankfort Centre and welcomes the identification of the Frankfort Centre as an Opportunity Site.		



**Variety of Uses**

- Submits that Policy DLAP 42 of the draft LAP requiring the Frankfort Centre to provide “a variety of uses that meets the needs of the community it serves” is unnecessary given that the current zoning objective NC in the CDP already designates it “To protect, provide for and/or improve mixed-use NC facilities.”
- States that the centre continues to be a ‘massive success’ and the submitter has been advised that there will be little to no demand for retail uses at Frankfort Centre.
- Submits that the Frankfort Centre should not be treated as an opportunity to promote further retail or other commercial services in the area as poor viability will negatively constrain the ability of the plot to be redeveloped.
- Cites a planning application for proposed development (reg. ref. D22A/0255) currently before Bord Pleanála which includes an active ground floor use in the form of a café of 105m2 as being the only use that might be successful at the centre, given its positioning at the corner of Dundrum Road and Frankfort Road.
- States the endorsing submission from DLR planning report to ABP regarding this application as being in conflict with proposals for the plot.
- States the draft LAP designation would impose tangibly unrealistic and unviable criteria if applied to this particular property.
- Believes the local authority is in agreement with there being no real necessity to push for further retail/services in the area, and that any such commercial space in any future development should be limited to what is demonstrably viable.

**Objectives NC1 and NC2**

- Submits that a requirement for Frankfort Centre to provide enhanced active travel amenities and urban greening measures for the Dundrum Road is vague, onerous and beyond the requirements of NC zoning.
- Submitter believes it should not be the requirement of a private owner to deliver these services to the public, which is more appropriate to Council-owned or controlled lands.
- Requests the council recognizes that there are extensive green areas directly across the road from the site that are in the ownership of the local authority, and that the roadway there widens significantly for the 100m stretch opposite the Frankfort Centre.
- Believes that such matters are highly site specific and should be dealt with as part of the normal planning process, to ensure that additional demands on brownfield development do not fatally constrain the feasibility of otherwise viable projects within the area of the Local Area Plan.
- Submits that the NC zoning definition in the CDP is sufficient and should not be further amplified in the LAP through a requirement that a future development of the site should “...provide active street frontage to Dundrum Road and a suitable mix of permissible NC uses which enhances the offering of this NC to the local community” as it will be self-defeating by virtue of constraining otherwise positive development.
- Submits that the requirement for Frankfort Centre to provide Active Street Frontage along the Dundrum Road should be amended to “active street frontage where appropriate to the proposed use.” Otherwise, it could inadvertently reduce the range of neighbourhood uses available and significantly impact any potential future development.
- Draws attention to DLR’s assessment of active street frontage provision in application D22A/0255 at the corner of Dundrum Road which was considered sufficient and acceptable to the PA in 2023.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
 Chapters 2 and 6

<p><b>DLR Submission No: B0317</b></p>	<p><b>Person: Anika Haget</b></p>	<p><b>Organisation: McCutcheon Halley Chartered Planning Consultants on behalf of UCC</b></p>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission is on behalf of UCC who operate the Irish Management Institute. Focus of this submission is on proposed transportation interventions of strategic importance to the LAP lands which would significantly improve connectivity and movement between Dundrum and the wider area, including to the Irish Management Institute.</li> </ul>		

- The history of the IMI is set out in detail.
- The site context of the IMI is set out in detail.
- National, regional and local planning policy is set out in detail including NPF NPOs relating to regeneration, alternatives to the car and pollution, RSES objectives and CDP policy objectives.
- Submission notes that the IMI is located within the ABTA study area and highlights that the IMI is as a leading third level educational institution is located within a 7-minute cycling and 15-minute walking distance from Dundrum Town Centre and should therefore be considered for the inclusion of relevant infrastructure upgrade measures.
- Submission notes only 23 of the 30 recommendations set out in the ABTA were included as objectives to support the DLAP.
- UCC welcomes the inclusion of the proposed junction upgrade at Sandyford Road/Wyckham Way/Overend Avenue (DAR17) as Objective T16 in the draft LAP as this will allow for the creation of a safe and attractive environment at this junction and encouraging active travel.
- Considers that omission of DAR 18 Sandyford Road Cycle Facilities Upgrade and 19 Sandyford Road and Blackthorn Drive Junction Upgrade in the DLAP misses out on a valuable opportunity to ensure an integrated network for walking and cycling in the local area. Requests their inclusion.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapter 4

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0318</a>	Person: David Howley	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appreciates the planning and work that has gone into the LAP.</li> <li>• Objects to the removal of traffic from the village as this will further negatively affect local businesses on the Main Street.</li> <li>• Prefers that two-way traffic flow is restored.</li> <li>• Suggests that the cycle lanes are extremely under-utilised.</li> <li>• Thinks the council should review their effectiveness and objectively reconsider the access for motor vehicles</li> <li>• Urges that the Hammerson's proposal is reconsidered and capped at 4 floors or less.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4 and Other Issues</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0319</a>	Person: Susan Reid	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requests that the Dundrum ACA area is specifically considered in the LAP as it is important to retain both its character and its functionality, especially for older or less mobile residents.</li> <li>• The heritage present in this area should take precedence over any desire for extreme high density residential developments at the old Dundrum S.C. site.</li> <li>• Dundrum's distinct character should be preserved rather than damaged by overdevelopment.</li> <li>• Welcomes the idea of a park at the OSC, to link the West side of Dundrum and to develop the Northern end of Dundrum and to make it all much more of a connected open space.</li> <li>• Believes that any development in the town centre should be no higher than 8 floors to avoid overshadowing and domination of Dundrum main street.</li> <li>• The development of the Old Dundrum Mental Hospital negates the need for 'extreme high density' in the village centre citing dormant sites in Sandyford Industrial estate still needing to be redeveloped.</li> <li>• Requests a safe drop-off area near the church grounds for those less mobile or unable to use public transport.</li> <li>• Suggests this area will need to be monitored to ensure drop-off point remains clear and traffic keeps flowing.</li> <li>• Suggests area in front of the church be reviewed as the step up onto the path has become a trip-hazard due to lack of a visible divide between path and the area in front of it.</li> <li>• Thinks there are better ways to encourage people on to bikes rather than banning the use of cars.</li> </ul>		

- Suggests that more electric bike rental and options for locals to rent out the kid/cargo carriers could encourage more cycle lane use for those who don't have access to a bicycle already.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 2, 4 and 8

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0320</a>	Person: Joyce Farnan	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submits that the draft LAP is 'another ill-thought-out plan by the council for Dundrum' .</li> <li>• Notes that many Dundrum businesses are long-term legacy enterprises which will continue to suffer due to lack of footfall unless Main Street is reopened to two-way traffic again.</li> <li>• Believes that the new proposals will adversely impact the aging population of Dundrum noting the social value of attending mass and go to the post office/pharmacy/GP/bank etc. which has been affected by the one-way system.</li> <li>• Believes the one-way system is a serious health and safety issue affecting movement of ambulances and fire-engines.</li> <li>• Requests a reduction of bicycle lanes and opening of Dundrum to the locals.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 4 and 6		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0321</a>	Person: Paul Naessens	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Views the Draft LAP as a large and complex plan with a lot of positive things in it.</li> <li>• Thinks the creation of a bus gate across the front of the Carnegie library could result in the potential loss of amenity of the small square in front of the library.</li> <li>• Sees this square as one of the few public (i.e. not private/commercial) meeting spaces in Dundrum which is well used.</li> <li>• Thinks any gain attained seems non-existent or minimal as busses will continue to turn right onto the main St. and left up Upper Churchtown Road.</li> <li>• Submits that this bus gate will negatively impact on safe, pedestrian access to the library and a diminution of the quiet, historic green oasis in the St Nahy's enclosure which the draft plan points to and indicates a plan to include a wetland area behind the library (damage to rare pieces of heritage and character).</li> <li>• Considers that the passage of continuous bus traffic, labouring in 1st or 2nd gear uphill at a steep turn would make it noise and air polluted.</li> <li>• Believes the negative effects are impossible to reconcile with stated principles of the draft plan concerning improved access, the 10-minute city, respect for heritage.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0322</a>	Person: Brenda Doyle	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strongly objects to draft LAP proposal of denying access to Dundrum village via Barton Road.</li> <li>• Is concerned this change will cause immense hardship for locals and especially for the elderly of the village needing easy access to use the banks, shops, cafes and go to mass on a regular basis.</li> <li>• Submits that the plan is not in touch with the residents' needs.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 3 and 4		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0323</u>	Person: Kate Shearer	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests more consideration of local residents before publishing the plan.</li> <li>• Cites plan by Imagine Dundrum as not been taken into account in preparation of the draft LAP.</li> <li>• Regarding Chapter 3: 3.2.5. Potential new Community, Cultural and Civic Centre asks what will happen to the Carnegie building should a new library be included within the civic centre.</li> <li>• Questions location of the new civic centre on a triangle of land with very poor motor access and zero parking.</li> <li>• Asks whether extra monies will be allocated to support the Mill Theatre which struggles with severe underfunding.</li> <li>• Compares the proposed new civic amenity with the Mill Theatre asking if a forward budget for upkeep and management will be in place each year to ensure viability.</li> <li>• Notes the need for motorists to be considered along with pedestrians and cyclists in preparing the plan.</li> <li>• Considers restriction of access for those who cannot walk or cycle.</li> <li>• Considers road changes from Sandyford Road on to the Ballinteer Road which is also an access for Sandyford Industrial Estate will cause traffic jams.</li> <li>• Considers the changes to traffic routes to be ill-considered and anti-motorist.</li> <li>• Suggests their should have car parking near the bus terminal.</li> <li>• Wonders who will use buses when the Luas tram is so close.</li> <li>• Suggests more investment needed into the Luas rather than buses to avoid more pollution and illegal parking in residential areas.</li> <li>• Thinks idea of Dundrum being a car free zone is excellent but not realistic.</li> <li>• Submits that a rethink of the draft LAP is required with reversion to proposals from Imagine Dundrum plan the best option.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2, 3, 4 and Other Issues</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0324</u>	Person: Eoin Daly	Organisation: Office of the Planning Regulator
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b> This submission is summarized in full in Volume 1 in accordance with section 20 (3) (c) (ii)(II) of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 (as amended).</p>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 2 under the following heading(s):</b> <b>Overview of the Submission, Main Issues Raised and Recommendations Made by the Office of the Planning Regulator</b></p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0325</a>	Person: Louse Carpenter	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not support Draft LAP.</li> <li>• Considers data informing LAP is out of date as it comes from 2016 Census.</li> <li>• Supports more inclusive and environmentally conscious community.</li> <li>• Concerned that one-way system on Main Street has exacerbated congestion issues in area, including at Taney Cross, Sandyford Road and Churchtown Road. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Requests additional traffic management and cycle lane use surveys.</li> <li>○ Notes no information on cycle lane usage is provided in LAP.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Concerned at impact to local businesses as a result of access restrictions and consequential impacts to vibrancy of village and community life. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Notes in particular difficulties for delivery access, elderly, mobility impaired, issues due to weather.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers proposed measures do not align with DLR values of inclusivity and accessibility for all on basis of issues raised.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 3, 4 and 6</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0326</a>	Person: Dee	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports proposed measures to reduce vehicular traffic on Main Street.</li> <li>• Suggests considering full pedestrianisation of village. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers this would bring life back to village.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4 and 6</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0327</a>	Person: Peggy Mason	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Critical of LAP, noting impacts to elderly and mobility impaired who are unable to cycle. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers LAP will restrict access to local amenities.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers proposed civic centre has not been coherently planned and will not serve the community. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Queries access and parking arrangements.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Supportive of redevelopment of OSC site, however raises concerns with ownership by international investment funds, lack of enhancement to village, impacts to light, health and wellbeing of residents of Sweetmount Avenue.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2, 3 and 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0328</a>	Person: Mark Johnston	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Raises concerns with Section 3.3.5.2 / Policy DLAP18 'Building Height' of Draft LAP. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers heights of civic centre and new apartment buildings around Main Street should be restricted to 4/5 storeys.</li> <li>○ Notes heights may be higher on Bypass.</li> <li>○ States proposed heights should consider issues arising from height imbalance of adjacent housing at Sweetmount/The Laurels.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers apartments should not be small in size, in order to facilitate long term use.</li> <li>• Raises concerns with negative impacts of one-way systems proposed, noting impacts to existing businesses.</li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcomes focus on walking/cycling in LAP, however feels proposals go too far. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Concerns at use of cycle lanes by e-scooters/e-bikes.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Queries whether reduced car parking provision has been considered in respect of new apartments planned, noting predicted impacts of apartments on existing traffic congestion.</li> <li>• Considers LAP will have significant impact on jobs in village area, noting the need to retain these jobs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Concerned that people will instead drive outside the area to access services.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2, 3, 4, 6 and 7</p>

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0329</a>	Person: Margaret Richardson	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers LAP discriminates against the most vulnerable in society, namely children, people with physical/mental disabilities/special needs and their families, carers/SNAs.</li> <li>• Highlights many people with disabilities cannot walk/cycle or use public transport.</li> <li>• Highlights that access/parking for specially adapted vehicles of disability service providers and families in Dundrum and other areas will be prohibited. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers this will result in exclusion of these groups attending services, in particular in Dundrum village, including facilities in new civic centre.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Notes needs of certain groups amongst those identified to easily access car parking spaces as close as possible to schools.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 3 and 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0330</a>	Person: Mark Johnston	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers Draft LAP is comprehensive and well thought-out overall</li> <li>• Raises concerns with Section 3.3.5.2 / Policy DLAP18 'Building Height' of Draft LAP. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers heights of civic centre and new apartment buildings around Main Street should be restricted to 4/5 storeys.</li> <li>○ Notes heights may be higher on Bypass.</li> <li>○ States proposed heights should consider issues arising from height imbalance of adjacent housing at Sweetmount/The Laurels.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers apartments should not be small in size, in order to facilitate long term use.</li> <li>• Raises concerns with negative impacts of one-way systems proposed, noting impacts to existing businesses.</li> <li>• Welcomes focus on walking/cycling in LAP, however feels proposals go too far. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Concerns at use of cycle lanes by e-scooters/e-bikes.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Queries whether reduced car parking provision has been considered in respect of new apartments planned, noting predicted impacts of apartments on existing traffic congestion.</li> <li>• Considers LAP will have significant impact on jobs in village area, noting the need to retain these jobs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Concerned that people will instead drive outside the area to access services.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2, 3, 4, 6 and 7</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0331</a>	Person: Siobhán O'Connor	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fully supportive of Draft LAP. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Hopeful that Draft LAP will be adopted in its entirety.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

- Welcomes proposed walking/cycling infrastructure upgrades (in particular on Main Street and Ballinteer Road).
  - States that walking/cycling to village currently is highly unpleasant, noting significant vehicular traffic and on-street parking dominates area.
  - Considers proposed traffic restrictions on Ballinteer Road at Dundrum Cross will significantly enhance environment aesthetically and improve air quality.
- Supportive of location of proposed landmark building at northern end of Main Street, noting its remove from low-rise existing residential development and provision of a focal point for civic amenities in Dundrum.
- Considers height objectives at OSC site are graduated and respond well to local environment and strategic transport links (Luas/bus interchange).
  - Considers this site is suitable for high density mixed-use development.
  - States residential is welcome but must be balanced by mix of uses appropriate to MTC zoning.
  - Proposes inclusion of phasing objective at OSC site, which would ensure that non-residential/employment/community uses are delivered first.
  - Considers this would mitigate against scenario in which non-residential development fails to be delivered at site.
  - Supportive of objectives to provide public park and green linkages at OSC site, noting they will allow for high walking/cycling mobility within village.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 1, 2, 4 and 9

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0332</a>	Person: Kevin McGrattan	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Raises concerns with proposed restrictions to car traffic access on Ballinteer Road at Dundrum Cross.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Highlights difficulties for local residents accessing services on Main Street.</li> <li>○ Highlights challenging to topography of area to cyclists, noting this is acknowledged in Draft LAP.</li> <li>○ Concerned at safety issued that would be presented to elderly residents walking to village in wet/dangerous conditions.</li> <li>○ Considers proposal would exacerbate traffic congestion/safety issues on Ballinteer Road and Old Ballinteer Road.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Critical of existing one-way traffic system on Main Street.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0333</a>	Person: Pauline Callaghan	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers proposed high rise buildings are excessive and will have significant negative impacts on village.</li> <li>• Queries whether former HSE site to rear Carnegie Library could be considered for civic centre instead of Taney Cross site.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2 and 3		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0334</a>	Person: Clare Byrne	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appears to inquire about future location of Rosemount Family Resource Centre.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 3		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0335</a></b>	<b>Person: Justin Baker</b>	<b>Organisation: Rosemount Family Resource Centre</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highlights that need for community facilities in Dundrum CCCAP and DLAP, but considers there is nothing to address this need. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Requests clarity on future of community facility provision in Dundrum.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Photograph of Main Street / Rosemount Family Resource Centre accompanies submission.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 3		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0336</a></b>	<b>Person: Ann Coleman</b>	<b>Organisation: Rosemount Family Resource Centre</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned at future location of Rosemount Family Resource Centre, noting this is not stated in Draft LAP.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 3		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0337</a></b>	<b>Person: Liam Farmer</b>	<b>Organisation: Haven Pharmacy Farmers</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned at impacts on the respondent's business as a result of traffic access restrictions proposed on Ballinteer Road at Dundrum Cross, as set out in Section 4.6.1.1 of Draft LAP. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Notes current impacts as a result of temporary traffic measures that were introduced in response to Covid-19.</li> <li>○ Considers measures will threaten viability of business and result in job losses.</li> <li>○ Requests review of impacts on village of one-way vehicular traffic system on Main Street.</li> <li>○ Respondent would be happy to provide details of decline in business as a result of this and would partake in any discussions regarding this issue.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4 and 6		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0338</a></b>	<b>Person: Stéphane Maurin</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that Beaumont Avenue has not been considered in Draft LAP, despite serving as main road connecting Churchtown Road Upper and Barton Road East. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Notes heavy traffic on Beaumont Avenue resulting in safety risks to children, elderly and mobility impaired, in particular on adjoining streets.</li> <li>○ Notes difficulties for pedestrian crossing Beaumont Avenue at peak times which has been previously with DLR.</li> <li>○ Notes there is a pedestrian path on one side of Beaumont Avenue only.</li> <li>○ Concerned at increased traffic and associated safety risks on Beaumont Avenue if traffic is removed from Dundrum Bypass.</li> <li>○ Notes vehicles coming from Rathfarnham, Rathgar and Milltown would have to use Beaumont Avenue instead of Bypass.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		



DLR Submission No: <u>B0339</u>	Person: Ms Ingrid Masterson	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of cycle/pedestrian infrastructure improvements and nature/biodiversity proposals in Draft LAP.</li> <li>• Objects to proposed Main Street to Churchtown Road Upper bus gate. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers it would adversely impact quiet area around library and connection to Finsbury Park, noting frequent cycle/pedestrian use of latter.</li> <li>○ Proposes as alternative that small mobility buses could be provided to transfer elderly/disabled residents to homes west of Bypass.</li> <li>○ Considers provision of a small layby area near library and safe pedestrian crossing over Bypass would sufficiently accommodate this service.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Notes loss of local business in old town centre due to presence of large high-end business development focusing mainly on commercial fashion. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Hopes town centre is re-developed as pleasant amenity area with small local shops catering for neighbourhood needs, in addition to civic and leisure facilities.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2, 4, 5 and 6</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0340</u>	Person: Joel Franklin	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strongly supportive of Draft LAP. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ States that the Dundrum area is one of only a few bona fide suburban centres with a suitable location for careful densification, mix of uses and commercial/public services.</li> <li>○ strengthening of active travel modes to maximise the benefit of the Luas corridor running as a central axis through the study area.</li> <li>○ Notes need to hold high regard for placemaking and biodiversity in implementing measures.</li> <li>○ Considers ABTA recommendations should be further progressed to detailed design and presented for further consultation with local community.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• States that 'Dundrum ABTA Junction Assessment Report' (Appendix D of ABTA) erroneously reports changes in motor vehicle travel time as representing the entirety of changes in journey times. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Notes this excludes travel times for active travel modes.</li> <li>○ Highlights that these modes are equally (and often conversely) affected by proposed measures.</li> <li>○ Identifies that local area transport modelling tools for walking/cycling are readily available to provide estimates for these modes.</li> <li>○ Considers omission of active travel modes within the estimated change in journey times should be more clearly stated in the results.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• States with reference to Options WC6 to WC12 of ABTA Options Assessment Report (Appendix B) that cycle infrastructure is urgently needed along the Dundrum Road corridor route to enhance connectivity between town centre and lands to the north. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers that a parallel pedestrian/cycle route along the River Slang (as referred to under Options WC7 and WC8) would be desirable, provided it is sufficiently direct, of sufficient quality and given sufficient priority over intersecting streets.</li> <li>○ Acknowledges constraints of providing such a route and the likely time required to implement.</li> <li>○ Proposes safe, shared route along Dundrum Road as an interim measure (as referred to in various options under WC10), which incorporates harmonised car/cyclist traffic speeds and safe pedestrian infrastructure.</li> <li>○ Considers that the proposed Dodder to Dundrum pedestrian/cycle route in the Draft LAP (as referred to in Option WC6) would not represent an adequate substitute for an on-street or parallel corridor.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Notes that Sandyford Road represents one of few safe cycle routes across the M50, including for access to schools in Dundrum and surrounding areas.</li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Conversely, notes availability of alternative routes for motorists including Drummartin Road.</li> <li>o Highlights utility issues with existing cycle infrastructure on this route which should be addressed by provision of segregated cycle lanes (with reference to recommendation for same under Option WC17 of ABTA Appendix B).</li> <li>• Notes that pedestrian/cycle route improvement options considered through Balally area (as referred to under Options P9 and P10 of ABTA Appendix B) represent natural continuation south from LAP lands.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Suggests these routes could be extended further south to integrate with redevelopment of the Currency Centre Facility site on Sandyford Road.</li> <li>o Considers Option P9 should be prioritised and designed to include enhanced accessibility, including for cargo bikes and having regard to points currently only accessible by stairs.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers provision of cyclist/pedestrian connectivity between Holywell/Greenacres estates and Drummartin Link Road and Airfield (as referred to under Option P9 of ABTA Appendix B) would be beneficial, noting relative lack of active travel access in area currently.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Acknowledges implementation would depend on cooperation between a number of stakeholders.</li> <li>o Proposes consideration of additional link between these estates to the Balally area south of the Luas line.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Proposes restrictions on car access to Dundrum Road and Main Street for local residents only.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Notes availability of alternative routes for through travel.</li> <li>o Highlights key role of these roads facilitating cycling and public transport access.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• States that the junctions along Wyckham Way/Overend Avenue currently act as significant barriers to pedestrian/cyclist movement, in spite of relatively high volume of pedestrian/cyclist traffic accessing town centre and Luas stops.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Considers proposed transport/movement measures would significantly improve safe and efficient active travel movement in southern LAP lands and beyond.</li> <li>o Considers however that junction designs which more effectively serve cyclists/pedestrians could be considered (e.g. CYCLOPS design).</li> <li>o Proposes ‘bike boxes’ should be provided along stop lines of junctions to ensure efficient navigating of right-turns by cyclists.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Notes that ‘Complimentary Measures’ as stated in LAP/ABTA should read ‘Complementary Measures’.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 4 and Other Issues.</p>

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0341</a></b>	<b>Person: Anthony Gerrard</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about car access restrictions as a result of measures proposed in Draft LAP, in particular highlighting impacts on elderly.</li> <li>• States that Dundrum Road / Bypass (R117) and Churchtown Road Upper / Taney Road (R112) are important regional routes.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Notes proposed active travel infrastructure upgrade works on Dundrum Road and at Taney Cross (as referred to under Sections 4.6.3.1 and 4.6.1.2 of Draft LAP respectively) will restrict car traffic travelling on these routes.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers that proposed high rise buildings on street will result in permanent shading of Main Street.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Proposes blanket height restriction of 5 storeys within Dundrum area.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers providing public transport infrastructure within street space and removal of car parking will negatively impact elderly/disabled in particular.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Proposes provision of on-street car parking on both sides of Main Street.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Proposes reinstatement of two-way vehicular traffic system and maintaining two-way car access on Main Street, Sandyford Road, Ballinteer Road and Kilmacud Road Upper.</li> <li>• Concerned at impacts to delivery access and consequent impacts to commercial activity in village/MTC.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2, 4 and 6</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0342</u>	Person: Mary Kedroff	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to some proposed restrictions to car access under the Draft LAP, highlighting difficulties they would present accessing services/amenities village from Barton Road East. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Also considers difficulties would arise travelling to locations within to east of Dundrum (e.g Stillorgan village).</li> <li>○ Notes particular challenges to elderly.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Concerns on impacts of proposed Main Street to Churchtown Road Upper bus gate on receiving area.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0343</u>	Person: John Murphy	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Raises concerns with proposed additional restrictions on car access to village. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers measures will discourage trips to village, except to DTCSC.</li> <li>○ Perceives DTCSC as sole priority of DLR.</li> <li>○ Highlights particular impacts to elderly and families with young children, who can't walk/cycle.</li> <li>○ Concerned at impact on remaining smaller shops in village.</li> <li>○ Considers restrictions will also discourage casual trips to village during commutes home.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Notes under proposals that car traffic from Barton Road East will need to access village via Sandyford Road, thus competing with traffic accessing DTCSC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Notes also that car traffic exiting village will not be able to directly access Ballinteer Road / Barton Road East via Dundrum Cross.</li> <li>○ Considers measures will encourage local residents to access services/amenities elsewhere.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Proposes alternative solution to Dundrum Cross junction which would retain access to cars and buses, wherein traffic lights are installed further west along Ballinteer Road (before entrance to DTCSC car park) and a single lane of traffic providing two-way access is provided between car park entrance and junction. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Proposes that this solution would allow for sufficient cycle access.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4 and 6</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0344</u>	Person: John Murphy	Organisation: BMA Planning on behalf of Dundrum Retail Limited Partnership (DRLP)
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Dundrum Town Centre (DTC) development has transformed Dundrum into a major shopping centre with a regional catchment. Within the development, Millpond Square is a central public space, the Pembroke District, now a hub for food and leisure, has seen a shift from retail to mixed-use uses. Ashgrove Terrace and Pembroke Square provide modern commercial spaces. The Dundrum South Quarter hosts office and retail spaces, while the 'Ironworks' is a housing development with 107 new apartments, refurbishment of 15 existing ones, and a new café, currently under construction.</li> </ul> <p><b>Dundrum Village Site (OSC Site)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site, which includes the Old Dundrum Shopping Centre and surrounding properties, has an overdue SHD planning application with ABP (ABP 313220 22). Previous planning permissions granted up to 2009 were not carried out.</li> <li>• The proposed SHD scheme is residential-focused with relevant non-residential facilities. It consists of 881 apartments in 11 blocks and 4 zones, arranged around interconnected courtyards. The buildings range from 3-5 storeys on Main Street to 9-16 storeys by the Dundrum Bypass. The development also includes 4,458.7 sqm of non-residential space. Access to parking and servicing will be from the Dundrum Bypass, supporting the Council's goal to reduce vehicular traffic on Main Street.</li> </ul>		

- The scheme provides new public spaces and allows connectivity across the site, linking to Dundrum Town Centre via Ballinteer Road and Dundrum Cross. A new internal road system and a pedestrian and cyclist bridge leading to Sweetmount Park are also included.
- The SHD proposal, based on extensive design and technical studies over the last 3-4 years, aligns with the DRLP strategy for the Dundrum Village site.

#### Waldemar Terrace

- Waldemar Terrace, at the northern end of Main Street, includes three houses with modern rear extensions. Redevelopment plans for this site may involve new building(s) and could be part of a larger scheme, possibly including the William Dargan bridge environs.

Other locations under the control of the submitter include:

- Usher House, a strategically located modern office block at the Dundrum Luas Stop.
- The submitter also owns two sites on either side of the public car park at the Dom Marmion, among other properties on Main Street, Sandyford Road, and Ballinteer Road, including Rockville and the English Car Park.
- Maher's Terrace and 1A / 1B Ballinteer Road, which form the northwestern quadrant of Dundrum Crossroads, have potential to further enhance the development of the old village centre.
- Lastly, the submitter owns various other smaller properties on the east side of Main Street and several smaller/one-off properties within the LAP (LAP) lands.

Consequently, the submitter has significant land ownership in 3 of the 4 Character Areas – Retail Core, The Village and The Community Core and submits the following with regard to each:

#### OSC Site KDA

OSC1:

- The SHD masterplan included a north-south spine through the site with connections to the Main Street and the Bypass and a series of open spaces and pocket parks.
- The submitter generally supports improvement to the walking environment on the bypass. However, the at grade crossing of the Bypass presents significant challenges and interventions that impact on road space needs to be balanced against the needs of a MTC retail development and the important role of Dundrum Bypass (which was delivered in conjunction with the developers of the DTC development) in terms of accessing and servicing the retail development.

OSC2:

- A new pedestrian/cycle bridge was proposed for crossing the bypass in the SHD plan. This bridge was also a part of the 2009 permission for a predominantly retail development on the site.
- The submitter opposes the use of the term "shall" in OSC2 regarding new at grade pedestrian connections to access Sweetmount Park, as it suggests a fixed or non-negotiable proposal. The submitter suggests an alternative form of language to allow flexibility in this regard.
- While the merits of at-grade crossings are recognised, DRLP remains unconvinced that it can be practically achieved considering various competing factors.
- The following amendments are suggested to OSC2:  
*Any redevelopment of the site ~~shall provide~~ **should explore the provision of** new at grade pedestrian and cycle connections to access Sweetmount Park and the residential area to the west to activate the bypass. These ~~shall~~ **may** include a 'green link' to connect the new local park to the bypass and then on to Sweetmount Park. The level difference between the bypass and the adjoining residential area ~~shall~~ **may** be overcome through a terraced arrangement down to the bypass with universal access ramps and steps, combined with attractive soft landscaping and age friendly seating. ~~The general location of this crossing shall be adjacent to the point where the river emerges from culvert as shown on figure 2.7.~~ (See also OSC3 below).*

OSC3

- Given concerns about OSC2 above the submitter suggests merging OSC2 and OSC3 and that a pedestrian and cycle bridge across the bypass should not be discounted.

OSC4

- The SHD scheme included a new pedestrian link on Ballinteer Road, connecting to an internal street. The local park in the SHD is at Church Square, making the acceptance of this objective reliant on the submitter's comments regarding OSC7 and OSC8.

## OSC5

- The pedestrian wayfinding objective aligns with the SHD layout and can be further improved with signage at the implementation stage. The SHD scheme includes bus stops on Ballinteer Bridge and Dundrum Bypass, developed in consultation with NTA. Enhancing the pedestrian route to the Luas Stop, included in the SHD, is desirable. The submitter is open to cooperating with DLRCC on the Taney Cross development, outside the SHD site.

## OSC6

- The SHD retains the existing vehicular connection to the shopping centre car park under Ballinteer Road. The removal of the primary access to the existing Dundrum Village Centre shopping centre is crucial for achieving the LAP's vision for Main Street but is predicated on suitable alternative access from the Bypass. The LAP proposal for two service/parking cells on either side of the green link raises issues, as demonstrated by the design and technical studies that informed the SHD scheme. The mandatory language of OSC6 is inconsistent with the allowance for a grade-separated solution in OSC3, and flexibility should be introduced to accommodate the possibility that the at-grade solution might not work in practice. The following amendment is proposed:

*Any redevelopment of the site shall:*

- *Provide service access and access to residential car parking from Dundrum bypass. There shall be two service/ parking cells provided either side of the 'green link', to ensure no vehicles will cross the 'green link'. **The design of parking garages and service areas for the OSC site should consider the need to facilitate pedestrian and cycle movement between Main Street and the Bypass and Sweetmount Park.***
- **Retain the existing vehicular connection to the shopping centre car parking under Ballinteer Road.**

## OSC7

- The submitter accepts the "urban greening" objective for Glenville Terrace's front and supports the objective for suitable trees and planting along the bypass and Main Street. However, the submitter opposes a local public park of 2,000sqm as shown on Drawing 2.8. The SHD application proposed a preferred 2,303sqm public park at Church Square, backed by the site's planning history and complex inter-relationships between OSC owners and Holy Cross Church. The SHD also provided other urban spaces connecting the residential development to Main Street and incorporating Glenville Terrace. DRLP strongly believes Church Square's proposal is the most suitable solution and requests the Council to reconsider this aspect of the LAP, or at least, allow flexibility for the Church Square proposals to be reconsidered during detailed planning application stages if necessary. The following amendment is proposed:

*Any redevelopment of the site shall:*

- *Contribute to the provision of a hierarchy of complementary public spaces that are well connected both visually and physically by way of urban greening.*
- *Provide a new community focused local public park ~~at grade on Main Street at the location shown on drawing 2.8 with a minimum size of 2000 sq metres.~~*
- *Provide new urban greening in front of Glenville Terrace to enhance the setting of the Dundrum ACA.*
- *Require a street planting strategy with suitable trees and planting along the bypass and also along Main Street where it should connect to an enhanced tree line on Sandyford Road.*

## OSC8

- The submitter requests the amendment of OSC8 as follows, in order to align it with the SHD scheme:

*Any redevelopment of the site shall:*

- *Provide continuous building frontage along Main Street except for the locations of the new civic and green spaces.*
- ~~*Provide active frontages at ground floor level for uses surrounding the new local park.*~~
- *Provide entrances at 5-10 metre intervals along Main Street except where it can be demonstrated that a larger distance is required due to the specific use on site. Such exceptions shall demonstrate how the proposed use is contributing to active frontage.*
- *Provide a pedestrian street parallel to Main Street with a residential character incorporating own door units where feasible.*
- ~~*Provide a setback containing privacy buffers for ground floor residential units along the bypass.*~~
- ***Where ground floor residential units are proposed they should provide for appropriate privacy buffers along the bypass.***

- Provide a variety of building architecture reflecting the existing character of the town.

## OSC 10

- The submitter seeks the following changes based on the reasons outlined regarding OSC2 and OSC3: *Dundrum Bypass shall read as an urban street with a vibrant park to the west and new mixed use quarter to the east. ~~New at-grade crossings and new building blocks overlooking the street with the provision of some own door units shall be provided where residential uses are proposed.~~ Proposals should positively consider the pedestrian and cycle environment along the bypass and, where possible, consider the introduction of direct access and surveillance towards the Bypass*

## OSC11

- The current objective is imprecise and combines contradictory notions of prescription and flexibility. It directs the developer to discuss "mix of uses" with the PA without clarity. Given this ambiguity, the objective should either be removed or revised and repositioned within the text.

## OSC12

- The submitter agrees that 1-3 Glenville Terrace is worthy of retention and it has been incorporated as a key feature of the SHD scheme. However, the SHD has made a robust case for the removal of the former Post office (also known as former Joe Daly Cycles), no 4 Glenville Terrace and 13 - 13a Main Street. The submitter requests the following amendment:

*Any redevelopment of the site shall:*

- Maintain and enhance the existing character along Dundrum Main Street.
- Reflect the building character of the existing protected structures/ACA, such as Pembroke Terrace.
- Retain and refurbish *existing buildings of historical merit where possible and in particular, the former Post office (also known as former Joe Daly Cycles) which is the building which directly abuts the shopping centre on the Mains Street, nos 1-3 and no 4 Glenville Terrace and 13 – 13a Main Street). The ironwork at Glenville Terrace shall be retained.*

## OSC 13

- The SHD application included a plot ratio of between 1:2.4 and 1:2.9 depending on the definition of the site area. The submitter states that the Draft LAP plot ratio objective does not (and, we submit, cannot) be a maximum where the Building Height Guidelines preclude the setting of blanket height restrictions. The submitter requests the following change:

*An overall ~~general~~ indicative plot ratio of 1:2.25 shall be achieved.*

## OSC 14

- The LAP aligns with national policy on urban and brownfield intensification, adopting a criteria-based approach to height limits. The LAP generally supports 4 storeys, but the submitter suggests to refer to 4-5 storeys. The submitter considers that the reference to up to 11 storeys next to the Dundrum Bypass aligns with the SHD's height strategy and doesn't preclude considering more than 11 storeys at the northern end. The following amendments are suggested:

*Any redevelopment of the site shall:*

- Ensure that the proposed heights along Main Street are sensitive to the original streetscape, in keeping with its character, scale and ACA status.
- Ensure heights along Main Street are generally 4 – 5 storeys ~~with a potential 5th floor setback for blocks adjoining the proposed new local park.~~
- Ensure heights to the rear and northern side of Holy Cross Church and Parochial House do not detract from their setting. Heights immediately adjacent may ~~be required to be lower than 4 storeys and/or~~ incorporate a graduation in heights.
- ~~Allow for increased height at the designated point adjoining the new local park (see figure 2.9 below).~~
- Allow for greater height along the Bypass (of up to 11 storeys) in alternating heights to create visual interest. ~~The buildings~~ *Taller buildings of increased heights shall be sited in the general location of the designated points shown in figure 2.9 below unless it can be demonstrated in the masterplan that an alternative location along the bypass provides a more favourable urban design solution for the site.*
- Ensure ~~increased heights~~ *that taller buildings* do not have a negative impact on residential amenity and on the proposed new public park ~~on Main Street~~ and the proposed Civic space to the north of the OSC site by way of overshadowing and/or overbearing.

## OSC15

- The submitter states that this objective is generally acceptable subject to the following proposed amendments:  
*Any redevelopment of the site shall:*
  - Provide for a sustainable mix of uses commensurate with the MTC land use zoning objective.
  - Provide for retail/food and beverage/leisure and tourism focused mixed uses along the Main Street with the most active uses at ground floor. Such uses should be in keeping with the village character.
  - ~~Provide residential focused mixed use development along the Dundrum Bypass.~~
  - ~~Provide an appropriate form of residential accommodation for older persons e.g. nursing home / assisted living / age restricted units. (Refer also to Objectives H2 and H3 in Chapter 3).~~
  - Ensure the mix of uses along the new predominantly residential pedestrian street are complementary to the residential character of this street and do not divert footfall from the Main Street.
  - Provide for a supermarket(s) of circa 1500—2500 square metres within the land parcel.
  - ~~Provide for community and/or tourism and/or childcare facilities and/or cultural uses adjacent to the new local park.~~
  - Explore the provision of a hotel use adjacent to the new local park.
  - Provide for employment uses, including office uses and/or remote working hub(s) to reflect the designation of Dundrum as a strategic employment location.
  - ~~Provide a balance of day and evening uses.~~
  - Provide residential units for “right-sizing” and/or “downsizing.” (refer to objective H2 in Chapter 3).
  - Figure 2.9 on the next page provides indicative ground floor locations for the proposed mix of uses.

#### OSC16

- While the submitter considers that the removal of the two way traffic on the northern section of the Main Street could facilitate improvements in public realm planting and street trees, they comment that there is limited scope for set back on Main Street within the OSC site. The objection to the prescription around the local park and the concerns around the “green link” to Sweetmount Park (Refer to OSC7) also impact on this objective. The following amendments are suggested:

*Any redevelopment of the site shall:*

- ~~Provide a setback along Main Street running from the new local park northwards to the new civic space at Taney Cross thus providing a green connection between the two spaces (see figures 2.8 and 2.9).~~
- Provide mature tree planting along the **Main Street and the Bypass.**
- ~~Provide a green corridor running east west across the site and the bypass connecting Main Street, the new local park and an upgraded and enhanced Sweetmount Park.~~

#### Taney Cross KDA

- The submitter welcomes the decision to designate a specific location for the Dundrum Cultural, Civic and Community Building, which enhances clarity and certainty. The submitter expresses interest in further engagement to explore development opportunities around Dundrum Luas Stop, including their properties, Waldemar Terrace and Usher House, despite noted flood constraints. No specific amendments are sought.

#### Dom Marmion KDA

- The submitter states that they own part of the 0.67-hectare Dom Marmion land parcel and agree that it has development potential, albeit noting restrictions due to site size. The submitter suggests removing the reference to retail from DM3's ground floor, instead proposing active residential uses and potential commercial activity. The submitter states that they are open to further discussions.

#### Transport and Movement (Chapter 4) and Dundrum ABTA Report

- The submitter expresses serious concerns about the wholesale adoption of Dundrum ABTA Study's options into the Draft LAP and state that these options could negatively impact the accessibility of the Dundrum Town Centre, a major regional shopping destination. The submitter stresses the need for a balanced approach to cater to both private car users and pedestrians/cyclists. The submitter anticipates that the proposed measures may cause congestion, longer queues, and reduce visits to Dundrum and DTC and seek engagement with DLRCC prior to these recommendations being included in a statutory LAP.

**Dundrum Cross (4.6.1.1) – Figure 4.4**

- The submitter fully concurs with Bullet point 4 which identifies *‘The need to safeguard the strategic function of Dundrum MTC by maintaining access to car parks while also reducing the volume of strategic traffic through the town’*. However, they state that the proposals for Dundrum Cross, the objective of safeguarding the Dundrum MTC is not being achieved. The submitter raises the following:
  - The Bus Gate on Ballinteer Road results in the removal of westbound traffic movements on Dundrum Cross roads. This is an important route for customers from the catchment to the east.
  - The Kilmacud Road Upper proposed one-way system to Overend Way needs to be reconsidered in relation to maintaining access to the DTC from the east.
  - The proposal to remove the right turn option out of Green Car Park/ Ballinteer Bridge and on to Main Street is a further diminution of access options.
  - Objective T1 seeks to *‘Retain the existing one-way northbound traffic layout on Main St/Sandyford Rd and to extend it out to the junction of Main St with Dundrum bypass.’* This objective is reliant on removal of existing access/egress point into Village Shopping Centre. The submitter has, in the context of the SHD proposal, indicated a willingness to consider the concession of the Main Street access, however, it is predicated on a high-quality access from Dundrum Bypass which is not achieved in the Draft LAP proposals.

**Taney Cross and Environs (4.6.1.2)**

- The proposed design does not reflect the existing two-way system on Main St as part as the OSC car park entrance. The submitter is only prepared to contemplate forgoing the existing car park entrance from Main Street if a high-quality access and servicing solution is available from Dundrum Bypass to compensate for the loss of this high-profile entrance.
- The accompanying report in Appendix A of the submission provides comments on Scenario 3a and expresses concerns regarding the accessibility for HGVs serving the DTC and the exclusion of right turning movements eastbound on Taney Road.

**Sandyford Road (North of Junction with Wyckham Way/ Overend Avenue)**

- The submitter notes that the ABTA proposals would eliminate the loading bay outside Building 4 and refers to the report in their appendix.

**Dundrum Bypass (4.6.1.5)**

- The submitter has concerns regarding the proposals in the context of the OSC framework. Overall, it is submitted that priority afforded to the pedestrian / cycle users is to the detriment of the private car user and HGV servicing and that the balance has shifted too far in that direction to the detriment of both the DTC development and the future OSC development.
- The submitter states that the proposals for the bypass in Section 4.6.1.5 would appear to support the bridge over the pass and this also appears to be the inference in ABTA Options Assessment document. Objective T11 needs to be reconsidered in light of the comments on the OSC site above.
- In relation to the Dundrum Bypass/ Overend Way junction, the submitter is not in favour of the Concept / Feasibility junction - Figure 4.9 – and is not in favour of Wyckham Way Roundabout Upgrades (4.6.2.1 / Objective T15).

**Bus Gates (4.6.1.8)**

- Refer to comments in relation to the Ballinteer Road westbound junction.

**Wyckham Way Roundabout Upgrades (4.6.2.1 / Objective T15)**

- The submitter objects to the roundabout upgrade which they state represents a threat to the commercial viability of the Town Centre. They note that it is not clear whether these proposals were recommended through the ABTA or were merely presented as a concept design of feasibility which was to be tested in detail. In this context, the submitter states that it is premature to include such proposals in a statutory LAP and they should be removed until fully tested and consulted upon.
- The submitter states that the modelling is based on AM and PM peak periods for a weekday with no weekend assessment, which is the busiest period for DTC and submits that this would appear to be a major flaw in the modelling work undertaken to date. The report included in the appendix of the



submission includes an assessment of the impacts of the proposal.

#### **Sandyford Road/ Wyckham Way/ Overend Avenue Junction (4.6.2.2/ Objective T16)**

- The main issue stated by the submitter is the removal of the left turning lane from Overend Way onto Sandyford Road. They further refer to the report in their appendix.

#### **Overend Avenue Cycle Facilities Upgrade (4.6.2.3 / Objective T17)**

- No comment made by the submitter, but they reiterate the imperative to protect the already strained road network.

#### **People and Homes (Chapter 3)**

- The Draft LAP's "10-minute Neighbourhood Concept" supporting urban intensification overlooks the importance of maintaining Dundrum as a primary regional retail destination, vital for the area's urban and retail hierarchies.

#### **New Community, Cultural and Civic Centre (Section 3.2.5)**

- The submitter did not support a Civic building on the "Phase 2" lands but is open to alternative options with DLACC from the Dundrum CCCAP study. The submitter supports the Council's Taney Cross proposal for a new Community, Cultural and Civic Centre and advocate for less prescription on the local park's location or size, proposing Church Square instead.

#### **Density, Plot Ratio, Building Height and Residential Mix**

- The submitter acknowledges the Draft LAP's alignment with national policy on building scale and height, but seeks clarity on plot ratio and building height. They dispute Objective OSC13, arguing plot ratio should not be fixed under the Building Height Guidelines. They also assert Objective H1 seems restrictive rather than encouraging achievement of indicative plot ratios. Thus, they suggest Objective H1 should be deleted as Policy DLAP17 (Residential Density) is considered sufficient.

#### **Residential Mix**

- The submitter highlights that Policy DLAP19 aligns with Section 12.4.3.1 of CDP's residential mix objectives. Policies DLAP20 to DLAP23 encourage specific types of housing. The submitter considers Objective H2, mandating 25% of housing stock for ageing/disabled populations in developments over 10 units, as unclear and difficult to enforce and suggest its removal.

#### **GI**

- The submitters considers the GI proposals largely acceptable. While Objective G10 on open space provision at the OSC site is suitable, given previous statements on the OSC site's public park location, they suggest the deletion of Objective GI11, which addresses this provision.

#### **Flood Risk Management (5.5)**

- The submitter welcomes confirmation that the OSC site passed the Justification Test as required by the 2009 Planning System and Flood risk management Guidelines and contend that this supports the SHD application awaiting decision in this regard. The submitter also welcomes the added emphasis on regeneration areas in the DLAP's SFRA.
- The submitter draws attention to the accuracy of Section 1.6 vi of the SFRA, stating that quantitative modelling for the Dundrum Village SHD Scheme had confirmed the OSC site wasn't part of the Slang Stream's functional flood plain.
- The submitter also notes that the development of the Dundrum Gym site is tied to an unspecified timescale for a catchment-wide FRS but expresses interest in developing these lands as part of the Taney Cross KDA.

#### **Dundrum Multi-functional town and NCs (Chapter 6)**

- The submitter supports the LAP's focus on multi-functional centers, which they consider aligns with their own intent to consolidate retail within the Phase 1 site and transform the old Dundrum Shopping Centre (OSC) into a residential-led area with diverse ground floor uses. The submitter considers the Objectives MTC1 to MTC6 compatible with the proposed SHD scheme and seeks no amendments.

**Employment (Chapter 7)**

- The submitter is generally satisfied with and has no comments or amendments relating to Chapter 7.

**Heritage and Conservation (Chapter 8)****Main Street Sandyford Road ACA area (8.5.3):**

- The submitter supports the statements regarding the sensitive renovation of the Mill House and Ashgrove Terrace. The submitter supports the refurbishment of Glenville Terrace but argues against preserving other nearby properties, including 13/13A Main Street and the Old Post Office, based on their poor condition, mismatch with modern commercial use, and lack of typological uniqueness. They further point out that their removal had been permitted in 2009 and a full record of the structures would be kept.
- The submitter considers that their masterplan respects architectural heritage policies and development policies in the Dun Laoghaire Rathdown Development Plan 2022-2028. They also consider that the needn't decide on these buildings' future and that this should be assessed during the planning application process.

**Maher's Terrace (8.5.4):**

- The submitter is satisfied with the LAP commentary and objective (HC2) for Maher's Terrace and has no further comments at this time.

**Appendix to Submission**

- The submitter includes as an Appendix to their submission a report prepared by T.J. O'Connor and Associates, Civil and Structural Consulting Engineers, which sets out a review of the Area Based Transport Assessment Reports. The report provides first an overall commentary in relation to the ABTA and then goes on to provide a detailed commentary on the ABTA Options Assessment Report – Section 5. The following points, *inter alia*, are raised:
  - The DLAP (DLAP) and associated Area Based Transport Assessment (ABTA) reports lack a balanced approach between vehicles, pedestrians, and cyclists in the proposed '10-minute' neighbourhood concept for Dundrum. These plans focus on improving pedestrian and cycling access, risking the economic viability of the Dundrum Town Centre and Dundrum Village, by overlooking the significance of vehicular access.
  - Increased vehicle journey times and longer queue lengths are expected due to proposed junction alterations and vehicle turning restrictions.
  - The removal of left turn slips lanes from junctions, despite DMURS guidelines suggesting they should be retained where large turning movements occur.
  - Significant increases in vehicle travel times due to focus on a '10-minute' neighbourhood concept.
  - Failure to acknowledge the needs of Dundrum as a regional destination and employment hub, despite the ABTA report stating the importance of maintaining access.
  - Modelling based on AM and PM peaks on weekdays, overlooking peak periods during weekends when the shopping centre is at its busiest.
  - The report recommends against incorporating the current concept junction proposals into the DLAP. Instead, it is suggested that a new approach that considers a balance of pedestrian, cyclist, and vehicular provisions, includes weekend peak periods in traffic modelling, and ensures the economic viability of Dundrum Town Centre and Village is adopted.

**Figure 5-4 Dundrum Cross – Option being included as part of 'DLR Connector' scheme**

- The draft DLAP (DLAP) proposes changes at the Dundrum Cross Junction to prioritize bus traffic, forming part of the Dun Laoghaire- Rathdown Connector project. This involves the creation of a bus gate, affecting the existing car park access point of Dundrum Town Centre (DTC), impairing vehicular access from the east. Key impacts include:
  - Compromised access to DTC and Main Street, affecting businesses and customers.
  - Forced rerouting of traffic to Sandyford Road/Overend Way Junction.
  - Inadequate consideration of pedestrian volumes between proposed Dundrum Village Development and Pembroke Square.

- Ignorance towards the necessity of vehicular access to and from DTC in the traffic investigation using DLRCC's TomTom database.

**Figure 5-5 Kilmacud Road Upper -Option being included as part of 'DLR Connector' scheme**

- The proposed change would affect access to the Green Car Park at Dundrum Town Centre from areas including Mount Merrion, Kilmacud, Goatstown, and Foxrock, diverting this traffic to Overend Way. Key impacts include:
  - Blocked access to Green Car Park from Upper Kilmacud Road.
  - Questionable provision of east-bound rather than west-bound vehicular access.
  - Does not take account of TomTom database evidence regarding vehicles' access to and from Dundrum Town Centre through Dundrum Cross.
  - Elimination of slip lane from Overend Way to Upper Kilmacud Road.
  - Limited access to Holy Cross School from Taney Road via Sydenham Road only.
  - Increased vehicle movements at Overend Junction with Sandyford Road, extending queuing times.
  - Adversely affected access to Main Street for vehicles from eastern neighbourhoods.

**Figure 5-11 North Sandyford Road Proposed Measures**

- Proposes two-way cycle lane on Sandyford Road next to Buildings 3 and 4. Key impacts include:
  - Removal of a heavily used loading bay outside Building 4 without suggesting alternatives, affecting Dundrum Town Centre servicing requirements.
  - Failure to consider potential reduction in footpath width and the effect on pedestrian traffic from the Luas.
  - Welcome improvement through raised table at junction with Ridgeford Apartments.
  - Need for discussions between Dundrum Town Centre and DLAP regarding loss of critical loading bays due to two-way cycle lane implementation and to ensure alternative servicing methods for commercial units.
  - Potential elimination of left-hand slip lane from Sandyford Road to Overend Way may affect junction efficiency, but could be acceptable if other slip lanes are maintained.

**Taney Cross – Concept Adopted in DLAP:**

- Four options for junction reconfiguration were explored. The study found Scenario 3a as the most efficient, which was adopted in the Draft DLAP despite its impacts on travel time and vehicle queuing as identified in the Junction Assessment Report. Key impacts of Scenario 3a include:
  - Significant increase in queuing and delays, further hindering access to Dundrum Town Centre (DTC) and proposed Dundrum Residential development.
  - The study lacks a weekend assessment when DTC demand is high, suggesting the modeling may not accurately represent the proposal's impacts.
  - The right-hand turn for north-bound vehicles turning to Taney Road has been eliminated.
  - The left-hand turn from Taney Road to Dundrum Bypass seems not to account for delivery vehicles for DTC or Village Scheme.
  - Two-way cycle track on Dundrum Bypass doesn't consider cyclists accessing Village scheme residential development.
  - Proposed bus lay-by on Main Street's north end.
  - Existing Covid mobility measures, including a one-way system, contra-flow cycle path, and footpath improvements, have positively impacted Dundrum Village environment and their retention is welcome.
  - Two-way access to the existing Village Centre entry/exit point on Main Street is removed, with access only for northbound traffic. Maintaining two-way access is necessary and removal is only acceptable if alternative access points are provided on the Bypass in line with proposed Dundrum Village development.

**Main Street and Overend Avenue – Concept adopted in DLAP:**

- The draft DLAP proposes the elimination of all slip lanes at the junction. Key impacts include:
  - The removal of slip lanes on three arms of the junction impacts right-turning vehicles onto Sandyford Road from Overend Way. This could affect access to Dundrum's L1 and L1M Red Car

Parks, especially considering the proposed reduction in access to Dundrum Town Centre's main entrance. This seems to disregard weekend traffic movements.

- Vehicles from Sandyford turning left onto Overend Way towards the Wyckham Roundabout will also be impacted, particularly Dundrum Town Centre vehicles heading east to Stillorgan/Goatstown.
- The proposal does not account for additional trips from traffic diverted to Goatstown, should the Taney Cross concept be implemented, potentially underestimating the true impacts.
- The capacity of the junction is significantly reduced with the removal of left-turn slip lanes on Sandyford Road (North and South) and Wyckham Way.
- The removal of the left turn lane on the Overend Avenue arm reduces access to Dundrum Town Centre from Sandyford Road's access points.
- The introduction of full pedestrian/cycle facilities will delay vehicles accessing and leaving Dundrum Town Centre.
- The junction becomes too tight for HGV movements, potentially disrupting delivery/ servicing to Dundrum Town Centre.
- Modelling shows increased queue levels at the junction, including a large queue up Overend Way hill, which could overlap with the upstream signal-controlled junction. Also, Sandyford Road south could have queues over several access road junctions, which is unacceptable.
- The creation of large queues on a key bus route appears self-defeating and neglects Dundrum Town Centre's requirements.
- No weekend assessment, when Dundrum Town Centre is busiest.

#### **Dundrum Bypass/Overend Way – Concept Adopted in DLAP:**

- The draft DLAP proposes eliminating the roundabout at Dundrum Town Centre's main entrance and reducing the double entry lane to a single entry. The modelling suggests travel time on Wyckham Way could double, but doesn't consider the weekend peak, which could further increase travel times. Key impacts include:
  - Elimination of the current roundabout and reduction of entry lanes into DTC from two to one, increasing queuing lengths during weekend peak periods. This shows a lack of understanding for traffic volumes accessing the Town Centre and the economic viability of the Town Centre.
  - Elimination of slip lanes from Bypass into Tesco Level 3 and from Wyckham Way to Bypass, while the single lane entry does not account for delivery vehicles accessing the Town Centre.
  - Signal-controlled exits from DTC could impact exit times.
  - The proposal significantly compromises the original vehicular design capacities of the roundabout, which was designed for the traffic levels associated with DTC.
  - Removal of the left slip lane into DTC from the Wyckham Bypass and from Overend Way onto the Wyckham Bypass, along with a reduction in the number of exit lanes to the Wyckham Bypass from the junction from two to one.
  - Some movements at the junction do not appear adequate for HGVs servicing DTC.
  - The introduction of full pedestrian/cycle facilities will delay vehicles accessing and exiting DTC.
  - The increase in queuing associated with the new junction format is significant on all arms, leading to longer journey times and potential operational problems, with queues increasing by more than 1.0 kilometres at key junctions.
  - The modelling is based on a strategic model and requires more detailed analysis of the junction, signal phasing, pedestrian scenarios, and different time periods.
  - The modelling is based on weekday AM and PM peak periods with no weekend assessment, which is a significant flaw given the weekend is DTC's busiest period.

#### **Wyckham Way /Ballinteer Road- Concept Adopted in DLAP**

- The draft DLAP suggests replacing the existing roundabout on Wyckham Way with a signal-controlled junction, introducing enhanced pedestrian and cycling infrastructure. Key impacts include:
  - The roundabout is replaced with a signal-controlled junction.
  - The number of entry and exit lanes remains the same, so this change is less concerning. However, the introduction of walking/cycling facilities will impact capacity, as shown by modelling results.
  - Traffic impacts are less significant at this junction compared to other junction changes, but there are still substantial increases on the way to DTC. The impact on exit back to M50 is less.
  - There's no assessment for weekend peak times when DTC demand is highest.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ It could be suggested to remove the existing pedestrian crossing south of the junction.</li> <li>● Further discussions with Dundrum Retail LP and Dundrum Town Centre are required. The impact on the network would be less significant than other junctions if accurate network modelling is presented.</li> </ul> <p><b>Wyckham Way Junction – Concept Adopted in DLAP</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The draft DLAP proposes transforming the existing Wyckham Way Roundabout into a signal-controlled crossroads junction, potentially doubling weekday travel times on Wyckham Way by up to 100% or more when including weekends. Key impacts include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The current number of entry and exit lanes remains, lessening concern, but the addition of pedestrian and cycling facilities will impact capacity, as per modelling results.</li> <li>○ Delays could increase by up to 90 seconds per vehicle, which could frustrate individuals trying to access DTC. Additionally, the resulting queue lengths could be problematic.</li> <li>○ There is no assessment for peak weekend times when DTC demand is highest, making the conclusions potentially inaccurate.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, Appendix 1 and Other Issues</p>

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0345</u></b>	<b>Person: Willow-Avon Management Company CLG</b>	<b>Organisation: C/O Sherry FitzGerald Lettings</b>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The plan utilises 2016 census data, notes that 2022 census data, offers updated population and demographic information.</li> <li>● Concerns regarding the Sandyford road / Wyckham road / Overend Avenue intersection, in particular the removal of the left slip lane will lead to no left turning being allowed.</li> <li>● Notes that maintaining left turns is essential for access to main routes and to prevent additional traffic congestion.</li> <li>● Alternative pedestrian-friendly solutions such as zebra crossings or pedestrian bridges with Balally luas and Dundrum centre should be explored.</li> <li>● Concerns regarding the proposed Balally luas stop mobility hub and requests that the council provide clarity about the hub's scale and potential noise, particularly nocturnal, and its relation to the NTA's bus connection programme plan.</li> <li>● The submitter is concerned about Heavy traffic on Sandyford Road North and recommends that the council should ensure two-way vehicle access to Holy Cross National school and town centre to reduce congestion at the Sandyford road/Wyckham road / Overend Avenue junction.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 1 and 4</p>		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0346</u></b>	<b>Person: Dermot Keenan</b>	<b>Organisation: N/A</b>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The submitter only became aware of the LAP after the two public consultation days and comments that it is unfortunate that the LAP was released during a period when many residents/business owners may have been away.</li> <li>● Concerns centre around proposed changes to the traffic plan, as this will deter motorists from visiting/passing through Dundrum Village and will likely have a negative impact on existing businesses.</li> <li>● The Plan seems to require the elderly and disabled who rely on their vehicles to walk or cycle, which will only serve to isolate them further.</li> <li>● The Plan makes no allowance for electric / hybrid vehicles that will significantly reduce GHG emissions.</li> <li>● There is no demand or need for this Plan.</li> <li>● The Plan is very anti-people and is almost totally concerned with walking and cycling.</li> <li>● The Plan takes no account of the fact that most people will be unable to cycle on the steep slopes in and around Dundrum, especially the slopes on Taney Road, Dundrum Bypass and Upper Kilmacud Road.</li> </ul>		

- The vast majority, and especially the elderly, are physically unable to cycle to Dundrum for their day-to-day needs.
- If the current plan is implemented, it will lead to empty streets and take the life out of Dundrum.
- The submitter included a document setting out their concerns for motorists approaching Dundrum as follows:
  - From Milltown, Windy Arbour and Dundrum Road Areas to Dundrum – Congestion due to traffic restrictions (Section 4.6.3.1) and long detour along bypass to get to Main Street (Section 4.6.1.1).
  - From Churchtown area, including Churchtown Road Lower and Churchtown Road Upper Areas – Congestion at Taney Cross due to inability to complete right-turn movement to Dundrum Bypass (Section 4.6.1.2) and long detour along Dundrum Bypass to Main Street (Section 4.6.1.3) as a result of closing off southbound access from Dundrum Bypass to Main Street (Section 4.6.1.1).
  - From Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East Areas – Barrier to traffic on Ballinteer Road (near Main Street) preventing entry to Dundrum at Dundrum Cross (Section 4.6.1.1) which will result in long detour to get back to Sandyford Road (northern part) to Dundrum Cross (Section 4.6.1.3) and Main Street. This barrier will also result in long detours and delays from Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East commuting to Dublin city.
  - Passing through Taney Cross (Junction of Dundrum Rd / Taney Rd and Churchtown Rd Upper) – severe congestion and unnecessary delays as a result of Bus priority and the elimination of all left-turn lanes (Section 4.6.1.2).

