

**222102 - Residential Development,
Fortfield Road, Terenure**

LRD Opinion Summary Response

December 2024

Document Control

Document Number: 222102-LAOSR-PL0

Status	Rev	Description	Date	Prepared	Checked	Approved
A0	C01	Stage 3 LRD Draft	01/11/2024	P. Casey	P. Casey	P. Casey
A0	C02	Stage 3 LRD Submission	10/12/2024	P. Casey	P. Casey	P. Casey

Table of Contents

Document Control.....	i
Table of Contents	2
1 Introduction.....	3
2 Summary Table.....	4
Appendix A NTA Correspondence	A
Appendix B Dublin Bus Correspondence	B

1 Introduction

This document seeks to outline items raised by Dublin City Council (DCC) in their LRD Opinion document 'Notice of LRD Opinion' (Planning Authority Ref No. LRD6058/24) that relate to the engineering aspects of the proposed development at Fortfield Road, Terenure.

The purpose of the document is therefore to actively demonstrate how the development proposals have sought to address local authority concerns/requests, and to assist in the easy identification of where these items are addressed in detail within the overall planning documentation.

2 Summary Table

The following table outlines items raised by Dublin City Council in their LRD Opinion document that relate to the engineering aspects of the proposed development and provides summary responses to the DCC comments and provides specific guidance to the relevant locations within the planning submission that actively address these items.

Ref No.	DCC Comment	PUNCH Response
8 (a)	The applicant is required to consult with the NTA and Dublin Bus regarding the capacity of the urban bus services serving the application site. Relevant information regarding service capacity, including existing and planned bus priority measures along the relevant bus routes within the network, should be included in the planning application to inform the applicant's justification for the scale and density of development.	<p>Feedback was sought from both the NTA and Dublin Bus in relation to this Opinion item. Please refer to Appendix A and Appendix B for the associated email correspondence.</p> <p>The NTA did provide feedback, specifically two comments as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The main comment we would have at this point relates to the proposed relocation of the southbound bus stop. There would be some concern with the significantly reduced distance between stops as a result of the relocation as this would not be considered best practice from a service planning perspective. We acknowledge however there may challenges with other locations in the vicinity and so would just request that you ensure potential alternative options have been fully explored as part of your design process. In terms of the design of the stop, it is considered that the detailed design elements can be addressed prior to construction but generally the plans as presented at this stage are considered acceptable. 2. With regard to the proposed junction, we would recommend that the existing footpaths through the adjacent green space at College Drive are maintained as they accommodate desire lines to the northbound bus stop and other locations.

Ref No.	DCC Comment	PUNCH Response
		<p>PUNCH provided a response to these NTA comments as follows:</p> <p><u>Response to Comment 1:</u> We believe relocating the Bus Stop 2397 south along Fortfield Road is the optimum solution in order to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clear the new 4-arm signalised junction to ensure that the junction can operate safely and effectively. 2. We cannot move the Bus Stop north of the 4-arm signalised junction as this would coincide with the residential dwelling or be located too close to the junction with Greenlea Road. 3. Positioning the Bus Stop along our proposed development frontage negates the risk of objections from existing Residents. 4. Similarly, we are very reluctant to propose extinguishing the Bus Stop 2398 as a proposal for our development given the relationship with the school and the controversy/objections that may result. <p><u>Response to Comment 2:</u> We note the recommendation to maintain the existing footpaths through the adjacent green space at College Drive given they are a desire line. Our reluctance to maintaining these short sections of 'diagonal' footpaths is that their omission would greatly assist in formalising the upgraded 4-arm junction and the associated pedestrian crossing facilities. We believe that this improves legibility and removes a possible source of confusion for Vulnerable Road Users, specifically the visually impaired as they will be able to negotiate the route more clearly via the proposed tactile paving proposals.</p> <p>We would be happy to progress on the basis of the Planning Authority's preference, which can be approved/conditioned as appropriate.</p>