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
 Chapters 1, 4, 6 and Other Issues

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0347</a></b>	<b>Person: Paula Devine</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed location for the bus gate is totally unsuitable.</li> <li>• The nice public space outside the library will be gone.</li> <li>• The area close to a bend on the road isn't suitable for large vehicles such as buses and will endanger pedestrians.</li> <li>• The library building will be obscured and access for children and the elderly will be hazardous.</li> <li>• If the Hammersons development does not have a large number of family friendly apartments it will attract a transient population which will take the life out of Dundrum village.</li> <li>• The plan is anti-people and is only concerned with walking and cycling.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4 and Other Issues		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0348</a></b>	<b>Person: Flonan Morrissey</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whilst some of the objectives in the plan are laudable, many are intangible and have insufficient detail.</li> <li>• Whilst placing Dundrum village at the centre of a 15-minute plan, it fails to develop any coherent cycling routes to the village.</li> <li>• The one-way traffic system introduced curtailed access to the village and has negatively affected small traders and ignores the fact that Dundrum village is adjacent to the largest shopping centre in Ireland.</li> <li>• It does not provide or enhance any open space or deliver on any amenities and only briefly mentions potential amenities i.e. "Civic Hub".</li> <li>• The submitter objects to the proposed Cycle way and bus gate at Dundrum Village on the basis that there is no requirement for same; there are minimal cycling facilities on Ballinteer Road and minimal provision along Barton Road East; which the submitters states does not then merit a full short dedicated cycle lane at the entrance to the village.</li> <li>• Removal of car access is not acceptable and is not beneficial to residents seeking access and is detrimental to trade.</li> </ul>		

- The submitter objects to the proposed amendments to Taney Cross – restricting traffic flow as proposed will cause severe delays and the submitter questions whether any traffic modelling had been done and what are the expected delays.
- Travel on Dundrum Road is already very busy and this will cause further delay.
- The addition of a bus gate for a nonexistent bus route and the logic of this is not well planned and the proposal will affect the library.
- The submitter objects to the proposals on Sydenham Road – this is an architectural gem with many listed buildings and has been turned into a “Rat Run”. Buses should be redirected and the cycle route should not be pursued.
- There is no merit in any of the proposed traffic amendments which will cause delays and the village should be reinstated to two way traffic.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapter 3, 4 and 6

DLR Submission No: <u>B0349</u>	Person: Dr Ciaran Bent	Organisation: Dr Ciaran Bent, GP Surgery
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ballinteer Road and Barton Road Access – the Ballinteer Road is the life line to the village and provides quick access with low emissions. Local businesses require these residents to be able to gain access to ensure business viability. The submitter requests that the proposed restrictions of cars at Ballinteer Road be deleted.</li> <li>• The option of reversing the temporary covid measures and returning Dundrum Main Street to a two-way street should be considered. There is a purpose-built bypass with cycle lanes on both sides with access to the village and the Main Street cycle lanes are duplication. The one-way system has had a detrimental effect on the economic viability of our village and in certain cases, businesses have suffered a 20% drop in turnover.</li> <li>• The submitter requests that a proper consultation with relevant resident associations and the Rate payers of Dundrum with DLR and their planners is undertaken.</li> <li>• That there is an independent traffic analysis.</li> <li>• That an economic survey specific to Dundrum be undertaken.</li> <li>• That there be an analysis of the one-way system.</li> <li>• The submitter references a public meeting held on 17/07/2023 which they state was attended by 300 people attended and summarises issues raised with regard to further road closures from the meeting as follows (section 4.6.1.1): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Dundrum was a thriving village.</li> <li>o Planners and Council introduced plans for a one-way system and closed roads for access and now plan to block access from Ballinteer Road and Barton Rd East which will reduce access from 9 roads to only 2 roads. As each road had 2 lanes of traffic, the reduction would be from 18 traffic lanes to service the village to 2 lanes.</li> <li>o The proposals delay Emergency Response time to the local area for Police, Ambulance and Fire brigade.</li> <li>o Elderly and Disabled were able to pop in/out to Village for Mass and to shop (Impossible with changes).</li> <li>o Local residents were able to pop in/out village in same way, now it is very difficult.</li> <li>o Must retain ability to pop-in and pop-out/drop-off/collect as village car parks will evaporate with future developments.</li> <li>o Pedestrians continue to trip over black cycle step sustaining bad injuries, including fractures.</li> <li>o The changes will destroy the village and make it impossible for local traders.</li> <li>o Planners say it is difficult for buses to turn onto Main Street but buses were turning onto and turning off the main street for years. This was before the bypass reduced traffic flow.</li> <li>o If a large bus 5 times bigger than a car is allowed to turn onto main street, why can't cars also be allowed to turn?</li> <li>o If a car is made to go all around the world to get on to the main street and all around the world to get home – this only increases carbon emissions.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o At this stage the best submission would be to ask to reverse the one way system in the village.</li> <li>o The village has a bypass with two cycle lanes so there is no need to close Ballinteer Road.</li> </ul>
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4, 6 and 7

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <b>B0350</b>	<b>Person: David McCarthy</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is disappointed with the LAP.</li> <li>• The submitter expresses serious concerns about the proposed addition of the bus gate (4.6.18/12 Bus Gate connecting/traversing Dundrum Bypass to Churchtown Road Upper/Sweetmount Avenue) and fears that this will increase traffic in the local area, notably through their estate (Weston Park) and surrounding roads, making it more dangerous for children walking to school.</li> <li>• The submitter states that the bus gate, combined with the proposed village centre development, would further reduce access to Dundrum for people living west of the bypass.</li> <li>• They highlight safety concerns for local children, cyclists, and pedestrians with increased bus traffic in a residential area.</li> <li>• The submitter doubts the feasibility of a proposed bus layover on Churchtown Road Upper, predicting chaos due to heavy traffic at the junction. They fear the proposed bus gate threatens the existence of the local Carnegie Library by turning it into a "traffic island". They challenge the idea that the town has outgrown this facility and express concern about potential developments like the Lexicon in Dún Laoghaire.</li> <li>• The submitter is also concerned about potential one-way traffic changes to accommodate buses, fearing that it would further reduce their access to Dundrum and necessitate more traffic diversions. They feel as though the village is being 'barricaded' off for locals on the west side of Dundrum.</li> <li>• The submitter implores the Council to reconsider these aspects, fearing significant negative consequences for locals, especially given that the impacts of a recent one-way system in Dundrum have yet to be fully felt as traffic volumes return to pre-Covid levels.</li> <li>• Concerned about the proposed Civic Centre, particularly the lack of detailed plans.</li> <li>• The location of the Civic Centre, which the submitter considers to be effectively on a traffic island and far from the village centre, questioning its viability as a Civic Plaza.</li> <li>• Lack of parking, especially with the imminent disappearance of Dundrum Village Centre.</li> <li>• The proximity to busy Luas tracks and roads, which may affect the quietness required for a functioning library.</li> <li>• The suitability of this location for the Dundrum Music School and the Post Office.</li> <li>• Unconfirmed reports suggesting the facility might reach 11 stories high, which they find inappropriate and out of scale for the area.</li> <li>• The lack of clarity on the facility's purpose, suspecting it could be an excuse for constructing office spaces.</li> <li>• Whether the building is truly designed for local use, especially considering its direct access from the Luas station. They also question the necessity and value of the new Civic Centre to locals.</li> <li>• Criticises the lack of engagement from those behind the LAP (LAP) and call for more effort in engaging with residents and local businesses to develop an LAP that offers benefits to Dundrum. References the video presentation of the plan considers that there was little enthusiasm or belief in the proposal.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 2, 4 and Other Issues		

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <b>B0351</b>	<b>Person: Sally Ann Flanagan</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dundrum Already Has been ruined with the current one-way system, constant traffic jams.</li> <li>• The plan will impact everyone but in particularly the elderly.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 3 and 4		



DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0352</a>	Person: Gerard Watchorn	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern over the diminishing village life due to commercial development focused on international retailers.</li> <li>Considers that the LAP threatens the remaining local community by catering to external developers and retailers, without investing in local vendors.</li> <li>The LAP only benefits outside investors and is designed for a future demographic of transient residents rather than the current community.</li> <li>The submitter disputes the comments made on the webinar regarding "increased public open space", pointing out the absence of such spaces in the LAP map.</li> <li>State that Airfield Farm is not a freely accessible public space as it requires a subscription to enter.</li> <li>Questions the potential future transport demand due to population growth and that this should be explicitly stated considering the predicted increase in population of 5,000 people.</li> <li>Concerns about proposed changes to the Taney Cross junction, which will lead to traffic congestion, increased fuel consumption, and higher carbon dioxide emissions due to traffic congestion.</li> <li>The submitter also opposes the proposed bus gate, which they see as a source of further traffic congestion and a threat to the local library and Taney Church due to increased pollution.</li> <li>The submitter suggests an alternative approach that involves enhancing the Dargan bridge for pedestrian and cyclist use, thereby allowing vehicular traffic to flow freely beneath it, reducing congestion and pollution.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0353</a>	Person: Mary Mason	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter expresses concern that if the Ballinteer Road is closed to traffic, they won't be able to shop and suggests they might starve as a consequence.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0354</a>	Person: Michael and Barbara Cahill	Organisation: Balally Residents Association
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opposes the 'proposed planned development' for Dundrum, stating that it will decimate the village.</li> <li>Objects to the proposed bus routes along Sweetmount Avenue, which they state would disturb residents and exacerbate traffic at Taney Cross (Section 4.6.1.2).</li> <li>Criticises the proposed closure of the slip road from Sandyford Road to Wyckham Road, arguing it would worsen an already problematic junction.</li> <li>Strongly opposes to the plan and suggests that the authors of the plan don't live in the area or understand its needs.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 2 and 4		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0355</a>	Person: Aoife Kelly	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter strongly objects to the closing of the Ballinteer Road as it will limit access to Dundrum.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0356</a></b>	<b>Person: Adrienne Bourke</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter is concerned that Dundrum will no longer be a village if the changes in the draft plan are undertaken.</li> <li>• The residential area of Sweetmount Avenue will become a major traffic route.</li> <li>• The changes around the Library, currently a pedestrian pathway, include introducing bus traffic and access to the Dundrum Bypass from Sweetmount Avenue.</li> <li>• The submitter believes these changes will disrupt residents' ability to visit their local library and alter the area's character.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b>		
Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0357</a></b>	<b>Person: Helen and John O'Keeffe</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The consultation period for the LAP is too short and should be extended by at least six months, noting that it falls during the summer holiday period, making it difficult for many people to properly assess the plan's impact on Dundrum's character and vitality. They state that a plan of this scale and significance requires more time for consultation.</li> <li>• Concerns are particularly focused on the proposed changes to traffic and road closures, which seem to prioritize cycling over vehicular access. They argue that this approach is not inclusive, especially for elderly and less able-bodied individuals who depend on cars to access essential services on the Main Street.</li> <li>• Concerns regarding the development of the Dundrum OSC site, stating that the pending decision from ABP creates uncertainty regarding the area's future. They state that good urban planning cannot happen without a clear Masterplan for the site, and further refer to their request for the extension of the consultation period by six months.</li> <li>• Regarding height, scale, and density, the submitter stresses the importance of any future development on the OSC site must reflect the importance of Dundrum as a second MTC in the County in terms of its quality and design.</li> <li>• The submitter states that the proposals in the LAP fail to take on an economic understanding of the Town and in particular of Main Street and that the LAP needs to provide for an economic strategy that addresses traffic, private and public, and access to the town and to businesses.</li> <li>• In conclusion, the submitter urges an extension of the consultation period to address these issues properly and ensure Dundrum's development is well-planned.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b>		
Chapters 2, 4, 6 and Other Issues		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0358</a></b>	<b>Person: Shane O'Kelly</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter notes that they couldn't attend the council open days on the 27th June or 6th July due to being away and contends that the consultation was poorly timed during the summer months.</li> <li>• The plan lacks consideration for the elderly and individuals with mobility issues, especially those attending Holy Cross Church, the bank, doctors' surgery, pharmacy, and other businesses in the village.</li> <li>• Adequate parking within walking distance to these locations should be provided.</li> <li>• Closing off access to vehicles, excluding buses, from the Barton Road roundabout will lead to congestion on certain routes into the village. This change will force west side traffic to enter from Sandyford Road, causing increased travel time, traffic, and unnecessary emissions.</li> <li>• The plan appears to prioritize cycle lanes over other road users, which may not be necessary throughout the village. Consider reverting to two lanes instead of one.</li> <li>• The black low-level dividers pose a danger to all road users and have caused injuries to pedestrians, cyclists, and vehicles and should be removed.</li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The plan heavily favours cyclists, but the steep hills servicing Dundrum Village are challenging for some cyclists and pedestrians.</li> <li>• The plan should undergo a thorough review, and additional public consultation should be conducted. Proposing it during the summer months is not ideal.</li> <li>• The submitter urges a reconsideration of the plan, taking into account the age demographic in the area.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 3, 4 and Other Issues</p>

<p><b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0359</u></b></p>	<p><b>Person: Mary Esther Clark</b></p>	<p><b>Organisation:</b></p>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As a long-term resident of Dundrum, the submitter is concerned that the proposals in the Draft LAP will exacerbate difficulties already present in the Village re:</li> <li>• Easy access for all, including disabled access, to services including religious and medical;</li> <li>• The proposals in the LAP under Bus Connects may force buses into narrow roads in residential areas;</li> <li>• The proposals for massed high-rise buildings in the Village, both to replace the OSC, and the newly-proposed Civic Centre, will swamp the remaining vernacular buildings and destroy the Village quality.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2 and 4</p>		

<p><b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0360</u></b></p>	<p><b>Person: Christopher Kinahan</b></p>	<p><b>Organisation:</b></p>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed development does not align with the current visual concepts of residential properties in the area. The submitter believes that the density of future development should not be significantly different from the existing two/three-story residential properties in the vicinity, e.g. Sweetmount Avenue.</li> <li>• The proposed development of the old Dundrum Shopping Centre along the bypass should be in keeping with the area.</li> <li>• DLR should be safeguarding the character of established residential areas or protect local character and environmental quality. The proposed 11-16 story residential buildings are not in keeping with the current characteristics of the local area.</li> <li>• 1-2 bedroom apartments have been unsuccessful in the area and lead to an overdevelopment of "Dundrum Village" (e.g., Fernbank with only 40/50% occupancy).</li> <li>• The proposed 11 to 16 stories high buildings along the bypass would negatively impact neighboring properties, causing a loss of amenity, light, overshadowing, and overdominance. The proposals lack sufficient amenities.</li> <li>• The safety of the area should be a priority before increasing the population density. Recent incidents near the Fernbank at Notre Dame Secondary School site raise concerns about the need for improved safety measures. The submitter also reports incidents at their home address.</li> <li>• The current traffic situation is already at its maximum with very little public parking. If the access is limited, people will have to park in surrounding areas like Sweetmount Avenue, leading to increased traffic issues and making it a rat run.</li> <li>• The loss of parks due to insufficient amenity space in the proposed development and the lack of transparency in decisions regarding the Civic Centre, there should be more provision for green space.</li> <li>• Due to height, overshadowing, scale of monolithic development, being overlooked, materials being used in the development, landscaping there is erosion of our parks to facilitate the developer. Residential areas at the moment are made up of detached and semi-detached houses with gardens to the front and rear.</li> <li>• Concerned about the proposed changes to the Dundrum Civic Centre – It appears that the development is now being designed as an 11-story building, which is much taller than what was initially recommended. This change also involves moving the buses to Sweetmount Avenue, which could cause noise and air pollution, impacting the residents in the area.</li> </ul>		

- Lack of transparency and open discussion about this development, making it difficult for residents to object effectively and the submitter questions the need for such a tall civic centre when the initial recommendation was for a 2/4-storey building, which would be more in line with the area's character. There is confusion about how tall the building will be with the submitter citing several different heights from different sources.
- The submitter questions the need for a civic centre in Dundrum.
- The submitter states that busses would be going by Sweetmount Avenue and suggests this could increase to every 2 minutes in future. The old Dundrum shopping centre site should be used instead.
- New development will only be for rental and will not provide accommodation for local people who can't afford them.
- The submitter cites a range of other development or potential development sites in the area.
- The submitter criticises the proposed one-way system stating that it will take much longer to get to Dundrum Main Street for local people. The submitter also cites issues regarding the current form of the barriers on the cycle lanes leading to trip hazards.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4 and Other Issues

DLR Submission No: <u>B0361</u>	Person: Deirdre Barry-Stack	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter welcomes sustainable development for the locality and the Old Dundrum Shopping Centre site.</li> <li>• Would welcome additional leisure, cultural, civic, and educational facilities, as well as green areas and play areas.</li> <li>• Concerns about the current LAP (DLAP) and its lack of consideration for the actual needs and preferences of the people living and working in Dundrum.</li> <li>• The DLAP's "10 Minute Neighbourhood" concept is unrealistic for many people in the area. Those who are elderly, unwell, or have disabilities may find it difficult to use public transport or walk long distances. Also, people who work outside Dundrum may have to drive to access services, but the plan doesn't take their needs into account.</li> <li>• The proposals do not take account of the local climate, which is characterised by frequent rainy and icy days, posing challenges for walking and cycling. On these days, accessing vital local services becomes difficult without a vehicle.</li> <li>• The submitter is concerned about the proposed changes to Main Street access. The restriction on vehicle access from Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East will exclude many local people who need to drive to access essential services in Dundrum. Emergency vehicle access could also be impacted due to increased traffic congestion caused by access restrictions.</li> <li>• The proposed 11-story height buildings for the Old Dundrum Shopping Centre site are excessive and out of character with the surrounding area. They would negatively affect the view and privacy of neighbouring residential buildings.</li> <li>• The plan's focus on high-density apartments and duplexes doesn't cater to the needs of families, who are seeking houses with outdoor spaces. Many families have already moved out of the area due to a lack of affordable family-sized houses.</li> <li>• The allocated space for the local park is inadequate to serve the current community, let alone additional residents. The DLAP should require the Old Dundrum Shopping Centre development to provide a larger outdoor space to accommodate the increased population.</li> <li>• The DLAP needs significant adjustments to consider the real-life needs of the entire population, including those with mobility issues, families, and the elderly. The plan should also take into account the impact on emergency vehicle access and the preservation of community spaces.</li> <li>• Dom Marmion site – objects to the DLAP proposal as it removes a vital car park used to safely drop off and collect children attending Holy Cross school and the Dundrum Montessori. The new proposal diminishes car parking spaces, making it unsafe and inconvenient for the local community.</li> <li>• Dom Marmion site – The removal of a much-loved green space used by Holy Cross school children for outdoor activities is unacceptable</li> </ul>		

- Community, Cultural and Civic Centre – changing the proposed location from the Old Dundrum Shopping Centre to the lands at Taney Cross does not make sense. The Old Dundrum Shopping Centre site is more suitable, less isolated, and safer to access. The Taney Cross location, being at a busy and noisy crossroads, will be less conducive to creating a suitable community centre.
- Dundrum library – adding a bus lane in front of it will ruin the quiet and welcoming community space in front of the library. The library is widely used by the community, especially children who select, borrow, and read books. Adding a bus lane will increase noise and safety concerns for library-goers. Other options for adding a bus route should be considered.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5

<b>DLR Submission No: B0362</b>	<b>Person: John O'Flaherty</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
---------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------

**Summary of Submission / Observation:**

- The submitter is pleased to see the publication of the draft DLAP and acknowledges Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council's (DLRCoCo) effort to produce a long-term strategy for the development of Dundrum and surrounding areas.
- The submitter has expressed concerns regarding public transport elements as follows:

**Dundrum LUAS Stop/Bus Interchange Facilities**

- The submitter is somewhat dismayed that the plans for Dundrum LUAS Stop/Bus Interchange Facilities propose separate, widely dispersed bus termini and stops as this requires people to cross major roads when changing modes, rather than having an integrated interchange adjacent to the LUAS stop. Connections should be seamless, with minimal walking distance between modes.
- The current bus terminus offers close interchange with local bus routes. The new plan eliminates this, relocating the bus stops and often potentially requiring crossing major roads.
- With the BusConnects network redesign increasing the frequency of bus routes in Dundrum, the submitter believes the plan misses a significant opportunity to enhance public transport.
- Suggests a bus station next to the LUAS stop, utilising the space north of a realigned Main Street, the by-pass, and Waldemar Terrace. This investment, despite requiring significant CPO, would encourage people to use public transport.
- Examples of sub-optimal connections include:
  - Changing from the LUAS to the A2/A4 or eastbound S6 will require walking across Taney Road to access the terminus, which makes the possibility of people missing their bus far greater, while they have to wait while the traffic lights go through their sequences
  - Passengers switching from the eastbound S6 to the L25 will have to exit their bus on Upper Churchtown Road, cross that road, and walk along the bypass and cross it to access the L25 terminus.
  - The new stop for the 74 and L25 is not adjacent to the LUAS, but rather located at a windswept location on the by-pass, which is very sub-optimal.

**Bus Layover Facilities**

- Questions the proposed bus layover facilities, which might need more space for high-frequency routes and essential driver breaks. An alternative location might be necessary, along with a separate place for buses to lay over on breaks. This should be seen as an investment in transport infrastructure, not inappropriate land use.

**Bus shelters**

- The lack of bus shelters at key locations is another concern. Proper shelter is vital for making public transport appealing, so the Council must ensure this with the NTA.

**Looped Routing**

- Concerned about looped routing, like what's happened with the 14, making it unreliable in journey time.
- The one-way system on the Main Street might have been better in the opposite direction as was previously suggested by the submitter.

<p><b>Bus Gates</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any bus gates must be backed up by appropriate enforcement such as the use of camera technology, and flexibility must be available to amend routings and priority measures if they don't improve journey times.</li> </ul> <p><b>Orbital Routes not serving Dundrum Town Centre</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Notes a lack of east/west orbital bus routes serving Dundrum Town Centre as a shortcoming in the new network.</li> <li>People using the S6 will have to walk from the S6 at Taney Road or Upper Churchtown Road, and those using the S8 will have to get a second bus connecting from the S8 on Grange Road, which will mean longer journey times. Council and NTA should re-examine this to maximise public transport use for Dundrum Town Centre.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1 and 4</p>

<p><b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0363</u></b></p>	<p><b>Person: Declan Reid</b></p>	<p><b>Organisation:</b></p>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter notes that their family's history is deeply rooted in the village, they find the current proposed infrastructure and lifestyle changes to be nothing short of a mess.</li> <li>They state it is clear that DLRC aims to eliminate private cars from the Village, but the measures suggested, including the closure of access roads, reduction of traffic lanes, re-routing of flow, introduction of a bus gate across a bustling junction, and elimination of parking, will likely have a catastrophic effect on local businesses.</li> <li>Submitter concerned that these changes would hinder access for Dundrum's aging and elderly population, who rely on local services such as Retail, Health, Banking, Church, Educational, and Civic services. These changes are particularly detrimental to senior citizens, for whom Luas, Bus, taxi, walking, or cycling options aren't always feasible. The need for detailed planning and the potential increased costs, stress, and mental fatigue could prove too much for many elderly or disabled residents.</li> <li>Additionally, the village's topography doesn't lend itself to walking or cycling, especially for the elderly, as the Main Street access is steeply downhill entering and uphill exiting.</li> <li>Civic planning should enhance lives, not damage them. The submitter strongly urges a return to the drawing board to reconsider the proposed LAP, keeping in mind the above concerns.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 4 and 6</p>		

<p><b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0364</u></b></p>	<p><b>Person: Conor Rochford</b></p>	<p><b>Organisation:</b></p>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter has concerns regarding the present layout of the Main Street in Dundrum, specifically the installations for cycle lanes which are dangerous for pedestrians.</li> <li>The submitter believes that the cycle lanes are inhibiting older residents from accessing key services in the area, the implication of which will leave them remaining at home like during the pandemic.</li> <li>Access to the village and local businesses have been adversely impacted by the one way system. This makes the average journey for residents much longer as the average resident will not be able to walk (due to the hill) or cycle to their destination.</li> <li>The submitter is concerned the character of the village will be lost due to plans for high density developments.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4 and 6</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0365</a>	Person: Deirdre Wadding	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disagrees with proposed traffic changes in and around the Main St of Dundrum and Kilmacud Road to Barton Road.</li> <li>Submits that the village will be impossible to access.</li> <li>Questions location of cycle paths proposed for narrow roads.</li> <li>Submits it will be harmful to close any access points to Main St for businesses in the area.</li> <li>Questions idea of bus gate at the library and whether it will be effective without plans for traffic lights at Sweetmount Ave as crossing point is already difficult for pedestrians.</li> <li>Submits narrowing of road at Taney Cross for cycle paths to be ill-advised considering current high levels of traffic congestion there.</li> <li>Objects to previous implementation of one-way system.</li> <li>Thinks that proposed changes for restricting vehicular access to Main St. will kill off activity in the village.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4 and 6</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0366</a>	Person: Mary Finegan	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitter is a local resident, cyclist and walker in the area.</li> <li>Appreciates the effort DLR have put into the DLAP 2023.</li> <li>Compliments DLR on efforts to improve public transport links, district heating proposals, introduction of better planting and more green spaces, and the installation of safer walking and biking routes.</li> <li>Submitter cites concerns regarding safety impact on school children and other pedestrians with the movement of the bus terminus to Landscape Road/Upper Churchtown Road especially for young kids going to the Ballinteer Educate together school and Gaelscoil on the Notre Dame site.</li> <li>Submits concern about seniors and their ability to access the church, supermarket, doctor etc. in the village. Without ease of access and open surface carparking older residents will be cut off from vital services and social outlets.</li> <li>Suggests consideration of international learnings re. high density development with regards to developing the Old Dundrum Shopping Centre Site and the CMH sites.</li> <li>Considers issues such as storage, unit mix, design aesthetics, use of natural materials, access to light, private amenity spaces, trees and green areas.</li> <li>Submits a need to ensure building height does not negatively impact on the historic main street or local residents in Sweetmount Avenue.</li> <li>Supports all climate action measures and suggests provision of more green space and planting.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and Other Issues</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0367</a>	Person: Peter Mulvey	Organisation: Dundrum Business Association
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitter is unreservedly against the DLAP</li> <li>Believes it will be detrimental to the Dundrum area.</li> <li>Is concerned about traffic restrictions from Ballinteer side of Dundrum saying it will impede traffic flow and cause further issues for the residents of surrounding areas.</li> <li>Submits that bus services are inadequate for current demand and do not connect far enough into areas of South Dublin.</li> <li>Considers the one-way system on Dundrum Main St and the removal of the slip roads at the Luas bridge to be causes of major traffic disruption,</li> </ul>		

- Submits that traffic for schools and businesses passing through the intersection at Rockfield and Sandyford Road will cause more congestion and increase rush hour traffic jams.
- Thinks changes to traffic routes will crush small local and family businesses only recovering after the pandemic closures and leave only large multinational companies.
- Submits route changes will isolate elderly people in the community, further reducing social outlets and their ability to move around the village.
- Thinks that cycle lanes are already ignored by cyclists in favour of roads while increased traffic on changed routes will equate to increased emissions.
- Submits that consultative meetings with local residents appear as nothing more than box ticking to an already decided plan, with no open discussions or compromises seeming like a realistic outcome or conclusion.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 1, 4, 6 and Other Issues

DLR Submission No: <u>B0368</u>	Person: Maria Power-Watchorn	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter is a long-term resident.</li> <li>• Appreciates community feel of Dundrum village where they have raised their family.</li> <li>• Believes the draft plan disregards all community based organic growth which made the village successful.</li> <li>• Submits the integrity of the village is important to the make-up and character of Dublin city and thinks this plan turns Dundrum into a 'homogenised corporate shopping mall, without character or culture, the product of a planner's drawing board not made up over years of trials, experience, culture and history'.</li> <li>• Thinks the proposed Taney Cross changes will choke the flow of traffic and isolate elderly, visually impaired and physically challenged.</li> <li>• Submits that the rubber cycle path dividers on Main St. are a hazard for the visually impaired and have caused many accidents and injuries.</li> <li>• Questions how these were installed without consultation of the local community.</li> <li>• Counters statement of planners regarding low levels of use on Sweetmount Avenue and submits that traffic is backed up Sweetmount Avenue to Weston Park every day.</li> <li>• Suggests that the 'bus park' be located on Taney Road to keep the buses flowing, to leave the Library as it is and not disrupt the community meeting area in front of the Library.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1 and 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0369</u>	Person: Pauline Kinsella	Organisation: Private Citizen
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter does not support LAP.</li> <li>• Long-term resident of Meadow Grove since 1967 says changes to the area are not welcome.</li> <li>• Considers changes to make Main Street one-way have been a disaster and not needed.</li> <li>• Critical of proposed changes to the Main Street from the Barton Road East roundabout.</li> <li>• States that many of the residents on Barton Road East, Meadow Grove, Laurel Drive have reduced mobility and require the use of either their own transport or a lift to access services in the village.</li> <li>• Dislikes that the 'wonderful village is being re-arranged'.</li> <li>• Submits that more high-rise apartment buildings and buses driving through residential roads are definitely not welcome.</li> <li>• Submitter is disappointed with the draft plan stating it is 'hugely detrimental to the residents affected by changes'.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 3 and 4</p>		



<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0370</a></b>	<b>Person: Damian Lawrence</b>	<b>Organisation: Private Resident</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter has included images of the slip road proposed to accommodate a bus gate which sweeps around the national cemetery and church of St. Nathi's. The wall around the cemetery appears to require further reinforced butting mechanisms but, according to the submitter, is likely too unstable to accommodate large vehicles passing by it all day, every day.</li> <li>• References Fig. 4.5 from the Dundrum ABTA report saying that, due to a steep gradient and curved route, that the Bus Gate (especially the portion in front of the library) should be objected to as it will flush traffic, particularly up the road, on a road that is ill-suited to continual large vehicle use.</li> <li>• Considers that the proposed pedestrian footbridge is superfluous to need and could prejudice the 'cul-de-sac' nature of Sweetmount Park.</li> <li>• Is critical of proposed Hammerson's development at the Old Dundrum Shopping Centre.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2, 4 and Other Issues		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0371</a></b>	<b>Person: Conor Byrne</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submits that removing the left turns on Sandyford, Overend and Wyckham Roads will restrict access to the Dundrum bypass and force traffic that would take the bypass through the single lane of Dundrum Main St. stating this is counterintuitive to the purpose of the bypass by restricting access to it.</li> <li>• Submits that removing the left turn will also not help with foot / bike traffic as lights in situ will still be required.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0372</a></b>	<b>Person: Martina Mulholland</b>	<b>Organisation: Ballinteer Resident</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<p>Submitter is a long-term Ballinteer resident who objects to the Draft DLAP based on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All changes to transport routes proposed in the draft LAP including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Ballinteer Road and Barton East Area - Section 4.6.1.1 citing this will result in a barrier to traffic on Ballinteer Road (near main Street) preventing entry to Dundrum at Dundrum Cross, increasing congestion and long detours / delays for traffic from Ballinteer Road and Barton East commuting to the city.</li> <li>○ Taney Cross Junction Section 4.6.1.2: Implementation of Bus Priority and elimination of all left turns will result in more congestion and unnecessary delays.</li> <li>○ From Churchtown Area/Churchtown Road lower and upper will mean severe congestion resulting from delays at Taney Cross due to inability to complete right turn movement to Dundrum Bypass (section 4.6.1.2).</li> <li>○ Detour along Dundrum Bypass to Wyckham way and Sandyford Road (northern part) to Dundrum Cross (section 4.6.1.3) as far as main street (section 4.6.1.3) to access goods and services in Dundrum village.</li> <li>○ Milltown / Windy Arbour/ Dundrum Road.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Submits the draft plan is excessively focused on walkers and cyclists to the detriment of all other users in the community.</li> <li>• Asks why the plan makes no allowance for the estimated 1 million electric/hybrid vehicles in Ireland by 2030 which will significantly reduce greenhouse effect.</li> <li>• States the plan takes in no account for the elderly/infirm / vulnerable members of the community who are unable to cycle/walk/or hop on a bus with ease.</li> <li>• Questions why there has been no independent Traffic survey conducted for inclusion within the plan.</li> </ul>		

- Considers the inclusion of very high-rise buildings at the Old Dundrum Shopping Centre to be in conflict with the stated “LAP Visions” that the new design is mindful of the existing character /scale/heritage of Dundrum.”
- Submits there is no demand for the plan which is not inclusive and will take life out of the village.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 2, 3 and 4

<b>DLR Submission No: B0373</b>	<b>Person: Geraldine McAuliffe</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
---------------------------------	------------------------------------	----------------------

**Summary of Submission / Observation:**

- Considers that the plan doesn't show enough respect for the elderly or persons with mobility problems.
- Submitter is seriously concerned at increased traffic going to and from M50 through housing estates.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 3 and 4

<b>DLR Submission No: B0374</b>	<b>Person: Wendy Cox</b>	<b>Organisation: Private Citizen</b>
---------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------------------

**Summary of Submission / Observation:**

- Submitter is a long-term resident of more than 40 years.
- Welcomes the publication of the draft LAP, which was announced back in 2018.
  - Happy to have at last a coherent overview and plan for future development here, and fully endorses all 6 elements of the Council's Vision for the future Dundrum.
  - Hopes that many of the specific objectives set out in the draft LAP can be realised relatively soon.
  - Considers the centrality of climate action within the Draft Plan to be particularly welcome.
  - Is delighted to see the Council's determination to address the dominance of the motor car in the small village space, and to create an area at the heart of Dundrum which prioritises people and their activities over motor traffic, giving cleaner air and a more liveable urban environment.
- Supports the intention to provide a green public park area linking Main Street to whatever new development takes place on the OSC site and urges the Council to prioritise all of the Plan's suggested greening initiatives as soon as possible.
- Believes that Dundrum has sadly lacked the kind of civic and community centre, with a fully modern library, happily now proposed as part of the LAP.
- Welcomes the proposal of this exciting new initiative and looks forward to some innovative architecture and planning around the North end of Dundrum Village to make this a reality for the whole surrounding population.
- Hopes that the plan's vision for regeneration of the currently 'blighted' Main Street by means of buildings in keeping with the scale and the historic character of its position as a Conservation Area can be realised without further delay.
- Notes a significant gap in the draft LAP for any provision of facilities for teenagers and younger children, other than in relation to schools, childcare, and limited playground development.
- Submits that Dundrum as a whole is now an area full of young families and states that public spaces need to cater for younger teenagers in particular, who need places to gather outside school, other than street corners or the new shopping centre and citing examples in other European countries.
- Hopes the draft LAP will receive the overall support from local people which it deserves, and that those specific details or issues where local opinions vary greatly can be addressed effectively through further engagement by the Council with the community at the appropriate time.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 1, 2, 3 and 5

DLR Submission No: <u>B0375</u>	Person: Michael Mackey	Organisation:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter expresses concern and objection to the proposed LAP.</li> <li>• Expresses concern regarding the preservation of the charm and character of the community urging the council to reconsider the scale of the development being allowed in the village and its impact on the quaint and picturesque landscape, its historical buildings, lush green spaces, and a close-knit community.</li> <li>• Worries about the loss of aesthetic appeal saying the introduction of towering buildings will disrupt the visual harmony of the village.</li> <li>• Considers an increased strain on infrastructure due to the anticipated influx of residents and businesses attracted by large-scale developments will place immense pressure on these systems, leading to potential issues with traffic congestion, strained resources, and overcrowding.</li> <li>• Submits that high-rise developments often have significant environmental implications, including increased energy consumption, decreased green spaces, and disruption to local wildlife habitats.</li> <li>• Regards these factors as contradictory to the values of sustainability and environmental conservation that the community holds dear.</li> <li>• Cites concerns that introduction of large commercial or residential towers may attract transient populations, which can adversely impact the strong sense of community and cohesiveness.</li> <li>• Thinks that preserving the intimate, tight-knit atmosphere of the village should be a priority.</li> <li>• Requests that the council considers more thoughtful and moderate development alternative that will maintain the essence of what makes the community instead of pursuing an excessive expansion that will forever alter the character of the village.</li> <li>• Encourages low-rise, sustainable, and architecturally compatible developments which would allow for growth while still preserving Dundrum village's unique identity and charm.</li> <li>• Recommends that the council actively involves the community in the decision-making process as residents' perspectives, concerns, and ideas should be sought and respected considering they are the ones who will be most directly affected by these developments.</li> <li>• Implores the council to reconsider the current development plan and strive for a more balanced approach that prioritizes preservation, sustainability, and community well-being for current and future generations of the community.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4 and Other Issues</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0376</u>	Person: Eoin Ó Catháin	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter is a local resident and daily commuter cyclist living in the LAP area.</li> <li>• CMH Site provides a once-in-a-generation opportunity to widen Dundrum Road to provide cycle lanes, landscaping, or improved pedestrian realm.</li> <li>• Considers there are limitations on the existing transportation network including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The Luas system which struggles for capacity at peak times.</li> <li>○ A pronounced lack of safe cycling facilities through the northern end of the study area.</li> <li>○ Buses experiencing significant delays due to congestion on and approaching Dundrum Road.</li> <li>○ The local road network being fully saturated particularly at weekday peak times and at weekends.</li> <li>○ Traffic issues being exacerbated by recent changes to the lane configuration on the Dundrum Bypass side of Taney Cross.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Significant new development in Dundrum will increase the strain on all modes of transport.</li> <li>• Proposals in respect of cycling connectivity in the northern part of the study area are inadequate.</li> <li>• Lack of a high-quality cycling connection on Dundrum Road past the planned Central Hospital Site.</li> <li>• The southern portion of the proposed greenway along the River Slang, included within the GDA Cycle Network Plan 2013, appears to have been abandoned. Its reinstatement would yield benefits in terms of GI and re-establishing or enhancing a natural wildlife movement corridor.</li> </ul>		

- The proposed off-road connection through Rosemount will have limited local benefit and will not be used by cyclists between Dundrum and Milltown as the inbound route would require crossing the main traffic flow twice. Reinstatement of the Slang greenway objective would alleviate this
- The suggested public realm improvements on Dundrum Road are a cause for concern as the recent similar works on Bird Avenue have rendered it almost a no-go area for cyclists as the road is too narrow for motorists to pass safely.
- There is a safe off-road route through Mulvey Park that most cyclists now use to avoid Bird Avenue.
- Is concerned that a similar (mis)interpretation of DMURS would result in the same cross section being proposed along Dundrum Road, it should be noted that the traffic speeds and demand cycle flows are such that any narrowing of the road carriageway should only be undertaken in parallel with the provision of safe segregated cycling facilities.
- While the public realm improvements at the Arbourfield shops are to be welcomed necessary commercial and residential parking and loading facilities must also be prioritised.
- Considers that the cycling interactions with pedestrians through the Dodder Riverside park need to be carefully considered.
- Queries why the plan doesn't include the pedestrian / cycle bridge proposed in the 2013 GDA Cycle Network Plan to connect towards Richmond Hill and Milltown Luas Station.
- As a regular pedestrian user of Taney Cross would prefer that the four corners would have raised pedestrian priority crossings, considers that the junction operates highly efficiently for pedestrians.
- Proposals to remove lanes and movements should be very carefully considered as the Luas line acts as a barrier for car movements between the River Dodder and the Upper Churchtown Road, and the ability to get out of the area by car is dependent on being able to get to the junction and make the necessary turning movements.
- The removal of a through traffic lane on each arm will reduce the capacity of the junction by up to 50%, making it almost impossible to get into or out of the area. States this will also have significant knock-on impacts for buses – especially outbound where no priority measures are indicated.
- Suggests that the proposal to remove a right turn into Dundrum Road from Taney Road is perplexing, since this is a relatively light movement of benefit only to the local community and should be reinstated.
- Questions the proposed removal of corner islands which will create a necessity for a wraparound pedestrian crossing and significantly eroding the existing throughput capacity for cars and buses.
- The rationale for removing the Dundrum Public Transport Interchange is unclear.
- Concerned about proposals to replace the roundabouts on the Wyckham Bypass especially in consideration of the 3,200 parking spaces in Dundrum Town Centre. These changes will impede progress of visitors to the shopping centre and compromise the ability of the local citizens of Dundrum to make necessary car trips.
- Does not understand the proposal to enhance cycling facilities on the Dundrum Bypass when significant money has been spent improving the cycling environment and connectivity along Main Street.
- States that the bypass is a steep and uninviting cycling environment, and believes the money could be better spent elsewhere, especially in context of the lack of onward connectivity (currently) envisaged along Dundrum Road.
- The proposals as currently outlined will cause significant inconvenience to the existing population of the area which will be further exacerbated by the significant new development envisaged in the area.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapter 4

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0377</u></b>	<b>Person: Angie Fitzgerald</b>	<b>Organisation: Private Citizen</b>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to the anti-people nature of some of the plan especially those with accessibility issues due to health, age, and/or young children.</li> <li>• Thinks that more cycle lanes are of no use to the majority of people over 65 in Dundrum when they need to go shopping, to the village, to their local community centre in the Parish Hall and other service locations.</li> <li>• Submits that there will be many areas of difficulty should the proposed traffic routes be initiated per the draft LAP including:</li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Inability to complete right turn to Dundrum bypass will increase congestion and pollution.</li> <li>○ Difficulties turning left to access Churchtown from Dundrum, Ballinteer, Sandyford</li> <li>○ Difficulties coming from Barton Road East and Ballinteer Road without access to Dundrum Cross.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Questions how emergency services will access the village or how local businesses, or local citizens will receive deliveries to their businesses OR deliveries from the supermarkets that may no longer be able to easily access routes due to the changes.</li> <li>● Submits that the LAP as is will cause more problems than benefits regarding connectivity and transport and will force many people to do their business elsewhere causing the main street and village to stagnate.</li> <li>● Requests that the plan be used to enable the people in the local area who are not in a position to cycle, to continue to access it and use it as their local village.</li> <li>● Suggests the idea of using local area permits, so that locals can obtain access with their cars to the church, pharmacies, banks, community centres, main street etc.</li> <li>● Points out that electric scooters and electric bikes are not the same as traditional scooters or traditional bikes and it is incredibly dangerous when sharing pathways with electric scooters and electric bikes.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4 and 6</p>

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0378</a>	Person: Anne O'Callaghan	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Submits that the proposal for 11 stories of high-density apartments and a high-rise civic center will introduce towering structures that are entirely out of keeping with the existing village landscape.</li> <li>● Worries about the loss of aesthetic appeal saying the introduction of towering buildings will disrupt the visual harmony of the village.</li> <li>● Considers an increased strain on infrastructure due to the anticipated influx of residents and businesses attracted by large-scale developments will place immense pressure on these systems, leading to potential issues with traffic congestion, strained resources, and overcrowding.</li> <li>● Submits that high-rise developments often have significant environmental implications, including increased energy consumption, decreased green spaces, and disruption to local wildlife habitats.</li> <li>● Regards these factors as contradictory to the values of sustainability and environmental conservation that the community holds dear.</li> <li>● Cites concerns that introduction of large commercial or residential towers may attract transient populations, which can adversely impact the strong sense of community and cohesiveness.</li> <li>● Thinks that preserving the intimate, tight-knit atmosphere of the village should be a priority.</li> <li>● Recommends that the council actively involves the community in the decision-making process as residents' perspectives, concerns, and ideas should be sought and respected considering they are the ones who will be most directly affected by these developments.</li> <li>● Implores the council to reconsider the current development plan and strive for a more balanced approach that prioritizes preservation, sustainability, and community well-being for current and future generations of the community.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4 and Other Issues</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0379</a>	Person: Aidan Corless	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Submitter is a local resident who supports the shift to active travel by investing in walking and cycling infrastructure.</li> <li>● Believes that rate payers should have been consulted in the preparation of these plans as they see the traffic levels every day and are the eyes and ears of the village.</li> <li>● Submits there is a requirement to consider the huge population over 50 who need their car to go shopping, visit the bank and go to church.</li> </ul>		

- Suggests this cohort has been omitted from consideration by the plans, yet older populations are living longer and need to be factored in.
- Has concerns regarding changes to traffic routes and the dangers posed by same which they believe will be to the detriment of residents on Sydenham Road.
- Submits that Sydenham Road is too narrow a road to accommodate a change to one way and giving 3.2mts space to a two-way cycle path without increasing the narrow foot path widths of only 1.8 mts wide will increase risks for pedestrians, cyclists and motorists.
- Submits that installing a two-way cycle lane on a narrow road where residents will reverse blindly across the bike lanes onto the car lane on a road that will also have increased traffic and additional problems navigating the residential furniture (cycle road barriers) will be a major safety hazard.
- Submitter is critical of proposed changes to Sydenham Road given its proximity to Taney School and Holy Cross with many cars travelling back on to Sydenham Road after the Taney school and Holy Cross.
- Believes that Stoney Road would be a better route for the cycle track as it is 2m wider and each resident can turn their car in their grounds so they can safely exit their house. Stoney road also has car parking spaces.
- Submitter would like to know how a shopping truck will deliver groceries or where emergency services can stop when there are no places to park other than the footpath and the cycle lanes.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 3, 4 and Other Issues

<b>DLR Submission No: B0380</b>	<b>Person: Sandra Joyce</b>	<b>Organisation: of Weston Park</b>
---------------------------------	-----------------------------	-------------------------------------

**Summary of Submission / Observation:**

- Objects to breaking the footpath/common space in front of the library to put in a permanent bus gate that will allow buses to travel across the Dundrum Bypass on to Sweetmount Ave from Main St Dundrum essentially enabling buses/taxis/other public transport to act as throughway traffic on Sweetmount Ave up to Churchtown Rd Upper.
- Objects to removing access to Dundrum Village crossroads for cars from Barton Rd East bridge, forcing all traffic to travel down Ballinteer Rd to the Wyckham way roundabout and then up again via Sandymount Rd to access the Holy Cross church and other local amenities. Only the entrance to parking for the Dundrum Town Centre on the bridge will be accessible to cars; access into the Village will be only for bus/taxi/other public transport.
- Objects to removing the Bus Terminal from its current location opposite OSC and relocating it on to Churchtown Rd Upper permanently taking up part of the road towards Taney-Dundrum junction. Building a Civic centre (underdetermined usage and unconfirmed height) in the tight space where the bus terminal currently resides.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapter 4

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0381</a>	Person: Pat Sheehy	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submits the plan needs to be revised.</li> <li>• Considers life to be more difficult with the road restrictions.</li> <li>• Submits that the by-pass is meant to by-pass and if more cycle lanes are needed they should be put there.</li> <li>• Believes the cycle lanes are empty mostly anyway.</li> <li>• Requests that Dundrum main street be returned to its original condition as businesses are suffering and will close.</li> <li>• Requests that the council also removes 'those black death traps' (cycle lane dividers) from the road as people are being damaged by them.</li> <li>• States people can no longer get to the pharmacy, dentist etc.</li> <li>• Submits that it's ridiculous to expect older people to cycle everywhere.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 4 and 6</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0382</a>	Person: Sean Carthy	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submits that the draft LAP delivers little of any real value for Dundrum.</li> <li>• Believes the proposal is overly focused on cycling and pedestrian infrastructure to the detriment of Other Issues.</li> <li>• States that any plan for Dundrum needs to include mobility in all forms, not just cycling and walking.</li> <li>• Believes that cycling is simply not an option for many residents due to age, agility, health, local topography, time constraints and family requirements.</li> <li>• Thinks the council needs to recognise that Dundrum is a focal point for retail and leisure activity with people travelling to Dundrum from far afield to use the services largely by car.</li> <li>• The proposal does nothing to address the current traffic issues, never mind future congestion issues resulting from elements of the proposal being implemented.</li> <li>• Queries why there is no inclusion of ideas such as electric car charging infrastructure, charging points for e-bikes and Scooters, time-controlled access to roads.</li> <li>• Thinks that the whole proposal relies heavily on cheap solutions such as road marking, moving a few kerbs and signage while Dundrum deserves proper investment in the local infrastructure.</li> <li>• Is critical of proposed changes to turns at the bottom of the Sandyford Road towards the M50. Cites issue in the Balally estate with severe rat-running caused by the traffic signals at this junction.</li> <li>• Thinks removing the left turn lane will result in this situation going from bad to worse.</li> <li>• Requests that the council carry out a full traffic survey in Balally Estate and at the Sandyford Road / Overend Way junction to come up with a proper, viable solution.</li> <li>• Considers the proposal to turn Sydenham Road into a vehicular one way with 2-way cycle lanes to be ill-advised due to the steep gradient of the access road.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1 and 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0383</a>	Person: Eoin Wickham	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submits that the long-promised LAP is deeply disappointing.</li> <li>• Considers the draft LAP, if implemented, will lead to the death of what remains of the village and remove the remaining individual character of Dundrum.</li> <li>• Submits that the suggested closure of Dundrum Main Street to all vehicles makes it incredibly difficult for any citizen with reduced mobility to access businesses and other services like Holy Cross church in the village and will create more congestion on adjoining residential roads.</li> </ul>		

- Considers the proposed bus gate that will effectively cut off the Library an awful idea and will make it increasingly dangerous for children walking or cycling to the two nearby primary schools.
- Is disappointed to see a foot bridge into Sweetmount Park being proposed as the previous bridge led to quite a lot of anti-social behaviour in the area.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 1, 2 and 4

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0384</a>	Person: Nora Gorey	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submits that the draft DLAP has given no consideration to the needs and requirements of the elderly population and therefore fails in its vision to be inclusive as a place people can live and enjoy.</li> <li>• References the WHO which states that 'A society is measured by how it cares for its elderly citizens'.</li> <li>• Objects to changes in traffic management regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The proposed barrier to traffic on Ballinteer Rd, entering Dundrum over the by-pass bridge (Section 4.6.1.1) as restrictive to elderly residents who will not be able to drive into the village to attend Mass, visit the Doctor, visit the pharmacy, bank, Post Office, shops or socialize citing this is an 'anti-elderly' plan.</li> <li>○ Considers traffic proposals to ban cars from the Main Street will penalise business owners in the village.</li> <li>○ Submits current cycle lane has had a detrimental affect on business and was installed without proper consultation.</li> <li>○ Objects to the Bus Gate proposed opposite the library on the grounds that it is Anti-children and anti-elderly, two groups who use the library a lot, and whose safety the DLAP has obviously not considered.</li> <li>○ Objects to the proposed building of a bridge over the bypass from Main St. to Sweetmount Park as it is unnecessary, and it will cause anti-social behaviour for the residents there.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2, 3, 4 and 6		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0385</a>	Person: Tony O'Carroll	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Raises concerns with impact of Draft LAP proposals on car access around and through Dundrum. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ States that impacts of proposals on vehicular traffic have not been sufficiently considered.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers that the proposed one-way traffic system on Kilmacud Road Upper eastwards from Sydenham Road would exacerbate traffic pressure on Overend Way / Overend Avenue, in particular at peak times. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Proposes that traffic on this section of Kilmacud Road Upper should be in a westbound direction and that traffic on the proposed one-way system on Sydenham Road should be in a northbound direction, in the event that the proposed one-way systems on these roads are implemented.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Does not support proposed removal of left slip lanes at Taney Cross. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Highlights this junction forms part of a continuous road between Foster Avenue and Churchtown.</li> <li>○ Highlights again the impact of the proposed measures on the surrounding areas, noting the need to fully consider this in addition to the local impact.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0386</a>	Person: Robert Stack	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b> <b>10-minute Neighbourhood:</b>		



- Considers that application of the 10-minute neighbourhood principle in the Draft LAP does not consider the particular characteristics and practicalities of the Dundrum area.
- Considers that elderly/mobility impaired/disabled and others are not sufficiently accounted for by this concept.
- Notes importance of considering practicalities of local climate.

#### **Housing:**

- Considers that 1 and 2-bed apartments do not align with housing needs of families in local community, due to lack of living space/private outdoor space.
- Highlights volume of recent apartment developments in the area (e.g. on Sandyford Road) consisting of 1 and 2-bed units.
- Considers that 1 and 2-bed apartment schemes conflict with LAP vision to provide mix of types/sizes/tenures within new residential developments.
- Concerned at capacity of community services to support such large developments.
- Cites examples respondent is aware of in which locals moved out of area due to unavailability of affordable, family sized homes with open space.
- Notes some families do not want to buy apartments.
- Disputes the Draft LAP statements regarding the requirements to provide suitable right-sizing/down-sizing accommodation in area, citing figures from 2018 Housing Agency survey.
- Queries whether units will be for rent or purchase.

#### **KDA Sites – Taney Cross, OSC, Dom Marmion:**

- Overall in favour of some form of redevelopment of old town centre, but conscious of ensuring it is the right type.
- Considers that the ‘Community Core’ generally comprises the area around Dundrum Cross on Main Street, Kilmacud Road Upper and Sandyford Road (noting that Holy Cross NS, Garda Station and Holy Cross Church are all located in this area).
  - Considers community hub / civic centre should be located here, rather than at Taney Cross junction.
  - Doubtful of success of civic centre if located at Taney Cross.
  - Considers civic centre at Taney Cross would be too closely aligned with SHD application.
  - Considers and 11 storey building would be disproportionate.
  - Disputes value of proximity to library due to segregation caused by Bypass.
- Highlights provision in Objective OSC15 to ‘Provide for community and/or tourism and/or childcare facilities and/or cultural uses adjacent to the new local park.’
  - Seeks mandatory provision of all uses listed, noting scale of development site and projected needs of the future population on Dundrum.
- Considers scale/height/density of proposed LAP design of apartment buildings at OSC site would not be in keeping with the historic character, scale and streetscape of village/community, would not create visual interest, would be overbearing, block sunlight/daylight, overshadow, impose on landscape, block views and restrict access to area.
  - Considers demolishing historic buildings on Main Street within/adjoining ACA would further detract from history/character.
  - Considers scale/heights would conflict with LAP vision to ensure design is mindful of existing character/scale/heritage of area.
  - Proposes maximum height restriction of 5/6 storeys.
  - Considers 11 storeys along Bypass would be inappropriate, noting there are no other buildings of such height in the area.
- Considers there is a lack of provision of retail/entertainment/essential facilities in Draft LAP, for both local area and surrounding communities.
- States it has not been considered how Main Street/village area provides civic square/plaza for supporting market square/community facilities.
  - Considers park proposed at OSC site is not large enough to serve existing and future population of area, or indeed future development at site.
  - Highlights general inadequate provision of green space in local area.
  - Concerned at proposals which would detract from existing green spaces in area.

- Considers this space should include trees for providing shade/supporting wildlife.
- Notes poor condition/maintenance of existing planters on Main Street.
- Concerned that flooding infrastructure is inadequate to support OSC site development, stating that it is located on a flood plain.
- Highlights volume of submissions objecting to SHD application at OSC site.
  - Concerned at similarities between Draft LAP proposals and SHD proposal, querying whether public's issues have been addressed.
- Strongly objects to proposed redevelopment of Dom Marmion site.
  - Concerned that redevelopment of site would result in loss of community facilities – car park, Dom Marmion Centre and school/montessori drop-off area.
  - Considers development proposals could not provide sufficient drop-off space to cater for existing demand.
  - Considers proposal will make school drop-off unsafe for children.
  - States previous proposals by DLR to improve Dom Marmion site by providing safe pedestrian access to school, planting, additional bicycle racks and congregation area (while retaining car parking) were welcomed by some locals.
  - Considers removal of car parking will increase journey times to school and exacerbate traffic congestion along Sandyford Road.
  - Concerns redevelopment of site would result in loss of green space used as outdoor classroom / school garden by Holy Cross NS.
  - Considers street-fronting retail space proposed is unnecessary, noting large volume of retail space proposed at Main Street/village area.
  - Considers childcare facility proposed at site should instead be provided at OSC development or other largescale apartment developments.

#### **Transport/Access:**

- Raises concerns with proposed Main Street to Churchtown Road Upper bus gate.
  - Considers this will further segregate library, detract from safety/peace of community space and the quiet of the library.
- Welcomes proposed traffic calming measures and measures to promote active travel/public transport, however, feels proposals are overly exclusive of car.
  - Notes particular needs of elderly/families with school-going children/disabled/mobility impaired who may not be able to use these modes to access local services/amenities.
  - States that 22% of Irish people have permanent disability (citing CSO figures).
  - Cites CSO national figures for increasing proportion of elderly population, querying whether nursing home / assisted living accommodation could be provided in area.
  - Considers proposed car access restrictions on Ballinteer Road at Dundrum Cross will divide local community in 2.
  - Considers this will exacerbate existing congestion on local roads including Dundrum Bypass, Overend Avenue, Wyckham Way and Sandyford Road, and junctions associated with these.
  - Notes significant increase in car journey times.
  - Considers solution is unrealistic.
  - Proposes provision of cycle lanes on Dundrum Bypass and via northern DTCSC entrance (car park to rear of Holy Cross Church) as alternative measures.
  - Considers controlled traffic can be allowed while also providing sufficient infrastructure for cyclists.
  - Emphasises issues with cycling due to weather, citing Met Eireann statistics for annual rainfall, winds and ice.
- Considers existing cycle lane kerbs on Main Street pose trip hazard.
- Notes importance of car park to rear of Holy Cross Church for locals attending church / community centre.
  - Concerned at impacts of removing this parking, in particular on those with mobility issues.
  - Notes many uses that take place at community centre after church services.
- Notes need to consider emergency vehicle access along Main Street, stating that many elderly residents live on this street.
  - Queries how emergency services can access taller buildings, noting low water pressure in area.

- Concerned at transport capacity issues as a result of additional pressure from OSC development, noting existing public transport capacity issues.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and Other Issues

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0387</a>	Person: Mark Heffernan	Organisation: Dundrum Veterinary Clinic
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcomes measures supporting vibrant/thriving local community. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Notes importance of local independent businesses in order to achieve this.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Welcomes provision of cycle lanes, green space, pedestrian/cyclists access across bypass from Sweetmount Park to Main Street.</li> <li>• Respondent has many elderly clients and many who have sick pets, for whom adequate car access to respondent's business and nearby parking provision is essential.</li> <li>• Notes importance of existing OSC car parking and car parking to rear of Holy Cross Church for people accessing respondent's service. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers spaces needs to be allocated for local car park within OSC redevelopment site to ensure access to local businesses can continue.</li> <li>○ Concerned that without sufficient access/parking, Main Street will become de facto extension of entertainment/bar/restaurant uses associated with DTCS.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2, 5 and 6</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0388</a>	Person: Karen O'Donnell	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcomes proposed pedestrian/cycle infrastructure improvements, however considers there is continued need to facilitate car traffic.</li> <li>• Notes particular needs of families with young children/elderly/disabled to access local shops/services, sufficient parking and drop-off facilities. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Highlights longer/unreliable public transport journey times.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers new/improved cycle lanes are safer for cyclists, however notes lack of dedicated/secure bicycle storage near amenities/services. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers this issue particularly applies to e-bikes.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Concerned at impacts to emergency services access due to proposed one-way traffic systems.</li> <li>• States that car parking at Carnegie Library is also used by visitors to St. Nahi's Church. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers removal of this parking to facilitate Main Street to Churchtown Road Upper bus gate will negatively impact library/church functions.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4</p>		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0389</a></b>	<b>Person: Isobel Gorey</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers Draft LAP proposals will not improve local area, highlighting restrictions to car access in favour of pedestrian/cyclist infrastructure. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Cites increased journey times and emissions.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Objects to proposed cycle link from Sweetmount Park to OSC/Main Street. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers it is unnecessary noting readily available alternative routes.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Objects to proposed bus gates. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers proposed Main Street to Churchtown Road Upper bus gate will safety issues for pedestrians accessing library.</li> <li>○ Notes proposed Dundrum Cross bus gate will restrict car access.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0390</a></b>	<b>Person: Eileen Canny-Fitzpatrick</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned at difficulties accessing shops in village as a result of proposed measures in Draft LAP.</li> <li>• Notes resulting congestion issues and loss of local business.</li> <li>• States Dundrum has retained feeling of old, well-established village.</li> <li>• Considers much of unique atmosphere will be lost.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4 and 6		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0391</a></b>	<b>Person: Mary Fitzgerald</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highlights need to improve public transport before implementing any additional traffic restrictions in Dundrum.</li> <li>• Proposes provision of a continuous, regular and reliable bus service from Nutgrove SC to Dundrum TC to Stillorgan SC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers this would encourage shoppers and those attending church services to use public transport rather than car.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0392</a></b>	<b>Person: Ann Flynn</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Criticises Draft LAP for lack of consideration of large traffic volumes, pollution due to more cars.</li> <li>• Notes pressure on school/medical services due to increased population.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 3 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0393</a></b>	<b>Person: Katinka Spurling</b>	<b>Organisation: Movies @ Dundrum</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of submission made by DRLP (Ref. B0344 refers).</li> <li>• Concerned at diminished accessibility to DTCS from local and regional roads as a result of proposed measures of Draft LAP.</li> <li>• Considers any changes to road network should enhance access to DTCS and respondent's business.</li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Respondent states their business is a well-established entertainment/leisure facility.</li> <li>● Respondent requests consultation with DLR and updates regarding progress of Draft LAP.</li> </ul>
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4, 6 and Other Issues

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0394</a>	Person: Rebecca Cowhig	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Noting long-term impact of Draft LAP, considers that addressing needs of local residents, businesses and public amenities is crucial.</li> <li>● Concerned at degree of emphasis in Draft LAP on walking/cycling infrastructure.</li> <li>● Acknowledges importance of supporting walking/cycling/public transport.</li> <li>● Highlights estimated significant increase in EV use in Ireland. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ States this will significantly reduce CO2 emissions.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Considers one-way traffic systems are not suitable for Dundrum, stating that area is already well served by bus corridors, cycle/pedestrian routes and the Luas.</li> <li>● Proposed that two-way system on Sydenham Road should be retained.</li> <li>● Notes high traffic volumes on road at peak times.</li> <li>● Highlights that road provides access to local schools/educational facilities/Garda Station. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Concerned that making the road the sole access to Taney Parish Primary School would have significant negative impacts on local residents.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Considers road is too narrow to accommodate proposed active travel infrastructure.</li> <li>● Proposes that Stoney Road could more suitably accommodate proposed infrastructure, as it is wider than Sydenham Road and carries less traffic.</li> <li>● Considers issues will arise due to relatively high number of properties on Sydenham Road / Sydenham Villas. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers rubber cycle lane kerbs would create significant difficulties for cars existing driveways.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Highlights that no designated space for delivery/emergency services/taxis is provided, therefore these services would obstruct vehicular/cycle traffic.</li> <li>● Highlights that substantial detour would be required to access properties on road due to absence of right onto Birches Lane from Kilmacud Road Upper.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0395</a>	Person: Tracie James	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Strongly opposed to proposed pedestrian/cycle route connecting Main Street and Sweetmount Park (as set out in Section 4.6.1.5 of Draft LAP).</li> <li>● Does not consider pedestrian bridge would be necessary, noting convenient availability of alternative access routes, absence of amenities of public interest. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Disputes statement in Draft LAP (Section 2.9.2.4) that there is severance of community west of village.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Concerns at increased car traffic and parking in Sweetmount Park/The Laurels area from visitors to town centre area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers this poses safety risk, in particular to young children/elderly/mobility impaired.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Considers increased footfall in Sweetmount Park/The Laurels area would lead to increased anti-social behaviour/loitering/litter/ecosystems. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Notes trend of increase in this activity in recent years.</li> <li>○ Concerns litter would pollute Slang River.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● States that issues raised occurred during operation of temporary access bridge in place during construction of Bypass.</li> </ul>		

- Believes local Gardaí will echo concerns raised in this submission with reference to previous issues arising from temporary bridge.
- Skeptical of statement in Section 2.2 of Draft LAP that some submissions called for improved pedestrian permeability between OSC site and Sweetmount Park.
  - Requests to see submissions in question.
- Raises concerns with proposed transport measures at Dundrum Cross as set out in Section 4.6.1.1.
  - Notes issues with access to services/amenities of village/Main Street have arisen as a result of existing one-way system in place.
- Highlights issues with existing cycle lane on Main Street including underutilisation, trip hazard of cycle lane kerbs, disruption to traffic flow and access of properties on street.
- Calls for reinstatement of two-way vehicular traffic on Main Street and retention of two-way vehicular traffic access to Dundrum Cross from Ballinteer Road.
- Concerns regarding increased car journey times and distances for residents of Sweetmount Park/Laurels residential area travelling to/from village and surrounding areas.
- Calls for retention of two-way vehicular traffic on Sydenham Road due to traffic disruption concerns.
- Critical of delivery of civic centre at Taney Cross KDA.
  - Considers site is too small and will require too many storeys for facility to be effective.
  - Recommends locating civic centre on more central site on or near Main Street with suitable access.
- Concerned at prospect of high-density, high-rise development at OSC site.
  - Objects to 10/11 storey height limits suggested along Bypass.
  - Concerned at logistical, social and environmental impacts, negative impacts to village.
  - Supports redevelopment of OSC site in consultation with local residents.
- Objects to proposed Main Street to Churchtown Road Upper bus gate as set out in Section 4.6.1.8, referencing safety, access, noise and pollution issues.
- Requests more meaningful and robust consultation with local residents as part of decision-making in future.
- Requests more defined details on design of building facades to ensure they are in keeping with old look of village.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
 Chapters 2, 4 and Other Issues

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0396</a>	Person: Dudley Dolan	Organisation: Taney Parish Primary School
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional submission by respondent (B0284 and B0286 refer).</li> <li>• Lists document property dates of Draft LAP and ABTA documents, noting the LAP seems to have been created 2/6/2023 and modified 6/6/2023 but there is no date in the written document and the ABTA was written 30/5/2022 and approved 30/5/2023 however Appendix B is dated 2/6/2023 but properties indicate the 7/6/2023.</li> <li>• Highlights provision in Figure 5.5 of ABTA Options Assessment Report (Appendix B), which illustrates that no right turn for buses/larger vehicles from Sydenham Villas onto Kilmacud Road Upper is being considered as an option as part of the DLR Connector project. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Identifies that this provision is not included in the Draft LAP.</li> <li>○ Claims that this is an omission from the Draft LAP as a result of modifications to the Options Assessment Report after the Draft LAP had been finalised.</li> <li>○ Concerned that this provision would result in school buses/HGVs exiting Sydenham Villas having to travel via Main Street.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• It would appear that the documents were being modified at the last minute and that the Draft DLAP does not contain the most up to date information.</li> <li>• Raises concerns generally with emergency services access.</li> <li>• Critical of reference to Sydenham Villas as a 'quiet street' in Section 6.4.2 of Final ABTA Report. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Notes high traffic volume during peak school traffic times.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4 and Other Issues</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0397</a>	Person: Maria Murphy	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to proposed car traffic access restrictions on Ballinteer Road / Barton Road East and removal of car parking. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers it will inhibit local access to local services/amenities in the village.</li> <li>○ Notes difficulties for school children walking in bad weather.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers bus traffic in front of Carnegie Library will cause safety issues.</li> <li>• Considers cycle lanes on Bypass are underutilised.</li> <li>• Highlights particular impacts to elderly.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0398</a>	Person: John McCulloch	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers LAP is not necessary.</li> <li>• Requests reinstatement of two-way traffic system in village.</li> <li>• Considers LAP will negatively impact elderly/mobility impaired.</li> <li>• Considers LAP will inhibit access to local services/amenities.</li> <li>• Considers LAP documents are highly complicated.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1 and 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0399</a>	Person: Ali Norman	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers LAP should place more emphasis on importance of small-scale NBSs and green spaces to improve health/well-being of communities.</li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers measures can be easily implemented around cycle lanes/footpaths, e.g. bioswales.</li> </ul>
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5

<b>Submission No:</b> <u>B0400</u>	<b>Person:</b> Laura Thompson	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Census data: DLAP relies on census data from 2016 (referenced on various pages) and recommends that the council update this information by referring to the 2022 census data.</li> <li>• Sandyford road / Wyckham Road / Overend Avenue Junction (page 54 of DLAP) - While the submitter welcomes improvements for pedestrians and cyclists, they express concern that the removal of the left turn slip road may prohibit a left turn for vehicles, restricting access to vital routes. Possible alternatives might include a fully marked pedestrian crossing or even a pedestrian/cycling bridge or underground connection.</li> <li>• Sandyford Road North (page 52 of DLAP) –Considers that proposed changes could exacerbate the situation, especially at the junction with the south end of Sandyford Road. Suggests that the two-way access for vehicles to Holy Cross National School and the town centre is maintained to help alleviate potential traffic issues at the Sandyford road/Wyckham road / Overend Avenue junction.</li> <li>• Kilmacud Road Upper (page 54/56 of DLAP plan) – the submitter considers that traffic from this area may filter onto other roads, leading to further congestion and recommends that the flow of traffic is assessed to avoid adding to existing congestion.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No:</b> <u>B0401</u>	<b>Person:</b> Adrienne Hickey	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter objects to the road closure to all traffic / except bus access on the Ballinteer road, through Dundrum village without an alternative plan first being put in place.</li> <li>• Elderly residents rely on that road for their accessibility to Holy Cross church, and their local Doctor in the village. The gradient is far too steep for them to walk in bad weather, let alone cycle up and down from the village and after Covid they were left feeling isolated.</li> <li>• Cycle lanes are welcomed, but must consider senior citizens.</li> <li>• Please consider small shuttle buses to allow all residents access and enjoyment of the future vision for Dundrum village.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No:</b> <u>B0402</u>	<b>Person:</b> Eoin O'Driscoll	<b>Organisation:</b> Fine Gael
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter is supportive of the vision for Dundrum in the plan, which aims to create "a vibrant, inclusive and attractive town." The identified priorities, including a 10-minute neighbourhood, character and heritage preservation, quality homes, amenities, public transport, and climate action, are also supported.</li> <li>• The submitter looks forward to the proposed Masterplan for the Old Dundrum Shopping Centre, outlined in section 2.9.2. The development of a public park and pedestrian-focused areas will enhance the village's vibrancy and build on recent public realm improvements.</li> <li>• The submitter also acknowledges the importance of the measures in Section 5 regarding climate action. Addressing climate change is a major challenge for our generation, and it's important that the LAP supports DLRC in achieving their ambition in this regard. However, the submitter expresses concerns regarding the following aspects of the plan as follows:</li> </ul>		



**Insufficient Public Consultation**

- It is crucial that the community's engagement is deep and genuine, and their support for the ambitious measures in the plan is obtained. However, the submitter considers that this critical community engagement has not been achieved. Though public interest is high and residents clearly want to be involved, the Council's efforts to engage with them have fallen short.
- The consultation process began in 2018 with a pre-draft consultation, aiming for the adoption of the plan in late 2019, which has not eventuated. The lengthy gap between the initial consultation and the actual publication of the LAP undermines meaningful public engagement.
- The context has drastically changed in the nearly five years since the pre-draft process. The demographics of Dundrum have changed and lifestyles have shifted, particularly with the adoption of new technologies and the increase in remote working. These changes are not reflected in the pre-draft consultation.
- Moreover, this initial consultation predates two significant policy documents that underpin the draft DLAP: the DLR CDP and the RSES.
- In light of these concerns, the submitter believes that a renewed and genuine effort to engage with the community is necessary.
- The submitter states that they do not believe that the pre-draft consultation process can be considered meaningful public engagement in the development of this plan or that the draft plan can be considered to reflect "public and community aspirations".
- The submitter also states that they are satisfied with the timing of the consultation, being over the summer, and that the council should also consider more traditional communication measures, such as flyers.