Ref No.	DCC Comment	PUNCH Response
		<p>Relevant information regarding service capacity, including existing and planned bus priority measures along the relevant bus routes within the network, has been included in the planning application to inform the applicant's justification for the scale and density of development. This information is reflected in the Residential Travel Plan and Public Transport Capacity Study included in the planning submission.</p> <p>Despite attempts with engaging Dublin Bus for feedback in relation to this Opinion item, no response was forthcoming.</p> <p>We note that the proposed development will provide additional commuters to avail of Dublin Bus services. The works to the bus infrastructure is a nett benefit, with an existing bus stop being relocated locally but also upgraded to a bus shelter arrangement to the satisfaction of the NTA and Dublin Bus.</p>
8 (b)	<p>The applicant is required to consult with Dublin City Council's Environment and Transportation Department and the NTA regarding the design of the 4-arm signalised junction, the proposed relocation and design of the bus stop on Fortfield Road and the increased footpath provision along the eastern side of Fortfield Road, a continuous minimum width of at least 2 m should be achieved.</p>	<p>Consultation with Dublin City Council's Environment and Transportation Department and the NTA regarding the design of the 4-arm signalised junction has been undertaken.</p> <p>The NTA did provide feedback, specifically two comments as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. The main comment we would have at this point relates to the proposed relocation of the southbound bus stop. There would be some concern with the significantly reduced distance between stops as a result of the relocation as this would not be considered best practice from a service planning perspective. We acknowledge however there may challenges with other locations in the vicinity and so would just request that you ensure potential alternative options have been fully explored as part of your design process. In terms of the design of the stop, it is considered that the detailed design

Ref No.	DCC Comment	PUNCH Response
		<p>elements can be addressed prior to construction but generally the plans as presented at this stage are considered acceptable.</p> <p>4. With regard to the proposed junction, we would recommend that the existing footpaths through the adjacent green space at College Drive are maintained as they accommodate desire lines to the northbound bus stop and other locations.</p> <p>PUNCH provided a response to these NTA comments as follows:</p> <p><u>Response to Comment 1:</u> We believe relocating the Bus Stop 2397 south along Fortfield Road is the optimum solution in order to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Clear the new 4-arm signalised junction to ensure that the junction can operate safely and effectively. 6. We cannot move the Bus Stop north of the 4-arm signalised junction as this would coincide with the residential dwelling or be located too close to the junction with Greenlea Road. 7. Positioning the Bus Stop along our proposed development frontage negates the risk of objections from existing Residents. 8. Similarly, we are very reluctant to propose extinguishing the Bus Stop 2398 as a proposal for our development given the relationship with the school and the controversy/objections that may result. <p><u>Response to Comment 2:</u> We note the recommendation to maintain the existing footpaths through the adjacent green space at College Drive given they are a desire line. Our reluctance to maintaining these short sections of 'diagonal' footpaths is that their omission would greatly assist in formalising the upgraded 4-arm junction and the associated pedestrian crossing facilities. We believe that this improves legibility and removes a possible source of</p>

Ref No.	DCC Comment	PUNCH Response
		<p>confusion for Vulnerable Road Users, specifically the visually impaired as they will be able to negotiate the route more clearly via the proposed tactile paving proposals.</p> <p>We would be happy to progress on the basis of the Planning Authority's preference, which can be approved/conditioned as appropriate</p> <p>It is noted that the footpath provision along the eastern side of Fortfield Road achieves a continuous minimum width of at least 2m.</p>
8 (c)	A Road Safety Audit should be carried out, and made available to Dublin City Council's Environment and Transportation Department as part of the review of works proposed within the public road.	Refer to Quality Audit (including Road Safety Audit) completed by Bruton Consulting Engineers. This represents the final Stage 3 LRD Quality Audit following the inclusion of a Quality Audit in the Stage 2 LRD submission.
8 (d)	A Letter of Consent is required from Environment and Transportation Department for works within the public road.	Refer to Letters of Consent included as part of this planning submission.
8 (e)	With regard to the proposed works to the west side of the Fortfield Road / College Drive junction, on lands within South Dublin County Council, evidence of agreement for these works or confirmation of the planning application strategy for the works should be provided.	A separate planning submission has been made to South Dublin County Council (SDCC) with respect to the Works within their lands. This planning application is running in parallel with the LRD planning application with DCC.
8 (f)	Pedestrian connection to Lakelands Park should be reconsidered as this would improve the wider connectivity of the area.	Pedestrian connection to Lakelands Park was considered. However, due to strong local opposition, it has been decided to omit this connection in the interest of the wider development.
8 (g)	A robust rationale should be provided for the proposed locational designation of the application site in accordance with	In accordance with the definitions outlined in the 'Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements - Guidelines for Planning Authorities'