**Vibrancy of Main Street**

- Section 1 of the draft plan recognises Dundrum as a "MTC," but this is not sufficiently recognised throughout the plan. The heart of Dundrum community life is Main Street, and its vibrancy should be at the core of our planning. There has been a lack of meaningful engagement with the businesses on Main Street, many of which have been serving the community for generations.
- Local businesses and residents have expressed concerns regarding access to Main Street. While the measures to support pedestrian and bicycle access and specific efforts to reduce car usage are welcomed, the needs of the elderly and those with disabilities must be considered. This is especially important when it comes to access to vital places like Holy Cross Church.
- For Main Street to continue being the vibrant core of the Dundrum community, reasonable parking provision will be required.
- A detailed assessment of local residents' access needs, based on meaningful public engagement and consultation with the businesses operating on Main Street, should be undertaken by the Council to ensure that the finalised plan reflect this.
- The submitter also calls on the Council to consider adding facilities that would promote the increased use of public and active transport by providing public storage facilities for things like bike helmets and shopping, more people could utilise Main Street without relying on cars. Such facilities would augment the public realm improvements of recent years.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and Other issues

<b>DLR Submission No: B0403</b>	<b>Person: David Douglas</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b> The submitter commends the draft DLAP but also highlights several concerns as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on Sweetmount area – The submitter is concerned about the impact of high-rise apartment blocks and new bus routes on the Sweetmount area, which has become a welcome quiet oasis.</li> <li>• High rise – The construction of very high apartment blocks is clearly out of character for Dundrum village and the submitter is particularly concerned about the bypass.</li> <li>• The submitter opposes the opening of a bus gate in the area in front of the library.</li> <li>• The focus on reducing car use is criticized for neglecting the needs of the elderly and those with mobility issues. Creative responses are required.</li> </ul>		

- The commitment to a Community and Cultural Civic Centre in a quiet area of Dundrum should be used to extend and improve this area. The submitter seeks confirmation this will be a community hub and not an 11 storey high office block.
- The submitter is concerned that the redevelopment of the OSC could lead to the destruction of Dundrum's village character.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 2 and 4

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0404</a>	Person: Paul Callan	Organisation: Holy Cross Parish
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter raises the following concerns regarding the draft DLAP:</li> <li>• Impact on the ability of parishioners to access to Holy Cross Parish Church, Parish Pastoral Centre and The Presbytery.</li> <li>• A longer, more challenging journey will discourage parishioners especially those with mobility issues.</li> <li>• The submitter opposes the no left turn associated with the bus gate at Ballinteer Road.</li> <li>• Parishioners who would normally access the church and centre by coming down the hill opposite the Garda station will now have to travel up Taney Road, across Overend Way and turn right at the RSA building, resulting in traffic congestion.</li> <li>• Access to and from Holy Cross Parish School will become more difficult and dangerous.</li> <li>• Concern regarding access to the Dom Marmion Hall and the service it provides.</li> <li>• A local area bus service could facilitate access to and from the parish church, the parish pastoral centre, the presbytery, Holy Cross School, Dom Marmion Hall, the local shops and businesses, thus facilitating access and reducing the number of cars making short trips in the area.</li> <li>• The Presbytery, Main Street, beside Holy Cross Church, is the residence of the local parish priest and requires access in order to administer duties.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0405</a>	Person: Elizabeth Ryan	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
The submitter sets out the following concerns regarding the draft DLAP:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One way and cycle lanes – The one-way system is damaging businesses in the village due to the inability to go back looking for parking spaces, or to pull in, because of both the one-way system and the parking spaces now taken by the cycle lanes, which appear to be surplus to requirements. Taking a wrong turn means a much longer, corrective journey due to the one-way system and cycle lanes and the submitter opposes their expansion.</li> <li>• Bus route via Sweetmount – The proposed bus route via the Sweetmount area is unfair to residents, very unsafe for young families, and with buses every 4 mins, and will completely change the lived experience and noise and fuel pollution in that area.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0406</a>	Person: Mario Pio Russo	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter comments that they find the plan very informative and well structured, but wishes to express some concerns regarding the following:</li> <li>• Section 4.6.1.1 Dundrum Cross (Junction of Main St, Ballinteer Rd, Sandyford Rd and Kilmacud Rd Upper) – The elimination of a slip roads will increase the congestion time at the T Junction during rush hours for commuting to the city centre. An increased number of Buses (due to Bus Gate) and the lack of specific Bus lanes will increase the congestion time.</li> </ul>		

- Return to work – Most private companies are forcing return to office which will lead to more cars on the road in 2023/24.
- Section 3.3 Homes – No specific indication how many new apartments are to be developed in the area. High rise development (e.g. more than 4 storey Buildings) in an area accessed by single carriage roads toward the centre it is a concern for traffic, pollution, etc.
- Green space – The submitter would like to see more information in the plan about parks and green areas.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 3, 4 and 5

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0407</a>	Person: Ailesbury Residents Association	Organisation: Ailesbury Residents Association
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter welcomes the preparation of the draft DLAP and recognises the aims of the document to provide for effective planning of the area. In particular, the submitter notes proposals to create a vibrant and sustainable community in Dundrum village itself, including appropriate and considered treatment of future development potential. However, the submitter sets out the following concerns:</li> <li>• Restrictions on car movements - The proposal to restrict usage of a section of Ballinbeer Road to buses and cyclists, on the western approach to Dundrum Cross, will create severe difficulty for a number of our older residents or those with mobility issues, and who rely on a car to drive to the village. The alternative represents an overly circuitous route for elderly people. The submitter requests that the proposed restriction on cars at Ballinbeer Road approaching Dundrum Cross be deleted.</li> <li>• Impact on local businesses – Any measure restricting or discouraging vehicular access to the village will threaten existing businesses. The loss of existing businesses will compromise any proposals to improve the vibrancy of the area.</li> <li>• Car Parking – the submitter requests that specific measures be put in place to accommodate/retain car parking on or adjacent to Main Street. Such provisions are essential for the mobility impaired.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4 and 6		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0408</a>	Person: Edmund Cotter	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Redevelopment of OSC - the submitter states that there is a definite need for development of the OSC and the work in this area is welcomed.</li> <li>• Consultation – Appropriate consultation with local residents groups does not seem to have been conducted.</li> <li>• Access to Main Street / One way system - the elderly population is finding it challenging to attend the church on account of the new road layout. Businesses on the main street seem to have been significantly negatively affected by the new one-way system. Taney Primary School appears to be potentially quite cut off from much of its traditional catchment area.</li> <li>• Heights – The proposed 16 storey apartment development appears very excessive. Fire safety in such high rise buildings is a concern.</li> <li>• Luas capacity – It is often very challenging to get a space on the tram after 8am. Increased local population will also need increased service demands from workers commuting to the city centre.</li> <li>• Protected structures – The submitter would also like to see Dom Marmion house achieving protected status.</li> <li>• Processing of personal information – The submitter wishes to record that as part of the submission they were not given access to how their personal information would be held in accordance with DLR's Retention policy, the GDPR and Data Protection Act 2018</li> <li>• The submitter includes a screen grab of a broken link in support of this point.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4, 8 and Other Issues		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0409</a>	Person: Rachel Gerrard	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consultation – The submitter provides commentary on the drop-in days.</li> <li>• The 10-minute neighbourhood – Considers that it does not work in this jurisdiction. Imposing top-down technocratic design changes such as cycle lanes and mini pocket parks, does little to benefit residents.</li> <li>• Windy Arbour – The Dundrum Road is a major through route and its downgrading to a "Neighbourhood Street" with blockages at several key points, such as Windy Arbour and Taney Cross, would impede the smooth flow of traffic. Alterations like pinched roadways, tightened roundabouts, and the removal of left-hand turn lanes at various junctions are considered barriers that could disrupt traffic movement between significant arterial roads.</li> <li>• Traffic restrictions – The temporary pandemic measures should be reversed as they are hazardous and block emergency services access. Requests restoration of two-way traffic on Kilmacud Road.</li> <li>• Heights – All future development should be restricted to five storeys and should be set back from the public street by 10 meters</li> <li>• Bus gates – Maintain two-way access from Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East Road, the proposed bus gate and bus layover will prevent smooth flow of traffic through and access to the village. DLRC have no control over Dublin Bus or Bus connects, so claims that buses will cross every 4 minutes the proposed bus gate at Sweetmount cannot be confirmed.</li> <li>• Relocation of Bus terminus – Moving the terminus away from the Luas station (s.4.6.1.2.) and proposing a layover on a steep incline on Churchtown road upper will narrow traffic lanes on R112. Buses emerging from Sweetmount Avenue to layover on Churchtown Road will block traffic flow through Taney Cross.</li> <li>• Sydenham Road – Retain 2-way traffic along Sydenham Road, proposed cycle lane impedes access and egress for residents living along the road.</li> <li>• Civic Centre – The proposed civic centre at Taney Cross which involves relocating buses and constructing (the submitter understands) an 11-storey building is unjustified and may lead to excessive heights in nearby developments. The submitter questions future sources of funding.</li> <li>• Dom Marmion Hall – Dom Marmion Hall offers various activities to support the elderly and is under threat by the new plans.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4 and Other Issues</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0410</a>	Person: Stephen Mc Lean	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter comments that they are very supportive and that the DLAP contains some great ideas to encourage more active travel.</li> <li>• The submitter is also seeking secure bike parking at Luas stops.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1 and 4</p>		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0411</a></b>	<b>Person: Kevin Bent</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Left turn slip lanes – The submitter opposes the removal of the left turn slip lanes on all approach arms at the Luas bridge junction. The submitter cites a reference on page 50 to local car ownership and traffic and suggests that removing the slip lanes significantly increase traffic, which will increase idling time and increase CO2 emissions. Speed ramps could be used to calm traffic as an alternative.</li> <li>• Emergency services – Increased traffic will impede emergency services.</li> <li>• One way/bus gates – The submitter opposes the implementation of more one way roads or bus gates within the Dundrum village</li> <li>• Cycle lane to UCD – The submitter opposes the cycle lane within Mulvey Park and Gledswood Park route to UCD referenced on page 56 of the LAP plan.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0412</a></b>	<b>Person: Ruth Feehan</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<p>The submitter raises concerns regarding the draft DLAP as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LAP will add to the traffic congestion issue which new housing developments is already making worse.</li> <li>• The LAP will not improve connectivity for current residents or future residents.</li> <li>• The R117 regional road is not a neighbourhood street.</li> <li>• The LAP actually will exclude older people and those with a disability, as well as people with young children from accessing the village.</li> <li>• The plan seems to prioritise cyclists over pedestrians, however, the cycling lane through the village is currently under-used.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0413</a></b>	<b>Person: Laura Phillips</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access – The proposals block access for the community including to the Church for elderly and makes travel and access harder.</li> <li>• Safety – These types of measures haven't worked in nearby urban areas and cause more accidents for cyclists and cars.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0414</a></b>	<b>Person: Daniel Walsh</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter comments that they fully support the scheme and that it is essential to allow for the expected population growth in the area.</li> <li>• It is also essential to ensure we have any chance of meeting our climate goals.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 1		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0415</a></b>	<b>Person: Ian McCulloch</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter comments that they have never witnessed such change in the village between the OSC and bus routes and it is a disgrace.</li> <li>The submitter is appalled at the volume of traffic that uses the Sweetmount Drive/Avenue as a rat run.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0416</a></b>	<b>Person: Tony Randles</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter comments that they fully support the changes and that walking, cycling and public transportation should be prioritised.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0417</a></b>	<b>Person: Jutta Baum-Sheridan</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter comments that they are pleased to see that the area is being considered for improvement, but would like to make the following observations:</li> <li>Dundrum Road – The development proposed at the CMH could provide the opportunity to finally widen Dundrum Road, be it to improve cycle lanes, landscaping, but also improve pedestrian access.</li> <li>Transport capacity – There are acute limitations on the existing transportation network in the area especially at peak times, including luas capacity, lack of segregated cycle facilities on Dundrum Road, delays to busses resulting from congestion, and saturation of the road network.</li> <li>Changes at the Arbourfield shops are to be welcomed, but they have to take into account the necessary commercial and residential parking and loading facilities so as not to impact on nearby residents.</li> <li>The proposal to remove a right turn into Dundrum Road from Taney Road is perplexing, as it is not used a lot.</li> <li>The roundabouts on the Wyckham Bypass work well and would not need to be replaced with signalised junctions.</li> <li>The Dundrum Bypass is too dangerous for most cyclists and would not be used much, even with improved as it is also steep for cyclists to use.</li> <li>The submitter supports encouraging alternative transport but expresses disappointment, particularly with regard to the bus service, and questions whether collaboration is taking place to ensure suitable road systems for buses, bus infrastructure. The submitter feels there is too much focus on the luas, which they comment is already overcrowded.</li> <li>The submitter comments that the number 17 bus route used to bring people from Dundrum to Blackrock but is now cancelled.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0418</a></b>	<b>Person: Jane Burke</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fully supportive of suggested cycle lane/route through Mulvey Park/Gledswood.</li> <li>Currently estate is used as a rat run and would hope that this would lessen this.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0419</a></b>	<b>Person: Lyn O'Doherty</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>  The submitter states that they are extremely concerned about the DLAP and raise the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many elderly or disabled people will not be able to use the cycle infrastructure.</li> <li>• The plan will cause severe congestion, especially when all the left hand slip ways are closed.</li> <li>• People will be unable to access Dundrum village, including for funerals and will need to take long detours.</li> <li>• How will local businesses be able to survive if they can't be accessed.</li> <li>• More serious thought and studies need to be done before these plans are implemented.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b>  Chapters 1, 4 and 6</p>		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0420</a></b>	<b>Person: Clare Kilroy</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>  The submitter raises the following concerns about the DLAP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter opposes the bus gate at Sweetmount and wishes to see the space to the front of the library retained.</li> <li>• High rise buildings will be very intrusive to the homes close by, the submitter is seeking a lesser scale of development.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b>  Chapter 2, 3 and 4</p>		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0421</a></b>	<b>Person: Warren Logan</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter sets out that they have lived their entire life in Dundrum.</li> <li>• Considers plan contains both positive and negative elements.</li> <li>• Submission states that a member of staff informed them at the drop-in day that the reason for the bus gate was to make way for the proposed civic building. Submission expresses concerns in relation to Bus gate from Main Street to Churchtown Lower due to impact on quality of life of the submitter's family and neighbours. A photo is included to show location of submitters property.</li> <li>• Submitter considers that the bus gate contradicts the CCAP vision for the civic centre and considers that the bus gate will tear apart the fabric of the community.</li> <li>• Road Safety – Submission considers location of proposed bus gate could result in road safety issues due to Old Churchtown Road being small. Submission considers that the proposals to make Old Churchtown Road one way speaks volumes.</li> <li>• Bus Frequency – Submitter queries frequency and times of buses running through bus gate including concern regarding any 24 hour bus routes. Submitter considers that no family could remain living in their home if it was to be changed to become a busy bus gate route. A comparison is made with Dublin City Quays.</li> <li>• Submission provides commentary in relation to noise and air pollution from Buses and considers that noise pollution will remain with electric buses.</li> <li>• Submitter provides commentary in relation to the height of buses and concerns regarding the impact of same on their family's privacy. A series of photos are provided.</li> <li>• Submission provides commentary on the potential new Community, Cultural and Civic Centre, the options as presented in the Dundrum CCCAP and raises issues in relation to any potential location at Taney cross relating to the size of the site, the unremarkable location and the fact that the size will mean that any building will need to be tall. Submitter considers that a tall building would go against the vision of some local groups.</li> <li>• Submitter suggests that the site behind Dundrum Library could be used instead as a site for the CCC building as the flooding issues have not caused an issue on the adjoining shopping centre site.</li> </ul>		

- Submission provides commentary on height of any proposed civic centre building and states that they are concerned - based on information received at the drop in day - that the proposed building would be 11 storeys. Submission requests that the council consider a second submission date to give the Council more time to publish the confirmed height, scale and usage of the proposed civic building for the public to view.
- Submitter expresses concern about any proposed relocation of the library to the new civic building and raises the need for consultation on same.
- Submission expresses concern in relation to loss of existing amenity space to the front of the existing library should the bus gate go ahead.
- Submission expresses concern that the majority of space in any new civic, community building would be used for offices for public servants instead of for community uses.
- The submission then provides commentary on the OSC site including quotes from a newspaper article which quoted the planning authorities report on a current SHD on the site. Submitter considers that the DLR position has altered and considers that this may cause legal issues.
- Submission concludes by asking the Council to take on board issues raised.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 2, 4 and Other Issues

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0422</a>	Person: <a href="#">Conor O'Donnell</a>	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers only holding consultation in accordance with statutory timelines is insufficient for such a substantive plan. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers there was lack of awareness locally of Draft LAP consultation.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers LAP is biased in favour of 'anti-car lobby'. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers that impacts to community and businesses of restricting car access have not been sufficiently assessed.</li> <li>○ Notes large elderly population in Dundrum for whom access to village/services/public transport by walking is difficult.</li> <li>○ Considers that adequate parking near shops/services needs to be maintained.</li> <li>○ Proposes using carbon taxes/subsidies to promote transition to EVs and improving public transport as means to dissuade car use, as opposed to restricting access without viable alternatives.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• States that existing traffic issues are a result of previous planning, citing the following e.g.s: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Regional scale shopping centre in suburban neighbourhood.</li> <li>○ Road link to junction 13 of M50.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Critical of proposals to divert buses onto small residential roads.</li> <li>• Proposes reinstating two-way car traffic system on Main Street. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers this would facilitate access for emergency services vehicles.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Proposes medium scale/density of development with maximum height restrictions of 5/6 storeys. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Concerns at height and location of proposed civic centre building.</li> <li>○ Proposes a maximum height of 6 storeys and location in centre of village.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2, 4, 6 and Other Issues</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0423</a>	Person: <a href="#">Nicola Phillips</a>	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to LAP.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 1</p>		



DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0424</a>	Person: Ray Cunningham	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of LAP.</li> <li>• Considers Dundrum is suitable location for additional housing due to connectivity to high quality public transport.</li> <li>• Considers roads into village should only provide access to village, noting existing main roads around village.</li> <li>• Considers this would improve cyclists/pedestrian safety and increase footfall to shops.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 3, 4 and 6</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0425</a>	Person: James Mulholland	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to Draft LAP. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Notes excessive focus on cyclists/pedestrians.</li> <li>○ States estimated increase in electric/hybrid vehicles and consequent reduction in greenhouse emissions has not been accounted for.</li> <li>○ Does not consider elderly/mobility impaired who cannot walk/cycle have been accounted for.</li> <li>○ States there has been no independent traffic survey.</li> <li>○ Considers there is no demand for LAP.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Raises concerns with proposed restrictions to access on Ballinteer Road at Dundrum Cross (as set out in Section 4.6.1.1). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers proposed measures will cause long delays and detours for residents seeking to access local services and amenities, as well as commuting to city.</li> <li>○ Suggests additional issues in this regard will be caused by proposed measures on Sandyford Road as set out in Section 4.6.1.3.</li> <li>○ Considers measures will disproportionately impact elderly/disabled/mobility impaired/parents.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Suggests congestion and delays will be exacerbated by proposed active travel/public realm improvement measures at Taney Cross and environs (as set out in Section 4.6.1.2) and on Dundrum Road at Windy Arbour (as set out in Section 4.6.3.1).</li> <li>• Notes issues with existing car traffic restriction measures in place at the village. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Concerns at impacts to local businesses.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers proposed high rise buildings are not mindful of scale/character/heritage of Dundrum and therefore conflict with LAP vision.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 3, 4 and 6</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0426</a>	Person: Macdara O Seireadain	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Broadly supportive of Draft LAP, in particular active travel provisions.</li> <li>• Considers however that further measures are needed in order to provide high quality cycle/pedestrian infrastructure between Taney Cross and CMH site.</li> <li>• Notes that Dundrum Road is narrow and dangerous to cycle on.</li> <li>• Considers cycle upgrades on this road would make more trips by bike, cargo bike and hand-cycle bike possible.</li> <li>• Proposes that further provision of covered Sheffield stands in the area would be beneficial.</li> <li>• Welcomes re-wilding proposals. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Would like increased native tree planting in area.</li> <li>○ Notes benefits of providing shade and improving air quality.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ States improved/increased planting is linked to improved quality of life and reduced crime.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 4 and 5</p>

DLR Submission No: <u>B0427</u>	Person: Luke Mullholland	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Objects to Draft LAP. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Notes excessive focus on cyclists/pedestrians.</li> <li>○ States estimated increase in electric/hybrid vehicles and consequent reduction in greenhouse emissions has not been accounted for.</li> <li>○ Does not consider elderly/mobility impaired who cannot walk/cycle have been accounted for.</li> <li>○ States there has been no independent traffic survey.</li> <li>○ Considers there is no demand for LAP.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Raises concerns with proposed restrictions to access on Ballinteer Road at Dundrum Cross (as set out in Section 4.6.1.1). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers proposed measures will cause long delays and detours for residents seeking to access local services and amenities, as well as commuting to city.</li> <li>○ Suggests additional issues in this regard will be caused by proposed measures on Sandyford Road as set out in Section 4.6.1.3.</li> <li>○ Considers measures will disproportionately impact elderly/disabled/mobility impaired/parents.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Suggests congestion and delays will be exacerbated by proposed active travel/public realm improvement measures at Taney Cross and environs (as set out in Section 4.6.1.2) and on Dundrum Road at Windy Arbour (as set out in Section 4.6.3.1).</li> <li>● Notes issues with existing car traffic restriction measures in place at the village. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Concerns at impacts to local businesses.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Considers proposed high rise buildings are not mindful of scale/character/heritage of Dundrum and therefore conflict with LAP vision.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 3, 4 and 6</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0428</u>	Person: Pearse Cassidy	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <p><b>10-minute Neighbourhood:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Critical of 10-minute neighbourhood concept, noting that weekly shopping requires a car. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Requests that Draft LAP is revised to provide convenient car access for locals to grocery shops.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Requests inclusion of churches in lists of local amenities, stating they are not included currently. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Notes that elderly require car access to churches.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Requests that Luas is removed from definition of 10-minute neighbourhood. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ States that most residents drive/walk to village rather than use Luas.</li> <li>○ Suggests service is expensive.</li> <li>○ Highlights convenient access to 3 Luas stops in area.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Traffic/Access Issues:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Requests reinstatement of two-way traffic system in village.</li> <li>● Objects to extension of one-way traffic systems. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Notes increases to travel distances, carbon emissions as a result.</li> <li>○ Considers current system presents safety issues due to cars in advertently driving the wrong way.</li> <li>○ States deliveries can obstruct car/cycle traffic.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

- Considers system inhibits rather than enhances connectivity.
- Notes system was initially temporary in nature.
- Highlights restrictions on car access from Kilmacud Road Upper to Taney Road due to proposed eastbound one-way system on Kilmacud Road Upper.
- Objects to this provision and requests preservation/provision of access to Taney Road via Stoney Road or Birches Lane.
- Considers one-way system on Main Street has significantly worsened congestion at Taney Cross.
- Concerned that proposed removal of slip lanes at Taney Cross will exacerbate congestion.
- Requests that Luas underpass between Taney Drive and Main Street is upgraded.
  - Considers it is aesthetically poor.
- Requests that signalised pedestrian crossing of Taney Road at Taney Park is moved west to Taney Drive, considering they would be of more utility at this location.
- Considers safety issues arise for pedestrians from vehicles accessing Dundrum Office Park from Main Street.
  - Notes high excessive speeds of cars on this route.
- Requests amendments to traffic light systems and junctions to avoid traffic stopping for pedestrians who have already crossed.
- Notes traffic congestion as a result of misuse of Ballinteer Road/Ballinteer Avenue roundabout junction by motorists and requests this is addressed.
- Requests amendments to pedestrian lights on Dundrum Road at Milltown Bridge to ease congestion.
- Welcomes changes to Bypass / Wyckham Way junction.
- Concerned proposed bus gate on Ballinteer Road at Dundrum Cross would isolate residents west of Bypass by restricting car access.
  - Considers this contravenes principle 4 of Site Development Framework (Section 2.9.2.4).

#### **KDAs (OSC, Taney Cross):**

- Critical of integration of Bypass with 10-minute neighbourhood concept.
  - Considers it is unpleasant and has no pedestrian accessible amenities.
  - Highlights poor interface between DTCSC and Bypass.
  - Considers it functions solely as traffic corridor.
  - Skeptical of possibility of achieving active frontage on northern section of Bypass through provision of 10/11 storey apartment buildings.
  - Considers rise in level of OSC site towards Main Street further constrains this, noting uses along this section of Bypass frontage would consist of inactive uses e.g car park entrances, bike stores, loading bays, refuse storage, substations.
  - Considers OSC site developers would be reluctant to include basement/subterranean development due to cost of removing shallow bedrock.
  - Doubtful of feasibility of providing attractive public realm along Bypass.
  - Considers tree planting and pedestrian crossings will not be effective in improving pedestrian environment, noting lack of pedestrians currently.
- Considers heights/scales proposed for OSC site (e.g. 10/11 storeys along Bypass) would not be in keeping with surrounding area, stating existing maximum heights in the area are 6 storeys.
  - Considers buildings will overlook dwellings at Sweetmount Park
  - Considers proposed building heights along Main Street would not be in keeping with historical character of street, would be visually displeasing, result in litter thrown from apartments onto street, and would obstruct views of Holy Cross Church spire (in contravention of Principle 8 of Site Development Framework).
  - Considers buildings will overshadow civic centre.
  - Proposes maximum height restriction of 6 storeys along Bypass and should step down in height going north along Bypass.
  - Proposes heights across heights should be no higher than level of Luas tracks.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Critical of local park proposal on Main Street within OSC site.                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers it does not adequately meet objective to support/promote planting and urban greening along Main Street.</li> <li>○ Considers park will be dwarfed by apartment buildings, is too enclosed, will attract anti-social behaviour.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers links across OSC site between Main Street and Bypass are poor.</li> <li>• Proposes that civic centre building should not extend higher than the level of the Luas tracks.</li> <li>• Welcomes removal of Old Eircom building at Taney Cross.</li> </ul> <p><b>Various:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers provision of bus gate over Slang River is contrary to Draft LAP objectives to conserve/protect/enhance environment, citing pollution impacts.                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers this will compound current impacts to river due to development of DTCSC.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Requests removing of blue ‘Luas’ sign at top of William Dargan Bridge, stating it is not permitted.</li> <li>• Requests removal of ESB sub-station on Taney Drive, stating that it is visually obtrusive.                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ States that its removal was previously recommended by ABP.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Requests inclusion of the School of Music in the OSC site in list of educational facilities in Section 3.2.3.2.</li> <li>• Considers cladding of Joe Daly Cycles building is visually obtrusive and requests removal.</li> <li>• Requests silent traffic beacons at night time, citing current noise pollution.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4, and Other Issues</p>

<p><b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0429</a></p>	<p><b>Person:</b> Eileen O’Loughlin</p>	<p><b>Organisation:</b></p>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned at impacts of proposed Main Street to Churchtown Road Upper bus gate on open space area in front of Carnegie Library, noting historical and cultural value of library/graveyard area.                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Notes it would mean the area would be surrounded by bus/car traffic routes.</li> <li>○ Concerns at impacts to access for pedestrians/cyclists.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4</p>		

<p><b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0430</a></p>	<p><b>Person:</b> Deirdre Farrell</p>	<p><b>Organisation:</b></p>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strongly supports Draft LAP and hopeful of implementation of proposed measures.</li> <li>• Notes importance of safe walking/cycling routes for enjoyment local amenities and integration of local community.</li> <li>• In particular supportive of improvements to cycling infrastructure on Sandyford Road.                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers existing lack of segregated cycle lanes and high traffic speeds on this road create difficulties for cyclists, highlighting issues for school-age children and cargo bikes.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Welcomes proposed improvements to Sandyford Road/Wyckham Way/Overend Avenue junction, noting existing difficulties for pedestrians/cyclists navigating this junction.                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Suggests incorporating additional measures to improve right-hand turning for cyclists at this junction.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Welcomes proposed measures facilitating BusConnects infrastructure, in particular improved frequency of bus service to areas south of village.                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Highlights poor existing services at Sandyford Village / on Sandyford Road.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers improved cycling route along Bypass / Dundrum Road is critical for providing adequate access to city centre.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1 and 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0431</u>	Person: Patricia Hogan	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers Draft LAP excludes elderly/mobility impaired/local businesses.</li> <li>• Considers one-way traffic system/cycle lanes implemented in village in recent years have negatively impacted vibrancy/accessibility of village/local amenities/services. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Suggests cycle lanes are underutilised.</li> <li>○ Requests reinstatement of two-way traffic system.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Concerned at impacts to community of loss of Dom Marmion Centre.</li> <li>• Considers having only 2 public information sessions during public consultation was insufficient.</li> <li>• Believes the plan will have a significantly negative impact on local businesses located along the Main Street with regards to various proposals for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Windy Arbour (section 4.6.3.1), the Dundrum Bypass to Wyckham Way along Sandyford Road as far as Main Street (section 4.6.1.1), southbound access from Dundrum bypass to Main Street (section 4.6.1.1) Taney Cross (section 4.6.1.2) and Sandyford Road (Northern part) as far as Main Street (section 4.6.1.3).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Believes there will be an increase in severe congestion and unnecessary delays as a result of Bus priority and the elimination of all left-turn lanes passing through Taney Cross (section 4.6.1.2).</li> <li>• Raises concerns with proposed restrictions to access on Ballinteer Road at Dundrum Cross (as set out in Section 4.6.1.1). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers proposed measures will cause long delays and detours for residents seeking to access local services and amenities, as well as commuting to city.</li> <li>○ Suggests additional issues in this regard will be cause by proposed measures on Sandyford Road as set out in Section 4.6.1.3.</li> <li>○ Considers measures will disproportionately impact elderly/disabled/mobility impaired/parents.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Suggests congestion and delays will be exacerbated by proposed measures at Taney Cross and environs as set out in Section 4.6.1.2.</li> <li>• Thinks there is no need for the plan.</li> <li>• States plan is very anti-people and only concerned with walking and cycling.</li> <li>• Thinks the plan takes no account that most people will be unable to cycle on steep slopes in and around Dundrum.</li> <li>• Believes the plan will force people to do business elsewhere which will result in local business closures and taking the life out of the village.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0432</u>	Person: Thomas Hogan	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers Draft LAP excludes elderly/disabled/mobility impaired/families with young children.</li> <li>• Believes the plan will have a significantly negative impact on local businesses located along the Main Street with regards to various proposals for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Windy Arbour (section 4.6.3.1), the Dundrum Bypass to Wyckham Way along Sandyford Road as far as Main Street (section 4.6.1.1), southbound access from Dundrum bypass to Main Street (section 4.6.1.1) Taney Cross (section 4.6.1.2) and Sandyford Road (Northern part) as far as Main Street (section 4.6.1.3).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Believes there will be an increase in severe congestion and unnecessary delays as a result of Bus priority and the elimination of all left-turn lanes passing through Taney Cross (section 4.6.1.2).</li> <li>• Raises concerns with proposed restrictions to access on Ballinteer Road at Dundrum Cross (as set out in Section 4.6.1.1). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers proposed measures will cause long delays and detours for residents seeking to access local services and amenities, as well as commuting to city.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Suggests additional issues in this regard will be caused by proposed measures on Sandyford Road as set out in Section 4.6.1.3.</li> <li>○ Considers measures will disproportionately impact elderly/disabled/mobility impaired/parents.</li> <li>● Suggests congestion and delays will be exacerbated by proposed measures at Taney Cross and environs as set out in Section 4.6.1.2.</li> <li>● Thinks there is no need for the plan.</li> <li>● States plan is very anti-people and only concerned with walking and cycling.</li> <li>● Thinks the plan takes no account that most people will be unable to cycle on steep slopes in and around Dundrum.</li> <li>● Believes the plan will force people to do business elsewhere which will result in local business closures and taking the life out of the village.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 3, 4 and 6</p>

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0433</a>	Person: Peter Larkin	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Concerned at proposed car access restrictions at Taney Cross. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers local residents will be negatively impacted.</li> <li>○ Notes in particular existing traffic congestion on Taney Road and Churchtown Road Upper approaching junction.</li> <li>○ States that most traffic approaching junction is coming from outside of local area.</li> <li>○ Considers this contingent is unlikely to shift to public transport.</li> <li>○ Considers traffic travelling to DTCSC has not been accounted for in junction design.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Expresses disappointment in local councillors supporting proposed measures.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0434</a>	Person: Cormac o loughlin	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Objects to proposed bus gate in front of Carnegie Library.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0435</a>	Person: George Madden	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Supportive of proposals to improve pedestrian/cycle/public transport accessibility. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Notes success of similar measures in Blackrock village and on Grafton Street.</li> <li>○ States that majority of DTCSC staff access workplace by public transport.</li> <li>○ Considers measures will positively impact businesses and community.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4 and 6</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0436</a>	Person: Sharon Hogan	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Highlights difficulties accessing Dundrum by car since advent of one-way traffic system. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Skeptical of use levels of cycle lanes.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers further access restrictions to facilitate cycle lanes are unnecessary.</li> <li>○ Highlights difficulties for elderly/mobility impaired accessing local services.</li> <li>● Believes the plan will have a significantly negative impact on local businesses located along the Main Street with regards to various proposals for:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Windy Arbour (section 4.6.3.1), the Dundrum Bypass to Wyckham Way along Sandyford Road as far as Main Street (section 4.6.1.1), southbound access from Dundrum bypass to Main Street (section 4.6.1.1) Taney Cross (section 4.6.1.2) and Sandyford Road (Northern part) as far as Main Street (section 4.6.1.3).</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Believes there will be an increase in severe congestion and unnecessary delays as a result of Bus priority and the elimination of all left-turn lanes passing through Taney Cross (section 4.6.1.2).</li> <li>● Raises concerns with proposed restrictions to access on Ballinteer Road at Dundrum Cross (as set out in Section 4.6.1.1).             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers proposed measures will cause long delays and detours for residents seeking to access local services and amenities, as well as commuting to city.</li> <li>○ Suggests additional issues in this regard will be caused by proposed measures on Sandyford Road as set out in Section 4.6.1.3.</li> <li>○ Considers measures will disproportionately impact elderly/disabled/mobility impaired/parents.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Suggests congestion and delays will be exacerbated by proposed measures at Taney Cross and environs as set out in Section 4.6.1.2.</li> <li>● Thinks there is no need for the plan.</li> <li>● States plan is very anti-people and only concerned with walking and cycling.</li> <li>● Thinks the plan takes no account that most people will be unable to cycle on steep slopes in and around Dundrum.</li> <li>● Believes the plan will force people to do business elsewhere which will result in local business closures and taking the life out of the village.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 3, 4 and 6</p>

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0437</a>	Person: Nicholas and Jean Durham	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b> Submission has no content.</p>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> N/A</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0438</a>	Person: John Sayers	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Objects to proposed restrictions to car access into village/local services via Ballinteer Road and restrictions to car access previously introduced as temporary Covid-19 response measures.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Notes impacts to emergency services access, increased traffic congestion on other local routes (in particular Sandyford Road and Bypass), detours onto roads with heavy traffic bound for DTCSC (in particular at weekends/holidays) and environmental impacts.</li> <li>○ Highlights particular impacts to elderly/disabled/families, issues due to bad weather.</li> <li>○ Requests removal of these proposed measures.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Supports re-development of OSC site however considers proposed heights are excessive.</li> <li>● Emphasises importance of agreeing changes to area in collaboration with local community.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2 and 4</p>		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0439</a></b>	<b>Person: Tiernan Mulligan</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports promotion of walking/cycling/public transport. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Notes importance of discouraging unnecessary private car use to improve air quality and decrease emissions.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0440</a></b>	<b>Person: Eamonn Farrell</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers Draft LAP suitably addresses needs of Dundrum, noting it is a suburb of a growing capital city. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers Dundrum needs to be integrated with city in sustainable manner.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Highlights progress to date improving active travel in Dundrum, in particular for elderly/families with young children. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers this progress needs to be built on.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• States that people (in particular older generations) have been negatively impacted by chaotic traffic, deteriorating air/noise pollution, scarcity of quality accommodation, immigration.</li> <li>• Calls for implementation of LAP imminently.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0441</a></b>	<b>Person: Peadar O Ceannabhain</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to proposed pedestrian/cycle link between Sweetmount Park and OSC site, whether at grade or bridge. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Notes quiet residential nature of Sweetmount Park/The Laurels area.</li> <li>○ States that green area is essential part of this residential area.</li> <li>○ Notes objections by locals to previous temporary bridge installed during construction of Bypass, which cited lack of utility of bridge (due to nearby alternative routes), increase in noise, anti-social behaviour (including late at night), violence and general disturbance.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 2		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0442</a></b>	<b>Person: Cian McKenna</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of LAP in its entirety.</li> <li>• Concerned young people from County will be underrepresented in public consultation submissions.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Other Issues		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0443</a></b>	<b>Person: Craig Stephens</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of LAP.</li> <li>• Proposes provision of a Dodder to Dundrum cycling route along Slang River.</li> <li>• If not possible, supports alternative route proposed under Recommendation DAR23 of ABTA.</li> </ul>		



- Highlights that Dundrum Luas inhibits cyclist access to Main Street, therefore access is via Taney Cross at present.
- Considers this detour is unsafe and tiring.
- Considers cycle infrastructure upgrades are required, e.g. bicycle stair ramp.
- Highlights issues with cleanliness / operation of lift at Luas station.
- Proposes that mobility hub should provide bicycle hire facilities, including bike trailers for children.
- Considers former Railway Station building at Taney Drive should be reserved for use as café / amenity serving Luas passengers.
- Considers existing use as fashion outlet is not suitable.
- Supports provision of public access to view Dundrum Castle via Bypass or Castle View and provision of information boards.
- Highlights Castle's importance to local heritage.
- Considers local heritage / history of Dundrum should be highlighted (e.g. through permanent exhibitions) in library or cultural centre.
- Notes absence of publicly available information at present.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 1, 4, 6, 8 and Other Issues.

DLR Submission No: <u>B0444</u>	Person: Allen Morgan	Organisation: Director, Ashgrove Court Apartment complex
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that current SHD application at OSC site represents core part of Draft LAP proposals for village. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ States that locals were almost totally opposed to this application.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Concerned at impacts of one-way traffic system/cycle lanes in village, citing obtrusiveness, safety issues, under-use by cyclists, lack of on-street parking, impacts on commercial activity.</li> <li>• Concerned at loss of trade on Main Street, noting issues of vacancy / granting of short-term licenses only on west side of street due to homogenous ownership.</li> <li>• Concerned loss of amenity/ambience/integrity of village.</li> <li>• Considers DTCS has negatively impacted village citing increased traffic, lack of commercial benefit to Main Street/village. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers DLR were motivated to support DTCS in order to expand commercial rate base.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Concerned at impacts to business due to loss of off-street parking operated by DLR at Dom Marmion site. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Suggests that lack of car parking at other apartment developments in Dundrum area has resulted in additional parking pressure in surrounding areas.</li> <li>○ Cites Walled Garden and Gort Mhuire (both off Wyckham Place) as examples.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Notes that DLR needs to work with NTA to provide Luas / bus services and infrastructure.</li> <li>• Supports preservation of historical buildings in village for community use.</li> <li>• States that DLR requested that mature tree in Ashgrove Court be cut back. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Notes need to preserve existing mature trees in the area.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Refers to international examples of local level governance (France and Denmark), appearing to suggest DLR should adopt certain practices of these.</li> <li>• States that an LAP is not a prescriptive document and functions more as an aspirational document. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ States development is 'developer driven' and suggests Local Authority planners should instead lead on this.</li> <li>○ States that investment funds are exiting Irish market due to cost inflation / funding decreases.</li> <li>○ Considers an economic downturn is inevitable and that this will cause development to cease due to it being developer driven.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers it is unacceptable that DLR cannot facilitate direct access by public to Local Authority planners and that retaining services of private planning consultant would be required to establish development potential / planning opportunities at Ashgrove Court site.</li> <li>• Notes that DLR vision for the OSC site is for a development with a maximum height of 11 storeys, as opposed to 16 as proposed under the current SHD application.</li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers that the granting by ABP of the current SHD application prior to making the LAP would render the LAP ineffectual.</li> <li>● Critical of DTCSC reported support for the respondent’s positions, noting a single entity owns both the DTCSC and the OSC site and highlighting respondent’s significant objections to the current SHD application at the latter site.</li> <li>● Respondent is supportive of Irish Times newspaper article regarding a public meeting about the Draft LAP (published 21/07/2023). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ (Linked to submission no. B0445 below)</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Respondent is not supportive of second Irish Times newspaper article regarding transport proposals of Draft LAP (also published 21/07/2023). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers article disregards views and needs of local residents.</li> <li>○ (Linked to submission no. B0446 below)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b>  Chapters 2, 4, 6 and Other Issues</p>

<b>DLR Submission No: B0445</b>	<b>Person: Allen Morgan</b>	<b>Organisation: Director, Ashgrove Court apartment complex</b>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Submission consists of Irish Times newspaper article regarding a public meeting about the Draft LAP, published 21/07/2023 and referred to by respondent in submission no. B0444.</li> <li>● The newspaper article reports on views expressed by attendees at a community meeting regarding the Draft LAP.</li> <li>● The views reported in the article include the following commentary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ LAP will ‘kill off village’.</li> <li>○ Footfall in village will dramatically decrease as a result of proposed additional car traffic access restrictions in village.</li> <li>○ Will have consequential detrimental economic impact on village.</li> <li>○ Lack of meaningful public consultation on Draft LAP.</li> <li>○ Concerns at timing of public consultation, stating many locals are absent during Summer months.</li> <li>○ Concerns at impacts to local communities.</li> <li>○ Impacts are reflective of similar impacts to villages/towns throughout country.</li> <li>○ Importance of improving walking/cycling/public transport infrastructure such that it can serve as viable alternative to private car travel.</li> <li>○ Positive impacts to business of creating safe/pleasant public realm for pedestrians.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b>  Chapters 4 and 6, Other Issues</p>		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0446</a></b>	<b>Person: Allen Morgan</b>	<b>Organisation: Director, Ashgrove Court apartment complex</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission consists of Irish Times newspaper article regarding transport proposals of Draft LAP, published 21/07/2023 and referred to by respondent in submission no. B0444.</li> <li>• The newspaper article provides information regarding a number of the transport/movement proposals of the Draft LAP, including the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 10-minute neighbourhood concept.</li> <li>○ Retention of one-way traffic system on Main Street.</li> <li>○ Provision of one-way traffic system on Sydenham Road.</li> <li>○ Various cycle/pedestrian infrastructure enhancements.</li> <li>○ Bus gates at Dundrum Cross and Main Street / Churchtown Road Upper.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b>		
N/A		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0447</a></b>	<b>Person: Ferdia Soper Mac Cafraidh</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter is overall positive about the plan as a continuation and improvement on changes that have occurred over previous years.</li> <li>• Submits that housing and locally accessible services which prioritise efficient modes of transport such as walking and cycling, while also providing public transport hubs, should absolutely be the focus as shown in the plan. Dundrum is extremely well placed to better take advantage of this and should do as soon as possible.</li> <li>• Submitter's Dundrum visiting experience has never been better since the recent changes, and they look forward to how this plan will improve Dundrum for the better by focusing on people.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b>		
Chapters 1 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0448</a></b>	<b>Person: Jim Davidson</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submits that the plan takes little account of the needs of the people living around Dundrum.</li> <li>• Considers traffic restriction proposals will reduce the Main Street to a wilderness.</li> <li>• Is critical of proposed access restrictions and the negative impact they will have on those who need to use a car to get to medical appointments, shopping, the church etc.</li> <li>• Believes the plan to help people cycle and walk ignores the geography of the village which effectively is in a bowl where every exit requires climbing.</li> <li>• Thinks the plan has been written for limited cohorts of people while ignoring the real demographic profile of Dundrum.</li> <li>• Considers that the plan has been constructed by planners with an idealist outlook rather than an empathy for the community served by the council.</li> <li>• Submits the plan needs far more public discourse if it is ever to find a shape that will serve the needs of the people.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b>		
Chapter 4 and Other Issues		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0449</a></b>	<b>Person: Gerry Lloyd</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has concerns regarding the lack of provision in the plan for elderly and disabled access to essential services, especially in Dundrum Village.</li> </ul>		

- States that at present there are often no disabled car parking spaces available on Main street and some former pull in/drop off space outside premises have now been filled with street furniture.
- Considers that the plan does not recognise that an increasing proportion of the existing population of Dundrum are elderly or disabled and require vehicular access to facilities.
- Objects to the proposed cessation of the left turn from Ballinteer Road/ Barton Road East onto Main Street which would further compound the access problem.
- Requests that the plan be modified to take these matters into account.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapter 4

DLR Submission No: <u>B0450</u>	Person: Roberta Guiry	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commends DLRCoCo for the draft LAP and thinks it will make Dundrum a great place to live, work and visit. Particularly supports the prioritisation of cyclists and pedestrians which has the potential to really change the feel and culture of the local area for the better, as well as having overall improvements in terms of climate.</li> <li>• Thinks that the local business owners who are opposing these plans should wake up and see the wide potential for increased business from the footfall of cyclists and pedestrians.</li> <li>• Submitter states they are far more likely to stop and shop at a local village business when travelling by bike or on foot.</li> <li>• Considers that if they are travelling by car they are far more likely to drive further to larger shops for better value.</li> <li>• Thinks the one-way travel system currently in place is excellent and is delighted that it is intended to retain and extend this.</li> <li>• Considers the ten-minute neighbourhood to be a wonderful goal.</li> <li>• Believes that while cycle and pedestrian infrastructure is good in parts of Dundrum, there are also parts where it remains quite unsafe, so the plan under the ABTA to enhance connectivity to Dundrum via sustainable modes is very welcome.</li> <li>• Submits that improving the cycle/walking infrastructure further will hopefully encourage families to use sustainable modes more, for school and commuting.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 4 and 6</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0451</u>	Person: Dublin Commuters Coalition	Organisation: Dublin Commuters Coalition
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission opens with an outline of the Dublin Commuter Coalition established in 2018 as a voluntary advocacy group for public transport users, cyclists, and pedestrians in Dublin and the surrounding counties. Group acts as a unifying voice for commuters in these areas so that they may express their concerns, hopes and vision of a Dublin that works for all users of sustainable transport.</li> <li>• Submission extends general support for the DLAP and welcomes the extensive work that has gone into preparing it, including the research done to create the Area Based Transport Assessment (ABTA).</li> <li>• Recognises that the ABTA highlights a number of existing choke points in the current transport network which need to be addressed to keep in-line with expected population growth within the area.</li> <li>• Submission highlights a number of key issues they would like to see addressed in the proposed LAP to ensure Active and Public transport is both prioritised and adequate to support the growing population in Dundrum including:</li> </ul> <p><b>Luas Green line upgrade to Metro standard</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recognises from the ABTA, that the LUAS is already at capacity, especially when accessed from the Balally and Dundrum stops.</li> <li>• Considers 79% of Dundrum Public Transport demand is currently met by the Luas yet, with the town's population set to double within the next 6 – 10 years and 25,000 people expected to move into the</li> </ul>		

Cherrywood area in the near future, submits it is essential that capacity on the LUAS is increased to meet demand.

- Proposes it is necessary to reach out to the NTA to have the planned upgrade of the Green Line to Metro Standard reinstated as a matter of urgency as the plan to deliver an additional line serving UCD to relieve pressure on the existing Green Line won't happen until after 2042.

#### **Prioritisation of DLR Connector**

- Recognises the need to implement a modal shift in transport to alleviate pressure on the roads due to current and anticipated traffic which is supported by the recent recording that 49% of Employment Journeys and 41% of education journeys under 2km currently taken by car.
- Notes that the segregated cycle infrastructure within the County has seen a 100%+ increase in cycle usage with high usage by female and casual cyclists.
- Considers it important that the DLR Connector will allow a far greater capacity of people to travel throughout the Dundrum area and will provide a key connection to the Coastal Mobility Route and the Active Travel Network in future.

#### **10-minute City and Permeability**

- Welcomes the aim within the LAP to create a 10-minute city concept for Dundrum and how this will encourage active transport and healthy lifestyle within a community.
- Acknowledges that with major property developments planned throughout the area it is key that permeability be required by the Council for local residents, especially within major projects as that for the OSC site.
- Supports that DRLCC is committed to increasing and opening up permeability wherever possible, considering how high car ownership is within the area, and actively seeking out ways to increase pedestrian permeability will help ease reliance on the private car.

#### **Commitment to accessible cycle parking**

- Submits that the rollout of a County-wide cycle network can lead to greater accessibility for use of active transport for those with mobility and visual impairments.
- Requests a commitment within the LAP to provide adequate amounts of accessible parking for adaptive and cargo style bicycles at all destination points as adaptive Bicycles and Tricycles often take up a much greater amount of space than a traditional bike at cycle stands and therefore need to be catered for alongside 'standard' cycle parking facilities.
- Requests that increased lighting and security measures, including CCTV, be available at any accessible or cargo bike parking facility to discourage theft or damage as the cost of these bikes can be quite considerable.
- Submits that any new development should have prioritised and secure cycle parking for Cargo and adaptive bikes to ensure those who do not wish to or are not required to travel by car have alternatives available to them.
- Recognises that storage can become a major issue with larger bikes that can be substituted for car use, therefore storage lockers should be permitted in front gardens and on community streets where on-street parking is available to encourage more people to cycle where possible.

#### **Bus lane priority and 24-hour routes**

- Recognises that buses will continue to be an important element of public transport as the Bus Connects routes are rolled out.
- Submits that prioritising bus lanes and providing the adequate levels of enforcement is essential to maintain a reliable service within Dublin.
- Welcomes the implementation of bus gates throughout the LAP and would request any bus gate infrastructure also be furnished with camera enforcement or traffic monitoring systems to counter potential vehicular law-breaking and prevent casual breaking of the bus-gates.
- Considers, as the Luas is not a 24-hour service and in order for the Dublin nighttime economy to thrive, that it will become essential that 7-day access to a 24 hour bus service be provided.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposes that the A2 spine, while not currently scheduled as a 24-hour route yet does serve Dublin Airport, could be upgraded to 24 hours to facilitate non-car travel through the city and support the night-time economy.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1 and 4</p>

<p><b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0452</a></b></p>	<p><b>Person: NC</b></p>	<p><b>Organisation:</b></p>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submits that Dundrum main street should be made accessible only to buses and other named users including disabled sticker holders (as issued by the dlrcoco, and to disabled drivers).</li> <li>Considers there should be more "keep clear" boxes for private residences such as that at the Churchtown Lower Road.</li> <li>Submission provides commentary on local Garda.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4</p>		

<p><b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0453</a></b></p>	<p><b>Person: Tom Merriman</b></p>	<p><b>Organisation:</b></p>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitter welcomes the Draft LAP, even if long delayed, and acknowledges the considerable amount of work put into it.</li> <li>Acknowledges that Dundrum has undergone considerable development and change in recent years and that further development and change requires the development control measures of a LAP.</li> <li>Believes it is regrettable that it has taken Dun Laoghaire Rathdown County Council 5 years from the initiation of the LAP process as many sites in the area have had planning permission granted in the absence of any local area guidance, some of which might not have been successful had this Draft LAP been in place earlier.</li> <li>Questions necessity of having to travel to Dun Laoghaire (per DLR website regarding submissions) to hand-deliver a submission when there is a Council Office in the heart of Dundrum.</li> <li>Submitter supports the overall thrust of the plan and the Vision set out in it including the many positive aspects of it such as:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Sustainable travel and traffic calming</li> <li>o Active travel</li> <li>o The detailed housing policy</li> <li>o Community, Civic and Cultural Facilities</li> <li>o Connectivity, permeability, reduction of segregation/isolation of surrounding areas</li> <li>o Heritage and conservation</li> <li>o Employment</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Preamble Page 4 – Vision</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submits that Box 4 should include public transport viz; <i>‘To manage.....pedestrian facilities and integrated public transport arrangements and facilities combined with ...’</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Urban Framework and Site Development Frameworks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the anticipated DLAP V2 which will contribute to the protection of the unique heritage of Dundrum generally and the streetscape and ACA buildings on Main Street.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objective PR1 Dundrum Road Public Realm</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refers to the CMH development noting the developer’s reference to ‘improved pedestrian and cyclist connectivity with the Village’ in promotional materials.</li> <li>Submits that while the new Dodder to Dundrum cycle route will deal with the cycling aspect, pedestrians are ill-served by access facilities on the quiet route through Rosemount Estate.</li> </ul>		

- Notes also that the shared two-way cycle way through the restricted-width lane will be sub-standard.
- Submits that the natural desire line for pedestrians will be up the Dundrum Road and that improved footpaths (particularly on the west side) should be provided.
- Notes that the removal of cyclists from the road and the conversion to a neighbourhood street will allow for the opportunity to narrow the vehicle lanes and widen the footpath.
- Thinks that Objective PR1 should be more overt about improved footpaths and the objective should be added to the implementation table in Chapter 9 with an implementation timescale.

#### **Objective PR4 (New)**

- Submits that there are no recognisable actions proposed by the Council in the draft LAP to initiate public realm improvements on publicly owned areas of Main Street and believes DLR seems to depend on the owners of adjoining space for any improvements.
- Submitter therefore proposes the addition of the following new objective:

#### **PR4 Dundrum Main Street Public Realm**

- *'It is the objective to improve public realm along Main Street at appropriate locations as allowed for by building setbacks and available public spaces, including the undergrounding of new services and existing overhead services.'*
- In relation to public realm on Main Street please see proposal on **OSC4** below.
- Submits that the new cycleway on the Dundrum Bypass will reduce cycle traffic on Main Street therefore suggests that the cycleway on Main Street could be re-located to the new north/south pedestrian route through the OSC development, with appropriate links to Main Street to free up the existing cycleway for improved public realm, tree planting, a couple of additional disabled parking bays and be incorporated into a decent sized plaza outside the Church on Main Street.

#### **2.9.2 OSC KDA**

- Welcomes the concept of KDAs to allow for appropriate development controls to be put in place for various sites of different character throughout the LAP area.
- Believes that the OSC KDA does not work as one unified KDA due to a perceived division whereby the east side of this long narrow site is adjacent to and contains much of the Main Street ACA while the west side is of a completely different character.
- Recommends that the site be split into two separate KDAs and the LAP amended accordingly.

#### **OSC4**

- Suggests that the second bullet point should read as follows:  
*'Provide a new north/south pedestrian and southbound cycling link through the scheme adjacent to the park and onwards through to the northern site boundary to the civic space and Dundrum Luas stop'*

#### **OSC8**

- Suggests that DLR amends bullet point 3 as follows:  
*'Provide active frontages along Main Street to help ensure animation by day and by night. These should include entrances to residences as appropriate'.*

#### **OSC11**

- Submitter is critical of the build form shown in figures 2.9 and 2.10 as overly prescriptive.
- Thinks the east side of the site should read as a village street with low rise low density sympathetic building forms and uniform rooflines. The west side (Bypass side) should read as a compact higher density urban street reflective (in form/roofline) of many of the beautiful Dublin city streets (e.g. Fitzwilliam Street).

#### **OSC13**

- Submits that an overall plot ratio of 1:2.25 is not appropriate for a Conservation area and suggests a plot ratio of 1:1.5 for the Main Street KDA and 1:2.0 for the OSC West Side are appropriate.

#### **Height**

- Submits that compliance with SLO9 will require that the height of buildings on Main Street should not exceed 3 storeys with a uniform roofline also considering that there are likely to be non-residential buildings with a higher floor to floor height than residential buildings.
- Believes the remainder of the site should be in the range 6 to 8 storeys with a higher site coverage (up to 70%) to achieve the appropriate plot ratio.
- Thinks there is no justification or need for a height of 11 storeys in Dundrum.
- Submits that a tall building would be better located further south along the bypass edge where there is open land to the west, greater distance from existing houses and more suitable topography – higher land on the west side than in the vicinity of the Carnegie Library.

#### **OSC15**

- Submits that mixed use on Main Street should include residential, to allow for after-hours surveillance on Main Street
- Regarding Page 24 Fig 2.10 Section B submits that 5 and 6 storey buildings on Main Street are contrary to SLO9 and to the stated heights in OSC 14

#### **Taney Cross KDA**

- Is unable to comment on the proposed civic centre or transport mobility hub due to lack of detailed information.
- Thinks this TC KDA should be reimagined as the centre of the Dundrum MTC zone serving areas north and south in the LAP area. An appropriate Community, Cultural and Civic building of the highest international design standard is a good way to do this.
- Submission states it is unfair to ask people to comment on a proposal with little information given - the proposed landmark building is of unknown size, use, or height rumoured to be a civic centre, housing a new library and will probably be 8 or 9 storeys high and up to 40m tall.
- Thinks that the undimensioned footprint shown in the draft LAP is simply too small to house a world class library and is contrary to the recommendations of the CCCAP which set out clear plan for the location and siting of the CCC building.
- Thinks the objective shown for the TC KDA should be omitted from the LAP until such time as there is clarity brought to the unknowns (but intimated) proposals for a CCC building and surrounds and people can comment on the basis of clear information (perhaps it is the Council itself who should produce the masterplan for this area).

#### **TC7 Amend as follows**

- Provision of a landmark building shall have regard to the recommendations set out in the CCCAP

#### **TC8**

- Considers that the use of 'Suitably terminate the view north' –is not in plain English and should be rewritten as a clear objective, understandable by the layman.
- Asks DLR to please amend bullet point 3 as follows;  
*'Comply with the Building Heights Strategy set out in the CDP, the building heights policy of this document and SLO 9'.*

#### **2.9.5**

- Welcomes the prospect of a large number of affordable and cost rental homes in Dundrum noting it is important that this large enclave is well connected to Dundrum Village and not isolated.
- Submits that the LAP should include objectives for the Dundrum Road south of the CMH site as it looks like the focus has been directed to the north of the CMH and the vital link to the south has been forgotten.

#### **3.2.3.2**

- Requests that DLR corrects the mistake that Gaelscoil na Fuinseoige has a current enrolment of 206 pupils and will have approximately 270 pupils in Sept 2023.



**3.3.5.1**

- Notes most European cities can achieve appropriate residential densities in 4 to 8 storeys.
- Believes there is no justification for allowing 11 storey buildings on the OSC site. (See OSC 13 above)

**3.3.5.2**

- Requests that the reference to the William Dargan Bridge be omitted as it is not valid to use the 50m high concrete pylon supporting structure as a context justification for a tall commercial/residential/civic building.
- Questions why the Taney Cross site is identified as a site for a landmark building stating that this is an attempt to justify the shoehorning of the much-desired CCC Building into a site much smaller than recommended in the CCCAP report.
- Considers that Dundrum already has an acknowledged landmark in the Luas Bridge and that the proposed location may be appropriate for a landmark building but not a tall building as it will impair the view of the bridge from the north and to the Dublin mountains to the south.
- Submits not a site for a tall building in consideration of the context of the adjacent Aca, the protected structure opposite, and SLO9.
- Requests removal of the sentence 'The Taney Cross site is identified as a site for a landmark building.'

**DLAP18 Building Heights**

- States language used is unintelligible to most ordinary people and should be stated in plain English.
- Alternatively, a plain English explanation of the impacts of this policy should be appended to this section.

**3.3.6 Housing Options**

- States this is an excellent section that they fully support.

**Transport and Movement**

- Supports the 10-minute neighbourhood concept and the policy to move people from private vehicles to walking, cycling, and public transport but believes that local factors such as the road network, desire lines, topography, public service facilities, public transport arrangements and demographics must be taken into account.
- Submits that it is premature to consider the introduction of the full range of measures until a number of public transport and connectivity issues are addressed.
- Notes that the ABTA is a fluid document, subject to change and it is unclear if many of the details in this section are policy/objectives or recommendations.
- Considers that many of the physical alterations to roads, junctions and bus parking arrangements are causing great angst among the community and it would be useful to know which of these are set in concrete and which are not.

**DLAP 24 to DLAP 30**

- Supports the broad policies outlined in this section however objects to the following objectives and achievement of these policies:

**4.6.1.1 Dundrum Cross**

- Supports the proposal to install a bus only gate at the Ballinteer Road.
- Believes the DLR connector should go ahead without banning the left turn from Ballinteer Road.

**T1:**

- Supports the one-way traffic layout on Main Street as this has provided pedestrians with safe footpaths, crossable roads, a more pleasant environment and adequate (albeit slower) vehicular access to Main Street

**T2:**

- Proposes the re-location of southbound cycle lane to the proposed new north/south pedestrian route through the OSC site. Please amend the Objective to read 're-locate'.

**T5 and 4.6.1.2**

- Submits this objective makes overt reference to ‘upgrade..... in accordance with figure 4.5’ and states the detail in Fig 4.5 is largely illegible at the scale it appears in the printed document.
- Suggests that the layout shown will not provide either a safe or an efficient or an attractive environment. Instead of an international style transport interchange where people can transfer easily from bus to bus or to Luas or to taxi, there is a series of spread-out bus stops all over the place where riders will have to cross heavily trafficked roads to transfer with people dashing from one stop to another. It will be totally illegible with absolute confusion between parked buses and layover buses which will block the view of bus stops and other signage. This is very disappointing and needs a total rethink.
- The proposed bus gate at the Carnegie Library is unacceptable and ill-considered and will destroy one of the few quiet public spaces available in central Dundrum where the installation of seating has attracted a lot more people, young and old, to relax in this area.
- Submits it is crazy to chop up a lovely public plaza in front of beautiful, protected building and to run empty buses up past other protected buildings every 4/6 minutes so that they can park.
- This route is also used by a significant number of pupils in Gaelscoil na Fuinseoige who travel to Dundrum by Luas or bus and then walk to and from school (and the library) through Finsbury Park.
- States that Instead of enhancing a safe route to school this will create an unsafe route contrary to policy expressed in other parts of this document (DLAP 30).
- The negatives far outweigh the gains and an alternative has to be found.
- Suggests possible alternatives to include using the public space on the east side of the Luas Station for these specific buses, driving up to the roundabout at Beaumont Avenue to turn or creating a bus-only roundabout at the intersection of Upper Churchtown Road west of Taney cross.

**T19 Dundrum Road – Neighbourhood Street**

- Supports this objective if it includes better pedestrian facilities to connect the CMH site to Dundrum Village (See PR1) above.
- Submission includes a summary of the major points made within their submission.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
 Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4 and Other Issues

DLR Submission No: <u>B0454</u>	Person: Jennifer Sloane	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter is a long-term Dundrum resident from the Clonard estate off Sandyford Road and is a cyclist.</li> <li>• States it is unfair to propose a consultation period during the holiday season when many people are away and won't be able to make a submission.</li> <li>• Considers the proposed one-way routes and cycle lanes to be unrealistic in a town with so many hills and an aging population.</li> <li>• Submits that cycle lane dividers are a serious trip hazard and should be removed. Refers to Spain where cycle lanes are marked with red dots on the road.</li> <li>• Objects to the idea of Sydenham Road being made a one-way system to facilitate bicycle lanes citing safety hazards from residents backing out from their driveways onto the road.</li> <li>• Submits that the Plan is very anti elderly resident in restricting access to the village centre and closing off access to Main Street for cars coming from Barton Road areas is unfair.</li> <li>• Thinks more time is needed to prepare the plan.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b>                      Chapter 4 and Other Issues</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0455</a>	Person: Mark Murphy	Organisation: Irish Heart Foundation
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission states that the Irish Heart Foundation wholeheartedly supports the DLAP to facilitate greater use of walking, wheeling, cycling and public transport.</li> <li>• Believes that this proposal will deliver a multitude of physical health, mental health, environmental, and economic benefits for the local community and help deter the public from using private fossil-fueled motorised vehicles in favour of active travel forms of transport such as walking and cycling.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 1</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0456</a>	Person: Patricia Murray	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <p><b>Housing</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submits that DLR must include provisions for appropriate design and adaptable housing units for older residents in their plans for the future as reflected by the published report by Age Friendly Ireland "Housing for Older People".</li> <li>• Suggests that there appears to be no provision for low rise (2/3) story apartments that can accommodate older people who want to downsize.</li> <li>• Submits concerns about building apartment buildings or a tall civic centre on a flood plain.</li> <li>• Thinks that appropriate well-designed units for an ageing community should be considered and included in the "OSC" development.</li> </ul> <p><b>Transport</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter is concerned that access to and through the Dundrum Village is being eroded.</li> <li>• Thinks that traffic is now excessive while the proposed LAP will increase traffic and bring bus terminals into a residential area.</li> <li>• Submits that proposed changes will worsen traffic flows and increase pollution.</li> <li>• Considers the proposed new traffic flow is designed to drive business, people and the community out of the village and away from the greater community network.</li> <li>• Suggests a large parking lot near the M50 would dramatically reduce the volume of cars that come off the M50 at exit 13.</li> <li>• Suggests that a shuttle bus could utilize the bus corridor that already exist (but not is use) on the Wyckham Way bypass and bring many commuters to their destination (Dundrum Shopping Centre, Sandyford Industrial Estate, Stillorgan Village).</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2, 3 and 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0457</a>	Person: Tom Halton	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Delighted with the new Dodder to Dundrum cycle route.</li> <li>• Pleased with the new park at OSC, green space at Dom Marmion and playground at Finsbury.</li> <li>• Very pleased with wetland site at library and improvements at The Slang.</li> <li>• Pleased with the Sweetmount cycling and pedestrian access.</li> <li>• Pleased with upgrades to bus and cycle ways on the Taney Cross route.</li> <li>• Agrees with continued active travel cycle scheme on the Main Street and requests an upgrade and increased safety for pedestrians crossing street.</li> <li>• Requests better sitting facilities.</li> <li>• Agrees with bus corridor on Ballinteer Road.</li> </ul>		

- Strongly supports changes to Sydenham Road but asks that the pedestrian access be widened and upgraded as there are often large numbers of children/parents, and buggies that are too wide for pavement.
- Pleased to see new pedestrian access from Dundrum by-pass, the Wyckham bypass area junction improvements and the segregated cycle lanes on Balally road
- Encourages the council to engage with work already done by community organizations, such as the work done by Dundrum2030, ([www.dundrumtwentythirty.com](http://www.dundrumtwentythirty.com)) where a community sustainable development dashboard was created with UCD Earth Institute funding.
- Submits this would be an excellent citizen engagement mechanism to support the sustainable and environmental goals of the LAP.
- Supports the implementation of district heating in Dundrum.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0458</a>	Person: Emer Hyland	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter is concerned about traffic. Further concerned by what they perceive as an intent to reduce green areas and opportunity to promote sports and a healthy living environment in Dundrum thinks there seems to be a determination to turn Dundrum into a concrete jungle.</li> <li>• Submits that in Dundrum green areas to accommodate sports clubs are desperately needed.</li> <li>• Thinks that Main St Dundrum is currently an eye sore and high-rise blocks will not improve this.</li> <li>• Submits that Dundrum already lacks community spirit and has a disproportionate number of small apartments for a village when a much greater mix of houses / apartments is needed.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 3 and 5		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0459</a>	Person: Grace Stroughair	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter finds it extremely difficult to get though the village from Willow Road and back because of the one-way system now.</li> <li>• Submits that the cycle lane is highly dangerous especially at night.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0460</a>	Person: Maureen Flynn	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
Submits that:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to village is too limited.</li> <li>• Cycle lane is dangerous.</li> <li>• There are no parking spaces.</li> <li>• Planned buildings are too high.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 3 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0461</a></b>	<b>Person: David FitzGerald</b>	<b>Organisation: Holy Cross Parish Dundrum - Finance Committee</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter is disappointed at how difficult the proposals were for lay people to comprehend stating the size of the document and layout did not make it easy to comprehend the plan and that parishioners found it difficult to understand and grasp the details.</li> <li>• Submitter was disappointment that Council staff seemed ill-informed about details of the plan and were not equipped to answer parishioners' queries.</li> <li>• Thinks proposals will make accessing the town centre, services and social outlets difficult for many including mass-goers and children/parents getting to school.</li> <li>• Cites concern regarding the future of the location of the Dom Marmion facility citing need to access this by car is a must and a suitable replacement must be in place prior to the closure of the existing facility.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2, 4 and Other Issues		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0462</a></b>	<b>Person: Hazel Furlong</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter object to traffic route changes and bus gates.</li> <li>• Cites these will cause difficulties coming from the Churchtown area, from Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East Areas.</li> <li>• States the barriers will also result in long detours and resultant in delays for traffic from Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East commuting to Dublin City.</li> <li>• Considers the changes will increase difficulties to pass through Taney Cross (Junction of Dundrum Road/ Taney Road and Churchtown Road)</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0463</a></b>	<b>Person: Dr Garrett McGovern</b>	<b>Organisation: Priority Medical Clinic</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter is a local doctor who conducts an addiction treatment centre on Main St.</li> <li>• Objects to the draft plan regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The overdevelopment of Dundrum Main Street will destroy its rich history making it impossible for residence and business owners to remain on the street.</li> <li>○ The major upheaval of and noise from a vast construction site will make it virtually impossible for the submitter to carry out the important work they do regarding addiction services and vulnerable people.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 2		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0464</a>	Person: Jovi Pinon	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter feels that the Draft LAP was not planned and announced to the local communities appropriately.</li> <li>• Considers the Plan to have been drawn up without the thoughts of the citizens living and working in the area.</li> <li>• Objects to the removal of the slip lanes as this will increase traffic congestions and emissions due to motorists having to circle around before reaching Dundrum Main Street.</li> <li>• Objects to increasing bus gates and one-way roads in and out of Dundrum.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0465</a>	Person: Bronwyn O'Donnell	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter strongly objects to the proposed plans for the Dundrum area.</li> <li>• States that the LAP process is substantially flawed as its development should require an ongoing community-inclusive process of co-creation and meaningful consultation not just statutory timelines.</li> <li>• Considers that the plan stresses improved facilities for walkers and cyclists but does not mention and obvious agenda to make life extremely difficult for motorists.</li> <li>• Critical of potential impacts on elderly and less-abled members of the community and how they will be negatively impacted by changes to routes, one-way systems and bus gates.</li> <li>• States that the plans for bus routes seem non-sensical, diverting them down small residential roads. Considers that Dundrum main street should be re-opened to two-way traffic, facilitating access for all (including emergency vehicles).</li> <li>• Submits that current height proposals need to be reduced to more medium scale density for an Irish setting 3/4 storey max.</li> <li>• Believes the planned civic centre building is far too high and in the wrong place, it should be no more than four stories and should be in the centre of the village.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4 and Other Issues</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0466</a>	Person: William and Thérèse Devine	Organisation: Member of Lynwood Residents' Association
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter is a long-term resident of Dundrum.</li> <li>• Objects to the proposed barrier to traffic on Ballinteer Road (near Main Street) saying it will result in a long detour in the opposite direction and restrict access basic services and facilities.</li> <li>• Submits the plan is contrary to the interests of elderly and disabled residents of the local area as the plan is preoccupied with walking and cycling provision.</li> <li>• Suggests that the plan as it stands will be detrimental for the quality of life and for businesses in the village.</li> <li>• Objects to recent changes actioned within Dundrum Village Main Street regarding traffic flow and the cycle lane.</li> <li>• Submits that the dividing barrier between the cycle lane and the driving lane are dangerous as they have personally witnessed two people fall over them on two separate occasions.</li> <li>• Suggests that the number of cyclists travelling through the Village is extremely low and that the new cycle lane has done nothing to increase the usage of bicycles in the Village.</li> <li>• Submits the cycle lanes have been of no benefit to Dundrum and requests that the barriers be removed.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0467</u>	Person: William and Thérèse Devine	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submits that the DLAP will not be mindful of the existing character, scale and heritage of Dundrum, as noted in the plan as a key objective.</li> <li>• Objects to any proposal to accommodate any development in the village centre up to 11 stories in height, in addition to a landmark building of possibly greater height.</li> <li>• Is concerned with the large provision of Buy to Let in the area as this does not accommodate downsizing, and not in keeping with the existing character of Dundrum.</li> <li>• Submits that the planned bus gate to the west of Dundrum, reduces vehicle access to Dundrum and could be accommodated on the bypass.</li> <li>• Believes the existing Cycle Lane in Dundrum is barely used and dangerous suggesting this might be moved to the bypass or alongside the new pedestrian accesses.</li> <li>• States that access must be improved to Dundrum, for everyone to access shops, church, doctors and the Luas.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2, 3 and 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0468</u>	Person: Mark Murphy	Organisation: Climate and Health Alliance
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission outlines that it is being made on behalf of the Irish Climate and Health Alliance which is made up of twenty members, including the Irish Heart Foundation, the Royal College of Physicians and the National Children’s Hospital.</li> <li>• Submission strongly supports the DLAP which will help shift the local community to take up more walking, cycling, wheeling and public transport in lieu of private car use.</li> <li>• Submission outlines current environmental, health and climate position in Ireland regarding air pollution and climate impact and how the LAP will influence these if not implemented.</li> <li>• Considers also the benefits to residents and visitors in regards to these same issues when the ideas within the LAP are executed and how building more pathways, cycle tracks and public transport links will encourage active travel which will act as a boon to both physical and mental health.</li> <li>• Raises the issue of inequality and how the most disadvantaged in our society have limited access to private motor vehicles.</li> <li>• Suggests that increased provision for public transport and particularly active travel modes can help drive improved transport equity.</li> <li>• Notes that Ireland’s population of over 65s will rise to 1.6 million by 2051 therefore, establishing a sustainable transport model will help reduce mobility inequalities in our society while the resulting lower levels of air pollution will vastly improve the health of the most disadvantaged communities.</li> <li>• Cites the health and economic benefits of pedestrianized urban centres as reflected in studies from other international locations and concludes that the DLAP and facilitating more walking, cycling, wheeling, and public transport, will deliver many economic benefits to the local community and local businesses.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1 and 6</p>		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0469</a></b>	<b>Person: Robin Keenan</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter thinks there are some really great proposals in the draft LAP, particularly around climate change adaptation and transport.</li> <li>• Believes that the plan will put residents on the right path to face up to the reality of the climate emergency as a community.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 1 and 5		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0470</a></b>	<b>Person: Aidan Ffrench</b>	<b>Organisation: Nature-based Placemaking</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission is specific to Section 1.8 Flood Risk Management - Objective G17 (<i>which is located in section 5.4.2 not 1.8</i>)</li> <li>• States the section relates solely to private development and has little or nothing to say about the Council's responsibility in terms of Stormwater Management on its own lands.</li> <li>• Suggests that retrofitting existing roads (cycleways, bus lanes, planted verges) and to convert roadside grass (low Biodiversity) verges to Rain Gardens should be included as an objective within the plan.</li> <li>• Notes this idea was specifically recommended in the Council's GI Strategy (2016-22) 7 years ago.</li> <li>• Submits that there's ongoing failure to achieve Action 34 of the Council's legally-required Climate Change Action Plan (2019-2024): quoting the Annual Progress Reports for 2021 and 2022 which states that Action 34 is still "Not Started".</li> <li>• Suggests the need for an amendment to the draft LAP to undertake a feasibility study for retrofitting streets with Rain Gardens within 12 months of adoption of the LAP and to include mandatory performance metrics in respect of achieving 'soft' (NBS) SUDS in public retrofitting projects.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 5 and Other Issues		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0471</a></b>	<b>Person: Joseph Slowey</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<p>The submitter raises the following concerns regarding the DLAP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LAP disregards the needs of the elderly and those with poor mobility, who rely on vehicles for daily activities.</li> <li>• The plan takes away access to essential amenities for elderly inhabitants, including grocery shopping, church attendance, banking, and leisure activities.</li> <li>• Concerns that the character of Dundrum has been eroded due to persistent and "temporary" changes by the council.</li> <li>• The submitter indicates that some elected members have been influenced by specialist interest groups, with elderly residents unfairly disadvantaged by the method of communication.</li> <li>• The deadline for submissions on the LAP appears rushed, limiting the ability of elderly residents to understand and voice their opinions.</li> <li>• The submitter contends that some elected members are unwilling to represent the full range of views within the LAP. The submitter calls for DLRC to ensure democracy by carefully considering all submissions.</li> <li>• The proposed one-way system on Sydenham Road will increase congestion, raise safety concerns around schools, and cause conflicts with a permitted driveway off Annefield Manner.</li> <li>• Concerns regarding provisions for changes on Sydenham Road versus Stoney Road, especially regarding cycle lanes and increased occupancy.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4 and Other Issues		



<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0472</a></b>	<b>Person: Niamh Coyle</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed bus corridor in front of the Dundrum Library doesn't appear to make any sense and would be more damaging than beneficial to the village.</li> <li>• The height of the proposed Civic center and neighboring apartment blocks are excessive and ideally should be halved from the current number of proposed floors.</li> <li>• There isn't any need for any more one-way traffic systems in the area as it will make it even more awkward to get to certain locations for residents.</li> <li>• Objective T8 – North Sandyford Road: Create a school zone and safe access route for pedestrians and cyclists to Holy Cross National School via the Dom Marmion car park should be prioritised, as access to school via this car park is dangerous.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2, 3 and 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0473</a></b>	<b>Person: Michelle Ross</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission has no content.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> N/A		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0474</a></b>	<b>Person: Lynda Slattery</b>	<b>Organisation: Balally Residents Association</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
Correction to Balally Residents Association submission of 19 July 2023, ref <a href="#">B0264</a> .		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Under section 7 of the submission, the third point deals with traffic related issues and there is a correction to the sentence “The existing traffic congestion also adversely impacts on many residents' ability to exit their homes, with a particular pinch point heading Southwards out of the estate.”</li> <li>• This should have read “The existing traffic congestion also adversely impacts on many residents' ability to exit their homes, with a particular pinch point heading Northbound out of the estate towards Dundrum.”</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0475</u>	Person: Lorna Radcliffe	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <p>Section 2.9.2 Old Dundrum Shopping Centre KDA (OSC) OSC2 and OSC3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter believes the proposed pedestrian bridge over the overpass to Sweetmount is unnecessary due to existing access routes and is concerned that it will increase foot traffic and parking in the Sweetmount area.</li> <li>The submitter contends that the bridge proposal might be an attempt to rebrand Sweetmount Park as a new local amenity within Dundrum.</li> <li>The submitter states that there has been a noticeable increase in anti-social behaviour in the park in recent years and that there is a growing concern for the safety of elderly residents living alone in the vicinity and policing is challenging given the layout.</li> </ul> <p>Section 2.9.4 Dom Marmion KDA (DM) DM3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter is concerned for the continued ability to drop/collect children from Holy Cross school without adversely impacting traffic along Sandyford Road and allowing access to Dom Marmion House for the elderly and those with mobility issues.</li> </ul> <p>Section 4.6.1.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter is concerned about the possibility of a bus gate preventing car access to Main Street from Ballinteer Road and states that it should not be permanent possibly open to traffic at less busy times and particularly on Sunday for mass times.</li> <li>The submitter expresses concerns regarding a one-way eastbound traffic layout on Kilmacud Road Upper from its junction with Sydenham Road to its junction with Overend Avenue.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2 and 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0476</u>	Person: Billy Jones	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <p>The submitter states that they support in broad terms, the DLAP and makes the following observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support for all 6 principles set out in the DLAP Vision (p. 4).</li> <li>Support for the inclusion of the 10-minute neighbourhood concept and support for cycling and walking facilities particularly in the context of the climate crisis and the need to prioritise sustainable forms of transport over the private car.</li> <li>Dundrum Village currently lacks social and cultural spaces with street frontage. This situation could be improved by appropriate redevelopment of the OSC site.</li> <li>Density of housing will need to increase significantly in order to achieve sustainability, but this should be done with sensitivity to the existing urban fabric.</li> <li>Active street frontage will be key to revitalising the village.</li> <li>Support for the development of Windy Harbour NC in accordance with the 6 principles referred to in the LAP. The submitter supports the objectives of enhancing this area through urban greening, traffic calming and better pedestrian and cycle access, which should be prioritised over private car access.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 3, 4 and 6</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0477</u>	Person: Maurice Brady	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <p>The submitter states that they would like to congratulate the council for the initiative and imagination shown in the plan, but raises the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sustainable mobility – The submitter states that whilst they believe that prioritising cyclists can reduce vehicular traffic, standard mobility principles might not always be appropriate for Dundrum given the presence of one of the country's largest shopping centres and a limited-capacity light rail system constrained by infrastructure and topography.</li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Height – The proposed height limits for new development are welcomed but should be reduced to 6 storeys to match Dundrum's character, including for the proposed civic building.</li> <li>• Bus gates – Bus gate from Dundrum Main St. to Sweetmount Ave – Concerns about the proposed busgate plan's feasibility due to existing traffic issues; potential for increased delays and bus congestion.</li> <li>• Access to Main Street from Dom Marmion Bridge – The submitter questions the net benefits of preventing private vehicles from turning left from Dom Marmion Bridge onto Dundrum Main St and believes that it is highly likely that vehicles would turn left from Barton Road East onto Sweetmount Drive, to get onto Sweetmount Ave. to gain access to Taney Bridge. The submitter feels it is inequitable to have 5 vehicular entrance and exit points (not including delivery sites and surface-based car parks) available from 4 streets/roads to the shopping centre and only one access point on one side of the road, i.e. Kilmacud Rd Upper to Main Street.</li> <li>• Pedestrian bridge over bypass – the submitter questions the proposed bridge's benefit to Sweetmount Park given existing access; feels the bridge risks disrupting park's quiet, organic feel; and that expenditure on same, whether public or private, is not justified.</li> <li>• Submission analysis and timeframes – The submitter is seeking feedback on the process involved in submission analysis and there is a thematic analysis protocol? Likewise, what is the coding guideline? The submitter questions how a vast abundance of material and feedback will be analysed reliably and consistently, but also considered and responded to, within a 6-week time frame.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 2, 3, 4 and Other Issues</p>

<p><b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0478</a></b></p>	<p><b>Person: Robert and Polly OConnor</b></p>	<p><b>Organisation:</b></p>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter expresses that major concerns exist about the draft LAP's disconnected planning and safety in Dundrum, especially on Sydenham road. The road's narrowness, slope, and traffic create dangers. Proposed changes, including adding a cycle lane, exacerbate issues. The submitter suggests redistributing traffic between Sydenham and Stoney roads. Future accidents are anticipated.</li> <li>• The shift of cars to EVs will have the effect of decarbonising and cars aren't going away.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4</p>		

<p><b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0479</a></b></p>	<p><b>Person: Oisín O'Neill</b></p>	<p><b>Organisation:</b></p>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <p>The submitter states that they would like to register full support for the transport elements of the plan, and further raises the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for expanded bus routes – Delighted to hear that there are plans to expand the bus service and create bus gates to make public transport more attractive.</li> <li>• Support for cycle infrastructure – To date, the submitter hasn't felt confident cycling due to presence of SUVs, trucks, and buses. However, the proposed introduction of a much larger network of segregated cycle lanes will allow me the submitter to make some journeys on a bike. As somebody in their career, being able to access a mode of transport that is both safe and free is really welcome.</li> <li>• E-bikes – Given the availability of electric bikes, the submitter feels the suggestion by some that Dundrum is too hilly for cycling is an invalid point.</li> <li>• Pedestrianisation – the submitter welcomes the plans to keep the pedestrianised areas of the village and add more parks.</li> <li>• Civic centre – The civic centre is very welcome and the submitter looks forward to being able to use it.</li> <li>• Support for higher densities – As a young person still living at home with little hope of renting at the current costs, they would also welcome the introduce of high-density housing in the area.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2, 3 and 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0480</a>	Person: Vincent Walsh	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed bus lane/gate from Dundrum village crossing the bypass on to Sweetmount Avenue in front of the library – The submitter opposes the proposed bus lane as they contend it will restricts access to key areas, isolate residents, and increase disturbance and noise for Sweetmount Avenue locals.</li> <li>Proposed re-location of bus stand beside Usher house to Churchtown Road – This will move the inter-connection between bus and Luas further apart and an alternative site at the back of the Dundrum Luas stop could be explored.</li> <li>Proposed bus gate to prevent motorists entering Dundrum village from Barton Road East/ Ballinteer Road – Proposed changes will isolate the community, impact the elderly post-pandemic, redirect traffic to residential roads, and increase congestion and pedestrian risks.</li> <li>Elderly – Better consideration needs to be given to the needs of the elderly.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0481</a>	Person: Sean McCarthy	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter states that they are fully supportive of the changes to active travel planned in the document, in particular the focus on expanding the bike lane network and pedestrian permeability.</li> <li>Limiting car traffic, particularly for shorter trips will make a much safer environment for children.</li> <li>The submitter expresses concerns with how the bus gates will be protected from rat-running, particularly at Sweetmount park and questions whether the council will be active in monitoring of the bus gates to prevent un-authorized traffic from using them.</li> <li>The submitter seeks focus on designs to limit illegal parking on footpaths which is an issue at the moment, particularly near the junction of Ballinteer Road and Main Street.</li> <li>The submitter is fully supportive of the proposal for a playground in Finsbury park.</li> <li>The submitter welcomes a plan with the focus on delivering housing and living that is beneficial for young people and those with families, moving away from the sprawl and car dependency of the past.</li> <li>The submitter hopes that the proposals in the LAP will not be watered down.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 3 and 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0482</u>	Person: Adrian Slattery	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b> The submitter contends that the plans will increase traffic rather than reduce it and raises the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposals for Main Street ignore the requirement for emergency services.</li> <li>• The proposed alterations to Taney Cross fail to recognise the importance of this major intersection between two Regional Roads.</li> <li>• The proposed reduction in carriageway widths and proposed widening of footpaths on Sandyford Road (northern section) ignores the fact that, with the exception of Upper Kilmacud Road, this will be the sole access route to Main Street.</li> <li>• The proposed extension of the one-way northbound traffic system on Main Street would mean that any proposed new Civic Hub would effectively be located in a cul-de-sac surrounded on three sides by Regional Roads and the LUAS.</li> <li>• No measures included to indicate bus frequencies or how they would make it easier for people to access Dundrum.</li> <li>• The creation of a bus gate on Ballinteer Road closes off access to/from Dundrum for thousands of people living to the east and south-east of the town.</li> <li>• The proposal to change Sydenham Road to one way with two bike lanes is dangerous and irresponsible.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0483</u>	Person: Andy Heffernan	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is a final opportunity to preserve the village feel of Dundrum, the key issue being the ownership of the old village centre by one owner which dictates a commercial direction from an overseas developer.</li> <li>• The one-way traffic layout extension is ineffective, increases travel distance and emissions, and has poor traffic management at Taney bridge.</li> <li>• The Dundrum Bypass integration with the 10-minute neighbourhood concept is flawed, lacking amenities and potential for active frontage, especially near proposed high-rise.</li> <li>• It is proposed to have a one-way eastbound traffic layout on Kilmacud Road Upper from Sydenham Road to Overend Avenue. This means that any cars travelling west on the Kilmacud road from the Drummartin Link Rd will not be able to access Taney Road what-so-ever.</li> <li>• The proposed building heights for the OSC will harm Dundrum's character, clashing with the "Victorian" aesthetic. Restricting heights and ensuring appropriate design is crucial for preserving the area's identity. Not against housing but concerned about large-scale developments.</li> <li>• Relocate or upgrade the ESB Sub Station on Taney Drive as it is an eye sore.</li> <li>• Upgrade the LUAS underpass between Taney Drive and Usher House.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2, 4 and 5</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0484</u>	Person: John Deaton	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b> The submitter notes elements of Dundrum's history and development and then goes on to make the following observations on the LAP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LAP vision promotes a respectful neighbourhood, but the Plan transforms Dundrum into an urban centre second only to Dublin city centre, resembling post-war UK failures.</li> <li>• Demand for housing shouldn't justify high-rise density at any cost. The plan for 11 storeys is excessive; indeed experts the likes of the Royal Institute of Architects of Ireland advise low-rise, medium density.</li> <li>• Support site redevelopment for proposed civic centre but 11-storey height, as indicated, would overshadow Dundrum. Consider referencing the Luas station's height.</li> <li>• Address unsightly Waldemar Terrace rear; consider extending or consolidating its façade.</li> </ul>		

- The submitter proposes that the height of the civic centre be not greater than the ridge height of the old station at the Luas line and that the footprint be expanded and that the backland view of Waldemar Terrace be screened by new buildings or extensions.
- The elimination of the slip road/access from Taney Road into Dundrum would cause traffic chaos and unnecessary travel time for residents.
- The SHD planning application for the OSC site conflicts with the LAP; if approved, the LAP might be unviable. A decision is needed before finalising the LAP.
- The proposed public park's feasibility is doubtful due to land ownership issues.
- The Plan lacks clarity on the impacts of the scale of the proposed building heights.
- The proposed building height of "up to 11 storeys" on the bye-pass is grossly excessive. Building height here should not exceed 5 storeys.
- The proposal for a four storey façade with a fifth storey setback is out of character with the two-storey nature of Main Street. They should be three storey with fourth setback.
- The submitter proposes that the building height on Main Street should be three storey with a possible fourth storey setback.
- The thrust of the Plan is to eliminate all car parking and access in the interests of sustainability, but the plan fails to take into account the increasing availability and reducing cost of EVs as well as emerging technologies such as micro-cars.
- The Plan fails to recognise that car access and parking will continue to be required by a large section of the people in the area.
- The transport proposals only cater for the healthy and mobile and are profoundly ableist. In the interests of Social Inclusion this has to change.
- The proposed restriction on vehicular access to only two access points, taken with the elimination of the car parks would make the village inaccessible and unattractive to residents and would confer a retail advantage on the Town Centre.
- The submitter proposes that the topography of Dundrum be utilised to provide underground car parking e.g. under the proposed Town Park on Main Street.
- The development of the Don Marmion site should include for the retention of some car parking.
- As a resident of Dundrum Road, the submitter supports the objective of making it more of a neighbourhood street and less as a transport hub.
- The submitter would like to see more detail on what is proposed for the Dundrum Road Neighbourhood Street as regards any possible road widening.
- The submitter states that public consultation has been inadequate and should be extended or restarted with the views of residents in mind.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
 Chapters, 2, 4 and Other Issues

DLR Submission No: B0485	Person: Claire MacEvilly	Organisation: Airfield Estate
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Airfield Estate supports the plan's focus on sustainability, urban greening, and active travel.</li> <li>• The estate has historical significance, donated by the Overend sisters to the Irish public and offers various services including education, farming, heritage display, and advocacy.</li> <li>• The submitter is pleased to note the need for "supporting and facilitating the development of appropriate uses at the Estate" and the objectives EMP 1,2 and 3.</li> <li>• The estate employs 44 staff, accommodates 250,000 annual visitors, 12,000 student visitors, and has received various accolades.</li> <li>• Airfield Estate has launched a new strategy which aims to make Airfield Dublin's sustainable food hub by 2028, whilst driving for Dublin to be a sustainable food city under SDG11. The estate is seen as being a key part of this.</li> <li>• Objective EMP1 emphasizes diverse revenue models for the estate's longevity.</li> <li>• The estate recommends DLR develop a comprehensive food policy, drawing from international examples.</li> </ul>		

- Plans include opening a community garden in 2023 and furthering research initiatives on food sustainability. The submitter calls on DLRC to implement the recommendations in the National Strategy for Horticulture around community gardens and allotments and the submitter would be keen to share our learnings to help facilitate this.
- The submitter has recently developed a new research strategy for the estate which establishes a foundation for future thought leadership on food sustainability.
- Airfield is deeply involved in community and environmental projects, with the submissions outlining several eco-friendly projects/solutions.
- The estate seeks active engagement with DLR on various sustainability and development areas.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 1 and 7

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0486</a>	Person: Helen Carroll	Organisation: Thomas Carroll Opticians
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b> The submitter is the proprietor of local independent opticians located at the northern end of Main Street. The submitter comments as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The lower end of the village in particular has deteriorated over the years.</li> <li>• The submitter supports the re-development of the Village and surrounds as regards the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ For more housing, particularly for those with families</li> <li>○ For improved community facilities including schools, open green spaces, play areas etc.</li> <li>○ Better public transport, cycle routes and pathways.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The submitter opposes any further reduction in access routes to Dundrum Village by car, together with fewer parking facilities, as they feel it will have an extremely adverse effect on local businesses.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2, 4 and 6</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0487</a>	Person: Minister Josepha Madigan TD	Organisation: Minister for Special Education and Inclusion, and TD for Dublin Rathdown
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Minister for Special Education and Inclusion acknowledges the many residents, groups, and businesses have been in contact regarding the DLAP and urges the Council to take on the board the views of the local residents.</li> <li>• It is crucial that the plan includes much greater input from the local community to address concerns around access to Dundrum and Windy Arbour villages for medical appointments, attending mass, accessing local businesses, and reduction in movement of traffic from outlying areas like Sandyford, Ballinteer, and Stillorgan.</li> <li>• The Minister implores the Council to ensure that those with additional needs are considered, and that they are not in any way left behind. The plan must ensure that services are accessible for those who may be wheelchair-bound, less mobile, or have no choice but to travel by car.</li> <li>• The plan must enhance and support the vibrant businesses in Dundrum, who continue to serve the community well.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4, 6 and Other Issues</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0488</a>	Person: Aiden Bennet	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LAP's focus on expanding footpaths and cycleways over car access is seen as discriminatory, particularly against the elderly.</li> <li>• The "ten-minute concept" isn't feasible without expanded metro/light rail coverage in Dundrum's eastern and western areas. Nor is it plausible to expect that present or future bus services will be able to meet this notional "ten-minute concept".</li> </ul>		

- Sydenham Row – Sydenham Road is narrow; adding two cycle lanes risks safety due to reversing cars and limited parking; footpaths need improvement.
- Regional roads – LAP Disregards the Importance of Regional Roads. The submitter provides a quote from the Department of Transport’s Publication “Regional and Local Roads” (published in September 2019) in support of their statement.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapter 4

**DLR Submission**  
No: [B0489](#)

**Person: Sean Corcoran**

**Organisation:**

**Summary of Submission / Observation:**

The submitter states that they would like to strongly praise and support the DLAP for the vision it puts forward for the future development of Dundrum. The submitter raises the following points:

- Support the objectives for a more pedestrian and cyclist-friendly Main Street as there needs to be a shift from our car dependency. It sends the right message from the top-down that local authorities are taking the lead on the climate challenge and leading by example.
- Support the plans to redevelop the OSC into a mixed-use area with public open space and residential.
- It is critical to encourage the development of residential dwellings in the centre of towns and villages where there is public transport and services provided.
- The current form of the OSC is one of extremely inefficient land use with large swathes of the older half of Dundrum being made up of a concrete car park. It is wasteful and visually detracts from the architectural heritage of the main street.
- Support the creation of a civic space/landmark building beside Waldemar Terrace. This part of Dundrum has been an eyesore for the last 20 years and is a great opportunity to create a welcoming civic gateway to the town.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 1, 2 , 3 and 4

**DLR Submission**  
No: [B0490](#)

**Person: Tim Geraghty**

**Organisation: Finsbury Park Residents' Association**

**Summary of Submission / Observation:**

The submitter attaches a report prepared by a chartered engineer (Liam Coughlan) and states that the resident’s association supports its content. The report can be summarised as follows:

- 10-minute neighbourhood – the report states that most of the measures in the Transport and Movement Section relate to walking and cycling and that little consideration given to Dundrum’s “much wider draw”.
- The 10-minute concept is unrealistic without the inclusion of a more comprehensive luas/light rail system.
- It is unclear how many of the proposed measures will meet the objectives of the ABTA “to reduce congestion, create more liveable cities and reduce GHG emissions” when congestion at locations such as Taney Cross will experience severe congestion.
- With one exception around improving economic competitiveness for DTC (DLAP 28) all the “over-arching” policies are narrowly focused on improving walking and cycling facilities;
- The policy to reduce walking times to 10 minutes (DLAP 25) has been informed by a Catchment Analysis which was undertaken to identify the number of people currently within a 15-minute walk of the centre of Dundrum (Section 4.4.2.4). This is somewhat misleading and undermines the credibility of the Plan;
- No rigorous studies or analysis has been undertaken to support the proposed walking or cycling measures and will at the same time add to vehicular congestion;
- The cycling objectives fail to take account of the steep in and around Dundrum (Section 4.4.2.1);
- The proposals for Main Street ignore the requirement for emergency services to have an emergency lane / route to attend to emergencies;
- The Proposed alterations to Taney Cross fail to recognise the importance of this major intersection between two Regional Roads and the plan should not impinge on the smooth running of these;



- The proposed reduction in carriageway widths and proposed widening of footpaths on Sandyford Road (northern section) ignores the fact that, with the exception of Upper Kilmacud Road, this will be the sole access route to Main Street;
- The proposed extension of the one-way northbound traffic system on Main Street would mean that any proposed new Community, Cultural and Civic 'Hub' would effectively be located in a cul-de-sac surrounded on three sides by Regional Roads and the LUAS;
- There are no measures in the Plan to indicate bus frequencies or how they would make it easier for people to access Dundrum;
- The creation of a bus gate on Ballinteer Road closes off access to/from Dundrum for thousands of people living to the east and south-east of the town;
- The DLAP fails to recognise the important role which vehicles (including goods vehicles) play in transporting people and goods to Dundrum;
- The LAP will make it more difficult for the majority of people to access Dundrum and is particularly discriminatory against the elderly;
- It is inappropriate to attempt to reduce the status of the R117 from a Regional Road to a Local Road without due regard for the thousands who need to use this road on a daily basis for work, recreation or other purposes;
- The LAP fails to recognise that primary purpose of the R112 / R117 Intersection (Taney Cross) is to maximise throughput of all vehicles;
- The LAP disregards the purpose of the Dundrum Bypass;

The report suggests two possible options going forward, as follows:

Option A – Two way traffic system restored to Main Street

- Option A restores full connectivity, is cost-effective, ensures convenient access, and includes potential traffic and safety improvements.

Option B – One way south bound traffic system on Main Street

- Option B suggests reversing the current one-way traffic systems on Main Street, Kilmacud Road Upper, and Sydenham Road. It proposes removing the bus gate on Ballinteer Road and reviewing the operation of the Regional Routes to ensure smooth traffic flows and prevent unnecessary delays, retaining essential turn lanes where needed. The submitter contends that Option B enhances bus movements in Dundrum, aiding buses at the Bus-LUAS Interchange and reducing the need for specific lanes whilst alleviating traffic congestion at the R112/R117 intersection and restoring connectivity to Dundrum's east, including Ballinteer Road and Sweetmount area as well as better traffic options at Dundrum Cross.

The submission from the residents association also states that:

- There is little evidence that existing residents' needs have been adequately considered.
- The 2016 Small Area Population statistics show that almost 25% of the population of the LAP designated area are over 65 years of age and there is insufficient attention given to this age group. For many in these groups the concept of the 10 or 15 minute town is unrealistic, particularly when predicated on walking 0.8km in 12.5 minutes.
- Curtailing motor traffic movement around Dundrum will lead to increase in traffic jams with the resultant emission concentration disimproving the air quality for residents.
- The aim to make Dundrum Road a 'neighbourhood street' is risible. Dundrum Road has always served the neighbourhood and the regions it links.
- By curtailing traffic flow through Dundrum, commuters will be pushed to adjoining areas but the Clonskeagh Road is already carrying excess traffic, likewise the Terenure-Rathfarnham roads.
- The submitter cites experience in Cork through the creation of the N27 Southern Link Road and suggests a sunken carriageway parallel to the Dodder as far as the M50.
- Dundrum is a village, putting some council offices in the back yards of buildings on Main Street does not make it a town.
- A playground in Finsbury Park would result in decreased green areas, attract more traffic and potentially antisocial behaviour outside of daylight/ children's playtime. The centre of the village would be a better location.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It appears that the appropriate balance between the needs of the existing communities and planning needs are weighted against current residents and their legitimate aspirations given plans to 'reorient' towards apartments.</li> <li>• There is a keen sense that the plan does not have an understanding of the needs of long-term residents and that they are not recognised and catered for in this plan.</li> </ul>
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 3 and 4

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0491</a>	<b>Person: Clare Kerrigan</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter states that they are very supportive of the measures regarding transportation and climate.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1 and 5		

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0492</a>	<b>Person: Martin Sutton</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
The submitter states that:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter is concerned with the new proposed bus corridor that will take the wonderful communal space in front of Dundrum Library.</li> <li>• This will also lead to a very congested road from Sweetmount Ave leading onto upper Churchtown road, where also the new proposed bus terminus will reside.</li> <li>• The new civic centre could be located in Usher House which is for sale.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0493</a>	<b>Person: Yvonne Kealy Cowman</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
The submitter states that the plan is totally unsuitable and that:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dundrum has struggled to remain a village in the face of not always beneficial development.</li> <li>• The plan will wipe out what is left.</li> <li>• Public transport is currently at full capacity and it's almost impossible to get a Luas at peak times.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0494</a>	<b>Person: Mary Fanagan</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
The submitter states that:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The DLAP discriminates against the elderly by turning Dundrum into a walk/ cycle only area.</li> <li>• The one-way system already in place on the Kilmacud road had already extended travel time and the planned road closures will increase people's carbon footprint by making them drive more convoluted routes.</li> <li>• The plan does not consider how hilly Dundrum is and how challenging this makes it for older people to walk.</li> <li>• The plan disproportionately affects the elderly.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1 and 4		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0495</u>	Person: Niamh Ní Fhoghlú	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b> The submitter states that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter supports the idea that there should be some redevelopment of the Village Centre, but not at the price of the rest of Dundrum village.</li> <li>• While the submitter understands the aim to encourage people to cycle and walk more, the proposed alterations do not take into consideration the aging population living in Dundrum and the surrounding areas due to the local topography.</li> <li>• The Main Street covid measures have not been successful as a green initiative to lessen traffic and Main Street should be reverted to two way.</li> <li>• The two-way system would allow for better access for hearses into Holy Cross Church, and emergency vehicles all up and down Main Street.</li> <li>• Opposes an 11 storey building on Main Street (Urban Design Report 38) which is an extreme case of over development that would add to traffic issues and would negate any the good from any green initiatives.</li> <li>• An 11-storey building would destroy the beauty of the local area, overshadowing the rest of the historic Main Street.</li> <li>• Development should be a reasonable height (4-6 storeys), with businesses and accommodation.</li> <li>• Abandoned buildings on Main Street should be sympathetically renovated as at Ashgrove Terrace.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2 and 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0496</u>	Person: Kate Prendiville	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b> The submitter expresses the following concerns with the DLAP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New traffic proposals in Dundrum are viewed as inconvenient and discriminatory, particularly for the elderly.</li> <li>• The plan doesn't account for the elderly or those with mobility issues.</li> <li>• Many elderly residents depend on cars for essential activities.</li> <li>• The "10-minute town approach" favours the young and fit.</li> <li>• Older individuals may face difficulties and potential isolation due to limited access.</li> <li>• Isolation can lead to serious health issues like dementia, frailty, and depression.</li> <li>• There's a focus on accommodating younger apartment residents.</li> <li>• The plan might isolate and hasten the loss of independence for older individuals.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 3 and 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0497</u>	Person: Niamh McDonald	Organisation: Uisce Éireann
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UE supports the Draft LAP noting that comments from the pre-draft stage have been taken into account.</li> <li>• Welcomes the inclusion of policies in Chapter 5 regarding NBS and SuDS.</li> <li>• Notes the change of name from Irish Water to Uisce Éireann.</li> <li>• Notes a planned project in north Dundrum to accommodate population growth. Until such time that this is completed, the discharge of any surface water to sewers is not permitted and any misconnections should be rectified, noting that some local upgrade may be developer driven.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 1 and 5</p>		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0498</a></b>	<b>Person: Brian Welsh</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns at isolation of local residents from village/amenities as a result of car traffic restrictions and removal of car parking. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Highlights impacts to elderly who cannot cycle/carry heavy goods.</li> <li>○ Highlights additional difficulties posed by bad weather.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0499</a></b>	<b>Person: Rosemary Welsh</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns at isolation of local residents from village/amenities as a result of car traffic restrictions and removal of car parking. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Highlights impacts to elderly who cannot cycle/carry heavy goods.</li> <li>○ Highlights additional difficulties posed by bad weather.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0500</a></b>	<b>Person: Richard Cox</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcomes Draft LAP overall, in particular focus on 10-minute neighbourhood.</li> <li>• Considers Dundrum presents problems due to its status as an urban centre and its relationship with suburban hinterland and city centre.</li> <li>• Considers village of the past has been lost and current Dundrum is spatially incoherent.</li> <li>• Considers long-term vision and firm action are required to create a liveable space which is not dominated by private car. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers local planning imperative to achieve this aligns with necessity for global action on climate and biodiversity.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0501</a></b>	<b>Person: Yseult Freaney</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers impact on Sydenham Villas as a result of proposed changes to roads are not clarified in Draft LAP.</li> <li>• Objects to proposed one-way traffic system on Sydenham Road and adjacent roads.</li> <li>• Notes commuting journey times by public transport can be significantly longer than by private car.</li> <li>• Sets out existing vehicular egress arrangements from Sydenham Villas, whereby access is provided onto Kilmacud Road Upper in both directions and Sydenham Road, and thereon connecting to adjoining roads in the wider network. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Notes that proposals of Draft LAP (with reference to sections 4.6.3.1/ 4.6.1.3/4.6.1.1/ 4.6.1.2) will significantly limit egress options.</li> <li>○ Notes that vehicular egress would only be available via Kilmacud Road Upper / Main Street.</li> <li>○ States this would necessitate having to negotiate very heavy through traffic seeking to access M50.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers proposed changes will result in significant increase in traffic congestion and corresponding increase in pollution.</li> <li>● Considers proposed measures of Draft LAP will have seriously deleterious impact on village/Main Street businesses.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers environment/character of Main Street will be negatively impacted by gridlocked traffic congestion.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Considers local cycle infrastructure is underutilised.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers investment in public transport infrastructure would much more useful.</li> <li>○ Expresses frustration/disappointment at lack of progress on planned public transport connections across the city.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b>            Chapters 4 and 6</p>

DLR Submission No: <u>B0502</u>	Person: Peter and Anne Costello	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Concerned about overall impacts of Draft LAP and queries demand for same.</li> <li>● Concerned at impacts of proposed car traffic restrictions on Ballinteer Road at Dundrum Cross (as set out in Section 4.6.1.1) on access to local services on Main Street.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers measures will result in long detours, delays to commuting traffic.</li> <li>○ States 10-minute neighbourhood concept should make provision for elderly/disabled, noting their needs to access services/amenities/public transport on Main Street.</li> <li>○ Doubts that adequate public transport service can be provided to make up for loss of car access.</li> <li>○ Proposes retaining one-way traffic system on Main Street would allow for sufficient access for elderly.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b>            Chapters 1 and 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0503</u>	Person: Ciara Slattery	Organisation: The Land Development Agency
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcomes opportunity to engage in LAP public consultation process.</li> <li>• Considers it is imperative that the LAP facilitates the delivery of residential development on state-owned lands.</li> <li>• Respondent states they are committed to future sustainable development of Dundrum and delivering social/affordable homes in area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Highlights recent grant of permission for 852 residential units on CMH site (ABP Ref. 313176-22 refers).</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>CMH KDA Objectives:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of identification of CMH site as KDA.</li> <li>• Welcomes support for respondent's design approach to CMH site as set out in Draft LAP vision for site in Section 2.9.5.2. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Notes that the permitted development achieves excellent level of sunlight/daylight access (including to all communal amenity areas), with reference to Draft LAP suggestion that modifications to heights of some blocks could allow for more sunlight/daylight access.</li> <li>○ Highlights that Condition 4 of existing permission requires alterations which result in significant exceedance of minimum size requirements for many units.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Notes that design principles/strategic objectives for CMH site (a set out in Section 2.9.5.3) generally align with permitted development / Masterplan, however raises concerns at certain deviations in this section.</li> <li>• States that areas of open space provided in existing permission (including c. 8,000 sq.m area of parkland open space south of Asylum building) represent high quality public spaces providing range of recreational uses/play opportunities. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Concerned at Draft LAP requirement (Objective CMH3) to provide c. 8,000 sq.m parkland open space in first phase, highlighting practicalities of developing a significant scheme and noting requirements of Condition 7 of existing permission to agree phasing plan with DLR.</li> <li>○ Considers phasing/sequencing of development requires careful consideration/discussion with DLR.</li> <li>○ Notes outline phasing plan submitted with application proposed delivery of parkland in second phase, however acknowledges need to discuss/consider further.</li> <li>○ Notes impact on phasing of construction practicalities, which must be agreed with DLR by way of CMP.</li> <li>○ Requests omission of CMH3 and replacement with objective requiring phasing plan which ensures delivery of sufficient open spaces to serve residents in line with completion/occupation of residential blocks.</li> <li>○ Welcomes provision in Objective CMH3 to provide pedestrian/cycle link with Larchfield Road via open space, noting this is provided for in existing permission.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Wildlife Corridors:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requests inclusion of text in LAP stating that the development of areas which accommodate wildlife corridors and are subject to existing planning permissions should adhere to development/maintenance requirements as set out by submitted planning application documentation (including EIAR and AA, as applicable) and conditions of permission. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Notes this with regard to CMH site's inclusion in the Ticknock to River Dodder Wildlife Corridor in both the Draft LAP and the DLR County Biodiversity Action Plan, 2021-2025.</li> <li>○ Highlights statement in Biodiversity Action Plan that identification of lands as a wildlife corridor does not preclude their development subject to suitable environmental assessment.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Transport/Movement:</b></p>		

- Supportive of Draft LAP aspiration to create safer/more accessible environment for pedestrians on Dundrum Road (with reference to Objective T19), noting this was a significant issue raised by locals during consultation on CMH SHD application.
  - Notes that proposed measures should be consistent with CMH SHD permission, including facilitation of construction access.
  - States that the pedestrian crossing of Dundrum Road indicated on Figure 4.13 would need to be re-located further south in order to align with permitted signalised junction at entrance to CMH site (Condition 5b of SHD permission refers).
  - Seeks consultation with DLR to appropriately co-ordinate implementation of proposed measures with development of CMH site.
- Respondent welcomes opportunity afforded by Draft LAP to contribute to delivery of Dodder to Dundrum pedestrian/cycle route (as per Objectives T21 and T23).
  - Highlights importance of aligning route delivery with overall phasing of CMH site development, noting LAP intention to progress route at early stage of redevelopment of site.
  - Considers health/safety issues may arise if route is in use during construction.
  - Requests that LAP instead refers to delivery of route in line with agreed phasing of CMH development.

#### Architectural Heritage:

- Respondent states they are progressing planning strategy for adaptive use of Protected Structures at CMH site.
- Respondent considers their planned redevelopment of the Protected Structures CMH site is consistent with Objective HC6 of Draft LAP, however highlights that preliminary assessment indicates that many of the subsequent extensions elements of these structures are of limited heritage value.
  - States that full conservation appraisal will accompany future planning application in respect of the Protected Structures.
  - Considers that removal of some extension elements may have positive impact on architectural heritage of Protected Structures and their curtilages.
  - Requests amendment of text of HC6 through inclusion of text stating that re-use of extension elements will be sought where such extensions are deemed to be of sufficient heritage value and to align with a considered adaptive re-use design.
- Supportive of further Objectives in Section 8.5.8 regarding the redevelopment of the CMH site.

#### Various:

- Supportive of 10-minute neighbourhood concept as core focus of the Draft LAP, stating it is consistent with respondent's development intentions for CMH site.
- Identifies the following inaccuracies in Draft LAP:
  - Refers to CMH site as being under ownership of LDA (Section 2.9.5), whereas the OPW are the current landowners.
  - Refers to single access to CMH site from Churchtown Road (Section 2.9.5, second paragraph), whereas this should refer to access from Dundrum Road.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 1, 2, 4, 5 and 8.

DLR Submission No: B0504	Person: Siobhan M McEvitt	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Believes the plan will have a significantly negative impact on local businesses located along the Main Street with regards to various proposals for:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Windy Arbour (section 4.6.3.1), the Dundrum Bypass to Wyckham Way along Sandyford Road as far as Main Street (section 4.6.1.1), southbound access from Dundrum bypass to Main Street (section 4.6.1.1) Taney Cross (section 4.6.1.2) and Sandyford Road (Northern part) as far as Main Street (section 4.6.1.3).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

- Believes there will be an increase in severe congestion and unnecessary delays as a result of Bus priority and the elimination of all left-turn lanes passing through Taney Cross (section 4.6.1.2).
- Concerns at impacts of one-way system on Main Street – requests reinstatement of two-way system.
- Raises concerns with proposed restrictions to access on Ballinteer Road at Dundrum Cross (as set out in Section 4.6.1.1).
  - Considers proposed measures will cause long delays and detours for residents seeking to access local services and amenities, as well as commuting to city.
  - Suggests additional issues in this regard will be caused by proposed measures on Sandyford Road as set out in Section 4.6.1.3.
  - Considers measures will disproportionately impact elderly/disabled/mobility impaired/parents.
- Suggests congestion and delays will be exacerbated by proposed measures at Taney Cross and environs as set out in Section 4.6.1.2.
- Considers it is important for elderly to retain Dom Marmion Centre.
- Critical of transport / movement proposals generally
  - Notes excessive focus on cyclists/pedestrians.
  - States estimated increase in electric/hybrid vehicles and consequent reduction in greenhouse emissions has not been accounted for.
  - Does not consider elderly/mobility impaired who cannot walk/cycle have been accounted for.
  - Considers there is no demand for LAP.
  - Highlights issues for cyclists in area including topography.
  - Trip hazard / safety issues due to cycle lane kerbs.
  - Emergency services access

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 1, 3, 4 and 6

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0505</a>	Person: Cormac O Sullivan	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Critical of transport / movement proposals generally               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Notes excessive focus on cyclists/pedestrians.</li> <li>○ Does not consider elderly/mobility impaired who cannot walk/cycle have been accounted for.</li> <li>○ Suggests congestion and delays will be exacerbated by proposed measures.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Difficulty understanding LAP.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4, Other Issues</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0506</a>	Person: Eoghan	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of LAP overall.</li> <li>• Objects to Transport / Movement proposals including the following:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Taney Cross removal of slip lanes – increase congestion, CO2 emissions.</li> <li>○ More parking / drop-off in town centre – current / future issues due to one-way system.</li> <li>○ One-way on Sydenham Road will cause issues for school access / drop-off.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Issues with time of year of public consultation – people on holidays.</li> <li>• Concerns at heights / aesthetics / amenity provision at OSC development.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 2, 4 and Other Issues</p>		



DLR Submission No: <u>B0507</u>	Person: Dolores McGilligan	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Believes the plan will have a significantly negative impact on local businesses located along the Main Street with regards to various proposals for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Windy Arbour (section 4.6.3.1), the Dundrum Bypass to Wyckham Way along Sandyford Road as far as Main Street (section 4.6.1.1), southbound access from Dundrum bypass to Main Street (section 4.6.1.1) Taney Cross (section 4.6.1.2) and Sandyford Road (Northern part) as far as Main Street (section 4.6.1.3).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Believes there will be an increase in severe congestion and unnecessary delays as a result of Bus priority and the elimination of all left-turn lanes passing through Taney Cross (section 4.6.1.2).</li> <li>• Raises concerns with proposed restrictions to access on Ballinteer Road at Dundrum Cross (as set out in Section 4.6.1.1). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers proposed measures will cause long delays and detours for residents seeking to access local services and amenities, as well as commuting to city.</li> <li>○ Suggests additional issues in this regard will be cause by proposed measures on Sandyford Road as set out in Section 4.6.1.3.</li> <li>○ Considers measures will disproportionately impact elderly/disabled/mobility impaired/parents.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Concerns at impacts of one-way system on Main Street – requests reinstatement of two-way system.</li> <li>• Suggests congestion and delays will be exacerbated by proposed measures at Taney Cross and environs as set out in Section 4.6.1.2.</li> <li>• Considers it is important for elderly to retain Dom Marmion Centre.</li> <li>• Critical of transport / movement proposals generally <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Notes excessive focus on cyclists/pedestrians.</li> <li>○ States estimated increase in electric/hybrid vehicles and consequent reduction in greenhouse emissions has not been accounted for.</li> <li>○ Does not consider elderly/mobility impaired who cannot walk/cycle have been accounted for.</li> <li>○ Considers there is no demand for LAP.</li> <li>○ Highlights issues for cyclists in area including topography.</li> <li>○ Trip hazard / safety issues due to cycle lane kerbs.</li> <li>○ Emergency services access</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 3, 4 and 6</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0508</u>	Person: Jim Colgan	Organisation: Imagine Dundrum
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission provides commentary and background on the Imagine Dundrum group which is a voluntary group of citizens founded in 2016. Views are based on 7 years of active engagement with the local community.</li> <li>• Whilst delayed, the draft LAP is welcomed and Imagine Dundrum believes that the LAP offers a means to help create a sustainable, modern, thriving Dundrum that effectively blends its rich past and heritage, its unique character, and its present strengths, with an exciting future.</li> <li>• The submission sets out that the focus is on Dundrum Village and specifically on Main Street and the OSC (OSC), and the Architectural Heritage Area.</li> <li>• The submission sets out the 7 fundamental principles of the group for Dundrum.</li> <li>• The submission then provides detail in relation to public consultation held in 2017 and the local community's hopes for Dundrum.</li> <li>• The submission then moves onto provide commentary and proposals in relation to the LAP</li> <li>• Submission recommends that the core concept of sustainability be included in the vision statement.</li> <li>• Submission recommends altering elements of the vision as follows;</li> </ul>		

- Box 2: To use language akin to SLO 9 of the CDP 'To ensure that new design respects and reflects the existing character, scale and heritage of Dundrum.'
- Box 4: To amend as follows: To manage future transport demand in a sustainable manner by providing improved and integrated cycling, pedestrian and public transport facilities combined with greater connectivity and permeability.

### Chapter 1

- Submission requests that Taney Church and grounds be included in the LAP as the community and school are both within the LAP lands. Submission notes that Goastown LAP has lapsed.
- Submission highlights the importance of library facilities.
- Submission proposes a number of additions to the SWOC analysis as follows.
- Proposal: Add to weaknesses: Limited capacity of the current library facility to cater for the expanding range of needs in the area. Poor location of civic offices and limited council services located in Dundrum. Proposal: Add to opportunities: Provide extended modern library facilities in new library to match the needs of the expanding population. Provide an appropriate range of council services in Dundrum for west side of the county. Strengthen the use and appreciation, awareness and appreciation of the heritage and history of the area.
- Submission suggest amending the final sentence of 1.11. para 2 to read; The CCCAP recommendations relating to the area of the LAP have been incorporated into the LAP.

### Chapter 2

- Both the character areas and opportunity sites are welcomed as is the Urban Design and Placemaking Vision
- Submission recommends amending the Urban Design and Placemaking Vision as follows;
- That bullet Point 8 be amended to read 'Promoting an efficient use of land by way of compact growth on a human scale' That the final bullet point be amended to read: Improving sustainability by enhancing SuDs and the ecosystem services of the area.
- Considers that by treating Main Street in the draft LAP purely as the edge of the OSC site in the draft LAP is not appropriate and needs to be revisited and revised.
- Suggests that a vision for Main Street be included as 2.7.1 at the start of 2.7. clearly flagging that Main Street will be treated in the LAP as a unique focus, and more than an edge to the OSC site. Main Street should be seen as a focus for an international-standard architectural and urban design response(s) to enhance this lively street such that it can become the iconic area of Dundrum.
- Submissions suggest that dlr should pursue stated objectives for improving the physical appearance of all structures to be retained along Main Street. A new objective is proposed as follows;
- "It is an objective of DLR to proactively engage with Opportunity Sites and set out a stated list of streetscape improvements it hopes to encourage for private realm property as it abuts and intersects with the Main Street."
- Submission endorses DLAP 5 and DLAP 6 dealing with the public realm. We also endorse PR1- PR3 which address the greening of key roads and Main Street. An additional objective is proposed as follows *"Dundrum Main Street Public Realm delivery. It is the objective to improve public realm along Main Street at appropriate locations as allowed for by building setbacks and available public spaces, including the undergrounding of new services and existing overhead services."*
- Submission considers that the OSC and the Main Street should constitute two different KDAs and not one. Submission considers that by including Main Street in the OSC means the Main Street is seen as an edge to a larger scheme and not as a street needing its own urban design scheme and architectural response
- Submission suggest addition to section 2.9.2.2 Issues, Constraints and Opportunities as follows;
  - Add to Opportunities offered by the OSC site: Main Street viewed as a KDA in its own right.
  - Enliven Main Street and bring more footfall onto Main Street.
  - Reinstate a thriving Main Street which reflects and respects the character and streetscape of the Old Main Street, including the local historical and cultural landmarks, and maintains a style and scale in tune its unique character.
- Considers that requirement for a masterplan should be an objective as opposed to just stated in text. Wording is proposed as follows; "A Master Plan for the entire site should accompany any planning

application for the OSC site for significant development on the site, accompanied by a 'consistency statement' detailing how each of the Guiding Principles and objectives in this SDF will be delivered."

- Proposes a new objective as follows *"Active consideration should be given to making the Masterplan the subject of engagement with the local community in the interests of proactive placemaking practice and to ensure maximum local support for the planned development"*
- Submission considers that separate sub-heading should be set out for site development principles for Main Street and/or Main Street should be a KDA in its own right. A bullet point is suggested as follows; *To ensure that new or redeveloped buildings on Main Street respect and promote the heritage of the Village, in terms of building materials, roof lines, shop fronts, signage.*
- Submission suggest that bullet point 9 on page 21 of the guiding principles for OSC KDA be amended as follows *"To provide for a view to any landmark building or structure at Taney Cross."*

**OSC KDA Movement Objectives** – a new objective is proposed as follows:

- OSC 1 Any redevelopment of the site shall recognise the importance of permeability by providing legible connected routes, via multiple access/exit points for pedestrians and cyclists along north/south and east/west, thereby facilitating a relatively even spread of movement from and to the new development and to local residential communities and to avoid isolating the development and ensuring its integration with the locality. The design of these routes shall accommodate universal access. Submission suggests that objectives OSC2 and 3 can then be omitted.
- Submission proposes amending OSC4 as follows; Amend bullet point 1 to read 'provide a universally accessible link to Ballinteer Road....'

**OSC KDA Placemaking Objectives -**

- Objective for a public open space on Main Street is welcomed and considers that the positioning is critical.
- 2 new placemaking objectives are proposed for the OSC site.
- The LAP should seek physical and visual links to the new Library/Civic Centre at the northern end of the Village, in order to optimise and ensure connected public spaces.
- Setback of buildings from Main Street should be of such depth as to optimise the width of the street and pavements thereby offering a safer and improved pedestrian experience.
- Heritage and Building Character OSC 12: Submission welcomes the objective to retain the Old Post Office, which, in heritage terms, is a significant building on Main Street and part of the Dundrum ACA
- Submission does not support indicative block layout and plot ratio shown on figure 2.9 and request replacement with a revised figure which based on revised plot ratios. No revised figure is provided.
- Submission does not support OSC 13 and 14 - Plot Ratio and Heights
- Considers that it is not sufficient only "To achieve an appropriate plot ratio for this highly accessible location"
- Submission queries what "To ensure that building heights are sensitive to existing heights on Main Street" means and considers that this is contrary to section 1.3 of the 'Development Management Guidelines (2007) which requires that "Development plans and LAPs should provide clear design principles". Third parties must be able to understand the development control framework set out for their area(s) and so must future applicants.
- Amendments proposed as follows;
- A plot ratio range of 1.0 to 1.5 on Main Street/ACA and 1.5 to 2 on the rest of the site.
- A site coverage of 45%-50% on Main Street/ACA and 45% to 70% on the rest of the site.
- Maximum densities must be maximums and not subject to over-riding provisions set out in national planning guidance.
- Submission requests specific guidance on buildings on the site within a range. Submission considers 11 storeys is too tall and 4/5 storeys is too tall for Main Street/ACA.

**Heights on OSC**

- Submission recommends that maximum height across the OSC KDA site site range from 6 – to 8 storeys with 8 storeys along the bypass. Heights of 2 – 3 storey are recommended for Main Street although heights up to 3.5/4 storeys could be accommodated along the northern end of the current car park.

**Land use**

- Submission considers that any response to Main Street in terms of land use should be of an international urban design and architectural design class, with high amenity as well as visual value
- Submission considers that there is a need for vibrant and balanced day and evening uses along Main Street.
- Submission considers that mixed uses should be provided for along the bypass.
- Submission considers that objective for a hotel should be strengthened.
- Submission recommends that objective OSC15 be amended as follows;
  - Amend present bullet point 6 to read: Provide for a supermarket of circa 1500-2500 square metres within the land parcel, with appropriate public parking.
  - Add new objective: It is an objective that public toilets will be provided on the OSC site
- Submission does not support height symbols in figure 2.9 and considers that the most attractive parts of European cities have consistent heights within quality urban quarters and do not contain repeated instances of unnecessary 'height as punctuation' within such small areas.

**Chapter 3**

- Submission welcomes approach which addresses inclusive, multi need and multi generational housing
- Submission supports DLAP7: Provision of SNI uses and delivery of the ten-minute neighbourhood and DLAP8: Co-location of Community Facilities, Policy DLAP9: School Facilities
- Submission considers that the educational listings should include adult education provision currently provided by D.A.T.E (Dundrum Adult Training and Education).
- Submission proposes that dlr should engage proactively with the Dublin Dun Laoghaire Education and Training Board with a view to partnership and joint learning programmes which maximise the offering of each to the people of Dundrum and surrounding areas, and which offer scope for a collaboration and sharing of the Dundrum College of Further Education.
- Submission recommends a new policy as follows *"It is the policy to provide unstructured play opportunities as part of public realm enhancement in Dundrum Village."*
- Submission provides commentary on the fact that they consider that Dundrum needs a new library and that they as a group they have termed the new library as a civic centre. They welcome the commitment to provide a new library in and new Civic building.
- The final sentence of 3.2.5 dealing with site challenges should be amended to include reference to the limitations of the current tight site at Taney Cross lands in accommodating a Civic Centre.
- Submission proposes a new section to the Plan – section 3.5.1 with new objectives:
  - Addressing the relationship between the Civic Centre and the William Dargan Bridge
  - Addressing the relationship between the redevelopment of the Taney Cross area and the Village
  - Maximising Civic Space.
  - Links with the Carnegie Library.
  - The Luas Entrance.
  - The Slang River.
- Submission endorses the commitment to inclusive design of public spaces, and the policy DLAP 14 covering the Age Friendly Strategy Priorities.

**3.3 Homes.**

- Submission suggests a new objective that at least 50% of the affordable homes to be built on the OSC site will be for sale.
- Submission does not support Objective H1, as the plot ratios in section 2.9. currently stands.
- Submission does not support statement *"Having regard to the Building Height Guidelines and more specifically in order to apply SPPR 3 there may be instances where an argument can be made for increased height and/or taller buildings."* Considers that building heights must be assessed on a performance-based approach unless there is a SLO which pertains to a given site which has been decided after the introduction of the guidelines. Therefore, any building height ranges set within the LAP should be adhered to, otherwise there is little point in having an LAP.

- Submission welcomes Policy DLAP 20, requiring an appropriate quantum of housing to enable older people to remain in their homes, and to provide adaptable layouts to facilitate intergenerational use.
- Objective H2 and H3 are welcomed.
- Request inclusion of an objective to meet children’s needs in apartment developments.

#### Chapter 4

- Submission provides commentary on chapter 4 and the ABTA process.  
In relation to ABTA recommendations submission considers that LAP needs to be explicit on:
  - What proposals are already permitted/provided for.
  - What proposals have the status of policies/objectives.
  - What proposals are indicative.
  - What mechanisms and timescales are intended in respect of finalising the proposals.
- Objective T1 - Submission supports the one-way northbound traffic layout on Main Street Dundrum together with the transfer of several bus routes onto the bypass, as the only mechanism that would ensure that, following the advent of the Bus Connects programme, bringing at least 10 bus routes through Dundrum Village in both directions, and thus turning the village into a virtual permanent bus corridor, could be averted.
- Objective T13 – Submission endorses the objective to ensure adequate provision of both disabled and age-friendly parking at appropriate locations within the town. Considers that further measures are required to provide access to Luas. An objective is suggested *“to secure use of part of the vacant land to the north of the Luas bridge for parking for people with special parking needs, including age friendly and disabled parking.”*
- *Submission notes that* the Bus Gates described in the draft LAP have the status of recommendations, rather than policies or objectives, meaning that they constitute indicative proposals, and as such, are not contained within the implementation section of the draft LAP.

#### Chapter 5

- Submission welcomes commitment in the opening paragraph of this chapter to treat climate
- action as a central theme of the LAP and suggest that it is appropriate here to emphasise that at present Ireland is far from achieving its planned reduction in carbon emissions.
- Suggest that Cherry Laurel should be noted in the LAP as non-native and invasive and should no longer be allowed for use for hedging in the LAP area. Bird Laurel should also be added to the list of non-invasive species.
- Submission recommends the following addition to DLAP37 Consider green roofing where appropriate and in areas without Photo Voltaic Panel Systems.
- Submission suggests a new objective on lighting as follows *“It is an objective to reduce light pollution and related energy use in Dundrum. The scope for reducing all night public lighting will be trialled in Dundrum with a view to finding innovative ways of reducing light pollution.”*

#### Chapter 6

- Submission provides commentary on chapter 6.
- Submission suggest a new objective as follows *“It is an objective to support opportunities for the use of vacant premises in Dundrum Village in order to maximise their use and strengthen the vitality of the Village.”*
- Submission suggests extending MTC 3 as follows: It is an objective to encourage owners/tenants of shop fronts on Main Street Dundrum to reflect the heritage of the village and its status as an ACA in the design of shop fronts.

#### Chapter 8

- Commentary is provided on heritage and conservation. Submission welcomes DLAP48, setting out Council policy to ensure the protection of the historical character of Dundrum and to ensure that any future development/redevelopment is carried out in a manner sympathetic to its special character and also endorse DLAP 49, 50 and 51, together with DLAP 55, and DLAP 56.

- A new policy is recommended as follows *“It is the policy to proactively encourage owners of private archaeological heritage to avail of national heritage schemes aimed at conserving these heritage structures.”*
- Submission strongly supports Objective HC1, HC2 and HC3 in relation to St. Nahi’s, Maher’s Terrace and courtyard, and Holy Cross Church.
- *On page 82, line 8, the document states that ‘a number of properties are excluded between the Church and Glenville Terrace...This should state ‘a number of properties are excluded between the Church and No 13 Main Street.*

#### Chapter 9

- Submission welcomes implementation and monitoring process.
- Submission requests that any approved amendments be included as relevant in the monitoring and implementation chapter.
- Objective T1 to be amended as follows: add under implementation as follows; ...to be delivered
- by completion of the re-development of the Taney Cross site or the OSC site, whichever comes first.
- Objective PR3, Main Street Tree planting and Urban Greening, (page 19) should be included in the table with an implementation comment as follows:
- Incremental delivery as and when suitable privately-owned sites are being redeveloped. Delivery on
- publicly owned sites to be progressed during the lifetime of the plan subject to resources.
- New Objective Px (2.8)
- ‘Incremental delivery as and when suitable privately-owned sites are being redeveloped. Delivery on
- publicly owned sites to be progressed during the lifetime of the plan subject to resources.
- Submission includes an appendix with details on views of local community on 3 questions ‘Why is Dundrum important to you?’, ‘What are the issues and what needs to change?’, and ‘Dundrum in the future – what would make it a really great place to live?’.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 1, 2,3,4,5, 6, 8 and 9

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0509</a>	Person: Claire Maynard	Organisation: Laurel and Sweetmount Park Residential Association
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to proposed Sweetmount Park to OSC pedestrian access route. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Notes convenient alternative access routes.</li> <li>○ Considers route not warranted – no amenities of interest in area.</li> <li>○ Anti-social behaviour, litter, security/safety concerns.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 2		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0510</a>	Person: Timothy O'Neill	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns at impact of proposed measures on local area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Highlights expected detours, traffic congestion due to car access restrictions.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0511</a>	Person: Jim Colgan	Organisation: Imagine Dundrum
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
This submission is a duplicate of <a href="#">B0508</a> which is summarized in full above.		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> N/A – see <a href="#">B0508</a>		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0512</u></b>	<b>Person: Patrick Gray</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission objects the draft LAP proposal regarding the one-way routing of traffic flow on Upper Kilmacud Road questioning the necessity of this change and how negative impacts on drivers, Gardai and emergency services will be alleviated.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b>		
Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0513</u></b>	<b>Person: Robert Jones</b>	<b>Organisation: Green Party</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Commends Plan</li> </ul>		
<b>Urban Framework and Site Development Frameworks</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Air, Noise and Light pollution and health and wellbeing and anti-social behaviour should be given greater consideration in the urban design principles and objectives.</li> <li>The main design principles for Dundrum should support designing physical activity into people's daily lives through the redesign of the built environment and public realm in addition to ensuring Dundrum has adequate areas for recreation and exercise appropriate for all age-groups</li> <li>The objectives for street improvements and public realm should be expanded to include providing utilities such as public toilets, public lighting, and both waste and recycling bins.</li> <li>The LAP objectives for all public spaces should support ensuring opportunities for people to be in nature by providing appropriate seating and varied habitats either natural or man-made (i.e., ponds, marsh areas, groves)</li> </ul>		
<b>People and Homes</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports ten minute neighbourhood and compact growth</li> <li>Welcomes the focus on universal design and supported housing.</li> <li>Suggests objective that as the population ages, the principles of green and sustainable universal design be applied to create or regenerate neighbourhoods, where community healthcare and supported housing capacity grow together and remove or delay the need for people to be accommodated in congregated settings.</li> <li>Animal-friendly, biodiversity-supportive, green, and blue spaces should be part of the design or regeneration of housing and neighbourhoods within the LAP.</li> <li>Objective P2 should be expanded to include the objective of specifically providing play facilities in the local public park included as objective OSC7 on the OSC site in addition to Finsbury Park.</li> <li>The identification of the need for provision of a major community, cultural and civic centre for the area along with a plaza at the site identified at Taney Cross has the potential to be a hugely positive development for the area.</li> <li>Site should be further expanded to consider the incorporation of the adjacent sites not currently in the control of DLR coco including the buildings at Waldemar Terrace, Usher House, and the building directly adjacent to the northern boundary of Usher House.</li> <li>The policy and objectives for housing in this LAP should reverse car dependency and suburbanised development in favour of policy that renews town centre living, making it attractive again and encouraging the ten-minute neighbourhood concept - where all amenities are within walking distance.</li> <li>LAP should support the swift build out of main sites to deliver badly needed homes as soon as possible.</li> <li>Housing developments should be of mixed size homes enabling those who wish to move to larger homes and those who wish to move down to smaller homes to stay within their own community.</li> <li>New housing development should provide for the inclusion of a variety of housing tenures</li> <li>New housing development should provide community facilities, workspaces and community gardens or allotments.</li> </ul>		

**Transport and Movement**

- Submission provides commentary on benefits of sustainable transport.
- Planning for transport and movement through sustainable transport infrastructure is much more cost effective overall and brings multiple benefits such as lower traffic congestion, shorter commutes, reduced energy use and emission outputs, increased economic competitiveness, and healthier communities.
- Considers that it should be a priority of this LAP to get traffic congestion out of Dundrum and the NCs identified in this plan and make it easy to get to work and school on public transport or cycling.
- Submission references Article 31 of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child.
- Concern expressed in relation to the ability for children to roam and play freely in the urban realm area to the front of the Carnegie Library.
- LAP should promote and prioritize a culture of walking, cycling, and increased use of shared and public transport.
- LAP should ensure that all active travel infrastructure is inclusive of people of all abilities and at all life stages.
- It should be an objective to limit the space dedicated to on-street parking in Dundrum village and the NCs while ensuring adequate disabled and “age-friendly” parking bays.
- As a climate mitigation measure, on street and above-ground parking within the LAP should encourage grass block paving systems or similar.
- Section 4.6.1.7 should provide further specification around the security of cycle parking. Bike theft and concerns around the security of public cycle parking are significant hinderance to modal shift to cycling.
- A highly utilised route from the St. Columbanus Road across the Luas track at Windy Arbour and onto Churchtown Road is needed and should be included in the LAP.
- Further consideration of the bus terminus location in Dundrum should include the area within the northeast of the Luas station boundary (fig. 4.5). This site presents the opportunity for the colocation of Luas, Bus and high-quality secure cycle parking.