Ref No.	DCC Comment	PUNCH Response
	Table 3.8 and SPPR 3 of the 'Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements' guidelines (2024).	<p>(specifically Table 3.8), the Fortfield LRD is located within an 'Accessible Location' given its proximity to a 'High-Capacity Public Transport Node or Interchange'.</p> <p><i>"High-Capacity Public Transport Node or Interchange"</i></p> <p><i>Lands within 1,000 metres (1km) walking distance of an existing or planned high-capacity urban public transport node or interchange, namely an interchange or node that includes DART, high frequency Commuter Rail, light rail or MetroLink services; or locations within 500 metres walking distance of an existing or planned BusConnects 'Core Bus Corridor' stop..."</i></p> <p><i>"Accessible Location"</i></p> <p><i>Lands within 500 metres (i.e. up to 5-6 minute walk) of existing or planned high frequency (i.e. 10 minute peak hour frequency) urban bus services."</i></p> <p>The distance from the development's entrance on Fortfield to the planned BusConnects 'Core Bus Corridor' stop on Templeogue Road is <500m (approx. 490m) as illustrated by the travel distance measured along the Fortfield Road eastern footpath and pedestrian crossing point at the junction with Templeogue Road.</p> <p>Please refer to PUNCH Consulting Engineer's Traffic and Transport Assessment 222102-PUNCH-XX-XX-RP-C-0008 revision C02, Section 11.2.2, Figures 11-1 and 11-2 for illustration.</p> <p>As a result, the default position per specific planning policy requirements (SPPR) 3 of the Guidelines is that car-parking provision should be substantially reduced.</p>

Ref No.	DCC Comment	PUNCH Response
8 (h)	A taking-in-charge drawing addressing the proposed junction and footpath widening on Fortfield Road is required.	Refer to relevant Taking-in-Charge drawings prepared by Urban Agency and included as part of this planning submission.
8 (i)	All pedestrian and cycle paths should demonstrate compliance with the relevant design standards of DMURS. All internal pedestrian access routes to Blocks should achieve a continuous minimum width of at least 2m. Where shared cycle and pedestrian access routes are proposed, it should be demonstrated that the proposed width can safely and comfortably accommodate shared use.	<p>Please refer to the Landscape Architect Drawing 'GENERAL ARRANGEMENT - ACCESS AND CIRCULATION' (dwg no. L1-100) prepared by NMP for illustration of the various pedestrian and cycle routes traversing the development.</p> <p>This drawing demonstrates that all internal pedestrian access routes to Blocks achieve a continuous minimum width of minimum 2m. Where shared cycle and pedestrian access routes are proposed, it also demonstrates appropriate widths to safely and comfortably accommodate shared use.</p>
8 (j)	<p>The following is required to further clarify and improve cycle parking proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. It should be demonstrated that access corridors, aisles and doors providing access to resident cycle parking achieve adequate widths, in compliance with the relevant design guidance of the NTA's 'Cycle Design Manual, 2023'. ii. The design of the visitor cycle parking provided at surface level and the quantity provided in each bank of standard should be specified. iii. The quantity of cycle parking spaces capable of accommodating non-standard cycle equipment (e.g. cargo bikes) should be increased. NTA's 'Cycle Design Manual, 2023' recommends 5%. The additional spaces 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Please refer to the Architectural drawings prepared by Urban Agency illustrating details of access corridors, aisles and doors providing access to resident cycle parking. ii. Please refer to PUNCH Consulting Engineer's Residential Travel Plan 222102-PUNCH-XX-XX-RP-C-0004 revision C02, Section 2.3.1 for details of the proposed cycle parking facilities distributed throughout the development. This includes Figures 3 and 4 that illustrate assignment of specific cycle parking spaces. iii. The cycle parking proposals achieve the 5% non-standard cycle parking quantum outlined in the NTA's Cycle Design Manual 2023. This is achieved for both the long-term and short-term cycle parking facilities. iv. Please refer to PUNCH Consulting Engineer's Residential Travel Plan 222102-PUNCH-XX-XX-RP-C-0004 revision C02, Section 2.3.1, Table 5 for details of the non-standard cycle parking facilities

Ref No.	DCC Comment	PUNCH Response
	<p>should serve both residents and visitors and should be dispersed throughout the site.</p> <p>iv. Provision for e-bike charging facilities should be demonstrated.</p> <p>v. Staff cycle parking in a secure facility is required for the culture/arts space, in accordance with the relevant standards of Table 1 of Appendix 5 of the City Development Plan. This facility and the residential cycle parking facilities should be accessed separately.</p>	<p>distributed throughout the development. This includes Figures 3 and 4 that illustrate assignment of specific cycle parking spaces, including the non-standard cycle parking components.</p> <p>v. Please refer to the Architectural plans for illustration of e-bike charging facilities.</p> <p>vi. Staff cycle parking for the culture/arts space and creche is provided in a secure facility at basement level, specifically at the base of the basement access ramp. The quantum of cycle parking complies with the DCC Development Plan as outlined in PUNCH Consulting Engineer's Car & Cycle Parking Management Plan 222102-PUNCH-XX-XX-RP-C-0007 revision C02, Section 2.1.4, Table 2-7.</p>
8 (k)	<p>Discrepancies in the submitted drawings and documentation are noted, in particular in respect of the quantitative figures for car parking provision. The final application submission should be consistent.</p>	<p>The drawings and documentation have been reviewed to avoid discrepancies and maintain consistency throughout the submitted content.</p>
8 (l)	<p>The following is required to further clarify and improve car parking proposals:</p> <p>i. It should be demonstrated that sufficient clear space is provided to accommodate one in-curtilage car parking space per house only, with suitable design measures (e.g. landscaping) provided to prevent additional parking encroachment.</p>	<p>i. The in-curtilage parking allows for a single car parking space only. The landscaping proposals to the housing units prevents additional parking encroachment as illustrated in the Landscape Drawings prepared by NMP.</p> <p>ii. We have relocated the car share spaces to surface level. A total of 10 No. parking spaces at surface level are dedicated for car share use. Please refer to PUNCH Consulting Engineer's Car & Cycle Parking Management Plan 222102-PUNCH-XX-XX-RP-C-0007 revision C02, Section 2.1, Figure 2-2 for illustration.</p>