**Climate Action**

- Considers that it is evident throughout the draft LAP that climate action is a priority.
- Supports the de-culverting of Slang and Wyckham streams. Such development of urban riparian buffer zones can also have significant benefits in terms of managing run-off and flood mitigation.
- Submissions welcome the LAP’s intension to prioritise the expansion of parks, green spaces, and other recreational infrastructure

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapter 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and Other Issues

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0514</a>	Person: Tony Kenny	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter initially outlines the LAP summary and follows with an outline of the two main inward traffic routes to the village centre.</li> <li>• Submits that the draft plan does not attach the required level of importance to the efficient working of these two regional roads.</li> <li>• Considers that the implementation of the draft plan will place additional restrictions on the traffic flows without assessing the likely impact of those restrictions.</li> <li>• Thinks that policy is taken as being prescriptive while the negative implications and likely impacts have not been fully explored and explained.</li> <li>• Submits that the draft plan does not address the consequences of increased traffic flow that is occurring and will occur in the future as a consequence of existing and future significant residential developments to the south and east of Dundrum.</li> <li>• Considers that detailed research into projected traffic flows in and around the Dundrum village area along the R112 and R117 regional roads should be undertaken, i.e., a proper outset and destination analysis.</li> <li>• Questions how DLR could envisage the proposed Civic Centre being a success without any provision of parking.</li> </ul>		



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that the LAP’s approach to parking will result in people driving to further away destinations, increasing pollution and reducing the viability of local businesses.</li> <li>• Submits that the number of on-street parking and loading bays is wholly inadequate for vehicles, both private and commercial, that need to access the shops and other services on Main Street.</li> <li>• Questions whether the area’s demographic has been factored into how many people will be able to access Dundrum within a 10-minute window and suggests that trying to coerce people into cycling who are elderly or physically unable will likely result in them using their cars instead.</li> <li>• Notes that the draft LAP doesn’t include any economic viability assessment and asks why this is given that the proposed changes are likely to impact on the many businesses in Dundrum village resulting in them not being financially viable given the restricted access to customers and the lack of adequate parking facilities.</li> <li>• Submits that parking is also a factor and likely to impact on the OSC KDA Movement Objectives.</li> <li>• Notes regarding the Don Marmion centre and its potential for redevelopment that the loss of this car park and the resource centre would be a significant blow to Dundrum and would not be compensated for in terms of its user-friendly location and operation by a large civic centre building.</li> <li>• Concludes by referencing the already over-burdened Luas and lack of route coverage by existing bus routes which will require expansion as populations increase in Cherrywood and the surrounding area.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 2, 4, 6 and 7</p>

<p><b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0515</a></b></p>	<p><b>Person: Ultan Carroll</b></p>	<p><b>Organisation:</b></p>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter contends that the appropriate location for the DCCC is the OSC, not TC.</li> <li>• The OSC already has designated community space.</li> <li>• The plan proposes a building and plaza at TC, not compliant with SLO 114.</li> <li>• The proposed TC site's proximity to the gym site raises flood concerns. The author suggests the mobility hub is better suited at this location.</li> <li>• The DCCC's designation as a landmark building would conflict with existing adjoining and potential future development, in terms of height.</li> <li>• The submitter questions the need for a landmark building at the identified location, stating the William Dargan Bridge already provides this function.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> <b>Chapter 2</b></p>		

<p><b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0516</a></b></p>	<p><b>Person: Ruth Horan</b></p>	<p><b>Organisation:</b></p>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter states that they appreciate the effort put into a published plan but criticise its limited dissemination, suggesting use of residential associations for wider awareness.</li> <li>• The timing of the plan's release during summer is criticised for impeding public meetings and discussions.</li> <li>• The submitter supports the "10 minute neighbourhood" concept, but highlights the need for accessibility for elderly and car-dependent individuals.</li> <li>• 2.9.2.3. Future development requirements – Welcome vision for integrated urban area; assume previous SHD application would not comply with this.</li> <li>• 2.9.2.4. Design principles and objectives – Support that heights be sensitive to existing heights on main street</li> </ul> <p>3.3.5.3 Residential Mix and 3.3.2. Pre-draft consultation pertaining to homes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Request that ‘buy to rent’ schemes are not permitted.</li> </ul> <p>4.6.1.1. Dundrum Cross</p>		

- Welcomes the maintenance of the southbound cycle lane on Main Street (T2, page 53) as the submitter uses it daily, but the current black curbs are dangerous for pedestrians.
- There needs to be a drop-off zone for cars to stop at and drop off those who cannot walk so that they can reach the businesses in the village. It is not enough to provide great bus services.
- As a regular user of the cycle lane on Main Street, the submitter requests the ability to turn right at 'Deveneys' premises at the crossroads. All it would take would be the addition of a pedestrian light that included an orange cycle light at the same time or similar.
- Difficulty walking from Ballinteer Road to Dundrum; plan lacks footpath solutions; proposed bus gate increases hazards.
- Increased traffic on Ballinteer Road due to Dundrum closure. Existing narrow road with inadequate footpaths is already dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists.

#### 4.6.1.2. Taney Cross and its environs and 4.6.1.8. Bus gates

- Proposed 'bus gate' seems illogical, leading to congestion at Taney Cross.
- 'Mobility hub' better in current location near luas station and invites people into Dundrum rather than leading them away.

#### 4.6.1.3. Sandyford Road (objective T8 North Sandyford road)

- Welcomes the creation of a school zone and safe access route for pedestrians and cyclists to Holy Cross National School via the Dom Marmion car park.
- Drop off zone also necessary.

#### 4.6.1.5 Dundrum bypass

- Given that the bypass is a "key link in the strategic road network surrounding Dundrum MTC" it makes little sense to cross it every four minutes with a 'bus gate'.
- Welcome improved cycle infrastructure to residential areas from the bypass.

#### 4.6.1.7. Cycle parking

- Agrees there is limited street capacity but prefers visible, on-street cycle parking for safety and convenience when shopping.

#### 4.6.2. South Dundrum

- Disagrees with focusing on key corridors for cycling/pedestrian infrastructure; prefers residential roads. Key roads may be unsuitable. Walking/cycling interventions shouldn't obstruct main traffic routes.

#### 4.6.2.4. Balally luas station mobility hub

- Welcomes bus stops near Balally luas, but concerns over potential longer bus journey times.
- Desires better transport connectivity between key areas. Current Dundrum to Dun Laoghaire bus trip is lengthy.

#### 4.6.3.1. Dundrum Road Traffic Calming and Public realm, improvements

- This is a hugely unpleasant road to walk or cycle on and the proposed changes are sorely needed.

#### 6.4.5 CDP

- Residents are concerned about old Dundrum shopping site's future. LAP suggests non-retail, community-focused use, which is supported.

#### 6.6.1 Multi-functional Town centre objectives

- Delighted with objectives for a vibrant Dundrum Town Centre, quality design, and residential use above ground.
- Advocates retaining original red brick architecture. Hopes development will follow LAP recommendations.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4, 6 and Other Issues

DLR Submission No: <u>B0517</u>	Person: Miriam Hand	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter's household relies on public transport and cycling and family prefer fully segregated lanes for safety and comfort.</li> <li>• The submitter particularly supports the proposed lanes at Sandyford Road/ Wyckham Way junction, Overend to Riversdale, Overend Avenue (this helps to hook up to the route to Blackrock), and Sydenham Road.</li> <li>• The submitter is concerned about disconnected segregated lanes and frequent dismounting, suggests dutch-style roundabouts for safety.</li> <li>• The section of Churchtown Road Lower from Windy Arbour Luas stop to the junction near the Bottle Tower pub is very dangerous for cyclists in places.</li> <li>• Welcome the proposal to introduce traffic lights to the roundabout at the southern end of the bypass.</li> <li>• Would like to see a safe cycling route through the roundabout along the lines of Dutch roundabouts.</li> <li>• Would like to see the painted lanes on Barton Road East and Sandyford Road to Sandyford village become fully segregated.</li> <li>• Registers support for the safe school routes.</li> <li>• Delighted by the proposals to prioritise bus services via the introduction of bus gates.</li> <li>• Support the new pedestrian crossings on the bypass.</li> <li>• Support the removal of slip lanes/reduced road widths under the Taney Luas bridge as would not currently consider cycling through Taney Junction.</li> <li>• The submitter feels that active travel as a package is far more inclusive for everyone from school children to older people.</li> <li>• There has been a lot of talk that the proposals will negatively impact older people but not every older person can drive or even afford to run a car. Everyone will benefit from a good bus service and a well-designed pedestrian area.</li> <li>• Notes that cycle lanes can be used by mobility devices too.</li> <li>• Emissions in Ireland are already too high and need to be tackled via planning that nudges people out of their cars.</li> <li>• The submitter states that they are not sure why certain businesses are so set against these positive developments, but feels that the personal financial concerns of the few should not be allowed to hold back progress that will benefit the many.</li> <li>• Supports the new civic/cultural centre proposal.</li> <li>• Supports the 10-minute settlement concept.</li> <li>• Supports the proposed pedestrian pathway parallel to the main street.</li> <li>• Supports high-density housing.</li> <li>• Would like to see a mix of social classes/ ages in any housing and provision for older people to move into supported community apartments.</li> <li>• Security of tenure is an important concern too.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0518</u>	Person: Gunda Dorothea Albert	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community consultation has not occurred to a sufficient extent. Local residents, businesses, and those in the surrounding areas should be involved. The submitter suggests that these people should be included LAP updates.</li> <li>• Regarding climate change: high-rise buildings reflect sun and heat. Proposed bus gate reduces greenery, affecting heat absorption.</li> <li>• Maintain or increase green spaces.</li> <li>• Plant trees directly into the ground rather than into pots.</li> <li>• Buildings should reflect village heritage and incorporate green elements, including rooftop nature.</li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building height should be limited to the previous Ulster Bank building to fit into the existing architecture.</li> <li>• Dundrum's traffic is congested and needs better solutions than proposed.</li> <li>• To promote public transport, it must be efficient and safe. Issues like unreliable buses and poor bus conditions deter users.</li> <li>• Luas capacity needs to be considered in light of development in Cherrywood.</li> <li>• Until there is trust in it to be a reliable public transport, any traffic management plan must include adequate measures for existing (car) traffic at peak times and seasons.</li> <li>• Removing options for parking and increasing cycling lanes will lead to people parking on the cycling lanes as there is no alternative and therefore pushes the cyclists into the car traffic decreasing the safety for all road users.</li> <li>• Cycle lanes need to be built in such a way that they are safe to use for all. For example the dividers such as the low black dividers on Dundrum Main Street at the moment are tripping hazard for pedestrians.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 3, 4, 5 8 and Other Issues</p>

<p><b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0519</a></p>	<p><b>Person: Tom &amp; Angela Irving</b></p>	<p><b>Organisation:</b></p>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the DLR County Council's draft LAP and appreciate the efforts to enhance sustainability, pedestrian amenities, heritage preservation, the ten-minute neighbourhood concept, a new Civic Centre, and increased green spaces to maintain Dundrum's village ambiance.</li> <li>• Support Objective T1 and endorse the one-way system on Main Street. Suggest brightly coloured cycle lane kerbs for pedestrian safety.</li> <li>• DLAP15 – recommend enhancing the Luas entrance for those with limited mobility.</li> <li>• Support creating a park behind the Library (Objective GI12).</li> <li>• Dundrum's heritage buildings must be preserved.</li> <li>• Approve the intention to keep building heights sensitive to Main Street.</li> <li>• For the OSC site development, the submitter suggests 2-3 storey buildings facing Main Street and a maximum of 6-8 storeys to the bypass.</li> <li>• Lower height, high-density structures are preferred in the village centre.</li> <li>• Welcome the inclusion of the Civic, Cultural, and Community Centre but need more details about its scale and height.</li> <li>• Incorporating the current library, Waldemar Terrace, and Usher House into a campus setup so that heights can be lower should be considered.</li> <li>• Proposed bus routes may exacerbate traffic issues. Could a bus interchange at Balally Luas station be considered?</li> <li>• Welcome residential accommodation for seniors (OSC15).</li> <li>• A hotel would also benefit Dundrum.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 8</p>		

<p><b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0520</a></p>	<p><b>Person: Pat and Kay Reidy</b></p>	<p><b>Organisation:</b></p>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b> Preamble / Executive Summary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The predicted population doubling in Dundrum to around 11,500 over two decades seems excessive, worsening regional imbalances. A more modest growth target in Dundrum could ensure diverse housing types, not just apartments.</li> </ul> <p><b>Urban Framework &amp; Site Development</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Main Street requires more than tree planting for vitality; high-rise structures could lead to shadowed streets, which isn't conducive for an inclusive, welcoming atmosphere.</li> <li>• Shops beneficial for locals, such as bakeries, banks, and coffee shops, are essential.</li> </ul>		

- Dundrum would benefit from a couple of hotels and a Community/Cultural Centre.
- Solutions for the Dom Marmion Society's continuity are essential.

#### People and Homes

- While 65% of dwellings in the DLAP area are houses, future projections indicate a shift towards apartments (62%). Many families prefer houses with gardens. Pushing towards predominantly apartment living could force families to buy homes farther away, affecting the environment and accessibility. The draft plan should re-balance housing types away from apartments.

#### Transport and Movement

- While emphasizing cycling and pedestrian facilities, the draft doesn't adequately address the sustained relevance of cars.
- Limiting cars on Dundrum Main Street is practical, but surrounding areas need car access.
- Restricting key junctions like Taney Cross will cause congestion.
- Ensuring safety on cycle/pedestrian paths is paramount.

#### Dundrum Multifunctional Town & NCs:

- Despite being urban, Dundrum should adopt the 'Town Centre First' policy which encourages vibrant, multifunctional town centres.
- The objectives under 6.6.1 (multi-functional town centre objectives) must be actively pursued.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6

**DLR Submission**  
No: [B0521](#)

**Person:** Roger O'Neill

**Organisation:**

#### Summary of Submission / Observation:

- The submitter opposes a footbridge across the bypass into Sweetmount Park on the basis that:
  - There is currently more than enough access into the village.
  - Any bridge would be hugely overshadowed by development on the OSC site and would be unlikely to provide any direct access to the main street.
  - It would encourage increased footfall into the Sweetmount Park area.
  - It would increase car traffic, parking issues for residents, and likely increase litter.
  - It would create further risk for residents regarding loitering and antisocial behaviour.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapter 2

**DLR Submission**  
No: [B0522](#)

**Person:** Eamonn Logue

**Organisation:**

#### Summary of Submission / Observation:

The submitter states that they strongly support the draft LAP for Dundrum and comment as follows:

- Long term resident of Dundrum who relies on public transport and walking to get around.
- Would consider cycling if there was a comprehensive network of fully segregated bike lanes.
- Particularly happy to see the introduction of bus gates and pedestrianised areas in and around the village.
- Do not agree that two lanes of traffic is better for older people as not every older person can afford to run a car.
- Pleased to see the new proposed pedestrian routes in the village and the crossings on the bypass.
- Fully supportive of the new civic/cultural centre and believe it will be a great addition to the village.
- Supportive of the high-density housing proposals and feel current housing needs necessitate this change.
- Would like to see a mix of social strata and strong tenancy rights too.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 3 and 4

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0523</a>	Person: Frank and Murette Mulvey	Organisation: business owners
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <p>The submitters is a local business owner and states that whilst they welcome many aspects of the LAP, they raise the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The one way system has had a devastating effect on the submitter's and other businesses. Suggest an independent analysis of how well used the current lane in the village is.</li> <li>• Section 4.6.1.1- Ballinteer Road and Barton Road Access – businesses require the support of local residents and closing off this road could cause them to go elsewhere which could would be detrimental to business and go against the plans improve the public realm and support the vibrancy and liveability of the area. The submitter requests that the proposed restrictions on cars be removed from further consideration.</li> <li>• Options should be considered to revert to a two-way system to allow more freedom of movement.</li> <li>• Question the need to keep the cycle lane in the village as it duplicates lanes on the bypass.</li> <li>• The submitter requests: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Proper consultation with all residents and ratepayers with the council and their planners and not the current rushed process.</li> <li>○ Independent traffic analysis.</li> <li>○ A full economic survey of Dundrum.</li> <li>○ One way system analysis.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4, 6, 7 and Other Issues</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0524</a>	Person: Aaron Moore	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strongly support the 10-minute neighbourhood concept whereby most of the amenities are available within a 10 minute walk or cycle from a resident's home.</li> <li>• Welcome the Traffic Calming objectives but would encourage that the plan ties these to a broader rollout of 30km/h speed limits so that legal and "natural" 30km/h speed limits are applied to all residential areas.</li> <li>• Overall, the submitter strongly welcomes the reallocation of space from cars to bikes/footpaths (including the use of one-way roads to facilitate this), as these will make the area a more attractive location to travel.</li> <li>• Welcome the removal of slip lanes, which will lead to safer roads.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1 and 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0525</a>	Person: Blaithin Kinsella	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <p>The submitter states that they would like to object to the plans for Dundrum village on the basis that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The plans will ruin the very fabric of this beautiful village, the implementations of the last few years have been detrimental for all the residents and businesses.</li> <li>• In the interest of keeping the local community and culture intact these extremely expensive plans should be abandoned.</li> <li>• Facilities and infrastructure should be maintained.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 1</p>		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0526</a></b>	<b>Person: Colm Walsh</b>	<b>Organisation: Yoga Dublin</b>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b> The submitter is a local business owner and supports the following aspects of the plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both staff &amp; clients would benefit so much from improving pedestrian, cycling &amp; urban realm infrastructure by reducing vehicular traffic in the area.</li> <li>• Support the proposals to curtail local vehicular journeys &amp; create a safe &amp; welcoming environment.</li> <li>• Blackrock &amp; Dún Laoghaire have enjoyed significant benefits to the local &amp; visitor experience of calmer roads, less traffic and enhanced streetscapes.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4</p>		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0527</a></b>	<b>Person: Nessa Walsh</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter states that anything that encourages and supports safe cycling and bike use is a positive.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4</p>		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0528</a></b>	<b>Person: Daniel Moody</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b> <b>Traffic Management and Sustainable Modes.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcomes efforts to manage and reduce traffic flows through the Main Street.</li> <li>• Notes need to redevelop OSC site to elevate village centre population to improve viability of plans with regards to local businesses.</li> <li>• Suggests that, while the proposals for traffic realignment appear necessary as supported by the ABTA, further consideration for seasonal traffic congestion (e.g. Christmas shopping) appears necessary in consultation with local businesses especially regarding parking for mobility impaired persons, loading/deliveries, local access dispensations.</li> <li>• Submits that further consideration is needed regarding route changes around channeling traffic away from Ballinteer Road and down Wyckham Way which are likely to increase congestion at busy periods.</li> </ul> <p><b>Main Street Public Realm</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcomes temporary/interim public realm changes and greening of Dundrum which have improved the town centre and should be made permanent.</li> <li>• Suggests that PR1 and PR3 should be reworded to reflect defined intention and timeframe of implementing intended changes to the public realm.</li> </ul> <p><b>Old Dundrum Shopping Centre KDA (OSC)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission considers that DLR be mindful of planning and design standards for this site.</li> <li>• Observes that plot ratio, building height, and mixed use/active frontages proposed may be in conflict with various objectives of the proposed DLAP.</li> <li>• Submits that DLR should: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Consider requiring a decent building line set back from the Bypass Road so as to avoid a canyoning effect and to counter noise, traffic, etc. disturbances for future residents.</li> <li>○ Consider being more prescriptive with respect to its open space and public open space expectations in the OSC KDA, beyond just the local public park at Main Street.</li> <li>○ Add an objective stating that they will seek to acquire (/ take in charge) all sizeable areas of public open space so that they remain in public control and use.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Taney Cross KDA (TC)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submits that there is conflict of reasoning/explanation which areas are definitely included within the Taney KDA i.e. Sections 2.4.1, 2.5 and 2.9 of the LAP in conflict with Section 2.9.3 and Fig. 2.12.</li> </ul>		

- Requests that DLR provide greater clarity in relation to the extent of this KDA.
- Suggests that DLR should consider the inclusion of Waldemar Terrace and the site to its rear (although noting its flood risk) in the Taney Cross KDA.
- Submits that Waldemar Terrace be included within the Dundrum ACA.
- Notes there is a lack of detail in relation to the proposed 'landmark' building on the Taney Cross site in the draft plan.
- Suggests that greater clarity with respect to suggested height and design parameters for the building should be prescribed, with exceptional architectural and landscape architectural standards required.

#### **Public Open Space, Amenity and GI**

- Submits that the LAP lacks detail in relation to public open space provision and the prospect of enhancing the spaces that exist.
- Questions an apparent reliance on the private delivery of public open space through redevelopment projects and how this may impact on design quality and taking-in-charge requirements in future.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 2, 4, 5 and 8.

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0529</a></b>	<b>Person: Robert MacNicholas</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter is fully in favour of the proposed LAP.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 1		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0530</a></b>	<b>Person: Jenny O'Brien</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commends all the work put into the draft LAP to Benefit Dundrum and surroundings.</li> <li>• Is very pleased to see the focus on retaining traditional and historic features of Dundrum and recognition of Airfield Urban Farm.</li> <li>• Supports plans for more community spaces that are free and accessible.</li> <li>• Expresses concerns about the planned closure of access to traffic to Dundrum cross roads in the village.</li> <li>• Considers that reducing traffic volume through Dundrum village would result in congestion on alternative routes and negatively impact the commercial outlets in the village</li> <li>• Submits that any further changes may place additional limits on the means of access and will extend car journeys.</li> <li>• Thinks that previous steps taken are sufficient and there is no need to impact residents further in their car journeys.</li> <li>• Submitter questions if there has been any planned consultation with people who have disabilities and vulnerable adults within this consultation process to ascertain the impacts of road closures on accessibility for people with disabilities to reach services easily</li> <li>• Questions whether input has been gathered from residents who may not have easy access to the internet or attending consultation meetings due to physical restrictions.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4 and Other Issues		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0531</a></b>	<b>Person: Mark Haughton</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
Fully supports changes proposed by the draft LAP.		



- Recognises the need for change to support accommodation provision, development of active travel modes, better infrastructure and the environmental considerations included in the execution of the plan.
- Submitter is highly critical of older generations who want to maintain towns and local areas in their exact current state as this attitude is preventing young people from owning homes or even finding homes to rent.
- Submitter is critical of opposition to new cycle lanes and larger pedestrian space as they recognize that global warming is having a significant impact both in Ireland and abroad stating that getting cars off the roads is vital.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 1 and 4

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0532</a>	Person: Charlie Ainsworth	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submits that the TC one-way system has caused more negative issues to traffic spilling over into surrounding areas.</li> <li>• Is critical of traffic changes suggesting they don't take impacts on the elderly/sick/disabled population into consideration.</li> <li>• Suggests that further restrictions will negatively impact access to local facilities for this cohort and others.</li> <li>• Submits that the proposed development at the OSC will cause further negative impacts on the town centre regarding parking and access including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Congestion with resulting delays at Windy Arbour due to traffic restrictions. (Section 4.6.3.1).</li> <li>○ Detours on Dundrum Bypass to Wyckham Way back along Sandyford Road as far as Main Street (section 4.6.1.3).</li> <li>○ Closing off southbound access from Dundrum Bypass to main street. (Section 4.6.1.1).</li> <li>○ Barrier to traffic on Ballinteer Road (near Main Street) preventing entry to Dundrum at Dundrum Cross. (Section 4.6.1.1)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Delays for traffic from Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East commuting to Dublin City. Severe congestion and delays as a result of bus priority and the elimination of all left turn lanes passing through Taney Cross junction. (Section 4.6.1.2)</li> <li>• Suggests these delays will cause more pollution.</li> <li>• Questions whether the plan is to get business to shut down and sell up to change Dundrum village into an area full of high-rise apartments.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2 and 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0533</a>	Person: Martin Finan	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is in favour of the draft plan seeing it as a positive step for Dundrum where walking/cycling should be prioritised over car use.</li> <li>• Is critical of local businesses placing cars over people.</li> <li>• Hopes that the plan goes ahead and that more public amenities within easy reach for all residents are provided.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 1</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0534</a>	Person: Michael Donlon	Organisation: Mfd Wine Consultant
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter objects to the plan.</li> </ul>		

- States that the proposed traffic restrictions will impact on their access to goods and services in Dundrum village centre.
- Submits that cycling is quite dangerous and objects to the idea to give absolute priority to bicycle traffic.
- Considers that restricting vehicular access past Wilson Hospital from Woodpark will require a long, unnecessary, and inconvenient detour to get to Dundrum Village.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapter 1 and 4

**DLR Submission**  
No: [B0535](#)

**Person:** Shaun and Mary McDermott

**Organisation:**

**Summary of Submission / Observation:**

- Opposes the road closures for Dundrum village and surrounding areas saying they would cause more traffic delays in the area and would increase travel distance and time.
- Opposes having "Bus Gates" through residential roads and creating a danger to pedestrians.
- Submits that the plan is not conducive to the growing elderly population.
- Considers that the proposed high-rise developments will not enhance Dundrum village and will cause problems with car parking will be a major problem
- Suggests that a car park in the same area would be more acceptable.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapter 2 and 4

**DLR Submission**  
No: [B0536](#)

**Person:** Geri Carroll

**Organisation:**

**Summary of Submission / Observation:**

- Submits that the current one way system in the village has caused significant problems to local businesses, local people and emergency services.
- Takes issue with cycle lane dividers saying they have caused accidents and are a trip hazard. Submits that the plan is not conducive to the growing elderly population.
- Opposes road closures for Dundrum village and surrounding areas saying they would cause more traffic delays in the area and would increase travel distance and time.
- Cites concern regarding proposed pedestrian bridge from Sweetmount Park to the village.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 2 and 4

**DLR Submission**  
No: [B0537](#)

**Person:** Niall Bolger

**Organisation:**

**Summary of Submission / Observation:**

- Submitter congratulates DLRCC on all the great sustainable transport work completed to date in the area.
- Fully supports the draft Dundrum plan and hopes to see it implemented in full.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapter 1 and 4

**DLR Submission**  
No: [B0538](#)

**Person:** Andrew Parkes

**Organisation:**

**Summary of Submission / Observation:**

- Submits that, in relation to the area of Sydenham Villas, Sydenham Road and Kilmacud Road Upper between Dundrum Cross and Overend Avenue, traffic calming measures and safe streets would be more appropriate than a one-way system or cycle lanes.
- Notes that due to proposed one-way systems and traffic access restrictions, vehicles can only access/exit Sydenham Villas via Sydenham Road.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers this would lead to increased traffic congestion (e.g. on Taney Road, Birches Lane and Sydenham Villas), noting access to schools via Sydenham Villas.</li> <li>○ Concerns in particular at impacts to emergency services, refuse trucks or tree care access.</li> <li>○ Seeks omission of proposed segregated cycle tracks on Kilmacud Road Upper between Sydenham Road / Sydenham Villas junction and Overend Avenue junction.</li> <li>○ Suggests instead that DLR should extend the “Cycle on carriageway” scheme for the whole stretch of Kilmacud Road Upper between the Garda station and Overend Avenue.</li> <li>○ Proposes examining alternative route for DLR Connector via Taney Road or Overend Avenue using available land in the public domain at Overend Avenue for provision of cycle tracks around the junction in addition to two-way traffic lanes.</li> <li>○ Submits that plans for Sydenham Road are in conflict with the designation of a number of protected structures within the ACA on this thoroughfare.</li> <li>○ In regards to the compatibility of cycle lane provision within an ACA the Submitter cites Policy Objective HER16 ii under the CDP 2022-2028 as applicable here which states:  <i>“It is a Policy Objective to:</i>  <i>ii. Ensure that works to the public realm - such as the provision of traffic control measures, street furniture, materials and finishes - have regard to the distinctive character of the area’.</i></li> <li>○ Questions whether an assessment of the impact on the ACA from a Heritage and Conservation point of view was conducted in preparation of this section of the draft plan.</li> <li>○ Suggests that Objective T9 should be deleted from the plan and that Sydenham Road should be included in the area with calmed two-way traffic and the “Cycle on carriageway” scheme.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b>  Chapters 4</p>

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0539</a>	<b>Person:</b> Aideen Morrissey	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Submitter very much supports the reallocation of road space to cyclist and pedestrians.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0540</a>	<b>Person:</b> E.J. Doyle and M. Altzinger	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Suggests that the idea of a 10-minute neighbourhood is ill-founded as the distance covered by bike in ten minutes is a lot further than can be covered on foot.</li> <li>● Considers that the plan lacks details regarding safety for pedestrians in the area suggesting cyclists often prefer to cycle on the footpaths rather than on the (parallel) cycle lanes provided.</li> <li>● Submits that eleven-storey buildings on the site of the OSC are not acceptable.</li> <li>● Suggests that the maximum height within the village should be eight storeys and preferably lower.</li> <li>● Opposes any bridge linking Sweetmount Park with the new developments.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1 and 2		

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0541</a>	<b>Person:</b> Catherine McHugh	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Submits that there is insufficient detail in the background to the proposal and potential for unintended consequences is currently too great to agree with the LAP.</li> <li>● Considers that an assessment of the availability of public transport should be made prior to granting any planning to double the population of the village.</li> <li>● Believes public transport on offer is insufficient at this time.</li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If there is limited parking proposed with development the intention for people to walk or use public transport makes assessment a critical issue.</li> <li>• Believes that any apartments built in the area should be available for local residents to buy and not BTR.</li> <li>• Objects to the blocking of Ballinteer Rd at Dundrum bridge for private vehicles due to impact on traffic down Sandyford Rd and on Overend Avenue and Ballinteer Rd.</li> <li>• References impact on older and disabled residents who cannot walk to public transport.</li> <li>• Questions need for signals at the roundabouts on the bypass.</li> <li>• Asks if the possibility of installing a flyover walkway has been investigated as they do not believe that a high number of cyclists use the currently available cycle paths.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2, 3 and 4</p>

<p><b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0542</a></p>	<p><b>Person:</b> Patricia Mary MacConville</p>	<p><b>Organisation:</b></p>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers it imperative that there is a left-hand turn available at the junction of Sandyford and Wyckham Road.</li> <li>• Submitter recognises that the removal of the slip road will be of benefit to pedestrians and cyclists but suggests it will also cause a backup of traffic on Sandyford Road to the detriment of the village.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4</p>		

<p><b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0543</a></p>	<p><b>Person:</b> Siobhra Rush</p>	<p><b>Organisation:</b></p>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thinks the plan proposals are very commendable.</li> <li>• Is concerned about the proposal to stop traffic coming from Ballinteer Road/Barton Road East/Churchtown area stating it will increase congestion.</li> <li>• Submits concern as to whether older and less-able residents have been considered in the plan.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 3 and 4</p>		

<p><b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0544</a></p>	<p><b>Person:</b> Bartosz Hacia</p>	<p><b>Organisation:</b></p>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finds the draft plan to be discriminatory against people with special needs as well as the elderly who need to drive to access services and social outlets.</li> <li>• Submits proposed changes will also add significant time to journeys.</li> <li>• Considers restriction of left-hand turns will negatively impact on travel times, congestion and pollution output.</li> <li>• Submits that the plan will have a negative impact on local businesses.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 3, 4 and 6</p>		

<p><b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0545</a></p>	<p><b>Person:</b> Cllr Oisin O'Connor</p>	<p><b>Organisation:</b></p>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission broadly supports the plan to facilitate the sustainable development of over 2,000 homes within this relatively small geographical area</li> <li>• Considers that mobility measures in the plan LAP reasonable, with a greater emphasis on providing safe, comfortable and reliable routes for people to walk, cycle and wait for public transport.</li> </ul>		

- Submission is grouped under 4 headings – Housing, Community and Place, Mobility, Climate, Biodiversity and Flooding.

#### **Housing**

- Welcomes apartments in area.
- Welcomes provisions on right sizing, down-sizing, apartments and specifically designing for older people and people with disabilities.
- A high quality mix including a generous provision of 3 bed apartments.
- Housing near to existing and newly planned infrastructure, amenities and services.
- The encouragement of the development of “Living above the shop” opportunities is welcome.
- Considers that the LAP should include an objective providing a well defined mix of rental and sale in all larger developments.
- Considers that Plan should contain more detail on identifying appropriate locations for living over the shop outlining what measures will be encouraged to enable property owners to overcome the existing barriers to provide this.
- Considers that plan should have more detail on planning requirements on particular sites that enable the development of adjacent sites, e.g. helping to resolve access issues and fire safety issues that prohibit development in tight urban spaces at the moment.
- Considers that Dom Marmion sites could show an additional block to adjoining Luas line.
- Requests additional opportunity sites – Dundrum office park surface car park, Tesco Dundrum surface car park, Flyefit building including surface car park, Surface car park and under-utilised buildings at Dundrum Luas station off Taney Rd
- Encouragement should be given in the plans for the development of car-free or car-lite residential developments and arrangements whereby spaces at existing carparks can be made available for new car free developments.

#### **Community and Place**

- Submission welcomes many objectives for the 4 KDAs and in particular welcomes the objective for a public open space on Main Street. Considers it could be enhanced by including natural play areas.
- Suggests provision of age-friendly play and art spaces in public realm and key development site objectives
- Public realm/urban design objectives should include the undergrounding of overhead wires and other services like utility boxes and bins.
- Public realm objectives should include that street “clutter” is kept to a minimum.
- Suggests a public realm objective for the front of the Carnegie Library, which protects it as an amenity while allowing the narrow 3m-wide bus gate to operate.
- Junction improvements should allow for improvements in public realm.

#### **Community Infrastructure**

- Support for new Civic Centre and library.
- Suggests bringing in Waldemar Terrace, the former EIR building and Usher House .
- Considers that Plan should provide more detail on height for any proposed Civic centre.
- Considers Dundrum is a Town
- Welcomes objectives for childcare. Considers that Fernbank facility should not be allowed to change use to another use.
- Welcomes continuing use of the former Notre Dame site for education use and considers campus should be modernised in order to cater for the existing permanent school on site.
- Suggests that schools and future schools inside and just outside the plan area<sup>1</sup> should be supported, particularly their open spaces.
- Considers tourism has a important role to play in Dundrum and that the need for a hotel should be expressed in stronger terms in the LAP.

<sup>1</sup> Holy Cross NS, Taney NS, Gaelscoil na Fuinseoige, Our Lady’s NS, Ballinteer ETNS, St Tiernans, Goatstown-Stillorgan ETSS, Goatstown-Stillorgan ETNS. Noting that there also around a dozen more schools near the plan area.

**Mobility**

- Submission strongly welcomes approach of the plan to prioritise sustainable and efficient transport modes such as walking, cycling and public transport over private car driving. Driving should still be provided for within the plan and this is clear from the content of the Plan.
- Welcomes provision of bus gates in order to achieve the space necessary to prioritise public transport, walking and cycling
- Welcomes one way roads in order to achieve the space necessary to prioritise public transport, walking and cycling
- Welcomes Objective T13 to provide more disabled parking bays in Dundrum and to integrate “age-friendly” car parking spaces but considers that an increase in both is required and apart from loading bays, should be the only parking spaces available on Main St.
- Welcomes the provisions that aim to reduce the through-traffic that doesn’t stop in the village as this traffic adds nothing to the village only congestion and is a disruption to people who are driving to Dundrum for their private business or as commercial drivers.
- Considers that as plan are will still have in excess of 3000 public car parking spaces council should engage with car park owners encourage the provision of low cost, priority car parking spaces in the car parks for people with reduced mobility.

**Public Transport****Bus gate**

- Supports bus gate on Ballinteer Road as it will facilitate quicker bus journeys, particularly of the future A2 and A4 services. However, a well thought out routing of the A2 & A4 buses should be developed to get more benefit for bus users out of the bus gate.
- Bus gate would work best if it was part of a later phasing of the roll out of the ABTA recommendations and in sync with new residential development in Dundrum.
- Considers that the roll out of the bus gate should include local engagement to ensure awareness of options for accessing the village either without a car or along alternative routes. For example, the drive from the Ballinteer roundabout to Dundrum House is currently a 1 minute drive but with the bus gate would be a 4 minute drive (add times to both to consider traffic congestion). Campaigns to encourage bus use and to help people to try out e-bikes should be considered.
- Consideration should be given to coordinating bus frequencies with the NTA so as they are responsive to local need.. E.g. Ensuring first bus on a Sunday morning can bring people to mass.
- Requests that Electric charge points and driver welfare facilities be made available at the planned bus interchange facilities.
- “No idling” rules should be in place for buses at the planned bus interchanges.
- Access to bus gates and other bus priority measures should be via retractable bollards and should only be open to buses and emergency services, not taxis.
- Considering visitors to the church or businesses around Dundrum Cross, the bus stops for people leaving Dundrum to go towards Ballinteer and Nutgrove should be much closer to Dundrum Cross than they currently are.

**Active Travel**

- Commentary is provided on active travel and the need to incentivise same for population under 64. Submission request that pathway be a minimum 2 metres
- Considers that Balally Mobility Hub should be pursued with the relevant car park owner as soon as possible rather than waiting for the planning process to take its course over time.
- Submission provides commentary on Development Management process and cycle parking and cycle audits.
- Considers LAP should include objective that repurposing of basement space to secure bike parking will be encouraged.
- Considers that there is a need for transport objectives to improve access under the Dundrum Luas underpass and across the Windy Arbour Luas station, particularly for cycling, buggies and people using mobility aids.
- Considers that there is a need for objectives around enabling commercial deliveries and logistics with a “last mile hub” developed in the plan area. Proposes that lands left over after junction improvements at junction of bypass and Wyckham Way. (Aerial photo is provided).

- Considers that there is a need to provide dedicated space for delivery mopeds and cyclists to park within the town.
- When planning out the provision of taxi ranks in Dundrum, consideration should be given to rapid EV charging points which taxi drivers may need when on long shifts.
- “No idling” rules should be in place at taxi ranks

**Climate, Biodiversity and Flooding**

- Commentary is provided on climate adaptation, flooding and biodiversity. Submission welcomes objectives to deculvert the Slang.
- Considers commitment to district heating needs to be strengthened. Proposes changing from “encourage” to “Require”
- Considers that there is a need for objective to support the use of excess wind energy in new developments.
- Submission notes some corrections as follows; –
- On page 62, reference is made twice to “Finlay Park” but this should be meaning Finsbury Park.
- On page 90, reference is made to childcare opportunity sites in Figure 4.3, but this should refer to Figure 3.3

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
 Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9 and Other Issues

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0546</a></b>	<b>Person: Elaine Comerford</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to existing one-way traffic systems on Main Street / Kilmacud Road Upper / Sandyford Road.                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Issues include: considers it has exacerbated traffic congestion, creates difficulty accessing services/amenities, particular impacts to elderly/mobility impaired, lack of parking, lack of bus bay, long detours, underutilisation of cycle lanes, trip hazard due to cycle lane kerb.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers additional proposed one-way systems on Sydenham Road / Kilmacud Road Upper and restrictions to car access on Ballinteer Road will worsen issues highlighted.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0547</a></b>	<b>Person: Niall Naughton</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highlights that it is not possible to provide bidirectional segregated cycle tracks on Kilmacud Road Upper between Dundrum Garda Station and the junction with Sydenham Villas / Sydenham Road.                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Notes this is reflected in Figure 4.4 of the Draft LAP, in which no segregated cycle tracks are shown on this section of road.</li> <li>○ Considers this absence of bidirectional segregated cycle tracks is inconsistent with the objectives of the DLR Connector, as set out in Objective T3 of the Draft LAP.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Notes that due to proposed one-way systems and traffic access restrictions, vehicles can only access/exit Sydenham Villas via Sydenham Road.                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers this would lead to increased traffic congestion (e.g. on Taney Road, Birches Lane and Sydenham Villas), noting access to schools via Sydenham Villas.</li> <li>○ Concerns in particular at impacts to emergency services access.</li> <li>○ Seeks omission of proposed segregated cycle tracks on Kilmacud Road Upper between Sydenham Road / Sydenham Villas junction and Overend Avenue junction.</li> <li>○ Proposes examining alternative route for DLR Connector via Taney Road or Overend Avenue.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Concerns at impacts of proposed one-way traffic system and cycle lanes on Sydenham Road                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers traffic data analysis model which informed ABTA (‘Tom Tom’) does not accurately reflect current or future traffic trends.</li> <li>○ Considers significant modal shift to walking/cycling in medium term is unlikely.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers automatic traffic counts on Sydenham Road are not reliable due to Covid-19 impacts on traffic at time of counts.</li> <li>○ States that traffic analysis has not taken account of Annefield/St. Anne's residential development (13 houses).</li> <li>○ States analysis of local bus routes does not account for impacts to bus routes as a result of access changes proposed (e.g. to 75 route); proposes further assessment of this.</li> <li>○ Proposes updates to ABTA analysis to fully account for latest statistics/future trends.</li> <li>○ Proposes further assessment of alternatives to Sydenham Road for one-way system/cycle infrastructure, e.g. Stoney Road (noting it is wider).</li> <li>● Welcomes proposal to enhance streetscape of Sydenham Villas ACA (per Objective HC4), but raises concerns about potential loss of surface car parking and turnabout area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Notes impacts to delivery/service/emergency services/school access.</li> <li>○ Proposes further consultation regarding potential changes with locals at detailed design stage.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4 and 8</p>

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0548</a>	Person: Mary Harrison	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Proposes reinstatement of two-way traffic system around Dundrum Cross. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Notes impacts on access to businesses/services/amenities in village, deliveries, emergency services, trip hazard due to cycle lane kerb.</li> <li>○ Highlights underutilised cycle infrastructure</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0549</a>	Person: Deirdre Naessens	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Queries need for LAP.</li> <li>● Concerned at impacts of car access restrictions proposed under Draft LAP (including on Ballinteer Road, retention of one-way system on Main Street) on Sandyford Road. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Notes exacerbated traffic congestion (highlighting existing heavy congestion), longer journey times, consequential environmental impact of increased carbon emissions, impacts to local businesses (reduced footfall) and consequent unemployment, reliance on car for shopping trips, particular impacts to elderly/mobility impaired, isolation within communities.</li> <li>○ Notes issues with cycling in area due to topography, weather, large elderly contingent.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Considers there was lack of awareness of public consultation on Draft LAP, in part due to time of year (Summer holidays for many).</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4 and Other Issues</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0550</a>	Person: Ross Mulvey	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Considers public consultation period on Draft LAP was too short.</li> <li>● Critical of existing active travel/public realm measures in village.</li> <li>● Considers figures relied on are outdated (i.e 2016 Census as opposed to 2022 Census).</li> <li>● Considers proposed car access restrictions on Ballinteer Road at Dundrum Cross will negatively impact elderly, noting increased journey times, availability of local distributor/cycle routes (e.g. Bypass), school traffic.</li> <li>● Proposes reinstatement of two-way traffic system in village.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b></p>		



## Chapters 1, 4 and Other Issues

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0551</a>	Person: Paul Corcoran	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of improvements to/expansion of cycle infrastructure, concerned however at impact of Draft Plan proposals on road system in and around Dundrum area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Notes high car ownership in area, disruption to traffic, increase in journey times.</li> <li>○ Highlights statement in ABTA that there is no scope for additional road capacity in Dundrum.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers proposed one-way systems on Sydenham Road / Kilmacud Road Upper will inhibit access to local amenities due to no right turn on Birches Lane. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers this will result in illegal right turns onto Birches Lane to avoid long detours / traffic on Drummartin Road.</li> <li>○ Proposes as alternative that Sydenham Road could be made cycle priority road with two-way car access remaining.</li> <li>○ Notes road is relatively short.</li> <li>○ Proposes complementary measures of cycle priority on Sydenham Villas and improvement of cycle access between Sydenham Villas and Overend Avenue.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers traffic congestion impacts as a result of removal of slip lanes at Taney Cross will negatively impact private vehicles/cyclists/public transport. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Notes existing impacts to cyclists by traffic blocking junction as a result of removal of turning access to Main Street in recent years.</li> <li>○ Considers traffic backlog generated by measures will block cycle lanes at other junctions in area.</li> <li>○ Proposes retaining slip lanes and consideration of elevated cycle lanes.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Notes issues with length/advertising/time of year of public consultation on Draft LAP.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4 and Other Issues</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0552</a>	Person: Patricia Mc Donnell	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned at densification of area, destruction of village, disruption to ecosystems.</li> <li>• Notes negative impacts to view of mountains from Dundrum Road due to development in recent years (Luas bridge, DTCS) and planned development of OSC site.</li> <li>• Proposes local tram system in Dundrum to connect locals around area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Notes safety/environmental/traffic reduction/local business benefits of this.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Critical of delivery of civic centre at 'main junction'. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Proposes locating on OSC site, adjacent to civic square/public realm.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Objects to Main Street to Churchtown Road Upper bus gate. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Notes impacts to heritage, views, traffic.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Objects to high rise apartment buildings, noting aesthetic issues.</li> <li>• Proposes provision of hotel at OSC site. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Notes employment/tourism benefits.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Objects to removal of slip lanes at Taney Cross. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Notes increase in congestion/pollution/detours/safety issues in residential areas.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2, 3 and 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0553</a>	Person: Anne-Marie Mhic Lochlainn	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to proposed bus gate/car access restrictions on Ballinteer Road/Kilmacud Road Upper at Dundrum Cross.</li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Notes detours, increase in journey times, difficulty accessing village/services/amenities (noting some businesses closed on weekends when there is more time to cycle).</li> <li>● Objects to removal of slip lanes at Taney Cross.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Notes increased traffic congestion.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Objects to traffic calming/public realm proposals on Dundrum Road, noting high through traffic, delivery access, increased traffic congestion (consequent loss of jobs in DTCSC).</li> <li>● Objects to Main Street to Churchtown Road Upper bus gate, noting impacts to pedestrians/cyclists (including school children), narrowness of road, air pollution.</li> <li>● Notes particular impacts to elderly/disabled/mobility impaired.</li> <li>● Highlights Census 2016 data used – considers this is outdated, elderly underrepresented.</li> <li>● Concerned at loss of car parking (OSC and Dom Marmion sites) due to redevelopment.</li> <li>● Objects to pedestrian/cycle bridge from Sweetmount Park to OSC site.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Unnecessary, convenient alternative pedestrian routes, waste of money.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Issues with cycling in area due to topography, underutilisation of cycle lanes in village, hazards due to cars existing driveways on Sydenham Road.</li> <li>● Concerned at loss of community facilities for elderly with removal of Dom Marmion Centre.</li> <li>● Requests reinstatement of two-way traffic system on Main Street, noting access/local business benefits.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 2 and 4</p>

DLR Submission No: <u>B0554</u>	Person: Aidan Culhane	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Suggests including area around the Barton Road East/Ballinteer Road roundabout in LAP boundary.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Notes opportunity for public realm measures at junction to improve pedestrian access to village without impeding use of junction.</li> <li>○ Notes poor quality of street/public realm/pedestrian infrastructure around this junction (including broken street furniture, uneven surfaces).</li> <li>○ Suggests improvements could include pedestrian plaza, additional planting, retaining existing trees, formal set-down area.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Concerned at potential at-grade pedestrian/cycle crossing of Bypass from Sweetmount Park to OSC site.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ States traffic on Bypass is main factor contributing to severance of area, and would only be overcome if traffic was eased on this route.</li> <li>○ Notes issues with Objective OSC10 proposal to make Bypass an ‘urban street’ due to high traffic volumes, lack of enclosure of street, gradient/boundary condition of park along eastern side.</li> <li>○ Prefers bridge option, noting possibility to cross at all times, elimination of steep gradient.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Mostly supportive of urban form proposals on OSC site.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Proposes stipulation in second bullet point of Objective OSC13 that building heights on Main Street would be a ‘maximum’ of 4 storeys, with 5<sup>th</sup> floor setback potential adjoining new park.</li> <li>○ Considers this would provide more certainty/confidence in LAP.</li> <li>○ Cautious about fine-grain approach to village, noting that pedestrian volumes could be diluted if grain is too fine.</li> <li>○ Lack of pedestrian activity could lead to new pedestrian street feeling deserted.</li> <li>○ Considers it is imperative that the provisions of Objective OSC15 are not diluted in final LAP.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Concerned that Taney Cross KDA proposals will not suitably consolidate/integrate Dundrum area, noting lack of detail.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers Draft LAP is unclear on how severance of Bypass can be overcome and how transport interchange can function.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Considers Transport/Movement Chapter is overly engineering rather than planning focused.</li> <li>● Critical of existing cycle infrastructure and one-way traffic system on Main Street.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers infrastructure is unattractive, deleterious on public realm, wasteful, creates difficulty crossing street, impedes car access to areas east of Dundrum, poses trip hazard, increases congestion, impacts on heritage of ACA.</li> <li>○ Considers segregated cycle lanes not required for safe cycling in area where there is moderate traffic/good quality surfaces.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Skeptical of ability to maintain expensive cycle infrastructure.</li> <li>○ Concerned at impacts to bus public transport – reduced access to Main Street businesses, long detours.</li> <li>○ Notes availability of convenient alternative cycle routes (e.g. via Sweetmount Park, Bypass, Goatstown Road, or Churchtown Road Upper).</li> <li>○ Seeks removal of one-way system on Main Street and Kilmacud Road Upper.</li> <li>● Objects to proposed bus gate on Ballinkeer Road at Dundrum Cross.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Notes impacts to east-west connectivity, compounding of traffic congestion.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Objects to proposed one-way traffic system on Sydenham Road.</li> <li>● Supportive of Objective T21 (Dodder to Dundrum Cycle Route), stating that it overcomes hazards of Dundrum Road route.</li> <li>● Supportive of Objectives MTC1 to MTC6, noting importance of suitable use mix to vitality of area.</li> <li>● Proposes designating Waldemar Terrace as an ACA, stating it is an attractive terrace.</li> <li>● Notes importance of carefully choosing materials for preserving heritage of town.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 2, 4, 6 and 8</p>

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0555</a>	<b>Person:</b> Aidan Culhane	<b>Organisation:</b>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Submission consists of images of poor public realm/street condition at Ballinkeer Road/Barton Road East junction and diagram illustrating respondent’s proposed improvements to this junction, as set out in Submission No. B0554.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4</p>		

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0556</a>	<b>Person:</b> Carol Marks, Secretary	<b>Organisation:</b> Churchtown Residents Association
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Objects to provisions in Draft LAP which respondent considers discriminatory and in conflict with stated vision of LAP for a town which is connected to / supports surrounding neighbourhoods.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers in particular that the LAP will negatively impact areas to the west of the village, beyond the LAP boundary.</li> <li>○ Considers it conflicts with Policy DLAP15 to support/promote universal access.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Notes that the population/demographic analysis focuses on the area contained within the LAP boundary.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ States that a significantly larger population (stated as c. 35,000 people) resides on the Dundrum municipal area.</li> <li>○ Concerned at reliability of figures, considering they are somewhat outdated as they are based on Census 2016.</li> <li>○ States that the area west of the LAP lands consists mainly of an elderly population.</li> <li>○ Notes mobility issues and inability to walk/cycle for many of these people.</li> <li>○ Concerned at restrictions to car access to village for this population.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Objects to proposed retention and extension of existing one-way traffic system on Main Street.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ States the residents to west of LAP lands have made repeated objections previously to this system.</li> <li>○ Considers system has not enhanced use of village/facilities.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Objects to proposed bus gate on Ballinkeer Road at Dundrum Cross and to proposed one-way eastbound traffic layout on Kilmacud Road Upper on the basis of restricted car access from surrounding neighbourhoods.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Highlights longer journey times to access local amenities/services, diversions onto heavily trafficked routes, environmental impacts.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Strongly objects to proposed Main Street to Churchtown Road Upper bus gate, citing noise impacts, hazards to pedestrians.</li> <li>● Objects to removal of left-hand filter lanes at Taney Cross, citing increased traffic congestion.</li> </ul>		

- Welcomes provision of civic centre.
  - Considers height should be consistent with existing buildings, location should be easily accessible by local residents.
  - Considers Taney Cross KDA represents inaccessible location.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 1, 2, 3 and 4

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0557</a></b>	<b>Person: Olivia</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of Draft LAP generally.</li> <li>• Considers additional bus bays needed in area as part of proposals, stating that there are currently a large number of these (c. 10 to 11).</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 1 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0558</a></b>	<b>Person: Alison Coyne</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposes reinstatement of two-way traffic system around Dundrum Cross.           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Notes impacts on access to businesses/services/amenities in village, deliveries, emergency services, trip hazard due to cycle lane kerb.</li> <li>○ Highlights underutilised cycle infrastructure.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Objects to removal of bus terminus at Taney Cross KDA.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0559</a></b>	<b>Person: Sheila Nolan</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to proposed retention / expansion of one-way traffic system in village area, citing diversions/longer journeys, exacerbated traffic congestion, trip hazard of cycle kerbs.           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers road signage guiding access to car parks would suffice as alternative to proposed Kilmacud Road Upper traffic restrictions while retaining access for local residents.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers proposed one-way traffic system on Sydenham Road will exacerbate issues highlighted.           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Also notes hazards for residents accessing/exiting properties on this road, issues with delivery/emergency/maintenance vehicle access</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0560</a></b>	<b>Person: Ian Epstein and Carol Marks</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to provisions in Draft LAP which respondent considers discriminatory and in conflict with stated vision of LAP for a town which is connected to / supports surrounding neighbourhoods.           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers in particular that the LAP will negatively impact areas to the west of the village, beyond the LAP boundary.</li> <li>○ Considers it conflicts with Policy DLAP15 to support/promote universal access.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Notes that the population/demographic analysis focuses on the area contained within the LAP boundary.           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ States that a significantly larger population (stated as c. 35,000 people) resides on the Dundrum municipal area.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Concerned at reliability of figures, considering they are somewhat outdated as they are based on Census 2016.</li> <li>○ States that the area west of the LAP lands consists mainly of an elderly population.</li> <li>○ Notes mobility issues and inability to walk/cycle for many of these people.</li> <li>○ Concerned at restrictions to car access to village for this population.</li> <li>● Objects to proposed retention and extension of existing one-way traffic system on Main Street.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ States the residents to west of LAP lands have made repeated objections previously to this system.</li> <li>○ Considers system has not enhanced use of village/facilities.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Objects to proposed bus gate on Ballinteer Road at Dundrum Cross and to proposed one-way eastbound traffic layout on Kilmacud Road Upper on the basis of restricted car access from surrounding neighbourhoods.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Highlights longer journey times to access local amenities/services, diversions onto heavily trafficked routes, environmental impacts.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Strongly objects to proposed Main Street to Churchtown Road Upper bus gate, citing noise impacts, hazards to pedestrians.</li> <li>● Objects to removal of left-hand filter lanes at Taney Cross, citing increased traffic congestion.</li> <li>● Welcomes provision of civic centre.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers height should be consistent with existing buildings, location should be easily accessible by local residents.</li> <li>○ Considers Taney Cross KDA represents inaccessible location.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 2 and 4</p>

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0561</a>	Person: Sean McGrath	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Submission is in favour of the draft plan.</li> <li>● Recognises the opportunity to improve Dundrum through the reduction of vehicular traffic and greater moves towards public transport and pedestrian facilities.</li> <li>● Would like to see better use of the OSC site and other opportunities around Taney Cross for high density housing.</li> <li>● Supports the benefit of housing development close to the Dundrum Luas stop where there is little need for reliance on cars as a means of transport.</li> <li>● Thinks Ireland needs to take the opportunity of these well-connected sites to maximise the amount of housing and facilities provided.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 2 and 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0562</a>	Person: John McGrath	Organisation: Principal, Holy Cross School
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Submission expresses concerns of Holy Cross National School relating to the impact the Draft LAP would have on the school going community in Dundrum. Children access through the entrance that adjoins the Dom Marmion car park (which, according to the plan provided will include two residential blocks) and will no longer be accessible in the same way.</li> <li>● Submission considers that the plan makes little reference to the needs of the school community. If the Kilmacud Road between the Airfield cross and Holy Cross school is made one way heading east then parents will have no way of dropping their children to school (They cannot turn right down Birches Lane so there is no way of even getting to Sydenham Road to travel on the proposed one-way system).</li> <li>● The school car park, at the front of Holy Cross School, has only capacity for staff car parking along with a space for parents of children with additional physical needs who need to be dropped to school by car.</li> <li>● Submission expresses concern in relation to proposals at Dundrum Cross.</li> <li>● Submission considers Main Street, with its narrowed road route and cycle paths is very dangerous for pedestrians including the elderly and those trying to navigate with buggies or mobility devices.</li> </ul>		

- Longer journey times for those collecting children by car who need to return to Barton Road East area.
- Submission expresses satisfaction with Safe Routes to School programme but considers what is shown in plans is different to original plans.
- Considers that it is not practical to remove all drop off facilities for cars from the Dom Marmion car park side of the school.
- Submission expresses concern at any taller residential buildings on Dom Marmion site due to impact on school.
- Fig 2.14 includes a garden which is part of Holy Cross School.
- Fig 2.17 on page 28 includes school yard which is in part covered in astro turf.
- Considers that there appears to be no evidence of any research conducted and requests an origin and destination study

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 2, 4 and 7

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0563</a>	Person: Jacques Barnard	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submits that the draft DLAP fails to promote the safety of pedestrians, cyclists and motorists.</li> <li>• Requests that the current draft plan should not be progressed further until a full and thorough review is undertaken of the transport and movement section (Chapter 4) of the plan.</li> <li>• Agrees that a solution needs to found to stop the rate of urban decay, and to promote the re-generation of the village and surroundings.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0564</a>	Person: Mark Coen	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questions why an informational postcard was not sent to every household in the locality.</li> <li>• Submits that the proposed Civic Centre and community and leisure facility needs to be designed in collaboration with people who are engaged in relevant cultural and community activities in the locality.</li> <li>• Questions whether any consultation with the people and groups involved in these areas has been conducted.</li> <li>• Submits that any development of Dom Marmion Hall should provide for community facilities in the form of meeting rooms that can be booked by local voluntary groups.</li> <li>• Submits that the proposed site for the Civic Centre, at the intersection of busy roads, is not very appealing.</li> <li>• Questions whether DLR could acquire a better site, eg the Dom Marmion site.</li> <li>• Requests that a commitment be given in the LAP that there will be extensive public consultation on the civic centre, including with voluntary groups in the area who engage in community, cultural and civic activities.</li> <li>• Suggests any civic centre should provide space with seating for at least 100 audience members for the performance of theatre, concerts etc by local groups.</li> </ul> <p>Submits that the proposed community and leisure facility on the former CMH site will require extensive public consultation and consider the needs of amateur drama groups in the area.</p>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2 and Other Issues		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0565</a>	Person: Damien Ó Tuama	Organisation: Dublin Cycling Campaign
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission outlines the background and remit of the Dublin Cycling campaign.</li> </ul>		

- Notes that Dublin Cycling Campaign has had concerns with the poor quality of the cycling environment at the Dundrum Bypass / Dundrum Road / Taney Road for 20 years.
- Congratulates DLR on recent interventions in the village centre and provision of a one-way system and cycle paths.
- Submission welcomes proposals by the draft LAP especially regarding provisions being made to integrate walking, cycling and high-quality public transport as a main focus in the future.
- Strongly supports the idea of a 10-minute neighbourhood plan for Dundrum.
- Welcomes the focus on filtered permeability interventions, high quality dedicated space for people walking and for people cycling, and the focus on integrated public transport and the development of mobility hubs.
- Submission notes DCC's support for proposed changes with regards specifically to Dundrum Cross, Taney Cross junction, North Sandyford Road and Objective T21 – Dodder to Dundrum Pedestrian and Cycle Route.
- Highlights the need for well-located, high quality, secure and attractive bicycle parking facilities to be provided at all destinations including provision for cargo bikes/ trikes to encourage family cycling and e-cycle logistics.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 1 and 4

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0566</a>	Person: Alice Churchill	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission fully endorses the LAP.</li> <li>• Submitter notes need to consider future residents of Dundrum regarding demand and how expensive housing has become over the past decade.</li> <li>• Notes that need for affordable homes and rental properties is only increasing.</li> <li>• Iterates the need to ensure our towns are fit for the future.</li> <li>• Submits recognition of climate impact and that reducing traffic while increasing availability for other modes of transport is the only way forward.</li> <li>• Submission notes the high levels of empty units and dereliction along Dundrum Main Street recognising that the council should intervene to build infrastructure that increases the demand for businesses in the form of increased, affordable housing for future generations.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 3 and 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0567</a>	Person: Jitesh Singh	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission considers the draft LAP is a 'Good job'.</li> <li>• Submits that traffic should be curbed.</li> <li>• Recognises benefit of the Luas and its three stops in the LAP area.</li> <li>• Considers that businesses will flourish if people walk in these areas.</li> <li>• Submits that Ireland should not copy what Americans have done with their cities.</li> <li>• Notes that a car-centric development model is bad for the environment and dangerous driving is more common than one would expect.</li> <li>• Recognises the need for more cycleways.</li> <li>• Considers there is a need for more 3-bed apartments with common areas.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 3, 4 and 6</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0568</a>	Person: Ruth Shanu	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submits that more consideration and local involvement is needed in drafting a plan.</li> <li>• Notes that road works to improve the water works for CMH development is causing traffic chaos.</li> <li>• Thinks that the bus route to get to the city centre is too infrequent and the luas is full.</li> <li>• Considers that bike lanes in Dundrum village don't make sense.</li> <li>• Submits that changing the junction from two lanes to one across the crossroads doesn't make sense.</li> <li>• Approves of the inclusion of benches and improved public realm in the village.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0569</a>	Person: Patrick Noonan	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to a bridge linking any proposed new development to Sweetmount Park.</li> <li>• Submits that there has been a huge increase in traffic using Sweetmount Drive and Laurel Drive as a rat run since the Main Street has been changed to a one-way system which has damaged the ramps on Laurel Drive and Sweetmount Drive.</li> <li>• Submitter is very fearful that the proposed plan will restrict movement by car as they have reduced mobility due to ill health.</li> <li>• Considers that any proposed plans needs to be more mindful of the aging population in this community.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2 and 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0570</a>	Person: Monica Uma	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter finds horn-honking car owners in Dundrum very annoying.</li> <li>• Suggests DLR should follow the Amsterdam model of city development.</li> <li>• Submits plan should allow buses to move through the village but not private cars.</li> <li>• Believes public transport should be encouraged.</li> <li>• Need to also encourage community development model.</li> <li>• Requests more trees and less lawns.</li> <li>• Requests provision for plans of bigger apartments.</li> <li>• Believes the LAP is a good start for community development.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 3, 4 and 5</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0571</a>	Person: Jan Osterkamp	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter thinks that the plan looks great.</li> <li>• Considers Dundrum to have a ton of potential and is currently held back by its car-centric design.</li> <li>• Believes the LAP should help Dundrum become a more liveable place and cannot wait to see it implemented.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 1</p>		



<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0572</a></b>	<b>Person: Yekaterina Chzhen</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter states they fully support the LAP because it will reduce traffic and encourage active transport.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0573</a></b>	<b>Person: Louise Barnewell</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitter raises concerns regarding reduced access to goods and services within the village centre due to car restrictions and one-way system.</li> <li>Objects to the proposed barrier to traffic on Ballinteer Road saying it will prevent access to Meadow Grove, Barton Road East, Dundrum Road from Dundrum and vice a versa, causing a long detour and increased traffic from an already difficult route.</li> <li>Is concerned this will increase traffic in local estates from cars taking shortcuts.</li> <li>Raises similar concerns regarding changes to access at Taney Cross, Dundrum Bypass, to Wyckham Way and Sandyford Road as far as Main Street.</li> <li>Submits concerns regarding pollution and use of fuel due to delays and longer journeys.</li> <li>Considers that alterations to Sydenham Road and Kilmacud Road will greatly effect delivery and collection of school children to the two local schools.</li> <li>Thinks the LAP is very anti people and almost totally concerned with walking or cycling.</li> <li>Thinks cycleways are not widely used and will be less used in winter.</li> <li>Submits that elderly people in the main do not cycle as they are unable physically to do so.</li> <li>Considers emergency vehicle access will also be restricted and is of major concern.</li> <li>Thinks the plan, if implemented, will 'drive' people away from Dundrum.</li> <li>Believes the changes will reduce quality of life for Dundrum residents.</li> <li>Submits plan would be better if Dundrum Main Street is reverted back to two-way traffic and a sensible speed limit should be imposed.</li> <li>Safer divisions should be made for bicycle lanes.</li> <li>Proposes further time should be allotted to further public consultation on the Transport and Movement Section (Chapter 4) of the Plan.</li> <li>Submits that further review should be informed by An Origin and Destination Survey, an Economic Viability Assessment for affected businesses and a rigorous Cost/Benefits Analysis.</li> <li>Considers that buildings in Dundrum should be no more than 7 stories and of a suitable aesthetic to complement the local architecture.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0574</a></b>	<b>Person: Máirín O Connell</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter supports the ten-minute neighbourhood concept but emphasises the need for infrastructure that aids mobility, especially for young children, the elderly, and others with mobility issues.</li> <li>Concerns are raised about obstructions to public transport due to walking and cycling interventions hindering traffic flow.</li> <li>The submitter, a cycling parent, notes the inadequacy of the local public transport network.</li> <li>While new childcare facilities are commendable, the feasibility of the journeys involved for parents juggling multiple drop-offs and work is queried.</li> <li>Concern that a high-rise civic centre development would affect the village character.</li> </ul>		

- Concerns about the environmental impact include potential flooding in high-density housing areas, despite FRAs.
- The submitter also warns against possible anti-social behaviour resulting from introducing large high-rises, citing historical precedents from the 60s.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 1, 3 and 4

DLR Submission No: <u>B0575</u>	Person: S O'Sullivan	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The recent changes to Dundrum are brilliant. The decrease in traffic and the increase in safety for cyclists and walkers are most welcome.</li> <li>• The submitter's kids go to Holy Cross School in Dundrum and the increase in safety resulting from the reduction in traffic due to the closure of "rat-run" roads over the last few years has been transformative – the submitter now walks/cycles the kids to school every day.</li> <li>• Dundrum has improved significantly since the one-way system and other changes have been implemented. There is more of a community feel and active travel is increased.</li> <li>• All future changes to reduce traffic, promote active travel, and to improve the community aspects are to be welcome.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0576</u>	Person: Manannán MacLear	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter notes that they are a daily commuter cyclist and raises the following issues:</li> <li>• The GDA Cycle Network Plan 2013 proposed a greenway along the River Slang, but the southern portion of this (which would have required limited land acquisition) appears to have been abandoned. The submitter seeks the reinstatement of this objective as they argue it would have significant benefits in terms of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o GI and re-establishing or enhancing a natural wildlife movement corridor.</li> <li>o Providing wider benefit than the proposed off-road connection through Rosemount which will not be used by cyclists between the Dundrum Bypass and Milltown as the inbound route would require users to cross the main traffic flow twice.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The proposed 800-unit development on the CMH site will significantly alter the Windy Arbour area. While efforts to retain the 'village feel' are appreciated, better integration of the public open space behind the Dundrum road is suggested.</li> <li>• There's a missed opportunity in connecting this space with the new park across Dundrum Hospital (area outlined below). Improving access, amenities, and maintenance would benefit local businesses, including the newly opened café, 'Alfama'. The park once had a National Pollinator Plan sign and given the ongoing biodiversity emergency, a plan to enhance the park's biodiversity is recommended, possibly involving a biodiversity officer's expertise.</li> <li>• Support the public realm improvements around Windy Arbour/Arbourfield, but limited parking should be retained. This should be stated clearly in the plan.</li> <li>• Support improving the 'neighbourhood' feel by incorporating traffic calming on the Dundrum Road. However, provision for safe cycling should be made a priority where possible. The submitter is seeking proposals for dedicated cycling routes to Dundrum, as only shared routes are proposed. A shared route on such a busy road is insufficient.</li> <li>• Suggest rerouting traffic away from the Dundrum Road as an alternative to the proposals at Taney Junction. Support the proposals insofar as they are intended to bring the village feel created in Dundrum village to the rest of the study area along the Dundrum Road.</li> <li>• The submitter suggests better promotion of the LAP during consultation.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4, 5 and Other Issues		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0577</a></b>	<b>Person: Frank and Marette Mulvey</b>	<b>Organisation: Business Owners</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This submission is a duplicate of <a href="#">B0523</a> which is summarized in full above.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b>		
N/A See <a href="#">B0523</a>		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0578</a></b>	<b>Person: Christopher Maher</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter states that as a young adult they enthusiastically support the DLAP and comments as follows:</li> </ul>		
<b>Chapter 2:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very supportive of initiatives to improve the public realm, especially ones that improve the Greening and the active travel accessibility of the town including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objectives for the OSC KDA,</li> <li>Objectives for the Taney Cross KDA improving the pedestrian and active travel experience and providing a community centre.</li> <li>Improving school safety and realm upgraded at the Dom Marmion KDA, providing a sustainable neighborhood at the CMH KDA including walkable and accessible public spaces.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Chapter 3:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support 10-minute neighbourhood and the provision of more nearby services</li> <li>Support the provision of more housing provided by well-designed apartment developments and especially for Housing for older people, Student accommodation, Housing for people with a disability, and social and affordable housing units.</li> </ul>		
<b>Chapter 4</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support the proposed changes to transport in Dundrum, prioritising sustainable modes and a reduction in car first design and in particular: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Safe, segregated cycle path provision</li> <li>Reorganisation of Dundrum Cross with the bus gate</li> <li>Reorganisation of Taney Cross removing the slip lanes and the bus gate short cut to the layover section</li> <li>Reorganisation of the crossroads and roundabouts along Wyckham Way to prioritise pedestrian and cycle access</li> <li>Reorganisation of the Dundrum bypass with more crossing and safe cycling facilities</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Chapter 5:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support measures to increase biodiversity, restoring nature corridors and minimising future damage to the local area and the climate, especially Objectives GI1-GI5 taking active steps to reinforce and revitalise the natural lands.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b>		
Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0579</a></b>	<b>Person: Anne O'Callaghan</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter expresses concerns regarding most of the measures in the movement section of the plan as they favour cyclists and make driving condition more difficult; particularly for those with children or the less able.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0580</a></b>	<b>Person: Kieran Lewis</b>	<b>Organisation: Ardglas Residents Association</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<p>The submitter notes that many residents will have made their own submissions, but raises the following points on behalf of the resident's association:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fully support the (re)development &amp; maintenance of Dundrum Village as a core community and civic space in addition to the retail space in the DTCSC.</li> <li>Recognise the need to upgrade transport infrastructure to meet current and projected population increases.</li> <li>However, residents have expressed major concerns, primarily related to the impact of the proposed changes to junctions along Wyckham Way and also the Sandyford Road/Wyckham Way/Overend Avenue.</li> <li>Whilst proposals to improve pedestrian and cyclist infrastructure are generally supported, the plan does not reflect the on-going need for residents to use a variety of transport methods including cars, particularly for the less able who rely on their cars.</li> <li>There will always be vehicular traffic accessing DTC, which will be increasingly focused on access via Wyckham Way and Sandyford Road. The proposed changes from roundabouts to signaled junctions will significantly increase journey times.</li> <li>Access to Ardglas is only via Sandyford Road, Overend Avenue and Wyckham Way so these proposed changes will greatly affect resident's ability to commute via car.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0581</a></b>	<b>Person: Linda Dalby</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supportive of pedestrian / cycle bridge over Bypass, noting similar heights on both sides.</li> <li>Seeks more frequent transport to Kilternan / Enniskerry.</li> <li>Supportive of safer cycle infrastructure, wider pavements.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0582</a></b>	<b>Person: Rita Heskin</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned at impacts to restrictions on car access to services/amenities on Main Street from Barton Road East / Ballinteer Road. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggests loss of business on Main Street due to people driving to alternative destinations.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4 and 6		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0583</u>	Person: Breda Cahill	Organisation: Business Owner
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers there was a lack of information about / awareness of Draft LAP consultation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Considers more collaborative engagement with Residents Associations was needed.</li> <li>o Considers timeframe for consultation was too short.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Concerned at impacts to car access as a result of proposed traffic calming/active travel/public realm improvement measures at Taney Cross, Dundrum Cross and Sandyford Road. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Issues cited include necessitated long detours onto heavily trafficked roads, increased journey times, exacerbated traffic congestion, particular impacts to elderly/mobility impaired, loss of car parking, negative impacts to local businesses, environmental impacts of increased emissions.</li> <li>o Concerned at loss of vibrancy, increased anti-social behaviour as a result of loss of business/footfall.</li> <li>o Queries whether independent traffic survey was undertaken.</li> <li>o Concerned at cost of implementing/amending proposed measures.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Concerned at impacts to community if Dom Marmion Centre is lost.</li> <li>• Objects to provision of civic centre, stating it will be 11 storeys high. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Considers there will not be sufficient demand, difficulty for locals accessing it.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Concerned at high rise apartments in village, noting pressure on services/infrastructure, impacts to appearance of village.</li> <li>• Concerned at impacts to residential areas of proposed changes to bus routes.</li> <li>• Considers LAP generally favours DTCS at expense of village.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2, 3, 4, 6 and Other Issues</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0584</u>	Person: Steven Phillips	Organisation: Number 8 Studio, Architects
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to Draft LAP, considering it does not represent good/proper planning and will harm residential amenity and local business.</li> <li>• Proposes more extensive public consultation is required due to significance of measures proposed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Proposes collaborative engagement with local community/businesses.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Objects to retention of one-way system and active travel / public realm improvement measures on Main Street and Bypass, stating they were untested, introduced on temporary basis and without public consultation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Cites negative impacts to character / 'feel' / liveliness of Main Street, poor design quality, unattractive appearance, impacts to front curtilage of Protected Structures, underutilised footpaths / cycle lanes, impacts to local business, increase in vacancy, exacerbated traffic congestion on neighbourhood streets.</li> <li>o Considers measures have reduced pedestrian safety on Bypass at crossing point to DTCS, due to removal of central median and increase in traffic.</li> <li>o Considers bus stops recently provided on Bypass (relocated from village) exacerbate safety issues due to inadequate accessibility measures, obscuring sightlines at pedestrian crossings.</li> <li>o Seeks upgrade to pedestrian crossings on Bypass.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers proposed changes to road network are overly reliant on future transport infrastructure which may not be delivered (e.g. Luas, Metro, BusConnects).</li> <li>• Seeks measures to address issues at Ballinteer Avenue / Wyckham Way junction, stating it is major source of traffic congestion in Dundrum.</li> <li>• Highlights that DTCS attracts visitors from all over the country, who generally travel to it by car. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Emphasises importance to local community of protecting functionality of DTCS.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 4, 6 and Other Issues</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0585</u>	Person: Michael McCarron	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to proposed pedestrian/cycle link from Sweetmount Park to OSC site. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Cites lack of benefit to neighbourhood, availability of alternative access routes to village, increased footfall, anti-social behaviour, safety/security issues, litter, on-street car parking pressure.</li> <li>o Notes issues arose previously as a result of temporary access bridge during construction of Bypass.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Critical of proposed civic centre, considering site is too small, distant from centre of village (i.e OSC site), insufficiently accessible. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Considers proposed height is excessive / not in keeping with character of area.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Objects to proposed redevelopment framework for OSC site. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Considers maximum height of 10 / 11 storeys would be excessive, cause overshadowing, unsustainable density, increased traffic on Dundrum Road, pressure on local services/amenities.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Objects to proposed Main Street to Churchtown Road Upper bus gate, citing safety, access, noise, pollution, traffic congestion issues.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2 and 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0586</u>	Person: Kevin Lynch	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strongly supports measures to limit car usage within/through Dundrum, including physical segregation, removal of turning lanes/parking spaces, increased green roads and one-way roads, contraflow cycle lanes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Proposes car parking restrictions on new residential / commercial developments.</li> <li>o Considers Draft LAP should go further in this regard.</li> <li>o Critical of existing road dominance in area.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Proposes removing the word “inclusive” from vision statement, considering that Dundrum is exclusive.</li> <li>• Proposes that a consistent architectural style should be required for new developments in Dundrum.</li> <li>• Proposes increase in protection of heritage of older buildings.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 2, 4 and 8</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0587</u>	Person: Paula O'Connell	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers there was insufficient information / awareness of the Draft LAP public consultation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Considers consultation period was too short, time of year was difficult for people on holidays.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers Draft LAP is overly focused on area within LAP boundary. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o States that c. 35,000 people live in the surrounding catchment area.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• States that there is a large elderly population in surrounding area, many of whom cannot walk/cycle to village. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Considers this contingent will be further isolated by proposed measures.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers strategic regional/national importance of roads in Dundrum has not been sufficiently considered in Draft LAP. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Highlights in particular the roads which intersect at Taney Cross.</li> <li>o Concerned that proposed impacts to car movements on Dundrum Road and car access to Main Street from Bypass and at Taney Cross will result in long detours, exacerbated traffic congestion, increased carbon emissions.</li> <li>o Considers MTC zoning necessitates connectivity/access by regional roads due to its significance.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

- Concerned at capacity of Luas to accommodate additional use following restrictions to car access, noting existing overcrowding issues.
  - o Notes that Luas does not conveniently serve various parts of wider Dundrum catchment area (as identified by respondent).
  - o Considers bus is inadequate alternative option due to unreliability/infrequency.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 1 and 4, Other Issues

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0588</a></b>	<b>Person: Michael Milmo</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned at impacts of proposed measures on elderly/young/disabled.</li> <li>• Concerned lack of details regarding height, location and use mix of civic centre.</li> <li>• Concerned at redevelopment of OSC site.           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Considers development proposed under current SHD application is excessive.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1 and 2		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0589</a></b>	<b>Person: Tim &amp; Anne Geraghty</b>	<b>Organisation: N/A</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers Draft LAP is biased in favour of high density development, noting stated population projections.           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Queries proportion of family size houses that will be delivered in the area, stating that many people prefer this dwelling type.</li> <li>o Considers projected additional population is being accommodated at expense of existing population.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Proposes convening of citizen's assembly so existing residents can express their concerns.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 3 and Other Issues		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0590</a></b>	<b>Person: Alan and Vicki Browne</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned at negative impact to character of village as a result of LAP.</li> <li>• Considers at impacts of proposed restrictions on car access to village for local residents, in particular disabled/mobility impaired.           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Cites exacerbated traffic congestion on surrounding roads, compounding of issues arising from existing one-way traffic systems, increased journey times/distances, difficulties accessing local services/amenities, impacts to local business, character/heritage.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4 and 6		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0591</a></b>	<b>Person: Frank Colgan</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to proposed one-way vehicular traffic system and cycle lanes on Sydenham Road.           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Cites hazards to cyclists/pedestrians from vehicles accessing/exiting driveways on road, lack of access for delivery vehicles.</li> <li>o Proposes using Stoney Road as alternative, noting it is wider.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Concerned at impacts of bus corridors/car access restrictions on village, noting difficulty for elderly/mobility impaired accessing services/amenities.</li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Seeks longer consultation period due to significance of proposed measures.</li> </ul>
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4 and Other Issues

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0592</a>	<b>Person:</b> Claire	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned at impacts to village/Main Street.</li> <li>Considers additional population will exacerbate pressure on school places in area.</li> <li>Considers family homes (including townhouses) should be provided rather than just apartments, noting lack of availability to satisfy demand in area.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 3		

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0593</a>	<b>Person:</b> Aldagh McDonogh	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Considers insufficient time was allocated to public consultation on Draft LAP, lack of awareness/information regarding consultation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requests that LAP process is put on hold and further consultation is provided.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Objects to existing SHD application at OSC site due to excessive height/overshadowing.</li> <li>Supports proposed Dodder to Dundrum Cycle Route.</li> <li>Supports provision of local park.</li> <li>Supports provision of Civic Centre, however concerned about accessibility due to proposed car access restrictions.</li> <li>Concerned at impacts of proposed restrictions to car access on Main Street, Sandyford Road, Dundrum Road and Sydenham Road. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Considers proposed measures are excessive, will impact adjacent areas around Dundrum.</li> <li>Proposes use of Stoney Road as alternative to Sydenham Road for cycle infrastructure, noting it is wider, has surplus of on-street car parking, less hazardous for vehicles accessing/exiting properties</li> </ul> </li> <li>Supportive of existing cycle infrastructure/public realm on Main Street. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acknowledges difficulties for elderly due to topography of area.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Supports provision of cycle lanes on Taney Road.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2 and 4, Other Issues		

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0594</a>	<b>Person:</b> Deborah Lambert	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Welcomes proposed cycle infrastructure improvements in Draft LAP, in particular at Taney Cross and along Dundrum Road, noting these areas are particularly hostile to cyclists.</li> <li>Welcomes proposed diversity of housing types in Draft LAP.</li> <li>Welcomes acknowledgement in Draft LAP of need to provide sufficient school places in the area.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 3 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0595</a>	<b>Person:</b> Margaret Evoy	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Considers that maximum heights of new apartment buildings on Main Street and of civic centre should be 4/5 storeys.</li> </ul>		



- Considers existing one-way traffic systems have negatively impacted residents and business in village.
- Concerned at impact of proposed measures on jobs in village, stating that people will drive to services/amenities in other locations outside area due to car access restrictions.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 2, 4 and 6

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0596</a>	Person: Richard Kelly	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highlights difficulties of cycling in Dundrum due to topography, weather. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Notes particular impacts to elderly/mobility impaired.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers that 16 storey heights does not accord with village setting. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Proposes taller buildings should first be provided in the city before suburbs.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Supportive of provision of variety of dwelling types/sizes/tenures. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Cautions that developments should not consist primarily of social housing, noting social issues arise.</li> <li>o Considers communal areas should be of sufficient quality/size.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Highlights local public transport capacity issues and considers these should be addressed before other measures implemented.</li> <li>• Considers Draft LAP serves DTCSC at expense of village.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 3, 4, 6, 9 and Other Issues		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0597</a>	Person: Gerald Farrell	Organisation: Lynwood Residents Association
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of proposals for additional community space and visual/environmental improvements to village area.</li> <li>• Considers the LAP proposals focus almost exclusively on the LAP lands to the north of Taney Cross and to the east of the Bypass, to the exclusion of Lynwood/Ballinteer Road residential areas.</li> <li>• Considers LAP does not address issues on north-south section of Ballinteer Road between Wyckham Way and Barton Road East junctions. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Issues highlighted include traffic/pedestrian hazards due to road layout, absence of footpath/cycle lanes in parts.</li> <li>o Concerned at increased traffic on this section of Ballinteer Road from motorists seeking to access town centre due to proposed bus gate on Ballinteer Road at Dundrum Cross.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Concerned the proposed replacement of Wyckham Way / Bypass junction roundabout with signalised junction will exacerbate traffic congestion along Wyckham Way / Bypass / Overend Avenue at off-peak times.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 3 and 4		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0598</a>	Person: Rita McNamara	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers Draft LAP lacks specific timeframe/performance indicators to ensure effective implementation of 15-minute city concept.</li> <li>• Considers public consultation was inadequate, LAP is overly lengthy and technical.</li> <li>• Critical of existing one-way traffic system on Main Street, citing negative impacts to businesses/services in village, emergency services access issues, poor quality street furniture/landscaping measures.</li> <li>• Objects to proposed cycle infrastructure/bus gates in village, proposed amendments to Taney Cross junction and proposed amendments to Sydenham Road, citing the following issues:</li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Negative impacts to businesses/services in village, restrictions on access to local services/amenities (in particular for mobility impaired), diversions, increased journey times, increased emissions, inadequate cycle parking facilities, focus on access through rather than into village, insufficient public transport services, inadequate detail on proposed community amenities.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 4, 6 and Other Issues</p>

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0599</a>	Person: Mary Milne	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers there was insufficient information/awareness of public consultation.</li> <li>• Welcomes provision of civic centre but objects to its delivery on the Taney Cross KDA site. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Considers site is too small, height would be excessive/obscure William Dargan Bridge.</li> <li>o Seeks provision for improved library facility.</li> <li>o Proposes locating civic centre on site of proposed new park within OSC site.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Objects to potential pedestrian/cycle bridge from Sweetmount Park to OSC site. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Cites convenient alternative routes, increased anti-social behaviour.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Objects to proposed Main Street to Churchtown Road Upper bus gate, citing impacts to pedestrian/cyclist mobility on Churchtown Road Upper, lack of provision for cyclists, narrowness of road/footpaths.</li> <li>• Objects to proposed car access restrictions (including on Ballinteer Road at Dundrum Cross), citing difficulties for locals accessing village, increased journey times/distances, particular impacts to elderly, necessity of commuting/dropping children to school, increased pollution, exacerbated congestion.</li> <li>• Considers Main Street should be designated as a KDA to ensure protection of heritage and maximum height restrictions of 3 storeys.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2, 4 and Other Issues</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0600</a>	Person: David Armstrong	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports proposed measures to increase priority for public transport and reduce private car traffic in village.</li> <li>• Supportive of existing active travel/public realm improvement measures in village.</li> <li>• Considers proposed measures will benefit local businesses, identifying Blackrock and Monkstown as examples of how this has worked previously.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4 and 6</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0601</a>	Person: Eoghan O'Brien	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter thinks the Draft LAP is a great direction and a positive step forward for Dundrum Village.</li> <li>• Supports the removal of cars and replacement with bicycle lanes /pedestrian routes.</li> <li>• Supports Dundrum moving towards a 15-minute city, especially in consideration of climate challenges.</li> <li>• Considers that a more compact density should be the aim of development on the OSC site but doesn't support overbearing tall buildings.</li> <li>• Suggests that nicely considered medium density with a range of heights and typologies and a focus on quality / amenity and the walking experience is a better goal for the OSC site.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 2 and 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0602</a>	Person: Zara Lloyd	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter is concerned about congestion within Dundrum and surrounding areas. Submits that their access to and from the village school will be compromised. Worries about overpopulation in the area and how this might impact on safety of their children. Fears Dundrum will lose its village feel and sense of community.</li> <li>• Questions cost, affordability and ownership of future apartments in the village. Suggests that the outdoor areas for these apartments are not adequate. Queries ability to access the church and shops within the village while work is taking place. Submits that high rise apartments are not the correct place for the elderly to live in considering these to be a health and safety issue.</li> <li>• Refers to communal rooms were previously mentioned indicating that these lead to anti-social behaviour.</li> <li>• Questions capacity of the Luas should the population greatly increase. Queries the adequacy of bus route planning.</li> <li>• Believes the draft plan is not right.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 2, 3 and 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0603</a>	Person: Alice Malone	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submits that the one way system has resulted in longer journey times to access Stillorgan, the N11 and hospitals.</li> <li>• Believes the one-way system has destroyed businesses in the area.</li> <li>• Questions how people will access the church, the banks or any other business.</li> <li>• Considers that high rise buildings will dominate and block off natural light and views for many residents.</li> <li>• Requests consideration for those who cannot cycle or have difficulty walking in the plan.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 3 and 4</p>		

DLR Submission No <a href="#">B0604</a>	Person: Angela Lemass	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appreciates some changes to the traffic routes around Dundrum saying the Main Street has become a more pleasant place for pedestrians and cyclists.</li> <li>• Is happy with the one-way system running along the upper Kilmacud Road from Sydenham Rd to Dundrum Cross.</li> <li>• Thinks some of the planned changes will cause greater traffic jams, air pollution &amp; danger to pedestrians &amp; cyclists regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic from the upper Kilmacud Road turning right onto Main Street at the Dundrum Crossroads.</li> <li>• Proposal to prevent traffic turning left from the Overend Way onto the Upper Kilmacud Road causing increased traffic on Birches Lane, Taney Road &amp; Sydenham Road.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Suggests that safety on the western end of the upper Kilmacud Road could be improved with a form of traffic calming or speed ramps to reduce vehicle speeds down the hill.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0605</u>	Person: Christine Erskine	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Feels the plan reduces access to Dundrum banking, chapel , library and shops.</li> <li>• Questions availability of parking in future.</li> <li>• Questions the need to convert the existing Lidl car park into a green space with a large green area nearby.</li> <li>• Feels that the new plan is for pedestrians and cyclists and young people passing through but not older Dundrum residents and diminishes our access to needed services.</li> <li>• Considers that Dundrum as a village is dying and the local shopkeepers will be gone.</li> <li>• Requests consideration for elderly people in the area who want easy access to facilities.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2, 4 and 6</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0606</u>	Person: Edward McCarron	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers that greater consultation is required regarding traffic management of the Dundrum Road - particularly in relation parking access.</li> <li>• Submits that provisions for commercial vehicle servicing to existing and proposed Village Main Street not clear.</li> <li>• Submits that detailed design criteria in the existing CDP will apply – this should be tressed in the text of the LAP in the interests of clarity and, ideally listing the relevant references to the sections of the Development Plan.</li> <li>• Questions whether a design feature concerning the linking of the existing commercial development south off the Ballinteer Bridge and the new development north of the bridge (rear of Holy Cross Church) has been adequately outlined within the draft LAP.</li> <li>• Suggests the draft LAP should be amended to recognise the opportunity for an iconic building on the north side of Ballinteer Road to be developed to include ideally a mix of social community uses such as Council building, library, Community provisions, HSE, elderly persons accommodation etc.</li> <li>• Considers that bus parking/storage along Churchtown Road could be visually intrusive and challenge pick-up/drop-off capability at the schools opposite.</li> <li>• Questions how DLR intends to protect the visual amenity and viability of the Main Street - particularly regarding conservation elements and commercial viability over the development / construction of both private and Council proposals.</li> <li>• Considers that discussion of possible phasing initiatives would enable greater enforcement of phasing etc when proposals are submitted.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 2, 4, 9 and Other Issues</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0607</u>	Person: Beatrix Donnellan	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission objects to high rise apartments and to limiting of car access routes.</li> <li>• Considers that proposed route changes will negatively impact on people with mobility issues/ elderly and businesses in the village.</li> <li>• Objects to the 15-minute city concept implementation.</li> <li>• Suggests developing the OSC to create employment opportunities for young people instead.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0608</u>	Person: Jonathan Victory	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission is broadly in favour of the outlined proposals, particularly around biodiversity, climate action, public tree-planting and ten-minute neighbourhood principles of design.</li> <li>• Requests that the LAP leaves as many heritage buildings intact as possible and to prioritise space for biodiversity efforts over new developments.</li> <li>• Believes that any new housing developments should prioritise affordable and social housing models.</li> <li>• Considers there are too many developments in Dun Laoghaire-Rathdown built as investment properties for international hedge funds with high prices/rents. The council should oppose any such developments.</li> <li>• Submitter doesn't think a hotel in the area is a priority if that land could be going towards affordable or social housing.</li> <li>• Suggests OSC site could be a good site for mid-density apartments not exceeding the height of the adjacent Dundrum Town Centre.</li> <li>• References potential to initiate a 'Housing First' development at the CMH site to house homeless.</li> <li>• Considers the plot of land at Taney Cross could be more developed as a piece of green space with more trees there and maximised for biodiversity.</li> <li>• Submits there should be an Dundrum action plan to prevent flood damage in future and sees the idea of developing wetlands behind the Carnegie Library playing a helpful part in that.</li> <li>• Supports the upgrading of infrastructure for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport considering this should be prioritised over cars.</li> <li>• Submitter supports reduced car access to cut carbon pollution and noise pollution.</li> <li>• Supports designing public space similarly to the Dutch model with advanced traffic light systems to prioritise pedestrians, then cyclists, then public transport, then private vehicles.</li> <li>• Commends the plans for a fully accessible pedestrian/cycling path from Dundrum Town Centre and village to Sweetmount Park.</li> <li>• Urges the council to think about accessibility for disabled members of the community.</li> <li>• Suggests development of universally accessible spaces for all ideally in consultation with disability advocacy groups.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 8</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0609</u>	Person: Pat Lloyd	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers the plan will negatively impact on village life and community due to over-population and transport changes.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 1</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0610</u>	Person: John Lloyd	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers the plan will negatively impact on village life and community due to over-population and transport changes.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 1</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0611</a>	Person: R Cosgrove & L Clause	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcomes the idea of a Dodder to Dundrum pedestrian and cycle route.</li> <li>• Welcomes reduced traffic in the area.</li> <li>• Supports the idea of sustainable development to increase in housing stock in the area.</li> <li>• Is concerned about the potential overdevelopment of the area.</li> <li>• Believes some of the proposed changes will aggravate current traffic issues rather than improve same including CMH development and route restrictions proposed.</li> <li>• Submitter is concerned that proposals to remove traffic access to the village or provide temporary car parks in the village will lead to a reduction of footfall and how this might impact on local businesses or draining life from the village.</li> <li>• Submitter would welcome any change that will improve conditions towards a thriving Dundrum village centre.</li> <li>• Submits that a longer consultation period would be preferable.</li> <li>• Questions the public consultation process and how residents' questions will be answered/publicised.</li> <li>• Considers that the 1 hour zoom call was not sufficient to fully understand the plans.</li> <li>• Requests that more dates for a drop-in clinic should be arranged considering people on holidays were unable to attend these.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2, 3, 4, 6 and Other Issues</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0612</a>	Person: Patricia Doran	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission is critical of consultation period and process.</li> <li>• Considers that demographics use are incorrect as surrounding areas have been omitted.</li> <li>• Suggests that DLR must provide shuttles for wider surrounding areas to facilitate age-friendly access to the village in support of local businesses and social connectivity.</li> <li>• Questions mapping scope of LAP boundary only includes certain length of Ballinteer Road up to Ballinteer Avenue.</li> <li>• Proposes a fully pedestrianised village without obstructions and hazards (e.g. black cycleway kerbs,) - No Ecycles, bicycles, escooters or similar, no cars, mopeds/motorbikes etc. except for deliveries for residents and businesses, repair/emergency vehicles, wheelchairs, Gardai and village resident vehicles.</li> <li>• Suggests the inclusion of spiral/underground parking outside the village for vehicles and all personal modes of transport, e.g. cycles scooters etc.</li> <li>• Suggests the provision of an all-weather ambulator to transport people with mobility issues to enter the village with daytime time-limits on free or nominal cost parking for personal transport.</li> <li>• Supports consideration for the heritage buildings and the proposed greening of village.</li> <li>• Submits that new builds respect the current landscape and skyline and be aesthetically pleasing, no vertical sprawl.</li> <li>• Considers these should be green living buildings with biodiversity growth and solar powered, rain filter systems for irrigation, cistern and heating use.</li> <li>• Submits that a rain capture and filter system should be developed for the whole village area along with communal energy pumps.</li> <li>• Believes that conservation of older buildings should employ eco energy systems as far as possible.</li> <li>• Requests consideration of community members with additional needs and those getting old in years to encourage social ties and community life.</li> <li>• Asks that DLR avoids only favouring the opinions of strong and loud but often minority groups.</li> <li>• Suggests considering the legacy and type of society needed to encourage all future generations and socio-economic groups.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 3, 4, 5, 8 and Other Issues</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0613</u>	Person: Robert Moloney	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thanks DLR for the effort that has gone into the draft plan and considers that most of 100 pages is a great achievement and commends the research and the SWOC table.</li> <li>• Considers the plan does not properly address current and future anticipated high rates of car usage.</li> <li>• Submits that the proposed traffic route changes will negatively impact on access to homes and the village businesses and amenities.</li> <li>• Submits that cycling in the area is difficult due to the hill topography.</li> <li>• Submitter is completely against 11-storey buildings comparing proposals to Ballymun and considers 4 storeys to be sufficient.</li> <li>• References a purchase by DLR of a local astro pitch from St. Benildus and now does not trust a word the council writes.</li> <li>• Questions the involvement of local elected representatives in the plan-making process.</li> <li>• Suggests that pitches in or near Stillorgan or Goatstown are required.</li> <li>• Submits more time is needed for residents to properly consult and contribute to a revision of this plan.</li> <li>• Raises issue of access with regards to proposed route changes for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East Areas: (Section 4.6.1.1)</li> <li>○ Taney Cross (Junction of Dundrum Rd / Taney Rd and Churchtown Rd Upper (Section 4.6.1.2)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Asks how the plan accommodates for battery powered devices in the future.</li> <li>• Objects specifically to OCS14 “Allow for greater height along the Bypass (of up to 11 storeys)”</li> <li>• Submits that mockups for proposed OSC development are contrary to objectives re height set out in the LAP.</li> <li>• Requests that DLR ensures increased heights do not have a negative impact on residential amenity, the proposed new public park on Main Street or the proposed Civic space to the north of the OSC site in terms of daylight/sunlight/overshadowing.</li> <li>• Submitter questions how the plan enhances the ten-minute life.</li> <li>• Submitter has concerns regarding the proposed population increases and the impact on village life.</li> <li>• Considers traffic congestion on the bypass already makes it unviable as a bypass at peak times and the junction under the bridge does not work in a southerly direction.</li> <li>• Questions why the plan seems to focus on cycling and limiting cars with so many drivers in the area.</li> <li>• Considers that car use is high because it rains a lot in this area.</li> <li>• Considers plan reference 4.6.3 Dundrum Road Corridor to be unrealistic referencing current travel times to St Vincent’s hospital.</li> <li>• Questions buying and selling processes of affordable housing.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4 and Other Issues</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0614</u>	Person: John FitzGerald	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter was not aware of the consultation meeting that took place recently until they read about it in the Irish Times afterwards.</li> <li>• Submitter critical of one-way/ pedestrianisation of Main Street as they cannot walk there from home and does not cycle.</li> <li>• Submits that the one-way system currently in place has increased petrol consumption and is certainly not helping the environment.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4 and Other Issues</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0615</a>	Person: Tom Dunne	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter is critical of the consultation period and advertisement of same for the draft LAP.</li> <li>• Feels let down by DLR and that the plan is being rushed through.</li> <li>• Considers the village has been destroyed since Main Street was made one way and the introduction of largely unused cycle lanes.</li> <li>• Submitter's son will not use many of the current cycle lanes deeming them unsafe, unfree from debris and a danger to himself and others.</li> <li>• Is critical of the proposed road changes saying they will cause nothing but more congestion, frustration and additional emissions due to the longer travel times and longer static times in traffic.</li> <li>• Considers that the quality of life for those living close or on the proposed new bus hubs will be destroyed.</li> <li>• Submits that the proposed Civic Centre and apartments will be too high.</li> <li>• Submits that Dundrum is less vibrant and a deserted place because of the council.</li> <li>• Requests that DLR works with the community to ensure equal choice of transport modes for all including the aging population and those less able to walk.</li> <li>• States removal of open space in and around the village is wrong.</li> <li>• Thinks that high-rise dwellings are a bad idea and low-level houses should be provided instead.</li> <li>• Fears there will be an increase in anti-social if the LAP is enacted as it stands.</li> <li>• Does not visit the village centre anymore since the one-way system was implemented.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 3, 4 and Other Issues</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0616</a>	Person: Maryellen Greene	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports making roads safer for both cyclists and pedestrians.</li> <li>• References the current and future impact of Dundrum SC on traffic and general movement capacity in the village</li> <li>• Reflects that residents of Dundrum are largely dependent on a volume constrained light rail system, which will always be constrained by the infrastructure and topography available to it.</li> <li>• Believes that 11 storeys is far too high for the village of Dundrum and would allow these buildings to be domineering and out of character with the current urban grain.</li> <li>• Suggests a limit of 6 storeys for any new developments in the area, including the proposed new civic centre.</li> <li>• Submits concerns regarding provision of a bus gate from Dundrum Main Street to Sweetmount Avenue.</li> <li>• Questions viability of preventing private vehicles from turning left from Dom Marmion Bridge onto Dundrum Main Street.</li> <li>• Is concerned that this may negatively impact on local small traders on Dundrum main street if this plan is carried out and DLR should do more to encourage and support these small business to keep trading.</li> <li>• Is critical of the proposed pedestrian bridge from Hammersmith site to Sweetmount Park: In the plan and whether there will be any benefit from same considering other access points are available already.</li> <li>• Believes a bridge from the OSC site would ruin Sweetmount Park.</li> <li>• Strongly encourages that this part of the plan is excluded.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2, 4 and 6</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0617</a>	Person: Laura McDermott	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submits that the proposed high-rise developments are not in keeping with the character of Dundrum.</li> <li>• Has concerns regarding the anticipated increase in population density in the area.</li> </ul>		



- Considers that the road closures make no logical or rational sense, especially in a growing advanced age population relying on private transport to access the village.
- Objects to traffic route changes and how they will impact on travel times and congestion.
- Considers that existing changes made during the pandemic have already had negative repercussions on the village and residents making it harder to navigate.
- Objects to the idea of bus gates on the grounds of safety, pollution and noise impacts on residential areas.
- Submits that the overall proposals will negatively impact on local and independent business traders.
- Is critical of the consultative process indicating that better communication and consideration of residents' desires would make the community more receptive to proposals.
- Reflects influence of Dundrum Town Center on bringing traffic and people to the village and increasing congestion with the current roadways and one-way system.
- Submits that Dundrum is the wrong location for a '15 minute city' Dundrum.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 1, 3, 4 and Other Issues

DLR Submission No: <u>B0618</u>	Person: Mairead Garry, Statutory Plans	Organisation: Department of Education
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission notes the population growth identified for Dundrum in the Draft LAP and for the County up to 2031. It is noted that the anticipated population growth for the LAP area is c.6,138 above the 2016 Census figure. The DoE considers that this increase would occur over the next 6-10 years.</li> <li>• Submission notes constraints on potential residential use within the former CMH building and that education is listed as a possibility at this location.</li> <li>• The DoE notes and acknowledges policies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o DLAP7 re: provision of SNI and the delivery of the 10-minute neighbourhood.</li> <li>o DLAP8 re: co-location of existing and future SNI facilities including schools and playgrounds.</li> <li>o DLAP9 re: use and access of school facilities outside of teaching hours, in line with Policy Objective PHP7 in the CDP.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Submission notes the existing schools listed in Section 3.2.3.2 and advises that Goatstown Educate Together is temporarily located in the former Notre Dame Campus. This school plans to relocate to its permanent campus at the IGB site in Goatstown.</li> <li>• The DoE welcomes section 3.2.3.3 'Future School Requirements' and notes that the council consulted with the Department as part of the preparation of the LAP where the Department indicated that a new 24 classroom primary school would be required.</li> <li>• The DoE supports objective DM1 with regard to the Dom Marmion KDA and provision of access to Holy Cross School.</li> <li>• The DoE supports objective T4 'Safe Routes to School' as this will provide a safer environment for children travelling to school on foot, or by bicycle / scooter.</li> <li>• The DoE supports Policy DLAP30 'Safe Schools' and supports the development of sustainable travel links between schools and residential areas.</li> <li>• The DoE notes that when assessing current and future school capacity, the Department has to be mindful of unforeseen circumstances such as the Ukrainian crisis, which has the ability to place undue pressure on school places. The Department will continue to engage with the council with regard to a review of existing or future school provision within specific locations.</li> <li>• The Department welcomes the continued engagement with the Council regarding the development of both new and existing schools.</li> </ul> <p><b>Primary School Provision:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is noted that there is currently little spare capacity identified in the relevant primary schools in the area. Should the projected population growth occur, there could be a significant need for extra primary school classrooms. This could equate to a 16-24 classroom school being required.</li> <li>• Submission notes that there is c.1.5 hectares of land zoned SNI at the former Notre Dame site that accommodates a primary school and temporary post primary school.</li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The DoE supports objective P1 to retain school use at this location so that a future school could be accommodated in the Notre Dame site. In addition, the Department supports the further provisions of objective P1 with regard to promoting urban typologies and encouraging linkage to Finsbury Park.</li> <li>• Submission notes that the Notre Dame site is a contingency site having regard to the potential for development of a primary school at the IGB site that would provide places for children from its surrounding area, which, depending on its size, could reduce school place requirements in that area. Notre Dame is seen as the location that would deal with extra capacity in the event that IGB cannot be developed.</li> <li>• In the event of IGB not delivering a primary school, this would place pressure on school placements for the projected population in Dundrum. Given this uncertainty, the DoE consider it prudent to zone additional land within the LAP for a primary school.</li> <li>• Submission notes that there are four primary schools within the LAP boundary and notes that the DoE’s preference would be to expand these existing facilities. In this regard, the DoE request that the potential to provide a buffer around each school is examined to protect each site to enable them to expand.</li> </ul> <p><b>Post-Primary School Provision:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission notes that there is currently little spare capacity identified for post-primary schools.</li> <li>• DoE states that there could be a sizeable need for extra post-primary school places based on population projections.</li> <li>• It is hoped that the new post-primary school at IGB would have capacity to cater for students from the LAP area, however, this school would also cater for students from its surrounding areas.</li> <li>• The DoE will monitor and review post primary place requirements within the LAP area.</li> </ul> <p><b>SEN:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The DoE anticipates that additional SEN provision at both primary and post-primary level will be required throughout the country – this may require additional accommodation to met a growing need.</li> <li>• The Department will consult with the Council if and when additional SEN accommodation is required within specific locations.</li> </ul> <p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2, 3 and 4</p>
---

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0619</a></b>	<b>Person: Derek Dunne</b>	<b>Organisation: N/A</b>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned at impacts of proposed measures on traffic congestion, noting existing difficulties accessing amenities. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Considers congestion will also negatively affect public transport, exacerbate congestion on other roads/junctions (e.g Bypass / Taney Cross).</li> <li>o Considers projected largescale developments (e.g. CMH site) will further exacerbate congestion, increase pressure on car parking in residential areas.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Concerned at proposals to narrow traffic lanes at Goatstown Road / Taney Road junction.</li> <li>• Concerned at impact of cycle infrastructure / one-way traffic systems on emergency services access.</li> <li>• Notes difficulty of topography of Dundrum (in particular for elderly).</li> </ul> <p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4</p>		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0620</a></b>	<b>Person: David Ingoldsby</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of proposals to improve pedestrian/cyclist access to village from lands to west of Bypass. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Highlights issues with pedestrian access to Main Street and Dundrum Luas due to priority given to cars.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Supportive of removal of left filter lanes at Taney Cross, noting benefits to pedestrian/cyclist movement.</li> </ul>		

- Supportive of increased availability of public transport, including provision of bus routes through residential areas.
- Supportive of existing one-way traffic system and cycle lanes on Main Street, noting more convenient access to shops.
- Considers proposed transport/movement measures will further enhance access and encourage modal shift.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapter 4

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0621</u></b>	<b>Person: John McCarthy</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
--	------------------------------	----------------------

**Summary of Submission / Observation:**

- Notes lack of public consultation prior to introduction on one-way traffic system on Main Street.
- Objects to Main Street to Churchtown Road Upper bus gate, citing impacts to space in front of library, difficulties accessing Churchtown Road Upper from Sweetmount area by car (noting existing issues with access, particular difficulties for school access).
- Concerned at permanent negative impacts of proposed residential development at OSC site on Dundrum area.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 2 and 4

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0622</u></b>	<b>Person: Clare Kelly</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
--	----------------------------	----------------------

**Summary of Submission / Observation:**

- Supportive of proposed cycling priority/connectivity measures in Draft LAP, noting particular benefits for vulnerable children.
  - o Considers however measures could be more ambitious.
- States that there are opportunities for expanded cyclist priority measures on Taney Cross junction and on Dundrum Road, and improved connectivity to neighbouring areas (e.g. Rathfarnham, Nutgrove Shopping Centre) and city centre.
- Considers driving must be disincentivised and effective, well-connected cycle infrastructure must be provided in order to encourage a modal shift.
  - o Considers modal shift is imperative due to current trend of increase in transport emissions nationally.
- Welcomes proposed Dodder to Dundrum Cycle Route and enhanced cycle connections to UCD.
- Highlights Blackrock as example of implementing unpopular active travel measures which have benefited local businesses/community.
- Concerned at increased traffic pressure/air pollution due to projected expansion of Gaeilscoil na Fuinseoige, if driving is main means of school transport.
  - o States that cycle route to this school is not proposed in Draft LAP, noting unsafe cycling conditions on Churchtown Road Lower and Woodlawn Park due to car traffic.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 3 and 4

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0623</a></b>	<b>Person: Shane Fitzgibbon</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of proposed measures to improve active travel/public transport provision, permeability, urban greening. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Cites benefits of active travel measures in Blackrock village, coastal mobility route.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Emphasises importance of efficient redevelopment of key sites in Dundrum, noting high public transport accessibility, projected significant population growth, existing prevalence of low density housing.</li> <li>• Welcomes mix of uses proposed, e.g. OSC site.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0624</a></b>	<b>Person: Breffni O'Connor</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned at maximum height allowance of 11 storeys along Bypass at OSC site, citing potential overshadowing/overbearing, impacts to context of buildings on Main Street. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Proposes maximum heights of 6-8 storeys along Bypass.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Seeks minimum requirements for public EV charging provision, park-and-ride in new developments, e.g within basement of OSC site. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Considers provision of hub at OSC site would allow removal of on-street infrastructure.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Supportive of proposed Main Street to Churchtown Road Upper bus gate, however concerned at impacts on congestion in residential areas.</li> <li>• Supportive of increased pedestrian/cycle access between Sweetmount Park and village area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Considers temporary crossing during Bypass construction should have been retained/improved.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0625</a></b>	<b>Person: Pat Lehane</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcomes proposed cycle infrastructure improvements, considering area (in particular Bypass and Taney Cross junction) is not currently cycle friendly. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Notes no indoor cycle parking in Dundrum (e.g. DTCS).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0626</a></b>	<b>Person: Hairul Sarmani</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports retention/expansion of one-way traffic system on Main Street, noting reduced pollution, active travel improvement, greater public realm.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0627</a></b>	<b>Person: Catriona Collum</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned at increased traffic congestion on Dundrum Road due to future developments (e.g. CMH, Frankfort Centre, Frankfort Castle).</li> <li>• Skeptical of effectiveness of traffic calming measures at Windy Arbour.</li> </ul>		

- Considers proposed measures (retained/expanded one-way system, removal of car parking) will impede access to services/amenities village, including for mobility impaired.
- Cites longer journey times, increased emissions, emergency services access.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapter 4

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0628</a></b>	<b>Person: Gary Manahan</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seeks retention of existing mobility hub/bus terminus on Main Street. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Considers proposed bus terminus arrangement will cause congestion on Main Street.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers proposed amendments to Taney Cross junction will exacerbate traffic congestion, cause diversions.</li> <li>• Highlights Luas capacity issues.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0629</a></b>	<b>Person: Maev Wren</b>	<b>Organisation: Landlord with business on Main Street Dundrum</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposes retaining one-way vehicular access on Ballinteer Road to Main Street.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0630</a></b>	<b>Person: Olive Fogarty</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers cycle infrastructure provision in Draft LAP is excessive, noting impacts to access for local residents. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Considers improvements to public transport infrastructure are more important.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Objects to car access restrictions proposed at Dundrum Cross and on Sydenham Road, noting difficulties with cycling locally and underutilisation of cycle infrastructure. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Cites weather, particular impacts to elderly/mobility impaired, large shopping trips, unsightly/hazardous cycle lane kerbs, increased congestion, fuel consumption, increase to journey time/distance, topography, loss of local business.</li> <li>◦ Considers Sydenham Road cycle lanes pose hazard to pedestrians/cyclists from vehicles accessing/exiting properties.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Proposes retaining existing bus terminus/hub at Waldemar Terrace, noting proximity to Luas, major junction. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Proposes frequent shuttle bus services from terminus to Booterstown Dart Station and Milltown/Ranelagh.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Supportive of proposed Dodder to Dundrum Cycle Route.</li> <li>• Objects to provision of dedicated cycle lanes on Dundrum Road, citing access difficulties for local residents.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0631</a></b>	<b>Person: Anthony Sheridan</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seeks additional public consultation with affected local residents.</li> <li>• Considers upgrades to Luas capacity necessary to accommodate projected additional population.</li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposes retaining bus terminus in current location.</li> <li>Proposes further assessment of impacts of proposed measures on surrounding areas.</li> </ul>
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4 and Other Issues

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0632</a></b>	<b>Person: Katie Heskin</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned at impacts of measures proposed in Draft LAP (in particular car access restrictions on Ballinteer Road at Dundrum Cross) on access to Holy Cross Church and other services/amenities in village for elderly/disabled/mobility impaired. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Highlights long detours required.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0633</a></b>	<b>Person: Leon McMahon</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Welcomes proposed c. 2,000 sq.m park at OSC site, but considers more usable space incorporating existing mature trees to rear of Glenville Terrace should be provided. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposes removal of some derelict buildings on Main Street to provide this space, considering many lack architectural merit.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Considers further parameters are required regarding the uses proposed at the OSC site to ensure they serve the local community. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Notes that DTCSC attracts visitors nationally and does not consider that the uses serve the local community.</li> <li>Considers conversely that existing units at OSC do serve local community.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Requests that DLR publish all correspondence/records of meetings with DTCSC site owners, stating that the OSC KDA framework aligns somewhat with current SHD application.</li> <li>Considers proposed maximum heights of 11 storeys on Bypass are excessive.</li> <li>Proposes Dom Marmion site should be redeveloped as green space incorporating school drop-off/taxi area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Considers local schools would benefit from additional open space.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Critical of future development requirements for Dom Marmion site as set out in Section 2.9.4.2, considering there is a lack of benefit to local community.</li> <li>Proposes removal of access to DTCSC car park from Sandyford Road to reduce traffic on Sandyford Road / Main Street.</li> <li>Proposes new KDA encompassing properties on eastern side of Main Street / lands to rear of these properties, including DLR offices, Dundrum College of Further Education, AIB and Permanent TSB. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Notes much of lands identified are public owned.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2, 4 and 5, Other Issues		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0634</a></b>	<b>Person: Margaret Hendley</b>	<b>Organisation: Ballinteer Active Retirement Association (BARA)</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned at impediments to access to services/amenities in village due to proposed car access restrictions at Dundrum Cross and Taney Cross, noting increased journey times, exacerbated congestion.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0635</a></b>	<b>Person: Brian Leonard</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned at increased traffic pressure in residential areas due to proposed car access restrictions at Dundrum Cross. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Requests closure of through access for cars on Ailesbury Lawn / Ailesbury Grove and on Meadow Grove.</li> <li>○ Notes these routes could serve as safe alternative cycle routes if closed to through traffic.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers cycle lanes on Barton Road East are dangerous for cyclists and requests their removal, with Meadow Grove serving as alternative cycle route.</li> <li>• Submission attaches video showing traffic congestion and dangerous driving in residential area.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0636</a></b>	<b>Person: Carmel O'Connor</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned at negative impacts to businesses in village due to proposed measures.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 6		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0637</a></b>	<b>Person: Jane O'Donnell</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers proposed traffic measures in and around village will negatively impact local business.</li> <li>• Considers pedestrian bridge link between Sweetmount Park and village will create parking pressure in area, notes availability of convenient alternative routes.</li> <li>• States development of OSC site should be in keeping with existing character, not overbearing.</li> <li>• Highlights Luas capacity issues.</li> <li>• Objects to Main Street to Churchtown Road Upper bus gate, noting impacts to quiet residential area / library setting.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2, 4 and 6		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0638</a></b>	<b>Person: Carmel O'Connor</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned at negative impacts to businesses in village due to proposed measures.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 6		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0639</a></b>	<b>Person: Paul Dowling</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that proposed removal of left filter lanes at Taney Cross junction will exacerbate traffic congestion.</li> <li>• Concerned at loss of open space/increased traffic on quiet road as a result of proposed Main Street to Churchtown Road Upper bus gate.</li> <li>• Proposes maximum height restriction of 3 storeys on Main Street. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Favourable to higher buildings away from Main Street which blend into existing environment/character.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Supports provision of affordable units and mix of rental/purchase in new residential developments.</li> </ul>		

- Concerned at potential traffic issues due to one-way traffic system on Main Street, queries utility/necessity of cycle lanes.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 2 and 4

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0640</a>	Person: John Mac Polin / Jennifer Murray	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers development framework for OSC site has been heavily influenced by current SHD application, in particular regarding the built form strategy. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Queries whether ABP are delaying deciding on SHD application until adoption of LAP.</li> <li>○ Suggests LAP provisions would serve to facilitate grant of permission for SHD application.</li> <li>○ Concerned development could include continuous wall of tall buildings along Bypass/part of Main Street, noting height diagram (Figure 2.10) is indicative only.</li> <li>○ Concerned at potential lack of variation/relief in streetscape.</li> <li>○ Highlights importance of ensuring that taller buildings ensure protection of existing amenities/environmental sensitivities/residential amenity/established character, in accordance with performance-based criteria.</li> <li>○ Considers on this basis that heights envisaged for OSC site divert too radically from existing scale of village/surrounding neighbourhoods.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Critical of criteria on which OSC site passed Justification Test of FRA. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers allowing development on these lands as they are “an essential element” of a major development site (as quoted from Section 1.7 of Appendix 1 SFRA) is insufficient justification, stating that this is a matter of opinion.</li> <li>○ Considers development of OSC site poses significant risk of flooding to surrounding areas, noting requirement of SSFRA to demonstrate absence of impact.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Critical of potential delivery of civic centre at Taney Cross KDA due to limited size of site. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Concerned at visual impacts to view of William Dargan Bridge and other nearby landmarks, cumulation of height at this location.</li> <li>○ Suggests providing landmark building at the site without necessity of significant height.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Concerned at impacts of proposed transport/movement measures (including removal of car parking, restrictions to car access) on access to village for elderly/mobility impaired. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Also cites trip hazard due to cycle infrastructure, impacts on quiet residential area/public realm of proposed bus gates, increased traffic congestion in surrounding areas.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Seeks further consultation with local community on proposed transport/movement measures.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2, 4 and Other Issues		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0641</a>	Person: Donal Donnelly & Cairíona Donnelly	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned at impacts of proposed LAP measures on access to local services/amenities in village, in particular for elderly. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Notes reliance on car for many due to weather, large shopping trips, topography.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Objects to vehicular access restrictions on Ballinteer Road at Dundrum Cross, proposes reinstatement of two-way traffic system on Main Street. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Cites negative impact to local businesses (loss of trade), exacerbated traffic congestion on surrounding roads.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Requests independent traffic and economic surveys of area to inform proposals.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4 and 6		



<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0642</a></b>	<b>Person: Michael Barry</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcomes proposed active travel improvements measures, bus gates retention of one-way traffic system.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0643</a></b>	<b>Person: David Bourke</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers LAP excessively focuses on pedestrian/cycle infrastructure. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Notes large elderly population.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Concerned at proposed bus gates, citing exacerbated traffic congestion on surrounding roads/junctions, restricted access to village for local residents to west, negative impacts to local businesses, noise/pollution, increased emissions, expense.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0644</a></b>	<b>Person: Yvonne McCabe</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned at large proportion of apartments amongst new residential developments, citing excessive height, overpopulation, unsuitability of BTR, units not large enough, lack of open space for existing/future population, insufficient parking provision, insufficient capacity of schools/recreational facilities.</li> <li>• Supportive of improvements to cycle infrastructure, however considers proposed cycle lanes are too narrow to accommodate larger bikes (cargo etc). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Seeks more provision for cycle parking in LAP, better maintenance of existing cycle lanes (noting overgrowth).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Notes importance of retaining car access/facilities for elderly. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Objects to proposed access restrictions and seeks removal of existing one-way traffic systems, or restricting measures to peak times only.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 3 and 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0645</a></b>	<b>Person: Patrick McGovern</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to proposed Main Street to Churchtown Road Upper bus gate, noting impacts to useability of public space in front of Library (in particular for children playing), increased air/noise pollution, overlooking of private amenity space.</li> <li>• Disputes statements in Section 2.9 that OSC site is poorly connected to Luas stop and that east-west / north-south connectivity within site is poor. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Considers heights of 11 storeys would not be in keeping with heritage/nature of village.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Disputes statement that Sweetmount area residents have poor permeability to village. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ States that previous temporary bridge during construction of Bypass was removed due to lack of use.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0646</a></b>	<b>Person: Sarah Jackson</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned at excessive heights in area.</li> <li>Suggests investigating provision of underground car parking.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 3 and 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0647</a></b>	<b>Person: Maria Redmond</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Critical of Draft LAP, citing lack of consideration for elderly/disabled/mobility impaired.</li> <li>Acknowledges need to build homes but concerned about affordability.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1 and 3		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0648</a></b>	<b>Person: Liam &amp; Alison Bannon</b>	<b>Organisation: Cottage Recordings</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned at proposed bus traffic on section of Churchtown Road Upper adjacent to Library/St. Nahi's.</li> <li>Cites quiet nature of road, increase in air/noise pollution, loss of private amenity for residences on road, safety issues for children crossing to access local schools.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0649</a></b>	<b>Person: Maria Redmond</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Critical of Draft LAP, citing lack of consideration for elderly/disabled/mobility impaired and local residents generally.</li> <li>Concerned proposed apartments will not be affordable for local residents.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1 and 3		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0650</a></b>	<b>Person: Wei Gao</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Queries demand/need for LAP, noting objections from local residents associations.</li> <li>Disputes statement in section 4.4.2.6 of Draft LAP that mobility enhancement routes have significantly improved urban realm on Main Street. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Considers one-way traffic system in particular has negatively impacted village, citing emergency vehicle access difficulties, negative impacts to businesses/loss of footfall, projected future uptake of electric/hybrid vehicles.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Considers proposed car access restrictions on Ballinteer Road at Dundrum Cross will negatively impact access to village, local schools and certain surrounding areas for local residents.</li> <li>Critical of effectiveness of proposed cycle infrastructure, noting challenges of weather, large shopping trips/large loads, driving hazards.</li> <li>Seeks more involvement by local residents in LAP process.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 4 and Other Issues		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0651</u></b>	<b>Person: Bernadette Colley</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supportive of Draft LAP promotion/support for 10-minute city and sustainable living, citing increase in green space, public transport accessibility, reduction in carbon emissions.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 4 and 5		
<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0652</u></b>	<b>Person: Dave Gavin</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supportive of LAP.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 1		
<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0653</u></b>	<b>Person: Emmanuel Ranchin</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objects to LAP, citing lack of consideration for community (increased isolation) and impacts to history and fabric.</li> <li>Considers LAP measures would not assist in provision of social/affordable housing.</li> <li>Considers height/size of apartment developments will negatively impact village feel / local community.</li> <li>Notes issues with developments situated on flood plains.</li> <li>Notes poor public transport (bus/Luas) frequency and capacity in area.</li> <li>Highlights issues with existing cycle infrastructure in village, including trip hazard due to cycle lane kerbs, loss of trade for local businesses.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6		
<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0654</u></b>	<b>Person: Geraldine Griffin</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned at impacts of proposed car access restrictions on Ballinteer Road at Dundrum Cross on access to businesses in village. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposes one-way vehicular access to Dundrum Cross at Ballinteer Road as alternative, noting this would still facilitate segregated two-way cycle infrastructure and would represent a reasonable compromise for local residents/businesses.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0655</u></b>	<b>Person: Máirín de Brún</b>	<b>Organisation: Committee of Broadford Residents' Association</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission provides background relating to the Broadford Residents' Association and outlines that the estate has a varied age profile.</li> </ul>		
<b>Local Amenities and Interaction with Dundrum</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support for ten-minute neighbourhood concept among residents who frequent Dundrum on a weekly and daily basis and avail of all its services.</li> <li>Highlights that church services are now offered on a rotating basis so there is a need to access Dundrum.</li> </ul>		

<p><b>Transport</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission hopes that the mobility hub will take into account agility or lack of, for residents/pedestrians when descending Luas, to continue their homeward bound bus trip.</li> <li>• Submission raises concerns as follows.</li> <li>• Ballinteer Road and Barton Road Access - request that vehicular traffic be allowed to turn left with public parking provided for.</li> <li>• Considers plan is not people friendly for those with mobility issues or the elderly.</li> <li>• Proposal does not tie in with the stated aim of the LAP “to improve the public realm and support the vibrancy and liveability of the area”.</li> <li>• Unintended consequence will be non-viability of village business.</li> <li>• Request deletion of proposal</li> <li>• Requests council to consider revoking one way system as there are cycle lanes on bypass.</li> <li>• Request an independent traffic survey of Dundrum.</li> <li>• Request proper consultation.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 3, 4, 6, 7 and Other Issues</p>

<p><b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0656</a></p>	<p><b>Person:</b> Máirín de Brún</p>	<p><b>Organisation:</b> Committee of Broadford Residents' Association</p>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b> This is a duplicate of <a href="#">B0655</a> which is summarised above.</p>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> N/A see <a href="#">B0655</a>.</p>		

<p><b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0657</a></p>	<p><b>Person:</b> Amanda Maher</p>	<p><b>Organisation:</b></p>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not support the LAP as it stands on the basis of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Scale of apartment development</li> <li>○ Population increase anticipated</li> <li>○ Housing typology and</li> <li>○ Negative impact of private rental schemes on the community ethos of Dundrum village.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Submitter would like to see a reduction in the scale for apartments allowed and some assurance that a variety of housing accommodation will be encouraged through the DLAP.</li> <li>• Considers that no traffic report has been undertaken, that the proposed plan is premature and will be to the detriment of the existing village businesses and their consumers.</li> <li>• Believes that as Dundrum is a major traffic thoroughfare for both the surrounding densely populated areas and a major M50 exit the proposed traffic calming measures are not sufficient and should be reconsidered.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 3 and 4</p>		

<p><b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0658</a></p>	<p><b>Person:</b> Orla Sarsfield</p>	<p><b>Organisation:</b></p>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter feels that the proposed Civic Centre and proposed OSC apartments are too high and too large a scale for the site.</li> <li>• Considers that additional housing should be of a scale appropriate to the area.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2 and 3</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0659</a>	Person: Anisha Khanna	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter is concerned about the new bus gate in front of the Library as this will take away the community space in front of the library, which contravenes the CDP objective of protecting and enhancing public realm;</li> <li>• Considers that there haven't been any robust studies carried out to determine the need to relocate the bus terminus to Churchtown Road or where might be the most appropriate bus stand location.</li> <li>• Submits that this change has not been appraised against alternatives such as integration of buses with the mobility hub behind the civic center where they can stop, stand and require less tarmac and be even closer to the Luas stop.</li> <li>• Questions the need for a bus gate on the bridge to Dundrum cross as this is already a well-working junction.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0660</a>	Person: Kevin Brady	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appreciates that the draft LAP has been developed based on evidence (e.g. census data) and detailed studies (e.g. the traffic study).</li> <li>• Fully agrees that Dundrum cannot continue to grow whilst remaining so car dependent considering road and parking capacity.</li> <li>• Supports the need to prioritise walking, cycling and public transport.</li> <li>• Supports maintaining and expanding the one-way system on the Main Street and introducing the bus gate at Dundrum cross.</li> <li>• Submits that the introduction of a bus gate onto Sweetmount Avenue needs further consideration on the basis of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Removal of some community space in front of the library.</li> <li>○ The possibility of cars, motor bikes etc. shortcutting (albeit illegally) via the bus gate.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Appreciates that there are clear benefits from moving the current bus terminus from outside the Luas stop in order to free up significant community space however, this may not require the bus gate at Sweetmount Avenue.</li> <li>• Thinks it is very positive to provide guidance on building heights to encourage greater housing provision and that the heights suggested are more appropriate than current proposals for the OSC.</li> <li>• Requests that the draft LAP sets out exactly what the proposed civic hub could be used for and also specify that its design should be in keeping with the Luas bridge (the key landmark) and surrounding buildings.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 2 and 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0661</a>	Person: Kay Rafferty	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter is concerned about the impact proposed road closures and route changes will have on residents and local businesses regarding journey times, access and movement restrictions citing issues for older people and increases in congestion and pollution.</li> <li>• Suggests there will be no businesses to shop in, if Main Street is made so inaccessible as people will be forced to shop elsewhere.</li> <li>• Welcomes the provision of outdoor recreation and seating areas in the village.</li> <li>• Welcomes the positive inclusion of a playground in the OSC and a new civic/cultural centre for Dundrum.</li> <li>• Considers that more cycle lanes and the imposition of the one-way system will negatively impact on villagers' use of these amenities</li> </ul>		

- Submits that the plan requires more input from local residents and hopes that DLR will make more time to meet with the Dundrum community and take their concerns into consideration.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 2, 3, 4, 6 and Other Issues

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0662</a>	Person: Development Applications Unit (DAU)	Organisation: Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<b>Archaeology:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission notes the inclusion of Dundrum Castle (RMP DU022-023001- Castle – tower house and DU022-023002- Castle - Anglo-Norman masonry castle) within the LAP boundary, stating that these monuments are subject to statutory protection under Section 12 of the National Monuments Act.</li> <li>• Submission requests that the RMP numbers for Dundrum Castle is included in the text in chapter 8.</li> <li>• Submission further notes the inclusion of figure 8.3 ‘Map showing Built Heritage within DLAP’ as a useful resource.</li> <li>• Submission notes that some recommendations made at pre-draft stage have been included in the Draft LAP and notes the inclusion of recommendations in the CDP 2022-2028.</li> <li>• Appendix to the submission sets out current national archaeological heritage protection and policy.</li> </ul>		
<b>Architectural Heritage:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission details architectural heritage policy context, noting the integration of circular economy for increased environmental, economic and social sustainability and resilience into current national and international policies.</li> <li>• Submission states that ‘<i>Architectural heritage is one of the key assets in meeting the varying aims and delivery outcomes of current national policies</i>’, as such, architectural heritage must be fully integrated with other LAP objectives including climate action, regeneration, housing delivery, infrastructure etc.</li> <li>• Submission notes that statutory designations such as protected structures and ACAs should form part of any plan and cross reference any guidance document or relevant assessments.</li> <li>• Submission states that plans should be fully accessible with consideration given to the use of mapping in open data format.</li> <li>• Submission recommends that a robust assessment is undertaken to ensure cohesion within overlapping policies and objectives relating to architectural heritage and specified land uses.</li> <li>• In addition, local policies should take account of up to date policy documents, in particular the Town Centre First policy which is key in “<i>creating town centres that function ‘as viable, vibrant and attractive locations for people to live work and visit, while also functioning as the service, social, cultural and recreational hub for the local community</i>”.</li> <li>• Submission details how a multi-disciplinary team is required with regard to the successful delivery of projects in complex urban environments.</li> <li>• Submission notes that character assessments that have been carried out for a particular historic area should be included in all relevant plans. It is noted that character assessments are an effective collaborative tool that help inform policy for e.g. public realm schemes, strategic infrastructure, measures to address dereliction and vacancy, urban and rural regeneration and integrated land use solutions.</li> <li>• Submission recommends that plans include definitions of architectural heritage and architectural heritage related statutory designations, such as protected structures, architectural conservations areas, areas of special planning control, vernacular buildings and historic demesnes, all of which can be found in the PDA, Architectural Heritage Protection: Guidelines for Planning Authorities’ and ‘A Living Tradition; A Strategy to Enhance the Understanding, Minding and Handing on of Our Built Vernacular Heritage’. It is recommended that a set of consistent terms / phrases are adopted and applied in all relevant plans.</li> <li>• Submission recommends that suitably qualified persons are involved in the preparation of the plans with regard to architectural heritage.</li> </ul>		
<b>Nature Conservation:</b>		

- The Department endorses the five objectives in relation to the conservation of flora and fauna and strongly supports measure to achieve the first 3 of the 5 following objectives to restore a Wildlife Corridor from Ticknock to the Dodder within the LAP lands :
  - Objective GI1—Dodder/Slang and linkages
  - Objective GI2—Wildlife Corridor
  - Objective GI3-- Deculverting
  - Objective GI4—Hedgerows
  - Objective GI5—Extension and Enhancement of Treelines
- Submission notes the severance of the riparian corridor that once linked the Dublin mountains to the Dodder over the past 50 years through culverting to facilitate road construction. It is noted that this has resulted in the connection between the trout population existing in the headwaters of the River Slang in the Ticknock area and the population of trout in the Dodder has probably been broken, and the movement of otter has been impeded.
- Submission notes that there have been the occasional reports of otter from the Slang downstream and badger setts are also present along that section of the Slang. Any reopening culverts will significantly benefit wildlife.
- Submission notes that roosts of bat species, (protected under the Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC) have been in recorded a number of times in the Dundrum area e.g. in a building proposed for redevelopment in Frankfort Park, and bats have also been recorded foraging over and commuting through the LAP area. In this regard, it would be desirable if an objective was incorporated into the LAP requiring that the design of all lighting within the LAP area, both external and internal, should seek to minimise light pollution and adverse effects on bat species.
- In addition, the lighting of greenways and footpaths in parks and other green spaces should be avoided if possible, or at least be made movement activated between the hours of 8 PM and 6 AM, similar to the lighting recently installed on the Dodder Greenway in the Firhouse area.

#### **Appendix 1:**

- Sets out the definitions for archaeological heritage and recommends a statement be included in this regard in the archaeological heritage section.
- Appendix states: *“Archaeological heritage occurs in all environments, urban and rural, upland and lowland, grassland, tillage and forestry, inland and coastal, dryland, wetland (including peatlands) and underwater (including watercourses, lakes and the sea). Archaeological heritage may exist in the form of upstanding or visible remains, or as subsurface features with no surface presentation. Given the above, archaeological heritage is present as yet unidentified in all environments.”*
- Submission states that the Draft LAP succinctly addresses archaeological heritage and requests that further detail is added to existing policies and objectives. Submission goes on the list 8no. detailed categories for the protection of archeological heritage.
- Submission states that the PA shall take full account of, and be guided by, national policy on the protection of the archaeological heritage as set out in the Framework and Principles for the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage (Government of Ireland 1999) and shall protect the archaeological heritage through ensuring preservation in-situ or preservation by record, as appropriate.
- Submission goes on to list very detailed objectives and policies for the protection of archaeological heritage, including overarching policies, development control objectives and climate change.
- The Department states that it welcomes where possible that the policies and objectives of core documents listed below be inserted into future development plans:
  - Heritage Ireland 2030,
  - Climate Change Sectoral Adaptation Plan for the Built and Archaeological Heritage (published in 2019),
  - Built Vernacular Strategy (published in 2021) and,
  - National Policy on Architecture (2022).
- The Department notes that research into the symbiotic relationship between cultural heritage and the biodiversity provides opportunities to build capacity as per the National Biodiversity plan 2017–2021.
- It is noted that the policy documents set out above integrate archaeology and built heritage within government policy, planning and funding frameworks and align with EU policies and funding programmes.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission states that this is an important time to be working collaboratively and strategically with Local Authorities with regard to vulnerable built and archaeological heritage sites, the safeguarding of vacant buildings and the promoting/enabling reuse and repurposing of existing cultural assets.</li> <li>• Submission notes the 17no. UN Sustainable Development Goals, cultural and natural heritage is represented under Goal no.11 - make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient, and sustainable, with targets for heritage focusing on strengthening its protection.</li> <li>• Submission states that the Department welcomes the opportunity for making cultural heritage more accessible and better integrated with wider tourism and recreational opportunities of the county. This will be strategically important to enhancing as well as spreading the tourism capacity through the county’s heritage sites and historic towns.</li> <li>• The Department supports the integration and communication of multiple strands of cultural and natural heritage, particularly through the implementation of blue and green infrastructural projects that holistically deal with all aspects of archaeological, built and natural heritage.</li> </ul> <p><b>Appendix 2:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This appendix provides links to European architectural policy development documents and the National Policy on Architecture.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 5, 7 and 8</p>

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0663</a>	Person: Regina O Keeffe	Organisation: Meadowbrook Residents Association
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers public consultation on Draft LAP was insufficient, noting time of year, lack of drop-in days, time of day of drop-in days, lack of engagement with residents associations, not long enough.</li> <li>• Objects to proposed car access restrictions at Dundrum Cross, retention of existing/expanded one-way traffic systems and removal of car parking in village.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Issues highlighted include difficulties for residents west of village accessing services/amenities and commuting to city, noise/air pollution, exacerbated traffic congestion, impacts to local businesses in village (noting some local residents will find it more convenient to shop elsewhere), emergency services vehicle access.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers LAP over-emphasises walking/cycling with insufficient focus on other sustainable measures (e.g. EVs).             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Highlights issues including particular impacts elderly/disabled (citing inability of many to walk/cycle, lack of available suitable parking on Main Street), topography, underutilisation of cycle infrastructure.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Concerned at impacts on surrounding areas if current SHD application on OSC site is implemented, stating that these potential impacts are not accounted for in Draft LAP.</li> <li>• Supportive of delivery of civic centre, but concerned at accessibility by car.</li> <li>• Concerned at further impacts to village due to lack of provision of open space, high-rise buildings detracting from character.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2, 4 and Other Issues</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0664</a>	Person: Elizabeth Moore	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports commitment in Draft LAP to maintain village character in Dundrum, noting dominance of DTCS currently.</li> <li>• Supports measures to reduce car traffic, enhance access to public transport (in particular Luas), increase pedestrian mobility/accessibility for all ages/abilities, provision of safe cycle lanes.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Highlights ecological benefits.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2 and 4</p>		



<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0665</a></b>	<b>Person: Hannagh Misstear</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned at impacts of proposed bus gate on Ballinteer Road at Dundrum Cross, retention of one-way traffic systems. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Highlights issues including impact on car access to services/amenities in village, exacerbated traffic congestion (including compound impact of projected largescale residential developments in area), lack of survey data, impacts on local business, access for emergency services vehicles, increased journey times (including for buses), particular impacts to elderly/mobility impaired, public transport service deficiencies.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4 and 6		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0666</a></b>	<b>Person: Susan Kelly</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned at impacts of proposed bus gate on Ballinteer Road at Dundrum Cross, retention of one-way traffic systems. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Highlights issues including impact on car access to services/amenities in village, exacerbated traffic congestion, access for emergency services vehicles, public transport service deficiencies.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Seeks improvements to drainage infrastructure on Ballinteer Road to address flooding issues.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4 and 6, Appendix 1		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0667</a></b>	<b>Person: Alec</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to proposed car access restrictions (removal of left filter lanes) at Taney Cross junction, proposed bus gate on Ballinteer Road at Dundrum Cross, retention/expansion of one-way traffic systems. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Highlights high car use/ownership in area, exacerbated traffic congestion, diversions, longer journey times, increased CO2 emissions, emergency services vehicle access.</li> <li>○ Proposes introducing speed bumps as alternative measure for Taney Cross.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Objects to proposed UCD cycle route via Mulvey Park and Gledswood Park. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers roads are sufficiently quiet for cycling, concerned at impact of removal of on-street parking.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0668</a></b>	<b>Person: Eoghan O'Shea</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of Draft LAP proposals to improve cycle/pedestrian safety.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0669</a></b>	<b>Person: Susan Kennedy</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of Draft LAP, in particular enhance cycle safety measures.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0670</a></b>	<b>Person: John</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that Draft LAP measures would negatively impact local community.</li> <li>• Concerned that new developments in area will exacerbate traffic congestion, increase noise pollution (construction, businesses operating late), detract from character/identity/architectural and cultural heritage of area.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b>		
Chapters 4 and 8		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0671</a></b>	<b>Person: Diliaver Eminov</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to proposed transport measures in Draft LAP. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Considers residential areas are sufficiently accessible.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Concerned at high rise buildings and overpopulation.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b>		
Chapters 1, 3 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0672</a></b>	<b>Person: Ricardo Segurado</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers assessment of junction layout options in ABTA should have been informed by projected impacts to pedestrian/cycle/public transport journey times, rather than just vehicle journey times. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Considers thresholds for determining unacceptable increases to vehicle journey times should have been higher, considering the significant potential improvements to active travel times that could have been yielded by some options.</li> <li>◦ Considers the lack of inclusion of school terms in the analysis is a drawback, noting their significant influence on peak time traffic.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Supportive of measures to reduce private car use. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Considers LAP could have considered additional one-way systems (e.g. on Dundrum Road – ABTA options WC11 and WC12, Churchtown Road Lower, Nutgrove Avenue, Wyckham Way), noting potential benefits to cyclists.</li> <li>◦ Supports provision of one-way traffic system along St. Columbanus' Road (from Patrick Doyle Road), stating this would calm traffic and ease traffic volumes at Dundrum Road junction.</li> <li>◦ Supports increased pedestrian crossings and increased pedestrian priority at junctions.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Seeks the following cycle infrastructure improvements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Complete removal of on-street car parking in areas near apartments or where all houses have driveways.</li> <li>◦ Clear routes (including right turns) for cyclists at junctions which avoid car traffic.</li> <li>◦ Provision of single cycle lanes, cyclist-friendly speed bumps and signage on roads on which the provision of two-way segregated cycle lanes is not possible due to width (e.g. Dundrum Road, St. Columbanus' Road).</li> <li>◦ Consistent cyclist priority rules at minor road junctions.</li> <li>◦ Bicycle lights at signalised junctions to ensure priority movement.</li> <li>◦ Sufficient and consistent barriers/protections for cycle lanes from car traffic.</li> <li>◦ Dedicated pedestrian/cyclist access routes, additional dedicated secure cycle parking facility and bicycle repair stations at large commercial hubs/village centres to facilitate active travel commuting.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers main roads are ubiquitous preference for cyclists over indirect routes through housing estate/along greenways etc, and as such sufficient cycle infrastructure needs to be provided on these routes.</li> <li>• Proposes pedestrianisation of streets in village, including most of Main Street.</li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Highlights convenient availability of public transport options, notes successful examples of other pedestrianised streets in Dublin, improvement to local commerce.</li> <li>● Supportive of high density, high-rise development in Dublin. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Notes importance of mix of apartment unit sizes and sufficient availability and variety of amenities.</li> <li>○ Considers large centralised shopping/leisure facilities do not accord with 10-minute model, therefore smaller and more local amenities are needed.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Concerned at potential impacts of climate change, noting need to take action at local level and complementary benefits to many climate mitigation/adaptation measures.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 3 and 4</p>

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0673</a>	Person: Muireann O'Higgins	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Concerned at size/location of Taney Cross KDA as potential site for civic centre. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers this will result in a building of excessive height/mass (noting proposal to deliver landmark building at site).</li> <li>○ Considers building would obscure views of William Dargan Bridge, Dublin mountains and other elements of surrounding area.</li> <li>○ Considers it will reduce permeability to 'Town Edge' lands to north.</li> <li>○ Concerns at overlooking/overshadowing of residential areas.</li> <li>○ Proposes CPO by DLR of Usher House, Exchange building and Waldemar Terrace to allow more space for civic centre building/plaza area.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Supportive generally of proposed framework for redevelopment of OSC site, including new parallel pedestrian street (per OSC8) and improved permeability. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers provision for 4 storey heights on Main Street is excessive due to impacts to ACA, character of street.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Supportive of proposed cycle lane infrastructure, however concerned at trip hazard to pedestrians of existing black cycle lane kerbs.</li> <li>● Supports proposed provision of age-friendly/disabled car parking in town. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Notes need to provide sufficient parking of this type for community/health facilities.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Concerned at health/safety and noise/air pollution impacts of proposed bus gates. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ With regard to Main Street to Churchtown Road Upper bus gate, cites heritage impacts (Library/St. Nahi's) and loss of much-used community space.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2 and 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0674</a>	Person: Muireann O'Higgins	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Concerned at size/location of Taney Cross KDA as potential site for civic centre. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers this will result in a building of excessive height/mass (noting proposal to deliver landmark building at site).</li> <li>○ Considers building would obscure views of William Dargan Bridge, Dublin mountains and other elements of surrounding area.</li> <li>○ Considers it will reduce permeability to 'Town Edge' lands to north.</li> <li>○ Concerns at overlooking/overshadowing of residential areas.</li> <li>○ Proposes CPO by DLR of Usher House, Exchange building and Waldemar Terrace to allow more space for civic centre building/plaza area.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Supportive generally of proposed framework for redevelopment of OSC site, including new parallel pedestrian street (per OSC8) and improved permeability. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers provision for 4 storey heights on Main Street is excessive due to impacts to ACA, character of street.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of proposed cycle lane infrastructure, however concerned at trip hazard to pedestrians of existing black cycle lane kerbs.</li> <li>• Supports proposed provision of age-friendly/disabled car parking in town. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Notes need to provide sufficient parking of this type for community/health facilities.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Concerned at health/safety and noise/air pollution impacts of proposed bus gates. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ With regard to Main Street to Churchtown Road Upper bus gate, cites heritage impacts (Library/St. Nahi's) and loss of much-used community space.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2 and 4</p>

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0675</a></b>	<b>Person: Suzanne Mahon</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to proposed car access restrictions (removal of left filter lanes) at Taney Cross junction, proposed bus gate on Ballinteer Road at Dundrum Cross, retention/expansion of one-way traffic systems. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Highlights high car use/ownership in area, exacerbated traffic congestion, diversions, longer journey times, increased CO2 emissions, emergency services vehicle access.</li> <li>◦ Proposes introducing speed bumps as alternative measure for Taney Cross.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Objects to proposed UCD cycle route via Mulvey Park and Gledswood Park. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Considers roads are sufficiently quiet for cycling, concerned at impact of removal of on-street parking.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4</p>		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0676</a></b>	<b>Person: Stephen Murphy</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of Draft LAP, in particular proposed active travel measures.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 1 and 4</p>		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0677</a></b>	<b>Person: Paul Waldron</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fully supportive of Draft LAP (in particular retention of existing active/travel realm measures), noting reduced pollution/congestion, improved safety for pedestrians/cyclists and climate action benefits.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1 and 4</p>		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0678</a></b>	<b>Person: Darren Israel</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of Draft LAP, in particular proposed civic centre and active travel improvements.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 3 and 4</p>		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0679</a></b>	<b>Person: Nicola Tyrrell-Maher</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned at impacts of height at OSC KDA on streetscape in village, overlooking, lack of visual interest. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Considers heights of 4/5 storeys on Main Street and 11 storeys on Bypass are excessive.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

- Concerned overshadowing/overlooking/impacts to character of village as a result of heights proposed in current SHD application at OSC site.
- Supports provision of dedicated car parking spaces for elderly/mobility impaired/disabled/ill (with reference to Objective T13).
- Concerned that proposed Main Street to Churchtown Road Upper bus gate will cause noise/overlooking impacts.
  - Proposes only allowing single decker/electric buses on this route.
- Supports low rise development with sufficient amenities.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 2, 3, 4 and Other Issues

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0680</a>	<b>Person:</b> Ross Kinsella	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports proposed transport/active travel measures.           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Seeks enhanced pedestrian access/mobility at the St. Columbanus' Road / Dundrum Road junction.</li> <li>○ Seeks improved cycle lane infrastructure on St. Columbanus' Road between Dundrum Road and Windy Arbour Luas.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Highlights error in Draft LAP whereby Gaelscoil na Fuinseoige is referred to as accommodating 90 pupils (whereas it is expected to grow capacity to 360 pupils).</li> <li>• Seeks more defined policy in LAP regarding Notre Dame site and provision of permanent school at site.           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers schools at this site should be included in Safe Routes to School objective.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 3 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0681</a>	<b>Person:</b> Hannah Gibson	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports proposed measures to improve active travel connectivity within area.</li> <li>• Seeks provision of direct and safe cycling route between Dundrum and Dun Laoghaire / Glenageary area.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0682</a>	<b>Person:</b> Mark Little	<b>Organisation:</b> TCD
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fully supportive of Draft LAP, noting improvement to liveability of village.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 1		

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0683</a>	<b>Person:</b> Fionnuala McGowan	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of Draft LAP proposals to improve pedestrian/cyclists safety.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0684</u></b>	<b>Person: Nichola Bardon</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned at negative impacts of proposed restrictions on car access to village on elderly/disabled who are unable to cycle. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Highlights topography of area.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Supportive of proposed provision of dedicated disabled/age-friendly car parking in town.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b>		
Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0685</u></b>	<b>Person: Fiona O'Reilly</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcomes the reinforcement of relevant LECP actions in Section 7.3.1 of Draft LAP. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers village lacks character/functionality/personality due to prevalence of short term leases (as a result of long-term ownership by a single entity) leading to vacancy and poor quality frontage.</li> <li>○ Concerned that retail provision in redeveloped OSC site would preclude existing local retailers due to high rents.</li> <li>○ Considers LAP does not address affordability/sustainability of retail in village.</li> <li>○ Proposes that Draft LAP should support the undertaking of analysis of impacts of Covid-19 (and post Covid-19) on changing work practices and footfall for local retail to inform the forthcoming new LECP.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers additional proposed measures are needed to prevent increase in traffic on minor residential roads as a result of traffic restrictions on main roads.</li> <li>• Supports retention of existing one-way traffic system in village, noting benefits to cyclists/pedestrians. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Notes safety issues with cycle lane kerb/barrier.</li> <li>○ Seeks provision of bus bay adjacent to Holy Cross Church to mitigate traffic disruption.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Proposes that bus gate on Ballinteer Road at Dundrum Cross should operate initially on a trial-run basis and should only operate during peak times.</li> <li>• Considers proposed Main Street to Churchtown Road Upper bus gate will further isolate library from local community. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers it contravenes CDP objectives to protect and enhance public realm.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers bus terminus should be retained at Taney Cross adjacent to Luas stop, however should not detract from public space adjacent to civic centre. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers there is a lack of detail regarding options considered for bus terminus.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Proposes that public car parking should be provided within redeveloped OSC site in order to avoid increased parking pressure on local residential streets.</li> <li>• Considers a communication plan is needed regarding proposed traffic measures, noting prevalence of misinformation in local community.</li> <li>• Supports proposals to increase green space and provide improved internal permeability within OSC site as part of redevelopment. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers heights of 11 storeys along Bypass would be excessive, proposes maximum height restriction of 8 storeys.</li> <li>○ Supportive of potential delivery of pedestrian bridge between Sweetmount Park and OSC site.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Supports provision of civic centre. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Seeks further clarity on definition of landmark building at Taney Cross KDA, including assurance it will be a building of architectural quality/interest, height limits, integration of library facilities/use of Carnegie Library building.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b>		
Chapters 2, 4, 6 and Other Issues		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0686</a></b>	<b>Person: Chris &amp; Norah Halligan</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned at impacts on access to local services/amenities, loss of local business/vibrancy in village, impacts of proposed car access restrictions on Ballinteer Road at Dundrum Cross.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4 and 6		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0687</a></b>	<b>Person: Edel Smith Alvarez</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned that heights of up to 11 storeys on OSC site will negatively impact on character/appearance/visual amenity of village and local views/vistas.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 2		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0688</a></b>	<b>Person: Jim Nugent</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned at excessive heights out of character with village/existing buildings and mix of uses.</li> <li>Concerned at impacts of proposed car access restrictions and retained/expanded one-way traffic systems on activity in village, access for elderly to services/amenities.</li> <li>Considers cycle infrastructure is under-utilised and cycle kerb poses trip hazard.</li> <li>Highlights current issues in village including vacancy, dereliction, loss of trade to DTCSC, poor use mix.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2, 4 and 6		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0689</a></b>	<b>Person: Vincent Wall</b>	<b>Organisation: Doctor</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supportive existing one-way system/public realm improvement measures on Main Street, citing enhanced vibrancy, increased footfall, reduced obstruction of on-street parking, reduced air pollution/carbon emissions.</li> <li>Supports redevelopment of sizeable surface car parks (e.g. OSC site) to providing residential development.</li> <li>Supportive of proposals to enhance public realm/urban greening in village area (as set out under Objectives PR3, OSC7 and OSC8).</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2, 4 and 6		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0690</a></b>	<b>Person: Jessica Dwane</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Considers Draft LAP will negatively impact local community/elderly/businesses/village, noting impacts to people travelling to Dundrum.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0691</a>	Person: Máirín de Brún	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned at proposed car access restrictions at Dundrum Cross/retention of existing one-way traffic system on Main Street, citing large shopping trips, weather.</li> <li>Concerned at public consultation process due to time of year (Summer holidays), lack of consultation with residents associations/local businesses.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4 and Other Issues</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0692</a>	Person: Charles Thomas Ridgway	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Critical of existing one-way traffic system on Main Street, noting lack of consultation prior to implementation, remedial works required, poor design quality of planting/bollards/street furniture, safety issues of cycle lane kerbs.</li> <li>Objects to re-location of existing bus terminus adjacent to Dundrum Luas station.</li> <li>Concerned at impacts of proposed heights of OSC and CMH site developments on historical context of existing buildings. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposes maximum height restriction of 8 storeys at OSC site and strict requirements to provide ground floor active frontage to village.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Seeks further public consultation before finalising of LAP.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2, 4 and Other Issues</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0693</a>	Person: David A Gibson	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supportive of provision of residential development in taller buildings in area, in particular on underutilised surface car parking/office sites (e.g. DLR Dundrum Offices, HSE site to rear of library).</li> <li>Highlights importance of providing down-sizing accommodation, consistent/smooth pedestrian surfaces, car parking for elderly.</li> <li>Seeks widening of Dundrum Road to accommodate increased traffic flow, without removal of private garden space.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 3 and 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0694</a>	Person: Collette Tully	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submits concern regarding height of proposed development at the Civic Centre and apartments.</li> <li>Is concerned about proposed bus gates through residential areas.</li> <li>Objects to road closures which will cause more congestion.</li> <li>Would like the village feel of Dundrum to be maintained and improved upon.</li> <li>Requests public representatives and DLR to listen and action the requests of local residents and businesses.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2,4 and Other Issues.</p>		



<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0695</a></b>	<b>Person: Mary &amp; Olive Whooley</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expresses that Dundrum is a village not a city and should remain so.</li> <li>Submits that the changes proposed are not suitable for Dundrum and it should be left as it is for the people who maintained it as a village.</li> <li>Asks that DLR not 'destroy' the village.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 2		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0696</a></b>	<b>Person: Edward &amp; Eania Tighe</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission objects to the proposed LAP and requests that it not be enacted.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 1		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0697</a></b>	<b>Person: John J. Martin</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submits that Ballinteer Road should not be closed to car traffic.</li> <li>Submits that Lwr. Kilmacud Road should not be closed to traffic.</li> <li>Objects to any bus depot or bus stop at the library.</li> <li>Considers that Don Marmion House should not be closed until a suitable alternative location for its services has been found.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2 and 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0698</a></b>	<b>Person: Dr Mary Forrest</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objects to removal of slip lanes at Taney Cross. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Notes increased traffic congestion.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Objects to traffic calming/public realm proposals on Dundrum Road, Ballinteer Road and Main Street noting high through traffic, delivery access, increased traffic congestion.</li> <li>Objects to Dundrum Library bus gate, noting bus parking at terminus and movement via Waldemar Terrace already works well.</li> <li>Notes particular impacts to elderly/disabled/mobility impaired and how they will access goods and services in the village centre.</li> <li>Considers impacts on home deliveries and drop-off/collection impacts on schools by these changes.</li> <li>Appreciates recent changes to Main Street, Waldermar Terrace and the Library precinct by the new planting and public realm improvement (benches etc.)</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2 and 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0699</a></b>	<b>Person: Angela Byrne</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objects to the proposed plan and is critical of how DLR has prepared the plan.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 1		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0700</a></b>	<b>Person: Maureen Flynn</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to traffic calming/public realm proposals on Dundrum Road, Ballinteer Road and Main Street (at OSC) noting high through traffic, delivery access, increased traffic congestion.</li> <li>• Considers these changes will cause greater congestion, wastage of fuel and pollution.</li> <li>• Submits that Main Street should be returned to a two-way system.</li> <li>• Is critical of cycleway dividers on Main Street.</li> <li>• Submits that heights of buildings must be reduced.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0701</a></b>	<b>Person: Ann O'Dea</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strongly objects to draft LAP proposals regarding traffic-calming measures in the village centre.</li> <li>• Cites increased congestion since one-way system was implemented.</li> <li>• Cycle lane dividers are a health hazard.</li> <li>• Considers the plan to ignore needs of older residents.</li> <li>• Thinks that the high-rise development planned for the OSC is out of character for the village.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2, 3 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0702</a></b>	<b>Person: Dorothy Bergin</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to bus gate on Sweetmount Avenue</li> <li>• Objects to any changes which may result in restrictions on access to the village centre for shopping, medical appointments, banking etc.</li> <li>• Objects to buildings higher than 2/3 storeys in the village and retention of village character.</li> <li>• Requests that Main Street be reinstated as a two-way thoroughfare.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0703</a></b>	<b>Person: Eileen Lynch</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submits that Dundrum has been 'messed up' enough and no further damage should be done.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 1		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0704</a></b>	<b>Person: Pauline Costello</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to any changes which may result in restrictions on access to the village centre for shopping, medical appointments, banking etc.</li> <li>• Objects to any removal of car-parking spaces.</li> <li>• Objects to alteration of bus routes.</li> <li>• Considers that the proposed civic centre will be too high and conflicts with DLR's rejection of the Hammerson design at the OSC.</li> <li>• Objects to the proposed pedestrian bridge to Sweetmount Park.</li> <li>• Requests that Main Street be reinstated as a two-way thoroughfare.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0705</a></b>	<b>Person: Carol Hayes</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to the proposed pedestrian bridge to Sweetmount Park.</li> <li>• Objects to any proposed route changes which will impact on traffic flow or village centre access.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0706</a></b>	<b>Person: David Kent</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to any changes which may result in further restrictions on access to the village centre for shopping, medical appointments, banking etc.</li> <li>• Questions if the deterioration of the OSC can be halted by the proposed LAP changes or will be made worse.</li> <li>• Requests that DLR reconsider the proposed LAP regarding the needs of the older population of Dundrum.</li> <li>• Hopes that Dundrum will not become overpopulated by changes of the LAP.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0707</a></b>	<b>Person: Helen Phillips</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to any changes which may result in further restrictions on access to the village centre for shopping, medical appointments, banking etc.</li> <li>• Objects to current one-way system on Main Street.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0708</a></b>	<b>Person: Michael &amp; Pauline O'Sullivan</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to high-rise development in the village.</li> <li>• Objects to traffic-calming measures as they cause access restrictions which negatively impacts on emergency services and the older/less able members of the community.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0709</a></b>	<b>Person: Fionnuala Smyth</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submits there is no need for a LAP.</li> <li>• Considers the draft LAP to be anti-people and anti-culture.</li> <li>• Objects to any proposed changes to traffic routes, removal of slip roads etc.</li> <li>• Is concerned that any proposed traffic-calming measures will only increase congestion while restricting local residents' access to the village.</li> <li>• Submits that access restrictions will negatively impact on local businesses and life in the village.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 4 and 6		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0710</a></b>	<b>Person: Christina Robertson</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to the bus gate proposed for the library and any traffic route changes which will cause further congestion on Sweetmount Avenue and Churchtown Road.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0711</a></b>	<b>Person: Alo Brady</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to any proposed traffic-calming measures as they cause access restrictions which negatively impacts on emergency services and the older/less able members of the community.</li> <li>• Submits that current route changes are causing increased congestion as it is.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0712</a></b>	<b>Person: John Mullins</b>	<b>Organisation: Don Marmion Society</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outlines the services and social provisions supplied by the Don Marmion Society and highlights the vital nature of this social service to the older members of the Dundrum community.</li> <li>• Requests that DLR does not close or change the location of Don Marmion hall.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0713</a></b>	<b>Person: Joan Winston</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to any proposed traffic-calming measures as they cause access restrictions which negatively impacts on the older/less able members of the community.</li> <li>• Wants to see more life being brought into the village.</li> <li>• Considers that the LAP will kill village life.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0714</a></b>	<b>Person: Bridget McGee</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to the proposed pedestrian bridge to Sweetmount Park.</li> <li>• Objects to any proposed route changes which will impact on traffic flow or village centre access.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0715</a></b>	<b>Person: Tom Taber</b>	<b>Organisation: Resident</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter has concerns regarding the bus depot opposite the library or routing up the narrow road beside the graveyard.</li> <li>• Objects to any high-rise apartment development.</li> <li>• Suggests taking a portion of land from the OSC site for a bus depot.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 3 and 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0716</a></b>	<b>Person: Colette Grant</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submits that the bus gate on Sweetmount is unrealistic.</li> <li>• Requests that Main Street be returned to a two-way system.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0717</a></b>	<b>Person: Betty Gattule</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned at impacts of Draft LAP, in particular to elderly/disabled/mobility impaired. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Cites impacts to vibrancy of village/community, inability to walk to access services/amenities in village, loss of Dom Marmion Hall.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2, 4 and 6		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0718</a></b>	<b>Person: Barbara Dempsey</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to proposed bus gate/car access restrictions on Ballinteer Road/Kilmacud Road Upper at Dundrum Cross. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Notes detours, increase in journey times, difficulty accessing village/services/amenities (noting some businesses closed on weekends when there is more time to cycle).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Objects to removal of slip lanes at Taney Cross. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Notes increased traffic congestion.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Objects to traffic calming/public realm proposals on Dundrum Road, noting high through traffic, delivery access, increased traffic congestion (consequent loss of jobs in DTCSC).</li> <li>• Objects to Main Street to Churchtown Road Upper bus gate, noting impacts to pedestrians/cyclists (including school children), narrowness of road, air pollution.</li> <li>• Notes particular impacts to elderly/disabled/mobility impaired.</li> <li>• Highlights Census 2016 data used – considers this is outdated, elderly underrepresented.</li> <li>• Concerned at loss of car parking (OSC and Dom Marmion sites) due to redevelopment.</li> <li>• Objects to pedestrian/cycle bridge from Sweetmount Park to OSC site.</li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Unnecessary, convenient alternative pedestrian routes, waste of money.</li> <li>• Issues with cycling in area due to topography, underutilisation of cycle lanes in village, hazards due to cars existing driveways on Sydenham Road.</li> <li>• Concerned at loss of community facilities for elderly with removal of Dom Marmion Centre.</li> <li>• Requests reinstatement of two-way traffic system on Main Street, noting access/local business benefits.</li> <li>• The LAP will have a negative impact on local businesses located along the Main Street with regards to various proposals for:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Windy Arbour (section 4.6.3.1), the Dundrum Bypass to Wyckham Way along Sandyford Road as far as Main Street (section 4.6.1.1), southbound access from Dundrum bypass to Main Street (section 4.6.1.1) Taney Cross (section 4.6.1.2) and Sandyford Road (Northern part) as far as Main Street (section 4.6.1.3).</li> <li>o Believes there will be an increase in severe congestion and unnecessary delays as a result of Bus priority and the elimination of all left-turn lanes passing through Taney Cross (section 4.6.1.2).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Thinks there is no need for the plan.</li> <li>• States plan is very anti-people and only concerned with walking and cycling.</li> <li>• Thinks the plan takes no account that most people will be unable to cycle on steep slopes in and around Dundrum.</li> <li>• Believes the plan will force people to do business elsewhere which will result in local business closures and taking the life out of the village.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4 and 6</p>

<p><b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0719</a></p>	<p><b>Person:</b> Gerry &amp; Gina Hassett</p>	<p><b>Organisation:</b></p>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned at negative impacts of proposed active travel / public realm improvements works / car access restrictions on Sydenham Villas.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Cites difficulty for parents dropping off / accessing Taney NS, increased traffic congestion on Sydenham Road / Taney Road / Birches Lane / Kilmacud Road Upper / Main Street in mornings, difficulties for residents exiting Sydenham Villas.</li> <li>o States that alternative convenient cycle links between village and Overend Avenue are available, noting topography as challenge with proposed cycle route.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4</p>		

<p><b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0720</a></p>	<p><b>Person:</b> Ken Mooney</p>	<p><b>Organisation:</b></p>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers Draft LAP measures aim to accommodate additional population at the expense of local residents.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Cites inadequate references to public realm/civic space, safety issues of cycle lane kerb on Main Street, traffic impacts of one-way traffic system on Main Street (congestion, emergency vehicle/public transport access).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Identifies Malahide as good example of effective revitalisation of town by Local Authority.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4 and 6</p>		

<p><b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0721</a></p>	<p><b>Person:</b> Sally Cooke</p>	<p><b>Organisation:</b></p>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns at impacts of additional bus traffic at Taney Cross junction.</li> <li>• Queries provision of landmark building at Taney Cross KDA, noting presence of Usher House.</li> </ul>		

- Concerned at increased journey times, pollution, particular impacts to elderly/mobility impaired.
- Concerned at loss of Dom Marmion Hall, noting long-standing utility to local community.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 2 and 4

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0722</a>	Person: Randal Robertson	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Critical of existing one-way traffic system on Main Street, citing decline in activity in village, difficulty parking in village and accessing local services/amenities, difficulties for mobility impaired.</li> <li>• Critical of proposed Main Street to Churchtown Road Upper bus gate, citing traffic congestion on Sweetmount Avenue, skeptical of envisioned frequency of bus service.</li> <li>• Critical of proposed Ballinkeer Road bus gate, citing increased traffic congestion.</li> <li>• Concerned at future of existing businesses at OSC site following redevelopment.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4 and 6		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0723</a>	Person: Helen Finn	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned at impacts to village/local residents of proposed restrictions to car access on Ballinkeer Road at Dundrum Cross (in particular elderly/disabled), citing difficulties accessing local services/amenities, necessary lengthy detours, increased air pollution, emergency services access.</li> <li>• Concerns at height of proposed apartments.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 3 and 4		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0724</a>	Person: Moya & Paul Williams	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned at impacts of restrictions to car access on Ballinkeer Road at Dundrum Cross on access to local businesses, loss of car parking due to redevelopment of Dom Mamion/OSC sites. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Cites particular impact to elderly/disabled, increased journey times, increased emissions, emergency services access, school drop-off/access difficulties, exacerbated traffic congestion, topography.</li> <li>o Seeks reinstatement of two-way traffic system.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Objects to 11 storey heights for civic centre building, 16 storey heights at OSC site.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2 and 4		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0725</a>	Person: Denis Rice	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers heights of 11 storeys on OSC site would be excessive. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Proposes maximum heights of 4/6 storeys.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Welcomes provision of arterial pedestrian street within OSC site.</li> <li>• Supports widening of Main Street adjacent to OSC site to improve openness/circulation.</li> <li>• Skeptical of design quality/utility of proposed public open space within OSC site. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Proposes provision of public park to rear of Holy Cross Church</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Critical of provision of civic centre building at Taney Cross KDA, stating area is generally unattractive. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Proposes delivery of building within OSC site adjacent to Bypass.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Seeks delivery of hotel within OSC site.</li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcomes proposed pedestrian/cyclist infrastructure improvements, noting unsustainability of car reliance. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Highlights need for speed limits and ensuring pedestrian/cyclist priority.</li> <li>o Seeks improved cycle links with Blackrock and Dún Laoghaire.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Concerned at increased pressure on public transport capacity. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Seeks improved public transport links from Dundrum to St. Vincent's Hospital.</li> <li>o Suggests providing small buses to serve local area.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2 and 4</p>

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0726</a>	Person: Sheila Cosgrave	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questions need for civic centre in Dundrum.</li> <li>• Considers heights/densities proposed for buildings in village are excessive.</li> <li>• Concerned at impacts of proposed restrictions to car access on Ballinteer Road on access to services/amenities for local residents, noting particular impacts to elderly, increased journey times, exacerbated traffic congestion.</li> <li>• Critical of one-way traffic system on Main Street, noting underutilisation of cycle infrastructure, trip hazard due to cycle lane kerb.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2 and 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0727</a>	Person: Margaret Woods	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned at impacts of proposed removal of left-hand filter lanes at Taney Cross junction on village, citing increased traffic congestion, particular impacts to elderly, negative impacts to businesses.</li> <li>• Queries need for civic centre in Dundrum, considering existing community facility provision is sufficient.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2 and 4</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0728</a>	Person: Liam Coughlan	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <p>Submission includes a cover letter and report. Cover letter raises concerns as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plan closes off access to Dundrum except via Sandyford Road and Upper Kilmacud Road.</li> <li>• Plan in present form makes it difficult to access Dundrum.</li> <li>• Plan displays little understanding of importance of regional roads.</li> <li>• Plan ignores seep topography.</li> </ul> <p>Submission includes a comprehensive report on the draft LAP. Details of the Draft Plan are summarized and observations are made as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transport and Movement policies and objectives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Submission considers that it is unclear how ABTA measures will meet the aims of the ABTA “to reduce congestion, create more livable cities and reduce GHG emissions” when certain areas such as Taney cross will experience severe congestion</li> <li>o Submission considers that the overarching policies of the LAP are focused on improving walking and cycling</li> <li>o Submission points out that Policy DLAP 25 to promote the ten minute neighbourhood concept has been informed by the ABTA work which is based on a 15 minute catchment which is misleading and undermines the LAP</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		



- Considers that no analysis has been undertaken to indicate that the proposed transport measures will attract more people to Dundrum particularly when the implementation of the plan will add to congestion
- Considers that cycling objectives fail to take into account steep topography (section 4.4.2.1)
- Pre-draft Consultation:
  - Submission is critical of detail contained in the draft plan on the predraft consultation process and considers that it does not form a reliable basis for drawing up a draft LAP. Considers that no mention is made of when it occurred, number of submission received on selected topics.
- Report then sets out a summary of the Transport and Movement section of the draft LAP
- A series of further observations are set out as follows;
  - Submission considers that the proposals for Main Street ignore the requirements for emergency services to have a route to attend to emergencies
  - Submission considers that the proposed alternations to Taney Cross fails to recognize the importance of the cross roads. Furthermore there is nothing in the plan to indicate that the measures proposed will not cause more frequent breakdowns in traffic flows
  - The proposed works to Sandyford Road ignores that fact that this will be the sole access route to Main Street
  - New Civic Hub will be located in cul de sac surrounded on 3 sides by Regional roads and the Luas
  - Creation of bus gate on Ballinteer Road closes off access to/from Dundrum for those to east and south east of the town
- Conclusions of the report are set out as follows;
  - Draft LAP fails to recognize the important role which vehicles play in transporting people and goods.
  - Use of 15 minute catchment in ABTA to support ten minute neighborhood is disingenuous
  - Plan includes an excessive reliance on expanding footpaths and cycleways at the expense of motorized vehicles
  - Submission considers that only a small percentage of the population are physically able to cycle and vast majority of the population need their cars to access shops, churches, banks and other community facilities
  - Plan is discriminatory against the elderly.
  - Need a more comprehensive metro/LUAS for plan to be realistic and to support the ten minute neighbourhood concept.
  - Present or future bus service will not meet ten minute neighborhood concept
  - LAP disregards importance of regional roads
  - It is inappropriate that the LAP reduces the status of R117 from a regional road to a local road
  - LAP disregards the strategic importance of the R112/R117 intersection
  - LAP disregards the purpose of the Dundrum Bypass which is to facilitate strategic traffic yet a bus gate and 2 new pedestrian cycle crossings are proposed.
- Recommendations are proposed as follows:
  - Draft LAP should not be progressed until a full review of chapter 4 has been carried out. This should include an origin and destination study, an economic viability assessment for affected businesses and a rigorous CBA
  - Submission proposes two options to be explored:
    - Option A - Restore 2 way traffic on Main Street while including some improvement a Dundrum Cross such as a requirement that all cars wishing to enter Kilmacud Road Upper from Main street of Sandyford Road having to turn west onto Ballinteer road and proceed round the roundabout at Barton Road East Junction and then proceed back towards Upper Kilmacud Road. Car parking spaces on the east side of Main Street in the vicinity of the dental clinic could also be removed to make it safer for cyclists and buses.
    - Option B - One way traffic on Main street reconfigured so that it runs southbound with consequential change to Kilmacud Road Upper so that one way system runs eastbound and

<p>Sydenham runs northbound. This option also includes removal of bus gate at Ballinteer Road operation of Taney Cross. It is contended that this option would work better for bus traffic.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The report also includes an Appendix which outlines various proposals from the draft LAP.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4</p>

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0729</a>	Person: Eamon Regan	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In relation to the 4 town centre 'zones' as identified in Chapter 2 of the Draft LAP, submitter proposed that the 'Community Zone' should be re-located from the Taney Cross KDA area to a new location further south within the OSC site. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Considers Taney Cross area is unsuitable for community zone/civic centre due to proximity to busily trafficked junction, need to accommodate uses/functions in high density/high rise building due limited site area.</li> <li>Considers proposed new location would allow for provision of quality adjacent public plaza accommodating variety of public uses.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Proposes that the development opportunity sites in the village should be redeveloped on a low rise, high density basis. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Seeks in particular that buildings fronting Main Street are similar in character and scale to existing, traditional buildings on the street (i.e maximum height of 3 storeys).</li> <li>Proposes that these buildings would consist of commercial at ground floor with residential over (i.e 'Living Over The Shop').</li> <li>Proposes maximum height limits of c. 6/7 storeys along Bypass.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Seeks removal of car traffic and increased pedestrianisation on streets within town centre, in particular around Taney Cross KDA. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposes creation of a central pedestrianised street within OSC site development accommodating a variety of active uses.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Highlights importance of ensuring that design of proposed public realm areas achieves sufficient character / identity of spaces, and that spaces aren't overly large. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposes provision of 2 civic spaces in village: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One accommodating markets.</li> <li>One accommodating an ice-skating rink and space for general use, located to the rear of Holy Cross Church.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Proposes new plaza / linear park above Bypass, integrating OSC site with Sweetmount Park.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Proposes public parking and service yard at basement level of OSC site (i.e over 2 levels beneath level of pedestrianised streets / Main Street / new linear park).</li> <li>Proposes a general mix of residential/commercial/retail/hotel uses across redevelopment of village.</li> <li>Proposes that redevelopment of village would be sustainable/carbon neutral, incorporating roof gardens, renewable energy technology and SUDS measures.</li> <li>Submission includes plans/sections/artistic drawings illustrating the ideas set out.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 2</p>		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0730</a>	Person: Anne Brennan	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned at traffic hazards in Parkvale estate and at entrance to Ardglass estate on Sandyford Road due to traffic congestion. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Considers congestion has been exacerbated by significant local school development in recent years (Ballinteer Educate Together).</li> <li>Considers situation negatively impacts mobility by car for local residents seeking to exit their houses.</li> <li>Concerned at emergency services vehicle access.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

- States there is no demand for LAP.
- Seeks expanded Luas network.
- Notes safety issues due to cycle lanes, difficulty cycling due to topography.
- Considers LAP will lead to loss of business.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapter 4

DLR Submission No: <u>B0731</u>	Person: Úna Lawlor	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers provision of 3 and 4 storey buildings on Main Street would conflict with Draft LAP policies to respect existing character/scale/design of ACAs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers Holy Cross Church (not including spire) should serve as maximum height guide for development on southern end of Main Street.</li> <li>○ Concerned that a 2-4 storey building on Main Street adjacent to church (as illustrated indicatively in Figure 2.10 of Draft LAP) would be excessive.</li> <li>○ Considers 3 storey height restriction for buildings to rear of church may be acceptable subject to assessment.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers heights of 8 storeys would be unacceptable anywhere on OSC site due to flooding issues.</li> <li>• Disputes Draft LAP statement that the Bypass causes severance to communities to west. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Highlights convenient existing pedestrian access routes from Sweetmount Park to Main Street.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Disputes requirement to improve pedestrian connectivity/permeability in area west of Bypass, stating that footpaths are sufficiently wide and that there are adequate cycle facilities. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers proposed pedestrian/cycle link across Bypass is therefore unnecessary, noting proposed public park in OSC site for use of future residents.</li> <li>○ Notes issues of litter/noise/anti-social behaviour when previous temporary bridge was in place during Bypass construction.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Notes safety issue of cycle lane kerbs on Main Street.</li> <li>• Disputes Draft LAP statement that there is poor connection between OSC site and Dundrum Luas stop.</li> <li>• Seeks provision of public parking (in particular for elderly/disabled/parents of small children) and EV charging facilities within redeveloped OSC and Dom Marmion site.</li> <li>• Critical of 10-minute neighbourhood concept, citing unfeasibility for parents with young children/mobility impaired/elderly to cycle/walk/rely on public transport. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers pedestrianisation is not inclusive for these categories of people.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers population figures informing analysis of LAP lands are inaccurate due to reliance on Census 2016 data (highlighting that this data precedes development of Fernbank).</li> <li>• Considers that redevelopment of Taney Cross KDA / landmark building at this site must adequately preserve view of William Dargan Bridge and view of mountains from bridge.</li> <li>• Seeks provision of public ROW to access Dundrum Castle.</li> <li>• Highlights absence of Irish language in Draft LAP, noting its status as official language and need to include Irish speakers.</li> <li>• Seeks space for children, facilities for Irish language speakers, use of both Irish/English language in proposed cultural space in civic centre.</li> <li>• Seeks Irish language street names / block names / shop signage at redeveloped OSC site / Main Street.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4 and 8</p>		

DLR Submission No: <u>B0732</u>	Person: David Leonard	Organisation:
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to proposed restrictions on car access at Dundrum Cross, noting difficulty for local residents accessing village, exacerbated traffic congestion, competing with traffic accessing DTCSC, negative impacts to local businesses (reduced footfall), particular impacts to elderly. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Highlights impediments to use of cycle infrastructure including topography, demographics.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to proposed Main Street to Churchtown Road Upper bus gate, citing quiet residential streets impacted by buses, increased severance of Library.</li> </ul>
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0733</a>	<b>Person:</b> William Byrne	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that one-way traffic system on Dundrum Road (as considered under ABTA options) would result in exacerbated traffic congestion on Churchtown Road Upper / Churchtown Road Lower.</li> <li>• Concerned that removal of car traffic from Main Street (as considered under ABTA options) would impact on access to local services/amenities, result in loss of local business, increase in anti-social behaviour.</li> <li>• Concerned at impact of proposed amendments to Taney Cross junction, citing its use by traffic accessing M50.</li> <li>• Concerned at impact of overdevelopment on character of Dundrum.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 3 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0734</a>	<b>Person:</b> Philomena Murray	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned at impacts of proposed measures on access to village, in particular for elderly, citing traffic congestion.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0735</a>	<b>Person:</b> Marie Pierce	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned at impacts of proposed measures on access to village, in particular for elderly, citing traffic congestion.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0736</a>	<b>Person:</b> Anna Kirk	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned impacts to local community/village, lack of infrastructure to accommodate future apartment developments, excessive height, incongruity with character of established local area.</li> <li>• Concerned at impacts of proposed car access restrictions to village, noting increased journey times, diversions, lack of car parking.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 3 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0737</a></b>	<b>Person: Frank Kirk</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seeks retention of existing car access arrangements on Ballinteer Road at Dundrum Cross.</li> <li>• Concerned at overpopulation/overcrowding/traffic issues as a result of future developments.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 3 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0738</a></b>	<b>Person: Patrick &amp; Caroline Gray</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned at proposed expanded one-way system on Kilmacud Road Upper, citing impacts on access for local residents, access to services/amenities in village, access to local schools, emergency services vehicles access, access to M50, increased traffic pressure on Main Street, increased pollution, increased journey distances/times. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Queries need for proposed measure, stating road is not particularly busy with traffic, has adequate pedestrian/cycle facilities, is underutilised by cyclists.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers further consultation is needed with local residents impacted by proposed measures, as outlined in submission.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4 and Other Issues		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0739</a></b>	<b>Person: Bernadette Whiteley</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Queries need for additional cycle infrastructure in village, noting cycle lanes on Bypass.</li> <li>• Concerned at impact of proposed car access restrictions on access to Holy Cross Church/car park, emergency services access, bus access.</li> <li>• Compares development frameworks unfavourably to Ballymun Tower Blocks.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0740</a></b>	<b>Person: Patricia Geaney</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers high rise / high density apartment developments in the village would negatively impact character of area, be unattractive, be excessive, increase pressure on emergency services (compounded by proposed car access restrictions).</li> <li>• Compares development frameworks unfavourably to Ballymun Tower Blocks.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0741</a></b>	<b>Person: Anne &amp; Barry Denton</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned at impact of proposed measures on access to local services/amenities, in particular for elderly.</li> <li>• Critical of proposed cycle infrastructure/traffic restrictions proposed on Sydenham Road, citing narrowness of road, difficulties for residents existing properties across cycle lanes, safety issues, lack of delivery/service/taxi/emergency services vehicle access, particular impacts to elderly. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Proposes Stoney Road as alternative option for accommodating cycle infrastructure, noting it is wider, could retain two-way traffic layout.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers proposed transport/movement measures in village would negatively impact local businesses.</li> </ul>
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0742</a></b>	<b>Person: Seán, Aisling &amp; Barbara Berigan</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned at impact of proposed measures on access to local services/amenities, in particular for elderly.</li> <li>• Critical of proposed cycle infrastructure/traffic restrictions proposed on Sydenham Road, citing narrowness of road, difficulties for residents existing properties across cycle lanes, safety issues, lack of delivery/service/taxi/emergency services vehicle access, particular impacts to elderly. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Proposes Stoney Road as alternative option for accommodating cycle infrastructure, noting it is wider, could retain two-way traffic layout.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Considers proposed transport/movement measures in village would negatively impact local businesses.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0743</a></b>	<b>Person: Christine Cosgrave</b>	<b>Organisation: Ludford Area Residents Association</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned at impacts of proposed measures on local residents and businesses.</li> <li>• Concerned about need to rely on buses, cost of EVs.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0744</a></b>	<b>Person: Cyril Ryan</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to proposed Main Street to Churchtown Road Upper bus gate, citing increase in bus/taxi traffic and safety issues.</li> <li>• Seeks maximum height restrictions of 3 to 4 storeys.</li> <li>• Seeks reinstatement of two-way traffic system on Main Street.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 3 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0745</a></b>	<b>Person: Ena Kelly</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to proposed Main Street to Churchtown Road Upper bus gate, citing safety issues, loss of recreational space in front of Library.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0746</a></b>	<b>Person: Mary Treacy</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to proposed Main Street to Churchtown Road Upper bus gate, citing safety issues, loss of recreational space in front of Library, increase in bus/taxi traffic and increased traffic pressure on Churchtown Road Lower.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0747</a></b>	<b>Person: Astrid Coleman</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requests reinstatement of two-way traffic systems on Kilmacud Road Upper and Main Street, noting few benefits of existing one-way system, impeded access.</li> <li>• Seeks maximum height restrictions of 4 storeys.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 3 and 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0748</a></b>	<b>Person: Olga Lopalo</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to proposed Main Street to Churchtown Road Upper bus gate, citing safety issues, loss of recreational space in front of Library, increase in bus/taxi traffic and increased traffic pressure.</li> <li>• Seeks maximum height restrictions of 2 to 3 storeys.</li> <li>• Seeks reinstatement of two-way traffic system on Main Street.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 3 and 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0749</a></b>	<b>Person: Mary Nodlaig Noonan</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Compares development framework for village unfavourably to Ballymun Tower Blocks. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Considers 11 storey heights in village would be excessive.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 2		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0750</a></b>	<b>Person: Mary P Nicholson</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seeks maximum height restrictions of 4 storeys.</li> <li>• Seeks reinstatement of two-way traffic system on Main Street, retention of existing car access on roads into village.</li> <li>• Seeks retention of existing library in situ.</li> <li>• Objects to proposed Main Street to Churchtown Road Upper bus gate.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0751</a></b>	<b>Person: Adrienne Bourke</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to proposed Main Street to Churchtown Road Upper bus gate, stating separate legal/planning process required to implement.</li> <li>• Considers 11 storey heights in village would be excessive, seeks maximum height restrictions of 2 storeys.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0752</a></b>	<b>Person: Seán &amp; June Ryan</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to proposed restrictions on car access to southern end of Main Street from Bypass, noting impacts to local residents accessing local services/amenities, particular impacts to elderly.</li> <li>• Concerned at impacts to elderly of loss of Dom Marmion Centre.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0753</a></b>	<b>Person: Catriona Collum</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to proposed public realm improvements to Dundrum Road and removal of left filter lanes at Taney Cross junction, citing increased traffic congestion.</li> <li>• Considers there is inadequate provision of substantial green space in Draft LAP in light of projected significant population increase.</li> <li>• Queries need for further cycle infrastructure, noting existing cycle lanes on Bypass.</li> <li>• Concerned at impacts of proposed measures on access to services/amenities on Main Street.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4 and 5		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0754</a></b>	<b>Person: Jackie Kenny</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to proposed car access restrictions in village.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0755</a></b>	<b>Person: JL Grant</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter objects to high-rise development in the village.</li> <li>• Objects to proposed bus gate at Sweetmount Avenue.</li> <li>• Objects to any new opening from Sweetmount Avenue via the by-pass citing lack of by-law or planning approval for same.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 3 and 4		



DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0756</a>	Person: Michelle Grant	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submits that Main Street should be returned to a one-way system.</li> <li>• Considers cycle lanes to be dangerous and says many residents have fallen over the dividers.</li> <li>• Submits that any bus lane at the end of Sweetmount will not work and would be dangerous.</li> <li>• Objects to any new opening from Sweetmount Avenue via the by-pass citing lack of by-law or planning approval for same.</li> <li>• Objects to route changes proposed by the plan saying these ideas are anti-people, anti-elderly and will negatively impact on residents and businesses in the village.</li> <li>• Submitter objects to high-rise development in the village.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2 and 4		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0757</a>	Person: Mairead McEntee	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questions how the LAP will address traffic overflow spilling over from the adjusted roads into residential streets.</li> <li>• Submits that the plan will cause increased traffic congestion and impact on human health due to the associated pollution levels.</li> <li>• Objects to route changes proposed by the plan saying they will negatively impact on residents and businesses in the village.</li> <li>• Questions how the plan proposes to increase pedestrian safety when so many cars and cyclists run red lights at the Sandyford Road crosswalk.</li> <li>• Asks can cameras be installed to monitor those breaking the law?</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0758</a>	Person: Edwin Doyle	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers the draft plan to be anti-people and anti-elderly.</li> <li>• Submits that the cycle lane dividers are dangerous and should be removed. Notice should be taken that these dividers would be invisible after a snowfall and pose a danger to pedestrians.</li> <li>• Requests that Ballinteer Road should remain open to traffic.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0759</a>	Person: Dr Ciarán Bent	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requests that vehicular access from Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East into the village be retained.</li> <li>• Suggests that Main Street be returned to its original two-lane state as pre-covid citing support for local businesses and access for all residents including older/less able residents.</li> <li>• Objects to turning restrictions/changes to bus routes stating these have worked in the past and could continue to work now.</li> <li>• Proposal does not tie in with the stated aim of the LAP “to improve the public realm and support the vibrancy and liveability of the area”.</li> <li>• Considers that the one-way system is causing non-viability of village business.</li> <li>• Requests council to consider revoking one way system as there are already cycle lanes on bypass.</li> <li>• Requests an independent traffic survey of Dundrum.</li> <li>• Requests a Dundrum-specific economic survey.</li> </ul>		

- Requests a proper consultation with relevant DLR planners, residents' associations and business owners/rate payers.
- Requests an analysis of the effectiveness of the one-way system.
- Submission included a large volume of names objecting to the LAP.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 4, 6, 7 and Other Issues

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0760</a></b>	<b>Person: Sean Mason</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4.6.1.1 Submission objects to closing of Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0761</a></b>	<b>Person: John Lennon</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<p>Submitter as a long time Dundrum resident expresses their sadness at present condition of the Main Street</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission provides detailed commentary on history of Dundrum including the inception of the main village in 1781, the various leaseholders in place, the conditions in relation to building in red brick that were enforced on purchasers and resulted in the existing character.</li> <li>• Considers buildings built in the front gardens could be removed.</li> <li>• Albion House which is the oldest house in the village could be restored and should be in the ACA.</li> <li>• Submission supports policies DLAP 49, 50 and 51</li> <li>• Disagrees with the idea that a historic building should be excluded from and ACA because something modern which could be removed was placed in front of it (8.5.3)</li> <li>• 8.5.2. should be amended as there is only one window in S Nahi's</li> <li>• Submission raises issues with table 1.2 – considers weakness which states “bypass severs town” incorrect as town is all to the east of the bypass</li> <li>• Narrowness of Dundrum Road is raised as a weakness in the plan yet submission considers that proposals for traffic calming will make this worse</li> <li>• Submission considers that the OSC site should not be considered as one KDA as what is suitable on bypass is not suitable on Main Street.</li> <li>• Submission considers it not appropriate that in section 2.9.2.1 150 year old buildings are in same KDA as OSC as architecturally they are different.</li> <li>• In relation to section 2.4.1 there is no parade of shops on Main Street lower just 2 pizza establishments north of Victoria Terrace</li> <li>• In section 2.7 the former EIR building is still an active telephone exchange for Dundrum. This should be included in CCC site.</li> <li>• Submitter considers that trees would be inappropriate in front of Glenville Terrace</li> <li>• Shops (Frank Mulveys) in front of the first terrace built in Dundrum could be removed and gardens restored</li> <li>• 2.9.2.1 – There is no vehicular connectivity to the Main Street at Glenville Terrace</li> <li>• Figure 2.9 includes the garden/outdoor classroom for Holy Cross School</li> <li>• 3.2.3.1 – Holy Cross Parish Centre can be used by all the community not just parishioners. Many non-parish groups use it. Dom Marmion Hall is non-denominational.</li> <li>• Concern that new CCC building would negatively impact on William Dargan bridge</li> <li>• Bridge should not be used as a guide for height.</li> <li>• Submission considers that bus gate on Ballinteer Road will increase emissions</li> <li>• Submission considers that removal of left turn filers at Taney Cross will increase emissions</li> <li>• Submitter who is a regular pedestrian user of both locations can see no benefits from either proposal</li> </ul>		

- Slang River walk is a major asset from Ballinteer Road to Sandyford Road. Submission considers that vegetation along Slang river walkway between Ballinteer Road and Sandyford Road should be reduced on the pedestrian side.
- Proposed wetland park is within an archaeologically sensitive area and archaeology should be assessed before any wetlands park progresses.
- Submitter states that they do not understand what is a NC. They live in one and consider that it does not serve their needs as they do not play golf..
- Submission considers that the present 38KV and 10KV network will probably no be able for the CMH development. Considers that a 11KV cable from the station beside Dom Marmion bridge on the bypass may be required.
- Comments that road will probably have to be dug up again.
- The 1837 – 42 OS map in section 8.5 does not show the railway as claimed. It only came to town 10 year later.
- Manor Hill laundry was the name of the laundry that succeeded the iron works in 1863.
- Submitter is hopeful that Dundrum can be restored to its original state under the guidance of the LAP.

**Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):**  
Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4, 8 and Other Issues.

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0762</a>	Person: Andy Neary	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Raises issue of access with regards to proposed route changes for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East Areas: (Section 4.6.1.1)</li> <li>○ Taney Cross (Junction of Dundrum Rd / Taney Rd and Churchtown Rd Upper (Section 4.6.1.2)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0763</a>	Person: Terry Dunne	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Raises issue of access with regards to proposed route changes for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East Areas: (Section 4.6.1.1)</li> <li>○ Sandyford Road (Northern part) as far as Main Street (section 4.6.1.3).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Raises questions regarding congestion caused by route changes especially at Christmas.</li> <li>• Considers new development on Blackthorn Road will overburden the road system.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 3 and 4		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0764</a>	Person: Kathleen Doyle	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requests reversion of Main Street to a two-way system.</li> <li>• Objects to any road closures/ route restrictions.</li> <li>• Objects to the bus gate proposed for Sweetmount Avenue.</li> <li>• Submits that no high-rise development should be allowed and all buildings be only 2/3 storeys high.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2 and 4		

DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0765</a>	Person: Tony Doyle	Organisation:
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requests reversion of Main Street to a two-way system.</li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to any road closures/ route restrictions.</li> <li>• Objects to the bus gate proposed for Sweetmount Avenue.</li> <li>• Submits that no high-rise development should be allowed and all buildings be only 2/3 storeys high.</li> </ul>
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0766</a>	<b>Person:</b> Xi Lii Hu	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requests reversion of Main Street to a two-way system.</li> <li>• Requests that Kilmacud Road be reopened.</li> <li>• Objects to the bus lane proposed for Sweetmount Avenue.</li> <li>• Submits that no high-rise development should be allowed and all buildings be only 2/3 storeys high.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0767</a>	<b>Person:</b> H Xili Hu	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requests reversion of Main Street to a two-way system.</li> <li>• Submits that a bus gate outside the library is too heavy and unrealistic.</li> <li>• Objects to the bus lane proposed from CMH to Dundrum at Luas crossroads.</li> <li>• Submits that no high-rise development should be allowed and all buildings be only 2/3 storeys high.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0768</a>	<b>Person:</b> Ade Adeleice	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requests reversion of Main Street to a two-way system.</li> <li>• Requests that Kilmacud Road be reopened.</li> <li>• Doesn't consider apartments to be appropriate in a residential area.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0769</a>	<b>Person:</b> Susan Ponton	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requests reversion of Main Street to a two-way system.</li> <li>• Requests reopening of all closed roads.</li> <li>• Submits that cycle lanes are dangerous.</li> <li>• Can't access village centre easily with current route layout.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0770</a>	<b>Person:</b> Neil Cheung	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requests reversion of Main Street to a two-way system.</li> <li>• Objects to the bus lane proposed for Sweetmount Avenue.</li> <li>• Objects to any new access point into Sweetmount Park.</li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requests DLR gives people mortgages and builds duplexes.</li> </ul>
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 3, 4 and Other Issues

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0771</a>	<b>Person:</b> Brian Breathnach	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter needs access to Dundrum Road.</li> <li>• Requests a low-rise housing typology (houses) be built and offered for sale.</li> <li>• No apartments.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 3		

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0772</a>	<b>Person:</b> Mary Downey	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter needs access to Dundrum Road.</li> <li>• Objects to the bus lane proposed for Sweetmount Avenue.</li> <li>• Requests reversion of Main Street to a two-way system.</li> <li>• Objects to any high-rise building in the village or for the civic centre.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 3 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0773</a>	<b>Person:</b> Sarah Walsh	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter needs access to Dundrum Road.</li> <li>• Requests that Kilmacud Road be reopened.</li> <li>• Requests reversion of Main Street to a two-way system.</li> <li>• Objects to cycle lanes through Dundrum saying they're too dangerous.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0774</a>	<b>Person:</b> Ross McDonnell	<b>Organisation:</b> N/A
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questions how the LAP will be of any use or benefit to anyone.</li> <li>• Raises issue of access with regards to proposed route changes for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Taney Cross (Junction of Dundrum Rd / Taney Rd and Churchtown Rd Upper (Section 4.6.1.2)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 3 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0775</a>	<b>Person:</b> Glen Hannigan	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Raises issue of access with regards to proposed route changes for Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East Areas: (Section 4.6.1.1) as they are fearful this may impact on the viability of where they work and job stability.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0776</a></b>	<b>Person: Martin Morris</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to proposed Main Street to Churchtown Road Upper bus gate.</li> <li>• Objects to high rise development, proposed maximum height restriction of 2 or 3 storeys.</li> <li>• Objects to proposed car access restrictions at Dundrum Cross.</li> <li>• Seeks reinstatement of two-way traffic system in village.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 3 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0777</a></b>	<b>Person: Cathy Doyle</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to proposed car access restrictions in village, citing need to access services.</li> <li>• Objects to apartment developments.</li> <li>• Objects to bus gates due to safety issues.</li> <li>• Objects to high rise development.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 3 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0778</a></b>	<b>Person: Minerva Linqtar</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to apartment developments.</li> <li>• Objects to proposed car access restrictions at Dundrum Cross.</li> <li>• Seeks reinstatement of two-way traffic system in village.</li> <li>• Objects to bus gates.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 3 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0779</a></b>	<b>Person: Anne Marie Kilkelly</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to proposed car access restrictions at Dundrum Cross.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0780</a></b>	<b>Person: Audrey Grimes</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to high rise development, proposes maximum height restriction of 2 or 3 storeys.</li> <li>• Objects to proposed Main Street to Churchtown Road Upper bus gate, citing increased traffic congestion.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 3 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0781</a></b>	<b>Person: Paddy Mc Ardle</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seeks reinstatement of two-way traffic system in village.</li> <li>• Objects to high rise development.</li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to Built-to-Rent.</li> </ul>
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 3 and 4

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0782</a>	<b>Person:</b> Sunday Bassey	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to Built-to-Rent.</li> <li>• Seeks reinstatement of two-way traffic system in village.</li> <li>• Objects to proposed Main Street to Churchtown Road Upper bus gate.</li> <li>• Objects to proposed car access/mobility restrictions on Dundrum Road.</li> <li>• Requests removal of cycle lanes on Main Street</li> <li>• Objects to bus gate on Sweetmount Avenue</li> <li>• Objects to high rise development.</li> <li>• Objects to BTR</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 3 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0783</a>	<b>Person:</b> Saviour Ekum	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seeks reinstatement of two-way traffic system in village.</li> <li>• Objects to high rise development.</li> <li>• Objects to bus gate on Sweetmount Avenue</li> <li>• Objects to pedestrian bridge proposal into Sweetmount Park</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 3 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0784</a>	<b>Person:</b> Mark Corcoran	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requests that full access to Dundrum Road remains open citing concern of access for elderly residents.</li> <li>• Raises issue of access with regards to proposed route changes for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East Areas: (Section 4.6.1.1)</li> <li>○ Taney Cross (Junction of Dundrum Rd / Taney Rd and Churchtown Rd Upper (Section 4.6.1.2)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0785</a>	<b>Person:</b> Elizabeth Hunter	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requests that access is maintained with regards to proposed route changes for Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East Areas: (Section 4.6.1.1)</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0786</a></b>	<b>Person: Aleksander Kurek</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requests that access is maintained with regards to proposed route changes for Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East Areas: (Section 4.6.1.1)</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0787</a></b>	<b>Person: Edward Clyne</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requests that access is maintained with regards to proposed route changes for Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East Areas: (Section 4.6.1.1)</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0788</a></b>	<b>Person: Eamonn Maguire</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the green agenda.</li> <li>Considers proposed changes to village access will have a negative impact overall.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0789</a></b>	<b>Person: Joe Duncan</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requests that full access to Dundrum Road remains open citing concern of access for elderly residents and emergency services.</li> <li>Raises issue of access with regards to proposed route changes for Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East Areas: (Section 4.6.1.1)</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0790</a></b>	<b>Person: Aodhnait O'Neill</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requests that access is maintained with regards to proposed route changes for Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East Areas: (Section 4.6.1.1)</li> <li>Submits that proposed changes will have a negative impact on elderly/disabled residents trying to access shops and services in the village due to parking restrictions.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		



<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0791</a></b>	<b>Person: Neil Mulvaney</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers that traffic congestion caused during Christmas shopping period will only worsen due to overflow from Dundrum SC moving into adjoining streets should route proposals be enacted.</li> <li>• Submits that cycle lanes and dividers on Main Street are causing problems for buses turning.</li> <li>• Requests that access is maintained with regards to proposed route changes for Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East Areas: (Section 4.6.1.1)</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0792</a></b>	<b>Person: Noel Thompson</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requests that access is maintained with regards to proposed route changes for Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East Areas: (Section 4.6.1.1)</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0793</a></b>	<b>Person: Neil Mulvaney</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers that traffic congestion caused during Christmas shopping period will only worsen due to overflow from Dundrum SC moving into adjoining streets should route proposals be enacted.</li> <li>• Submits that cycle lanes and dividers on Main Street are causing problems for buses turning.</li> <li>• Requests that access is maintained with regards to proposed route changes for Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East Areas: (Section 4.6.1.1)</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0794</a></b>	<b>Person: Mary Jane Barnes</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requests that access is maintained with regards to proposed route changes for Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East Areas: (Section 4.6.1.1)</li> <li>• Submits that changes to Main Street have had a negative impact on elderly/disabled residents trying to access shops and services in the village due to parking restrictions.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0795</a></b>	<b>Person: Evelyn Kelly</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to proposed traffic route changes.</li> <li>• Considers current traffic situation untenable and further changes will cause gridlock in Dundrum.</li> <li>• Submits that DLR is intent on only allowing apartments to be developed in the area.</li> <li>• Submits that they are moving to a different area as a result of recent and proposed changes to Dundrum.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2 and 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0796</a></b>	<b>Person: Orla Cheromuk</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requests that access is maintained with regards to proposed route changes for Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East Areas: (Section 4.6.1.1)</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0797</a></b>	<b>Person: Maritte T Robinson</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requests that access is maintained with regards to proposed route changes for Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East Areas: (Section 4.6.1.1)</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0798</a></b>	<b>Person: Jane Ryan</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objects to any route restrictions into Dundrum village.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0799</a></b>	<b>Person: Mrs Josephine McGown</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Questions how there will be an adequate level of disabled parking with the route changes.</li> <li>Remarks on impact to businesses and loss of customers.</li> <li>Raises issue of access with regards to proposed route changes for:</li> <li>Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East Areas: (Section 4.6.1.1)</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4 and 6		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0800</a></b>	<b>Person: Jack Nyhan</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requests that full access to Dundrum Road remains open.</li> <li>References issue of access regarding Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East Areas: (Section 4.6.1.1)</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0801</a></b>	<b>Person: Kate Campbell</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requests retention of vehicular access regarding Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East Areas: (Section 4.6.1.1)</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0802</a></b>	<b>Person: Lisa McKenna</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to any restriction of cars accessing Dundrum.</li> <li>• References issue of access regarding Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East Areas: (Section 4.6.1.1)</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0803</a></b>	<b>Person: Joyce McCauley</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to any restriction of cars accessing Dundrum.</li> <li>• References issue of access regarding Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East Areas: (Section 4.6.1.1)</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0804</a></b>	<b>Person: Andrea Bahr</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to any restriction of cars accessing Dundrum.</li> <li>• References issue of access regarding Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East Areas: (Section 4.6.1.1)</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0805</a></b>	<b>Person: Trinidad Ortiz</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to any restriction of cars accessing Dundrum.</li> <li>• References issue of access regarding Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East Areas: (Section 4.6.1.1)</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0806</a></b>	<b>Person: Ciara Corrigan Margetts</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to any restriction of cars accessing Dundrum which may impact on access to medical services.</li> <li>• References issue of access regarding Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East Areas: (Section 4.6.1.1)</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0807</a></b>	<b>Person: Christopher Cacho</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to any restriction of access regarding Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East Areas: (Section 4.6.1.1)</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0808</a></b>	<b>Person: Sr Therese O'Brien</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to any restriction of access regarding Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East Areas: (Section 4.6.1.1)</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0809</a></b>	<b>Person: Dr. Ciaran Bent</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to any restriction of cars accessing Dundrum which may impact on access to medical services.</li> <li>• Raises concerns regarding access for elderly and disabled to the village centre.</li> <li>• References issue of access regarding Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East Areas: (Section 4.6.1.1)</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0810</a></b>	<b>Person: Khadidja Toumi</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to any restriction of cars accessing Dundrum.</li> <li>• References issue of access regarding Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East Areas: (Section 4.6.1.1)</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0811</a></b>	<b>Person: Desmond White</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to any restriction of cars accessing Dundrum.</li> <li>• References issue of access regarding Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East Areas: (Section 4.6.1.1)</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0812</a></b>	<b>Person: Boualem Tadjine</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to any restriction of cars accessing Dundrum.</li> <li>• References issue of access regarding Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East Areas: (Section 4.6.1.1)</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0813</a></b>	<b>Person: Declan Nyhan</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to any restriction of cars accessing Dundrum citing potential negative impact on businesses on Main Street.</li> <li>• References issue of access regarding Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East Areas: (Section 4.6.1.1)</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0814</a></b>	<b>Person: Tom Hickey</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objects to any restriction of access regarding Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East Areas: (Section 4.6.1.1)</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0815</a></b>	<b>Person: Declan Nyhan</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
This is a duplicate of <a href="#">B0813</a> which is summarized above.		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> N/A – see <a href="#">B0813</a>		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0816</a></b>	<b>Person: Sarah Nyhan</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objects to any restriction of cars accessing Dundrum main street.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0817</a></b>	<b>Person: Brenda Nyhan</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objects to any restriction of cars accessing Dundrum main street.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0818</a></b>	<b>Person: Fionn Morris</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objects to closing of Ballinteer Road.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0819</a></b>	<b>Person: Aoife Minogue</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objects to closing of Ballinteer Road.</li> <li>Requests that Main Street be returned to a two-way system.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0820</a></b>	<b>Person: Alex Hickey</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objects to any restriction of access regarding Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East Areas: (Section 4.6.1.1)</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0821</a></b>	<b>Person: Joe Hickey</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objects to any restriction of access regarding Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East Areas: (Section 4.6.1.1)</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0822</a></b>	<b>Person: Gareth Vance</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objects to any restriction of access regarding Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East Areas: (Section 4.6.1.1)</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0823</a></b>	<b>Person: William O'Brien</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objects to route changes due to impacts on older residents.</li> <li>Objects to any restriction of access regarding Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East Areas: (Section 4.6.1.1)</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0824</a></b>	<b>Person: Mary Doyle</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objects to any restriction of access into Dundrum especially regarding Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East Areas: (Section 4.6.1.1)</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0825</a></b>	<b>Person: Nicoleta Daniela Marin</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objects to any restriction of access regarding Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East Areas: (Section 4.6.1.1)</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0826</u></b>	<b>Person: Laurentiv Marin</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to any restriction of access regarding Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East Areas: (Section 4.6.1.1)</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0827</u></b>	<b>Person: David Bergin</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submits that any road closures are unnecessary and will negatively impact on the village.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0828</u></b>	<b>Person: Rachel Mowlds</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to any restriction of cars accessing Dundrum citing potential negative impact on village life.</li> <li>• References issue of access regarding Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East Areas: (Section 4.6.1.1)</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0829</u></b>	<b>Person: Padraic Ryan</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to any restriction of village access regarding Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East Areas: (Section 4.6.1.1)</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0830</u></b>	<b>Person: Margeret Twomey</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to any restriction of village access regarding Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East Areas: (Section 4.6.1.1) especially in consideration of emergency vehicle access.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0831</u></b>	<b>Person: John Guinen</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to retention of the one-way system on Dundrum main street.</li> <li>• Questions how this was implemented without public consultation.</li> <li>• Submits there is a cycle track already on Dundrum by-pass which isn't used.</li> <li>• Requests local councillors to outline why they are in favour of the LAP changes.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter and Other Issues		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0832</a></b>	<b>Person: Rebecca Moffit</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objects to any restriction of village access regarding Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East Areas: (Section 4.6.1.1)</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0833</a></b>	<b>Person: Bayer Azamsher</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objects to any restriction of village access regarding Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East Areas: (Section 4.6.1.1)</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0834</a></b>	<b>Person: Silvia Ball</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objects to any restriction of village access regarding Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East Areas: (Section 4.6.1.1)</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0835</a></b>	<b>Person: Helen Saeed Othman</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objects to any restriction of village access regarding Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East Areas: (Section 4.6.1.1)</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0836</a></b>	<b>Person: Shelley Moran</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objects to any restriction of village access regarding Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East Areas: (Section 4.6.1.1)</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0837</a></b>	<b>Person: Pauline Queally</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objects to any restriction of village access regarding Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East Areas: (Section 4.6.1.1)</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		



<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0838</a></b>	<b>Person: Denise Kavanagh</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objects to any restriction of village access regarding Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East Areas: (Section 4.6.1.1)</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0839</a></b>	<b>Person: Thomas Finn</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objects to the draft LAP</li> <li>Objects to any restriction of village access regarding Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East Areas: (Section 4.6.1.1)</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0840</a></b>	<b>Person: Michael Gannon</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitter is a lifelong resident of Dundrum.</li> <li>Restricting access to the village to 2 roads will destroy the services and character of the town.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0841</a></b>	<b>Person: Emma Godsil</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.6.1.1 Submission objects to closing of Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0842</a></b>	<b>Person: Michael O'Farrell</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitter wishes to see Ballinteer Road kept open</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0843</a></b>	<b>Person: Tony Parson</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.6.1.1 Submission objects to the closing of Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0844</a></b>	<b>Person: Kevin Bent</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.6.1.1 Submission objects to the closing of Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0845</a></b>	<b>Person: Aidan O'Mahony</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.6.1.1 Submission objects to the closing of Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0846</a></b>	<b>Person: Sinead O'Mahony</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.6.1.1 Submission objects to the closing of Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0847</a></b>	<b>Person: Ronan Bent</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.6.1.1. Submission objects to the closing of Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0848</a></b>	<b>Person: Nagendra Maeterard</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.6.1.1 Please do not stop cars. Keep roads open for cars</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0849</a></b>	<b>Person: Brian Breathnach</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.6.1.1 Queries how elderly to mass and shops. Keep Barton Road East open.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0850</a></b>	<b>Person: Michael O Farrell</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.6.1.1 Submission request that council do not close Ballinteer Road.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0851</a></b>	<b>Person: Erin Marsh</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.6.1.1 Submission request that council do not block access from Ballinteer Road .</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0852</a></b>	<b>Person: Michael Dover</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.6.1.1 Submission considers plan has been done to satisfy the demands of foreign investors.</li> <li>Requests that council do not close Ballinteer Road.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0853</a></b>	<b>Person: Leah Collins</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.6.1.1 Submission objects to closure of Ballinteer Road</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0854</a></b>	<b>Person: Suzanne Dunne</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.6.1.1 Submission requests that council do not close Ballinteer Road</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0855</a></b>	<b>Person: Zelig McGrath</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission objects to taller buildings as they are not in keeping with character of Dundrum.</li> <li>Concerns regarding overshadowing and overbearing impacts</li> <li>Objects to closure of Ballinteer Road</li> <li>Objects to location of civic centre.</li> <li>Suggests using Usher House.</li> <li>Not enough consideration given to older residents regarding access.</li> <li>Closing roads will impact on businesses.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 2, 3 and 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0856</a></b>	<b>Person: Noel McLone</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.6.1.1 Submission objects to plans to stop cars on Barton Road East and Ballinteer Road</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0857</a></b>	<b>Person: Andrew Moffat</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>

<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.6.1.1 Submission request that council do not close Ballinteer Road</li> </ul>
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b>
Chapter 4

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0858</a>	<b>Person: Marion Davenport</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.6.1.1 Submission request that council do not close Ballinteer Road</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b>		
Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0859</a>	<b>Person: Frances Peppard</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.6.1.1 Submission expresses concern at the number of elderly people falling and requests that council do not close roads Also states that it will inconvenience them going to work.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b>		
Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0860</a>	<b>Person: Tom Mc Cauley</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.6.1.1 Submission request that council do not close Ballinteer Road or Barton Road East</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b>		
Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0861</a>	<b>Person: Catherine Quinn</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.6.1.1 Submission request that council do not close Ballinteer Road</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b>		
Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0862</a>	<b>Person: John Hamilton</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.6.1.1 Submission objects to proposed road closures</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b>		
Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0863</a>	<b>Person: Liam Dunne</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.6.1.1 Submission request that council do not close Ballinteer Road</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b>		
Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0864</a></b>	<b>Person: Mark Keegan</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.6.1.1 Submission request that council do not close Ballinteer Road</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0865</a></b>	<b>Person: Mariusz Kiser</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.6.1.1 No to any more restrictions on cars. Submission requests that council do not close Ballinteer Road</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0866</a></b>	<b>Person: Maliya Tadjine</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.6.1.1 Implores council to reconsider</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0867</a></b>	<b>Person: Helen Hess</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.6.1.1 Village was designed years ago. Submission requests that council keep Ballinteer Road open.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0868</a></b>	<b>Person: Eamonn Keogh</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.6.1.1 Submission request that council keep Ballinteer Road and Barton Road East open</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0869</a></b>	<b>Person: Sorcha Gallagher</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.6.1.1 Submission request that council do not close Ballinteer Road or Barton Road East for accessibility reasons.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0870</a></b>	<b>Person: David Elliot</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.6.1.1 Submission request that council keep Ballinteer Road open for cars.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0871</a></b>	<b>Person: Miriam Furey</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.6.1.1 Submission request that council do not close Ballinteer Road to cars.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0872</a></b>	<b>Person: Michele Debrun</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.6.1.1 Further closure of access to village will exacerbate existing issues with access to doctors surgery, access for emergency services, backlogs on Main Street due to one way, injuries and falls and access for elderly.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0873</a></b>	<b>Person: Jack Cleary</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.6.1.1 Submission states that it will be a nightmare getting to doctors surgery. Considers council have taken away so many roads on Main Street and roads leading to Main Street.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0874</a></b>	<b>Person: Charlee McMenamin</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.6.1.1 Submission request that council do not close Ballinteer Road and objects to pedestrianization of Main Street.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0875</a></b>	<b>Person: Assumpta Fox</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.6.1.1 Submission objects to closing of road through village.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		
<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0876</a></b>	<b>Person: Clare Lynch</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.6.1.1 Submission raises concerns in relation to elderly patients falling over bollards for cycle lanes.</li> <li>Concerned regarding access to our services for elderly and people with children.</li> <li>Keep Ballinteer Road open.</li> <li>Parking already very limited.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0877</u></b>	<b>Person: Conor Bent</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.6.1.1 Submission objects to closing of Barton Road East and Ballinteer Road</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0878</u></b>	<b>Person: Niamh Conniham</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.6.1.1 Submission objects to closing of Barton Road East and Ballinteer Road</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0879</u></b>	<b>Person: Dara Moran</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.6.1.1 Submission request that council keep Barton Road East and Ballinteer Road open for cars to village</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0880</u></b>	<b>Person: Kate McAuley</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.6.1.1 Submission request that council do not close Ballinteer Road</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0881</u></b>	<b>Person: Tommy Walsh</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.6.1.1 Submission request that council do not close Ballinteer Road or Barton Road East to cars.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0882</u></b>	<b>Person: Liam Tadjine</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.6.1.1 This is terrible. How can I go to my GP. How can emergency services reach community.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <u>B0883</u></b>	<b>Person: Helen Enright</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.6.1.1 One way system does not work.</li> <li>Raises issue regarding existing blocking of access to Garda station.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No:</b> <u>B0884</u>	<b>Person:</b> Phil McDonogh	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.6.1.1 Submission request that council do not close Ballinteer Road</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No:</b> <u>B0885</u>	<b>Person:</b> G. Breslin	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.6.1.1 Submission request that council do not stop cars from Barton Road East and Ballinteer Road</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No:</b> <u>B0886</u>	<b>Person:</b> Assumpta Fox	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.6.1.1 Submission request that council do not close Ballinteer Road</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No:</b> <u>B0887</u>	<b>Person:</b> Ann Delaney	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.6.1.1 Submission request that council do not close Ballinteer Road</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No:</b> <u>B0888</u>	<b>Person:</b> Liam Sheeran	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.6.1.1 Submission request that council do not close Ballinteer Road or Barton Road East to cars</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No:</b> <u>B0889</u>	<b>Person:</b> Camille Farrar & Stephen Doyle	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.6.1.1 Do not close Ballinteer Road.</li> <li>Plans will damage village businesses.</li> <li>No need for change due to bypass.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapters 4 and 6		

<b>DLR Submission No:</b> <u>B0890</u>	<b>Person:</b> Liam Sheeran	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.6.1.1 Submission request that council do not close Ballinteer Road or Barton Road East to cars.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4		



<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0891</a></b>	<b>Person: Niamh Ryan</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.6.1.1 Do not close Ballinteer Road to cars.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b>		
Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0892</a></b>	<b>Person: Anna Kiser</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.6.1.1 Do not close Ballinteer Road to cars.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b>		
Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0893</a></b>	<b>Person: Garda Eugene O'Sullivan</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.6.1.1 Do not close Ballinteer Road to cars.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b>		
Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0894</a></b>	<b>Person: Kari Rosvall</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.6.1.1 Submitter asks how they can continue to come and see their doctor and requests that road be kept open</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b>		
Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0895</a></b>	<b>Person: Cillian Corcoran</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.6.1.1 Submission objects to blocking off Barton Road East.</li> <li>Public transport is poor.</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b>		
Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0896</a></b>	<b>Person: Yasmine Tadjine</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.6.1.1 Submission raises concerns around closing off of roads as she cannot access her GP or work</li> <li>Considers Public transport is poor and ask Council to reconsider Ballinteer Road</li> </ul>		
<b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b>		
Chapter 4		

<b>DLR Submission No: <a href="#">B0897</a></b>	<b>Person: Anne P. Lewis Flood</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>
<b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission objects to proposals to pedestrianize Dundrum Village and considers that a pedestrian only environment in Dundrum Village can't be justified.</li> <li>Businesses are finding it difficult operate and I is unfair to proceed.</li> <li>There will be more vacant units</li> </ul>		

<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4</p>		
<p><b>DLR Submission</b> No: <a href="#">B0898</a></p>	<p><b>Person:</b> Mary Clyne</p>	<p><b>Organisation:</b></p>
<p><b>Summary of Submission / Observation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not close Ballinteer Road.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Response and Recommendation to issues are located in Volume I, Part 3 under the following heading(s):</b> Chapter 4</p>		



**Part 2: List of persons who made a submission / observation.**

Submission No.	Name	Organisation
<a href="#"><u>B0001</u></a>	Jane Moran	
<a href="#"><u>B0002</u></a>	James Matthews	
<a href="#"><u>B0003</u></a>	Stephen Staines	
<a href="#"><u>B0004</u></a>	David Fitzgerald	
<a href="#"><u>B0005</u></a>	Niall Gantly	Dundrum Travel / Go Ahead Ireland
<a href="#"><u>B0006</u></a>	Helen Gargan	
<a href="#"><u>B0007</u></a>	Margaret Mawhinney	
<a href="#"><u>B0008</u></a>	Jonathan O'Grady	
<a href="#"><u>B0009</u></a>	Ronan Nally	
<a href="#"><u>B0010</u></a>	Paulo Pierrondi	
<a href="#"><u>B0011</u></a>	Brian Shields	
<a href="#"><u>B0012</u></a>	Paul Smith	
<a href="#"><u>B0013</u></a>	Laura Griffin	
<a href="#"><u>B0014</u></a>	Elaine Cassells	
<a href="#"><u>B0015</u></a>	Naoise Byrne	
<a href="#"><u>B0016</u></a>	Conall Mac Aonghusa	
<a href="#"><u>B0017</u></a>	Elisa Maya O'Hanlon	
<a href="#"><u>B0018</u></a>	Sean Goldrick	
<a href="#"><u>B0019</u></a>	Pat Larkin	
<a href="#"><u>B0020</u></a>	Michaela	
<a href="#"><u>B0021</u></a>	Philip and Joan Duff	
<a href="#"><u>B0022</u></a>	Elizabeth Hudson	
<a href="#"><u>B0023</u></a>	Jason Ennis	
<a href="#"><u>B0024</u></a>	John Reade	
<a href="#"><u>B0025</u></a>	Rachel Senior	
<a href="#"><u>B0026</u></a>	Ben Grossman	Retail
<a href="#"><u>B0027</u></a>	Russell Lee	
<a href="#"><u>B0028</u></a>	Una O'Shea	Roebuck Residents' Association
<a href="#"><u>B0029</u></a>	Philippe Duval	
<a href="#"><u>B0030</u></a>	Teresa Gantly	Dundrum Travel Landlord to TFI / Go Ahead Ireland bus company
<a href="#"><u>B0031</u></a>	Lance Grossman	Jewellery Shop
<a href="#"><u>B0032</u></a>	Patrick Egan	
<a href="#"><u>B0033</u></a>	Angela Brown	
<a href="#"><u>B0034</u></a>	Helen Donnelly	
<a href="#"><u>B0035</u></a>	John Egan	
<a href="#"><u>B0036</u></a>	Jeremy	
<a href="#"><u>B0037</u></a>	Michael Wilson	
<a href="#"><u>B0038</u></a>	Ruth Deveney	Deveney's of Dundrum
<a href="#"><u>B0039</u></a>	Liam Lysaght	Deveney's of Dundrum
<a href="#"><u>B0040</u></a>	Terry Dunne	
<a href="#"><u>B0041</u></a>	Tom Deveney	Landlord

Submission No.	Name	Organisation
<a href="#">B0042</a>	Eoin	
<a href="#">B0043</a>	Jen Mulvey	
<a href="#">B0044</a>	Patricia Deveney	Landlord
<a href="#">B0045</a>	Kevin Cassidy	
<a href="#">B0046</a>	Bobbi McDermott	
<a href="#">B0047</a>	Jenny Chawke	
<a href="#">B0048</a>	Rachel Freedman	
<a href="#">B0049</a>	Alan Holohan	
<a href="#">B0050</a>	Eoin Deveney	
<a href="#">B0051</a>	(none provided)	
<a href="#">B0052</a>	Amanda Masterson	The Grafton Barber
<a href="#">B0053</a>	Andrew O'Carroll	
<a href="#">B0054</a>	Jack	
<a href="#">B0055</a>	Pamela Kavanagh	
<a href="#">B0056</a>	Sinead Doyle	
<a href="#">B0057</a>	Roisin O Regan	
<a href="#">B0058</a>	Lynn Tolan	
<a href="#">B0059</a>	Sarah Blower	
<a href="#">B0060</a>	Strategic Planning	National Transport Authority
<a href="#">B0061</a>	Oguz Kartoz	
<a href="#">B0062</a>	Sahil Sharma	
<a href="#">B0063</a>	Danko Kozar	
<a href="#">B0064</a>	Kellie	Community Worker
<a href="#">B0065</a>	Aisling Meagher	
<a href="#">B0066</a>	Shane Dunne	
<a href="#">B0067</a>	C. and D. Kinlan	
<a href="#">B0068</a>	Adam Connaughton	
<a href="#">B0069</a>	Jack Quinn	
<a href="#">B0070</a>	Terry James	
<a href="#">B0071</a>	Una O'Mahony	Dom Marmion Society
<a href="#">B0072</a>	Gavin Clifford	
<a href="#">B0073</a>	Teresa Skorzevska	
<a href="#">B0074</a>	Courtney Raethorne	
<a href="#">B0075</a>	John Foody	
<a href="#">B0076</a>	(none provided)	
<a href="#">B0077</a>	Ruairi Browne	DBFL Consulting Engineers
<a href="#">B0078</a>	Nicole	
<a href="#">B0079</a>	Paul McDonnell	
<a href="#">B0080</a>	Shira Brady	
<a href="#">B0081</a>	John Fagan	
<a href="#">B0082</a>	Edel Murphy	
<a href="#">B0083</a>	Laura	
<a href="#">B0084</a>	Collette Mulligan	

Submission No.	Name	Organisation
<a href="#">B0085</a>	Jenny & John McGarry	Our local village
<a href="#">B0086</a>	Alan Dunne	
<a href="#">B0087</a>	Donal Courtney	
<a href="#">B0088</a>	Marc Evers	
<a href="#">B0089</a>	Julie Mandal	
<a href="#">B0090</a>	Karen Notley	
<a href="#">B0091</a>	Tara Spain	TII
<a href="#">B0092</a>	Eanna Burke	
<a href="#">B0093</a>	Vanessa	
<a href="#">B0094</a>	john cahill	
<a href="#">B0095</a>	Sharon Kinahan	
<a href="#">B0096</a>	Bruce Campbell	
<a href="#">B0097</a>	Terry Kinahan	
<a href="#">B0098</a>	Elizabeth McCloskey	
<a href="#">B0099</a>	Brian Stafford	
<a href="#">B0100</a>	Gwen Adams	
<a href="#">B0101</a>	Edmund Morris	
<a href="#">B0102</a>	Bryan O'Dowd	
<a href="#">B0103</a>	Myles Tierney	
<a href="#">B0104</a>	Carina Folan	
<a href="#">B0105</a>	Sarah McCarrick	
<a href="#">B0106</a>	Peter Reid	
<a href="#">B0107</a>	GERALDINE BROWNE	
<a href="#">B0108</a>	Mark Gilgallon	
<a href="#">B0109</a>	claire brennan	
<a href="#">B0110</a>	Conor Brennan	
<a href="#">B0111</a>	Nigel Brennan	
<a href="#">B0112</a>	Paul hawkins	
<a href="#">B0113</a>	Timothy O'Neill	
<a href="#">B0114</a>	Boylan Family	
<a href="#">B0115</a>	Mark Gilgallon	
<a href="#">B0116</a>	Jeffrey Ryan	
<a href="#">B0117</a>	Joe Lakes	
<a href="#">B0118</a>	Bernadette Donnelly	
<a href="#">B0119</a>	Anthony Kearney	
<a href="#">B0120</a>	Anne Smith	
<a href="#">B0121</a>	Aidan Clancy	
<a href="#">B0122</a>	Ruth Deveney	
<a href="#">B0123</a>	Derek Murray	
<a href="#">B0124</a>	Noel Gilmore	
<a href="#">B0125</a>	Kieran Sutton	
<a href="#">B0126</a>	Shane Moriarty	
<a href="#">B0127</a>	Maria Gillis	

Submission No.	Name	Organisation
<a href="#">B0128</a>	Dorothy McMahon & Noel McMahon	
<a href="#">B0129</a>	Darragh O'Neill	
<a href="#">B0130</a>	Martin O'Brien	
<a href="#">B0131</a>	Lucia Bradford	
<a href="#">B0132</a>	Stephen Kinahan	
<a href="#">B0133</a>	Jennifer	
<a href="#">B0134</a>	Tomas Breen	
<a href="#">B0135</a>	Niall Sisson	
<a href="#">B0136</a>	Office of Public Works	Office of Public Works
<a href="#">B0137</a>	David McCarrick	
<a href="#">B0138</a>	Laura Murphy	
<a href="#">B0139</a>	Margaret Pierce Sheehy	
<a href="#">B0140</a>	Jane Burke	
<a href="#">B0141</a>	Eoin O'Neill	
<a href="#">B0142</a>	Kevin O'Byrne	
<a href="#">B0143</a>	Lisa McNamee	
<a href="#">B0144</a>	Gabrielle Colleran	IHCA
<a href="#">B0145</a>	George Dikker	
<a href="#">B0146</a>	Sean Parkes	
<a href="#">B0147</a>	Stefan Hanrahan	
<a href="#">B0148</a>	George Young	
<a href="#">B0149</a>	Justin Smyth	
<a href="#">B0150</a>	Julia Vendrig	
<a href="#">B0151</a>	Michael Dwyer	
<a href="#">B0152</a>	Conor Hurley	
<a href="#">B0153</a>	David Kearney	
<a href="#">B0154</a>	Kathryn O'Connell	
<a href="#">B0155</a>	niall mescall	Reads Design & Print
<a href="#">B0156</a>	Ciara Franck	
<a href="#">B0157</a>	Maura Lane	
<a href="#">B0158</a>	Claire McGrath	
<a href="#">B0159</a>	Therese Herlihy	
<a href="#">B0160</a>	Dan Coffey	
<a href="#">B0161</a>	Ohad Lutzky	
<a href="#">B0162</a>	Alex Kinahan	
<a href="#">B0163</a>	Jimmy Doyle	
<a href="#">B0164</a>	Leona	
<a href="#">B0165</a>	Fiona oconnor	
<a href="#">B0166</a>	Ciarán Cuffe	European Parliament
<a href="#">B0167</a>	Trevor Platt	
<a href="#">B0168</a>	Anne Smith	
<a href="#">B0169</a>	Suzanne Boland	

Submission No.	Name	Organisation
<a href="#">B0170</a>	Pat O'Doherty	
<a href="#">B0171</a>	Marie Ryan O'Brien	
<a href="#">B0172</a>	Philip Nartey	
<a href="#">B0173</a>	Michael and Margaret Purcell	
<a href="#">B0174</a>	Ashling Keogh	
<a href="#">B0175</a>	Fergus McGrath	
<a href="#">B0176</a>	Sarah	
<a href="#">B0177</a>	Trish Hayden-Murray	
<a href="#">B0178</a>	Gillian & David Lynch	
<a href="#">B0179</a>	Ray Greer	
<a href="#">B0180</a>	Orna O'Brien	
<a href="#">B0181</a>	Dermot Ryan	
<a href="#">B0182</a>	Una Maguire	
<a href="#">B0183</a>	Patricia Kinsella	
<a href="#">B0184</a>	Grace Smyth O'Brien	
<a href="#">B0185</a>	Kev Kinsella	
<a href="#">B0186</a>	Agnese Eisaka	
<a href="#">B0187</a>	Stan and Pam McHugh	
<a href="#">B0188</a>	Sean Barry	
<a href="#">B0189</a>	Paul McDonnell	
<a href="#">B0190</a>	Matt Coughlan	
<a href="#">B0191</a>	no name provided	
<a href="#">B0192</a>	James William Corboy	
<a href="#">B0193</a>	Tomás O'Connell	
<a href="#">B0194</a>	Brigid McCullagh	
<a href="#">B0195</a>	John Feehan	
<a href="#">B0196</a>	Patrick Concannon	
<a href="#">B0197</a>	GORDON ALLEN	
<a href="#">B0198</a>	Paul Gillard	
<a href="#">B0199</a>	Kieran Hannan	
<a href="#">B0200</a>	Ciaran Moulton	
<a href="#">B0201</a>	Noreen Noonan	
<a href="#">B0202</a>	Petra O'Neill	
<a href="#">B0203</a>	Fiona Lalor	
<a href="#">B0204</a>	Natalia Silverio	
<a href="#">B0205</a>	Donna Breen	
<a href="#">B0206</a>	Pat Monks	
<a href="#">B0207</a>	Pamela Kirkham	
<a href="#">B0208</a>	Ruvé Stewart.	
<a href="#">B0209</a>	Emma Cahill	
<a href="#">B0210</a>	Patrick Schwanberg	
<a href="#">B0211</a>	Robbie Mc Guinness	
<a href="#">B0212</a>	Eamon Peregrine	



Submission No.	Name	Organisation
<a href="#">B0213</a>	Marie Cronin	
<a href="#">B0214</a>	Patrick Killalea	
<a href="#">B0215</a>	Joe & Carleen Lakes	
<a href="#">B0216</a>	Patricia Sheehy Skeffington	
<a href="#">B0217</a>	Declan O'Shanahan	
<a href="#">B0218</a>	Patricia Deveney	Deveney's Off Licence
<a href="#">B0219</a>	Mark O'Brien	
<a href="#">B0220</a>	Darach Mac Lochlainn	
<a href="#">B0221</a>	Kiernan	
<a href="#">B0222</a>	James Robertson	
<a href="#">B0223</a>	Marie Harvey	
<a href="#">B0224</a>	Kate Murray	
<a href="#">B0225</a>	Ann Rundle	
<a href="#">B0226</a>	Eoin Farrell	
<a href="#">B0227</a>	Graham King	
<a href="#">B0228</a>	Tom Deveney	
<a href="#">B0229</a>	Lisa O'Neill	
<a href="#">B0230</a>	Gerard McAuliffe	
<a href="#">B0231</a>	Seán Kettle	
<a href="#">B0232</a>	Karina Carroll	
<a href="#">B0233</a>	Gerard Gorey	
<a href="#">B0234</a>	Matt McE	UCD
<a href="#">B0235</a>	Eithne Kennan	
<a href="#">B0236</a>	Adrienne and Patrick Shannon	
<a href="#">B0237</a>	Leonard and Janet Fitzpatrick	
<a href="#">B0238</a>	Tatiana Vasiliuk	
<a href="#">B0239</a>	Teresa Hunt	
<a href="#">B0240</a>	Ruth Deveney	Deveney's of Dundrum
<a href="#">B0241</a>	Ciara Kennedy	
<a href="#">B0242</a>	Don McEntee	
<a href="#">B0243</a>	Eithne Kennan	
<a href="#">B0244</a>	Daniel M Collins	
<a href="#">B0245</a>	Patrick Griffin	Deveney's of Dundrum
<a href="#">B0246</a>	Donal O'Shea	
<a href="#">B0247</a>	Michael and Janet OSullivan	
<a href="#">B0248</a>	Ken Waller	
<a href="#">B0249</a>	DYMPNA MURRAY	
<a href="#">B0250</a>	Fiona Garvey	
<a href="#">B0251</a>	gerry hendley	
<a href="#">B0252</a>	Jeremy Fornasiero	
<a href="#">B0253</a>	Agnieszka Plewa	
<a href="#">B0254</a>	Aidan Dowling	
<a href="#">B0255</a>	Linda Feehan	

Submission No.	Name	Organisation
<a href="#">B0256</a>	Gillian Fischer	
<a href="#">B0257</a>	Gerry Furlong	
<a href="#">B0258</a>	no name provided	
<a href="#">B0259</a>	Maria Campbell	
<a href="#">B0260</a>	Mary Johnston	
<a href="#">B0261</a>	Darragh Rogan	
<a href="#">B0262</a>	Deirdre Blake	
<a href="#">B0263</a>	Priscilla Lawrence Launois	
<a href="#">B0264</a>	Lynda Slattery	Balally Resident's Association
<a href="#">B0265</a>	Raphael king and Alan King	
<a href="#">B0266</a>	Jack and Germaine Morrissey	
<a href="#">B0267</a>	Suzanne boland	
<a href="#">B0268</a>	William Kedroff	
<a href="#">B0269</a>	Sylvia Roddie	
<a href="#">B0270</a>	Louise Whelan	
<a href="#">B0271</a>	Tony Kelly	
<a href="#">B0272</a>	Eamon O'Doherty	
<a href="#">B0273</a>	Mark Kavanagh	
<a href="#">B0274</a>	Bernie Gaskin	
<a href="#">B0275</a>	Sean Gaskin	
<a href="#">B0276</a>	Brian Manners	
<a href="#">B0277</a>	Gerald Caulfield	
<a href="#">B0278</a>	Mary Caulfield	
<a href="#">B0279</a>	Mary O'Farrell	
<a href="#">B0280</a>	Kevin and Geraldine O'Sullivan	
<a href="#">B0281</a>	Katie Hackett	
<a href="#">B0282</a>	Jonathan Parkes	
<a href="#">B0283</a>	Lilia Eminova	
<a href="#">B0284</a>	Dudley Dolan	Taney Parish Primary School
<a href="#">B0285</a>	Elfie Eminova	
<a href="#">B0286</a>	Dudley Dolan	Taney Parish Primary School
<a href="#">B0287</a>	Finbar O'Foghlu	
<a href="#">B0288</a>	Gerry and Geraldine Hume	
<a href="#">B0289</a>	Eithne Ui Fhoghlu	
<a href="#">B0290</a>	Eric Roche	
<a href="#">B0291</a>	Ciara Kennedy	Laurel & Sweetmount Residents' Association
<a href="#">B0292</a>	Kieran O'Farrell	
<a href="#">B0293</a>	Pascal Launois	
<a href="#">B0294</a>	Al O'Tuathaigh	
<a href="#">B0295</a>	Brian Caulfield	
<a href="#">B0296</a>	Jack Slattery	Deveney's Dundrum
<a href="#">B0297</a>	Stephen Barrett	Tom Phillips + Associates
<a href="#">B0298</a>	Fionnuala Callan	(member of Orwell cycling club)

Submission No.	Name	Organisation
<a href="#">B0299</a>	finian meehan	
<a href="#">B0300</a>	Justin Carton	The Concerned Residents of Old Frankfort CLG
<a href="#">B0301</a>	Tom	
<a href="#">B0302</a>	Philomena Hanratty	
<a href="#">B0303</a>	Aine	
<a href="#">B0304</a>	Fergus Madden	
<a href="#">B0305</a>	Deirdre OBoyle	
<a href="#">B0306</a>	Ronan Stewart	
<a href="#">B0307</a>	Emma Morton	
<a href="#">B0308</a>	Hugh McBryan	
<a href="#">B0309</a>	John Mullins	
<a href="#">B0310</a>	Audrey O'Neill	
<a href="#">B0311</a>	Anne McCoy	
<a href="#">B0312</a>	Stuart Dawson	
<a href="#">B0313</a>	Thomas Gorey	
<a href="#">B0314</a>	John O'Donnell	
<a href="#">B0315</a>	Cillian McDowell	
<a href="#">B0316</a>	Jonathan Hickey	Macenas Ltd (Frankfort centre)
<a href="#">B0317</a>	Anika Haget	McCutcheon Halley Chartered Planning Consultants on behalf of UCC
<a href="#">B0318</a>	David Howley	
<a href="#">B0319</a>	Susan Reid	
<a href="#">B0320</a>	Joyce Farnan	
<a href="#">B0321</a>	Paul Naessens	
<a href="#">B0322</a>	BRENDA DOYLE	
<a href="#">B0323</a>	Kate Shearer	
<a href="#">B0324</a>	Eoin Daly	Office of The Planning Regulator
<a href="#">B0325</a>	Louse Carpenter	
<a href="#">B0326</a>	Dee	
<a href="#">B0327</a>	Peggy Mason	
<a href="#">B0328</a>	Mark Johnston	
<a href="#">B0329</a>	margaret richardson	
<a href="#">B0330</a>	Mark Johnston	
<a href="#">B0331</a>	Siobhán O'Connor	
<a href="#">B0332</a>	Kevin McGrattan	
<a href="#">B0333</a>	Pauline Callaghan	
<a href="#">B0334</a>	Clare Byrne	
<a href="#">B0335</a>	Justin Baker	Rosemount Family resource Centre
<a href="#">B0336</a>	Ann Coleman	Rosemount Family resource Centre
<a href="#">B0337</a>	Liam Farmer	Haven Pharmacy Farmers
<a href="#">B0338</a>	Stéphane Maurin	
<a href="#">B0339</a>	Ms Ingrid Masterson	
<a href="#">B0340</a>	Joel Franklin	

Submission No.	Name	Organisation
<a href="#">B0341</a>	Anthony Gerrard	
<a href="#">B0342</a>	Mary Kedroff	
<a href="#">B0343</a>	John Murphy	N/A
<a href="#">B0344</a>	John Murphy	BMA Planning - DRL
<a href="#">B0345</a>	Willow-Avon Management Company CLG	C/O Sherry FitzGerald Lettings
<a href="#">B0346</a>	Dermot Keenan	
<a href="#">B0347</a>	Paula Devine	
<a href="#">B0348</a>	Flonan Morrissey	
<a href="#">B0349</a>	Dr Ciaran Bent	Dr Ciaran Bent, GP Surgery , Village Dundrum.
<a href="#">B0350</a>	David McCarthy	
<a href="#">B0351</a>	Sally Ann Flanagan	
<a href="#">B0352</a>	Gerard Watchorn	
<a href="#">B0353</a>	Mary Mason	
<a href="#">B0354</a>	Michael and Barbara Cahill	Balally Residence Association
<a href="#">B0355</a>	Aoife Kelly	
<a href="#">B0356</a>	Adrienne Bourke	
<a href="#">B0357</a>	Helen and John O'Keeffe	
<a href="#">B0358</a>	Shane O'Kelly	
<a href="#">B0359</a>	Mary Esther Clark	
<a href="#">B0360</a>	Christopher Kinahan	
<a href="#">B0361</a>	Deirdre Barry-Stack	
<a href="#">B0362</a>	John O'Flaherty	
<a href="#">B0363</a>	Declan Reid	
<a href="#">B0364</a>	Conor Rochford	
<a href="#">B0365</a>	Deirdre Wadding	
<a href="#">B0366</a>	Mary Finegan	
<a href="#">B0367</a>	Peter Mulvey	Dundrum Business association
<a href="#">B0368</a>	Maria Power-Watchorn	
<a href="#">B0369</a>	Pauline Kinsella	
<a href="#">B0370</a>	Damian Lawrence	
<a href="#">B0371</a>	Conor byrne	
<a href="#">B0372</a>	Martina Mulholland	
<a href="#">B0373</a>	Geraldine McAuliffe	
<a href="#">B0374</a>	Wendy Cox	
<a href="#">B0375</a>	Michael Mackey	
<a href="#">B0376</a>	Eoin Ó Catháin	
<a href="#">B0377</a>	Angie Fitzgerald	
<a href="#">B0378</a>	Anne O'Callaghan	
<a href="#">B0379</a>	Aidan Corless	
<a href="#">B0380</a>	sandra joyce	
<a href="#">B0381</a>	pat sheehy	
<a href="#">B0382</a>	Sean Carthy	

Submission No.	Name	Organisation
<a href="#">B0383</a>	Eoin Wickham	
<a href="#">B0384</a>	Nora Gorey	
<a href="#">B0385</a>	Tony O'Carroll	
<a href="#">B0386</a>	Robert Stack	
<a href="#">B0387</a>	Mark Heffernan	Dundrum Veterinary Clinic
<a href="#">B0388</a>	Karen O'Donnell	
<a href="#">B0389</a>	Isobel Gorey	
<a href="#">B0390</a>	eileen canny-fitzpatrick	
<a href="#">B0391</a>	Mary Fitzgerald	
<a href="#">B0392</a>	Ann Flynn	
<a href="#">B0393</a>	Katinka Spurling	Movies @ Dundrum
<a href="#">B0394</a>	Rebecca Cowhig	
<a href="#">B0395</a>	Tracie James	
<a href="#">B0396</a>	Dudley Dolan	Taney Parish Primary School
<a href="#">B0397</a>	Maria Murphy	
<a href="#">B0398</a>	John McCulloch	
<a href="#">B0399</a>	Ali Norman	
<a href="#">B0400</a>	Laura Thompson	
<a href="#">B0401</a>	Adrienne Hickey	
<a href="#">B0402</a>	Eoin O'Driscoll	Fine Gael
<a href="#">B0403</a>	David Douglas	
<a href="#">B0404</a>	Paul Callan	Holy Cross Parish
<a href="#">B0405</a>	Elizabeth Ryan	
<a href="#">B0406</a>	Mario Pio Russo	
<a href="#">B0407</a>		Ailesbury Residents Association
<a href="#">B0408</a>	Edmund Cotter	
<a href="#">B0409</a>	Rachel Gerrard	
<a href="#">B0410</a>	Stephen Mc Lean	
<a href="#">B0411</a>	Kevin Bent	
<a href="#">B0412</a>	Ruth Feehan	
<a href="#">B0413</a>	Laura phillips	
<a href="#">B0414</a>	Daniel Walsh	
<a href="#">B0415</a>	ian mc culloch	
<a href="#">B0416</a>	Tony Randles	
<a href="#">B0417</a>	Jutta Baum-Sheridan	
<a href="#">B0418</a>	Jane Burke	
<a href="#">B0419</a>	Lyn O'Doherty	
<a href="#">B0420</a>	Clare Kilroy	
<a href="#">B0421</a>	Warren Logan	
<a href="#">B0422</a>	Conor O'Donnell	
<a href="#">B0423</a>	Nicola Phillips	
<a href="#">B0424</a>	Ray Cunningham	
<a href="#">B0425</a>	James Mulholland	

Submission No.	Name	Organisation
<a href="#">B0426</a>	Macdara O Seireadain	
<a href="#">B0427</a>	Luke Mulholland	
<a href="#">B0428</a>	Pearse Cassidy	
<a href="#">B0429</a>	Eileen O'Loughlin	
<a href="#">B0430</a>	Deirdre Farrell	
<a href="#">B0431</a>	Patricia Hogan	
<a href="#">B0432</a>	Thomas Hogan	
Sub. No.	Name	Organisation
<a href="#">B0433</a>	Peter Larkin	
<a href="#">B0434</a>	Cormac o loughlin	
<a href="#">B0435</a>	George Madden	
<a href="#">B0436</a>	Sharon Hogan	
<a href="#">B0437</a>	Nicholas and Jean Durham	
<a href="#">B0438</a>	John Sayers	
<a href="#">B0439</a>	Tiernan Mulligan	
<a href="#">B0440</a>	Eamonn Farrell	
<a href="#">B0441</a>	Peadar O Ceannabhain	
<a href="#">B0442</a>	Cian McKenna	
<a href="#">B0443</a>	Craig Stephens	
<a href="#">B0444</a>	Allen Morgan	Director, Ashgrove Court Apartment complex,
<a href="#">B0445</a>	Allen Morgan	Director, Ashgrove Court apartment complex,
<a href="#">B0446</a>	Allen Morgan	Director Ashgrove Court apartment complex,
<a href="#">B0447</a>	Ferdia Soper Mac Cafraidh	
<a href="#">B0448</a>	Jim Davidson	
<a href="#">B0449</a>	Gerry Iloyd	
<a href="#">B0450</a>	Roberta Guiry	
<a href="#">B0451</a>	Dublin Commuters Coalition	Dublin Commuters Coalition
<a href="#">B0452</a>	NC	
<a href="#">B0453</a>	Tom Merriman	
<a href="#">B0454</a>	Jennifer Sloane	
<a href="#">B0455</a>	Mark Murphy	Irish Heart Foundation
<a href="#">B0456</a>	Patricia Murray	
<a href="#">B0457</a>	Tom Halton	
<a href="#">B0458</a>	Emer Hyland	
<a href="#">B0459</a>	Grace Stroughair	
<a href="#">B0460</a>	Maureen Flynn	
<a href="#">B0461</a>	David FitzGerald	Holy Cross Parish Dundrum - Finance Committee
<a href="#">B0462</a>	Hazel Furlong	
<a href="#">B0463</a>	Dr Garrett McGovern	Priority Medical Clinic
<a href="#">B0464</a>	Jovi Pinon	
<a href="#">B0465</a>	Bronwyn O'Donnell	
<a href="#">B0466</a>	William and Thérèse Devine	Member of Lynwood Residents' Association
<a href="#">B0467</a>	David & Patricia Brennan	

Submission No.	Name	Organisation
<a href="#">B0468</a>	Mark Murphy	Climate and Health Alliance
<a href="#">B0469</a>	Robin Keenan	
<a href="#">B0470</a>	Aidan ffrench	Nature-based Placemaking
<a href="#">B0471</a>	Joseph Slowey	
<a href="#">B0472</a>	Niamh Coyle	
<a href="#">B0473</a>	Michelle ross	
<a href="#">B0474</a>	Lynda Slattery	Balally Residents Association
<a href="#">B0475</a>	Lorna Radcliffe	
<a href="#">B0476</a>	Billy Jones	
<a href="#">B0477</a>	Maurice Brady	
<a href="#">B0478</a>	Robert and Polly OConnor	
<a href="#">B0479</a>	Oisin O'Neill	
<a href="#">B0480</a>	Vincent Walsh	
<a href="#">B0481</a>	Sean McCarthy	
<a href="#">B0482</a>	Adrian Slattery	
<a href="#">B0483</a>	Andy Heffernan	
<a href="#">B0484</a>	John Deaton	
<a href="#">B0485</a>	Claire MacEivilly	Airfield Estate
<a href="#">B0486</a>	Helen Carroll	Thomas Carroll Opticians
<a href="#">B0487</a>	Minister Josepha Madigan TD	Minister for Special Education and Inclusion, and TD for Dublin Rathdown
<a href="#">B0488</a>	Aidan Bennet	
<a href="#">B0489</a>	Sean Corcoran	
<a href="#">B0490</a>	Tim Geraghty	Finsbury Park Residents' Association
<a href="#">B0491</a>	Clare Kerrigan	
<a href="#">B0492</a>	Martin Sutton	
<a href="#">B0493</a>	Yvonne Kealy Cowman	
<a href="#">B0494</a>	Mary Fanagan	
<a href="#">B0495</a>	Niamh Ní Fhoghlú	
<a href="#">B0496</a>	Kate Prendiville	
<a href="#">B0497</a>	Niamh McDonald	Uisce Éireann
<a href="#">B0498</a>	Brian Welsh	
<a href="#">B0499</a>	Rosemary Welsh	
<a href="#">B0500</a>	Richard Cox	
<a href="#">B0501</a>	Yseult Freeney	
<a href="#">B0502</a>	Peter and Anne Costello	
<a href="#">B0503</a>	Ciara Slattery	The Land Development Agency
<a href="#">B0504</a>	Siobhan M McEvitt	
<a href="#">B0505</a>	Cormac O Sullivan	
<a href="#">B0506</a>	Eoghan	
<a href="#">B0507</a>	Dolores McGilligan	
<a href="#">B0508</a>	Jim Colgan	Imagine Dundrum Community Placemakers CLG
<a href="#">B0509</a>	Claire Maynard	Laurel and Sweetmount Park Residential Associaton

Submission No.	Name	Organisation
<a href="#">B0510</a>	Timothy O'Neill	
<a href="#">B0511</a>	Jim Colgan	Imagine Dundrum Community Placemakers CLG
<a href="#">B0512</a>	Patrick Gray	
<a href="#">B0513</a>	Robert Jones	Green Party
<a href="#">B0514</a>	Tony Kenny	
<a href="#">B0515</a>	ultan carroll	
<a href="#">B0516</a>	Ruth Horan	
<a href="#">B0517</a>	Miriam Hand	
<a href="#">B0518</a>	Gunda Dorothea Albert	
<a href="#">B0519</a>	Tom & Angela Irving	
<a href="#">B0520</a>	Pat and Kay Reidy	
<a href="#">B0521</a>	Roger O'Neill	
<a href="#">B0522</a>	Eamonn Logue	
<a href="#">B0523</a>	Frank and Marette Mulvey	Residents and Business Owners
<a href="#">B0524</a>	Aaron Moore	
<a href="#">B0525</a>	Blaithin Kinsella	
<a href="#">B0526</a>	Colm Walsh	Yoga Dublin
<a href="#">B0527</a>	Nessa Walsh	
<a href="#">B0528</a>	Daniel Moody	
<a href="#">B0529</a>	Robert MacNicholas	
<a href="#">B0530</a>	Jenny O'Brien	
<a href="#">B0531</a>	Mark Haughton	
<a href="#">B0532</a>	Charlie Ainsworth	
<a href="#">B0533</a>	Martin Finan	
<a href="#">B0534</a>	Michael Donlon	Mfd Wine Consultant
<a href="#">B0535</a>	Shaun McDermott and Mary McDermott	
<a href="#">B0536</a>	geri carroll	
<a href="#">B0537</a>	Niall Bolger	
<a href="#">B0538</a>	Andrew Parkes	
<a href="#">B0539</a>	Aideen Morrissey	
<a href="#">B0540</a>	E.J. Doyle and M.Altzinger	
<a href="#">B0541</a>	Catherine McHugh	
<a href="#">B0542</a>	PATRICIA Mary MACCONVILLE	
<a href="#">B0543</a>	Siobhra Rush	
<a href="#">B0544</a>	Bartosz Hacia	
<a href="#">B0545</a>	Councillor Oisín O'Connor	Green Party
<a href="#">B0546</a>	Elaine Comerford	
<a href="#">B0547</a>	Niall Naughton	
<a href="#">B0548</a>	Mary Harrison	
<a href="#">B0549</a>	Deirdre Naessens	
<a href="#">B0550</a>	Ross Mulvey	
<a href="#">B0551</a>	Paul Corcoran	



Submission No.	Name	Organisation
<a href="#">B0552</a>	Patricia Mc Donnell	
<a href="#">B0553</a>	Anne-Marie Mhic Lochlainn	
<a href="#">B0554</a>	Aidan Culhane	
<a href="#">B0555</a>	Aidan Culhane	
<a href="#">B0556</a>	Carol Marks, Secretary	Churchtown Residents Association
<a href="#">B0557</a>	Olivia	
<a href="#">B0558</a>	Alison Coyne	
<a href="#">B0559</a>	Sheila Nolan	
<a href="#">B0560</a>	Ian Epstein and Carol Marks	
<a href="#">B0561</a>	Sean McGrath	
<a href="#">B0562</a>	John McGrath, Principal, Hilary Roche, Chairperson of Board of Management	Holy Cross National School, Kilmacud Road
<a href="#">B0563</a>	Jacques Barnard	
<a href="#">B0564</a>	Mark Coen	
<a href="#">B0565</a>	Damien Ó Tuama	Dublin Cycling Campaign
<a href="#">B0566</a>	Alice Churchill	
<a href="#">B0567</a>	Jitesh Singh	
<a href="#">B0568</a>	Ruth shanu	
<a href="#">B0569</a>	Patrick Noonan	
<a href="#">B0570</a>	Monica Uma	
<a href="#">B0571</a>	Jan Osterkamp	
<a href="#">B0572</a>	Yekaterina Chzhen	
<a href="#">B0573</a>	Louise Barnewell	
<a href="#">B0574</a>	Máirín o connell	
<a href="#">B0575</a>	S O'Sullivan	
<a href="#">B0576</a>	Manannán MacLear	
<a href="#">B0577</a>	Frank and Marette Mulvey	Residents and Business Owners
<a href="#">B0578</a>	Christopher Maher	
<a href="#">B0579</a>	Anne O'Callaghan	
<a href="#">B0580</a>	Kieran Lewis	Ardglas Residents Association
<a href="#">B0581</a>	Linda Dalby	
<a href="#">B0582</a>	Rita Heskin	
<a href="#">B0583</a>	Breda Cahill	Local Resident and Business Owner
<a href="#">B0584</a>	Steven Phillips	Number 8 Studio, Architects
<a href="#">B0585</a>	MICHAEL MCCARRON	
<a href="#">B0586</a>	Kevin Lynch	
<a href="#">B0587</a>	Paula O'Connell	
<a href="#">B0588</a>	Michael Milmoe	
<a href="#">B0589</a>	Tim & Anne Geraghty	
<a href="#">B0590</a>	Alan and Vicki Browne	
<a href="#">B0591</a>	frank colgan	
<a href="#">B0592</a>	Claire	
<a href="#">B0593</a>	Aldagh McDonogh	

Submission No.	Name	Organisation
<a href="#">B0594</a>	Deborah Lambert	
<a href="#">B0595</a>	Margaret Evoy	
<a href="#">B0596</a>	Richard Kelly	
<a href="#">B0597</a>	Gerald Farrell	Lynwood Residents Association
<a href="#">B0598</a>	Rita McNamara	
<a href="#">B0599</a>	Mary Milne	
<a href="#">B0600</a>	David Armstrong	
<a href="#">B0601</a>	Eoghan O'Brien	
<a href="#">B0602</a>	Zara Lloyd	
<a href="#">B0603</a>	Alice Malone	
<a href="#">B0604</a>	Angela Lemass	
<a href="#">B0605</a>	Christine Erskine	
<a href="#">B0606</a>	Edward McCarron	
<a href="#">B0607</a>	Beatrix Donnelan	
<a href="#">B0608</a>	Jonathan Victory	
<a href="#">B0609</a>	Pat Lloyd	
<a href="#">B0610</a>	John Lloyd	
<a href="#">B0611</a>	R Cosgrove & L Clause	
<a href="#">B0612</a>	Patricia Doran	
<a href="#">B0613</a>	Robert Moloney	
<a href="#">B0614</a>	John FitzGerald	
<a href="#">B0615</a>	Tom Dunne	
<a href="#">B0616</a>	Maryellen Greene	
<a href="#">B0617</a>	Laura McDermott	
<a href="#">B0618</a>	Statutory Plans	Department of Education
<a href="#">B0619</a>	Derek Dunne	
<a href="#">B0620</a>	David Ingoldsby	
<a href="#">B0621</a>	John McCarthy	
<a href="#">B0622</a>	Clare Kelly	
<a href="#">B0623</a>	Shane Fitzgibbon	
<a href="#">B0624</a>	Breffni O'Connor	
<a href="#">B0625</a>	Pat Lehane	
<a href="#">B0626</a>	Hairul Sarmani	
<a href="#">B0627</a>	Catrina Collum	
<a href="#">B0628</a>	Gary Manahan	
<a href="#">B0629</a>	Maev Wren	Landlord with business on Main Street Dundrum
<a href="#">B0630</a>	olive Fogarty	
<a href="#">B0631</a>	Anthony Sheridan	
<a href="#">B0632</a>	Katie Heskin	
<a href="#">B0633</a>	Leon McMahon	
<a href="#">B0634</a>	Margaret Hendley	Ballinteer Active Retirement Association (BARA)
<a href="#">B0635</a>	Brian Leonard	
<a href="#">B0636</a>	Carmel O'Connor	

Submission No.	Name	Organisation
<a href="#">B0637</a>	Jane O'Donnell	
<a href="#">B0638</a>	Carmel O'Connor	
<a href="#">B0639</a>	Paul Dowling	
<a href="#">B0640</a>	John Mac Polin / Jennifer Murray	
<a href="#">B0641</a>	Donal Donnelly & Caitríona Donnelly	
<a href="#">B0642</a>	Michael Barry	
<a href="#">B0643</a>	David Bourke	
<a href="#">B0644</a>	Yvonne McCabe	
<a href="#">B0645</a>	Patrick McGovern	
<a href="#">B0646</a>	Sarah Jackson	
<a href="#">B0647</a>	Maria redmond	
<a href="#">B0648</a>	Liam & Alison Bannon	Cottage Recordings
<a href="#">B0649</a>	Maria redmond	
<a href="#">B0650</a>	Wei Gao	
<a href="#">B0651</a>	Bernadette Colley	
<a href="#">B0652</a>	Dave Gavin	
<a href="#">B0653</a>	Emmanuel Ranchin	
<a href="#">B0654</a>	Geraldine Griffin	
<a href="#">B0655</a>	Máirín de Brún	Committee, Broadford Residents' Association
<a href="#">B0656</a>	Máirín de Brún	Committee, Broadford Residents' Association
<a href="#">B0657</a>	Amanda Maher	
<a href="#">B0658</a>	Orla Sarsfield	
<a href="#">B0659</a>	Anisha Khanna	
<a href="#">B0660</a>	Kevin Brady	
<a href="#">B0661</a>	Kay Rafferty	
<a href="#">B0662</a>	Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage	Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage
<a href="#">B0663</a>	Regina O Keeffe	Meadowbrook Residents Association
<a href="#">B0664</a>	Elizabeth Moore	
<a href="#">B0665</a>	Hannagh Misstear	
<a href="#">B0666</a>	Susan Kelly	
<a href="#">B0667</a>	Alec	
<a href="#">B0668</a>	Eoghan O'Shea	
<a href="#">B0669</a>	Susan Kennedy	
<a href="#">B0670</a>	John	
<a href="#">B0671</a>	Diliaver Eminov	
<a href="#">B0672</a>	Ricardo Segurado	
<a href="#">B0673</a>	Muireann O'Higgins	
<a href="#">B0674</a>	Muireann O'Higgins	
<a href="#">B0675</a>	Suzanne Mahon	
<a href="#">B0676</a>	Stephen Murphy	
<a href="#">B0677</a>	Paul Waldron	
<a href="#">B0678</a>	Darren Israel	

Submission No.	Name	Organisation
<a href="#">B0679</a>	Nicola Tyrrell-Maher	
<a href="#">B0680</a>	Ross Kinsella	
<a href="#">B0681</a>	Hannah Gibson	
<a href="#">B0682</a>	Mark Little	TCD
<a href="#">B0683</a>	Fionnuala McGowan	
<a href="#">B0684</a>	Nichola Bardon	
<a href="#">B0685</a>	Fiona O'Reilly	
<a href="#">B0686</a>	Chris & Norah Halligan	
<a href="#">B0687</a>	EDEL SMITH ALVAREZ	
<a href="#">B0688</a>	Jim Nugent	
<a href="#">B0689</a>	Vincent Wall	Doctor
<a href="#">B0690</a>	Jessica Dwane	
<a href="#">B0691</a>	Máirín de Brún	
<a href="#">B0692</a>	Charles Thomas Ridgway	
<a href="#">B0693</a>	David A Gibson	
<a href="#">B0694</a>	Collette Tully	
<a href="#">B0695</a>	Mary & Olive Whooley	
<a href="#">B0696</a>	Edward & Eania Tighe	
<a href="#">B0697</a>	John J. Martin	
<a href="#">B0698</a>	Dr Mary Forrest	
<a href="#">B0699</a>	Angela Byrne	
<a href="#">B0700</a>	Maureen Flynn	
<a href="#">B0701</a>	Ann O'Dea	
<a href="#">B0702</a>	Dorothy Bergin	
<a href="#">B0703</a>	Eileen Lynch	
<a href="#">B0704</a>	Pauline Costello	
<a href="#">B0705</a>	Carol Hayes	
<a href="#">B0706</a>	David Kent	
<a href="#">B0707</a>	Helen Phillips	
<a href="#">B0708</a>	Michael & Pauline O'Sullivan	
<a href="#">B0709</a>	Fionnuala Smyth	
<a href="#">B0710</a>	Christina Robertson	
<a href="#">B0711</a>	Alo Brady	
<a href="#">B0712</a>	John Mullins	
<a href="#">B0713</a>	Joan Winston	
<a href="#">B0714</a>	Bridget McGee	
<a href="#">B0715</a>	Tom Taber	
<a href="#">B0716</a>	Colette Grant	
<a href="#">B0717</a>	Betty Gattule	
<a href="#">B0718</a>	Barbara Dempsey	
<a href="#">B0719</a>	Gerry & Gina Hassett	
<a href="#">B0720</a>	Ken Mooney	
<a href="#">B0721</a>	Sally Cooke	

Submission No.	Name	Organisation
<a href="#">B0722</a>	Randal Robertson	
<a href="#">B0723</a>	Helen Finn	
<a href="#">B0724</a>	Moya & Paul Williams	
<a href="#">B0725</a>	Denis Rice	
<a href="#">B0726</a>	Sheila Cosgrave	
<a href="#">B0727</a>	Margaret Woods	
<a href="#">B0728</a>	Liam Coughlan	
<a href="#">B0729</a>	Eamon Regan	
<a href="#">B0730</a>	Anne Brennan	
<a href="#">B0731</a>	Úna Lawlor	
<a href="#">B0732</a>	David Leonard	
<a href="#">B0733</a>	William Byrne	
<a href="#">B0734</a>	Philomena Murray	
<a href="#">B0735</a>	Marie Pierce	
<a href="#">B0736</a>	Anna Kirk	
<a href="#">B0737</a>	Frank Kirk	
<a href="#">B0738</a>	Patrick & Caroline Gray	
<a href="#">B0739</a>	Bernadette Whiteley	
<a href="#">B0740</a>	Patricia Geaney	
<a href="#">B0741</a>	Anne & Barry Denton	
<a href="#">B0742</a>	Seán, Aisling & Barbara Berigan	
<a href="#">B0743</a>	Christine Cosgrave	
<a href="#">B0744</a>	Cyril Ryan	
<a href="#">B0745</a>	Ena Kelly	
<a href="#">B0746</a>	Mary Treacy	
<a href="#">B0747</a>	Astrid Coleman	
<a href="#">B0748</a>	Olga Lopalo	
<a href="#">B0749</a>	Mary Nodlaig Noonan	
<a href="#">B0750</a>	Mary P Nicholson	
<a href="#">B0751</a>	Adrienne Bourke	
<a href="#">B0752</a>	Seán & June Ryan	
<a href="#">B0753</a>	Catriona Collum	
<a href="#">B0754</a>	Jackie Kenny	
<a href="#">B0755</a>	J L Grant	
<a href="#">B0756</a>	Michelle Grant	
<a href="#">B0757</a>	Mairead McEntee	
<a href="#">B0758</a>	Edwin Doyle	
<a href="#">B0759</a>	Dr Ciarán Bent	
<a href="#">B0760</a>	Sean Mason	
<a href="#">B0761</a>	John Lennon	
<a href="#">B0762</a>	Andy Neary	
<a href="#">B0763</a>	Terry Dunne	
<a href="#">B0764</a>	Kathleen Doyle	

Submission No.	Name	Organisation
<a href="#">B0765</a>	Tony Doyle	
<a href="#">B0766</a>	Xi Lii Hu	
<a href="#">B0767</a>	H Xili Hu	
<a href="#">B0768</a>	Ade Adeleice	
<a href="#">B0769</a>	Susan Ponton	
<a href="#">B0770</a>	Neil Cheung	
<a href="#">B0771</a>	Brian Breathnach	
<a href="#">B0772</a>	Mary Downey	
<a href="#">B0773</a>	Sarah Walsh	
<a href="#">B0774</a>	Ross McDonnell	
<a href="#">B0775</a>	Glen Hannigan	
<a href="#">B0776</a>	Martin Morris	
<a href="#">B0777</a>	Cathy Doyle	
<a href="#">B0778</a>	Minerva Linqutar	
<a href="#">B0779</a>	Anne Marie Kilkelly	
<a href="#">B0780</a>	Audrey Grimes	
<a href="#">B0781</a>	Paddy Mc Ardle	
<a href="#">B0782</a>	Sunday Bassey	
<a href="#">B0783</a>	Saviour Ekum	
<a href="#">B0784</a>	Mary Clyne	
<a href="#">B0785</a>	Elizabeth Hunter	
<a href="#">B0786</a>	Aleksander Kurek	
<a href="#">B0787</a>	Edward Clyne	
<a href="#">B0788</a>	Eamonn Maguire	
<a href="#">B0789</a>	Joe Duncan	
<a href="#">B0790</a>	Aodhnait O'Neill	
<a href="#">B0791</a>	Neil Mulvaney	
<a href="#">B0792</a>	Noel Thompson	
<a href="#">B0793</a>	Neil Mulvaney	
<a href="#">B0794</a>	Mary Jane Barnes	
<a href="#">B0795</a>	Evelyn Kelly	
<a href="#">B0796</a>	Orla Cheromuk	
<a href="#">B0797</a>	Maritte T Robinson	
<a href="#">B0798</a>	Jane Ryan	
<a href="#">B0799</a>	Mrs Josephine McGown	
<a href="#">B0800</a>	Jack Nyhan	
<a href="#">B0801</a>	Kate Campbell	
<a href="#">B0802</a>		
<a href="#">B0803</a>	Joyce McCauley	
<a href="#">B0804</a>	Andrea Bahr	
<a href="#">B0805</a>	Trinidad Ortiz	
<a href="#">B0806</a>	Ciara Corrigan Margetts	
<a href="#">B0807</a>	Christopher Cacho	

Submission No.	Name	Organisation
<a href="#">B0808</a>	Sr Therese O'Brien	
<a href="#">B0809</a>	Dr Ciaran Bent	
<a href="#">B0810</a>	Khadidja Toumi	
<a href="#">B0811</a>	Desmond White	
<a href="#">B0812</a>	Boualem Tadjine	
<a href="#">B0813</a>	Declan Nyhan	
<a href="#">B0814</a>	Tom Hickey	
<a href="#">B0815</a>	Declan Nyhan	
<a href="#">B0816</a>	Sarah Nyhan	
<a href="#">B0817</a>	Brenda Nyhan	
<a href="#">B0818</a>	Fionn Morris	
<a href="#">B0819</a>	Aoife Minogue	
<a href="#">B0820</a>	Alex Hickey	
<a href="#">B0821</a>	Joe Hickey	
<a href="#">B0822</a>	Gareth Vance	
<a href="#">B0823</a>	William OBrien	
<a href="#">B0824</a>	Mary Doyle	
<a href="#">B0825</a>	Nicoleta Daniela Marin	
<a href="#">B0826</a>	Laurentiv Marin	
<a href="#">B0827</a>	David Bergin	
<a href="#">B0828</a>	Rachel Mowlds	
<a href="#">B0829</a>	Padraic Ryan	
<a href="#">B0830</a>	Margaret Twomey	
<a href="#">B0831</a>	John Guinen	
<a href="#">B0832</a>	Rebecca Moffit	
<a href="#">B0833</a>	Bayer Azamsher	
<a href="#">B0834</a>	Silvia Ball	
<a href="#">B0835</a>	Helen Saeed Othman	
<a href="#">B0836</a>	Shelley Moran	
<a href="#">B0837</a>	Pauline Queally	
<a href="#">B0838</a>	Denise Kavanagh	
<a href="#">B0839</a>	Thomas Finn	
<a href="#">B0840</a>	Michael Gannon	
<a href="#">B0841</a>	Emma Godsil	
<a href="#">B0842</a>	Michael O Farrell	
<a href="#">B0843</a>	Tony Parson	
<a href="#">B0844</a>	Kevin Bent	
<a href="#">B0845</a>	Aidan O'Mahony	
<a href="#">B0846</a>	Sinead O'Mahony	
<a href="#">B0847</a>	Ronan Bent	
<a href="#">B0848</a>	Nagendra Maeterard	
<a href="#">B0849</a>	Brian Breathnach	
<a href="#">B0850</a>	Michael O Farrell	

Submission No.	Name	Organisation
<a href="#">B0851</a>	Erin Marsh	
<a href="#">B0852</a>	Michael Dover	
<a href="#">B0853</a>	Leah Collins	
<a href="#">B0854</a>	Suzanne Dunne	
<a href="#">B0855</a>	Zelie Mc Grath	
<a href="#">B0856</a>	Noel McClone	
<a href="#">B0857</a>	Andrew Moffat	
<a href="#">B0858</a>	Marion Davenport	
<a href="#">B0859</a>	Frances Peppard	
<a href="#">B0860</a>	Tom Mc Cauley	
<a href="#">B0861</a>	Catherine Quinn	
<a href="#">B0862</a>	John Hamilton	
<a href="#">B0863</a>	Liam Dunne	
<a href="#">B0864</a>	Mark Keegan	
<a href="#">B0865</a>	Mariusz Kiser	
<a href="#">B0866</a>	Maliya Tadjine	
<a href="#">B0867</a>	Helen Hess	
<a href="#">B0868</a>	Eamonn Keogh	
<a href="#">B0869</a>	Sorcha Gallagher	
<a href="#">B0870</a>	David Elliot	
<a href="#">B0871</a>	Miriam Furey	
<a href="#">B0872</a>	Michelle Debrun	
<a href="#">B0873</a>	Jack Cleary	
<a href="#">B0874</a>	Charlee McMenamin	
<a href="#">B0875</a>	Assumpta Fox	
<a href="#">B0876</a>	Clare Lynch	
<a href="#">B0877</a>	Conor Bent	
<a href="#">B0878</a>	Niamh Conniham	
<a href="#">B0879</a>	Dara Moran	
<a href="#">B0880</a>	Kate McCauley	
<a href="#">B0881</a>	Tommy Walsh	
<a href="#">B0882</a>	Liam Tadjine	
<a href="#">B0883</a>	Helen Enright	
<a href="#">B0884</a>	Phil McDonogh	
<a href="#">B0885</a>	G Breslin	
<a href="#">B0886</a>	Assumpta Fox	
<a href="#">B0887</a>	Ann Delaney	
<a href="#">B0888</a>	Liam Sheeran	
<a href="#">B0889</a>	Camille Farrar & Stephen Doyle	
<a href="#">B0890</a>	Liam Sheeran	
<a href="#">B0891</a>	Niamh Ryan	
<a href="#">B0892</a>	Anna Kiser	
<a href="#">B0893</a>	Garda Eugene O'Sullivan	



Submission No.	Name	Organisation
<a href="#">B0894</a>	Kari Rosvall	
<a href="#">B0895</a>	Cillian Corcoran	
<a href="#">B0896</a>	Yasmine Tadjine	
<a href="#">B0897</a>	Anne P. Lewis Flood	
<a href="#">B0898</a>	Mary Clyne	