Ref No.	DCC Comment	PUNCH Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii. Review access to car share and consider relocating some spaces to surface level to benefit the dwelling units and public access. iii. Visitor allocation appears excessive and should be reviewed. Information on the management of visitor spaces is required. 	<p>iii. Visitor allocation has been reduced with a total of 9 No. parking spaces at surface level now being dedicated for visitor use (reduced from 19 no. spaces at LRD Stage 2). Please refer to PUNCH Consulting Engineer's Car & Cycle Parking Management Plan 222102-PUNCH-XX-XX-RP-C-0007 revision C02, Section 2.1, Figure 2-2 for illustration.</p> <p>For details of parking management/enforcement, please refer to PUNCH Consulting Engineer's Car & Cycle Parking Management Plan 222102-PUNCH-XX-XX-RP-C-0007 revision C02, Section 2.5.</p>
8 (m)	Proposed phasing of works within the public road is required due to proposals to use the new access point as the main site access during construction.	<p>For the proposed phasing of works, please refer to PUNCH Consulting Engineer's Outline Construction Management Plan 222102-PUNCH-XX-XX-RP-C-0006 revision C02, specifically Section 9 and Appendix A.</p> <p>Further details can be developed by the nominated Contractor and outlined in the Construction Management Plan to satisfy the Local Authority via an appropriately applied planning condition.</p>
9.	<p>Flood Risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarity needed around model; evidence that modelling carried out correctly. Pluvial risk has been identified and proposal aims to address risk from 1%AEP pluvial via storage pond – how was this sized/the volume derived for this event? • Protection to basement level – confirm and provide detail. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please refer to PUNCH Consulting Engineer's Site-Specific Flood Risk Assessment 222102-PUNCH-XX-XX-RP-C-0003 revision C07, Section 4.9 for detailed discussion on how the 1% AEP pluvial flood volume of 70m³ on Fortfield Road has been estimated. The proposed detention basin to store this flood volume provides 91.8m³ storage, representing a 31% overprovision for the 1% AEP pluvial flood event. 2. As the detention basin will cater for the 1% AEP pluvial flood event, with 31% additional capacity, risk of pluvial flooding within the site has been mitigated. However, as an additional check, a review of

Ref No.	DCC Comment	PUNCH Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide map of development indicating pre- and post-development extents for 1%AEP and 0.1%AEP, including depths. Need to demonstrate that FFLs and access points are suitably protected. DCC need to be satisfied that pluvial risk has been sufficiently addressed. 	<p>the 0.1% AEP pluvial flood volume on Fortfield Road was also undertaken. Please refer to PUNCH Consulting Engineer's Site-Specific Flood Risk Assessment 222102-PUNCH-XX-XX-RP-C-0003 revision C07, Section 4.9 for detailed discussion on how the 0.1% AEP pluvial flood volume of 120m³ on Fortfield Road was estimated. Using Civil3D modelling software, the proposed road levels within the site were modelled and the storage capacity of the roadway has been confirmed to be in excess of 30m³. Therefore, it is estimated that pluvial flooding during a 0.1% AEP event will not overtop the kerbs of the proposed roadway within the development site or breach the top level of the basement ramp, thus providing protection during a 0.1% AEP event.</p>
9.	<p>Engineering Services Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarity needed regarding design approach and calculations; inconsistencies within Report and some further detail/explanation is necessary. Query Taking in Charge proposals – confirm exact boundary between private and public. New infrastructure proposed to manage public road run-off however this would be draining to privately-maintained infrastructure (storage pond)? DCC would not generally accept such an arrangement. Further discussion and detail is necessary on this aspect. The use of SuDS should be explored for any carriageway junction works. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Please refer to updated PUNCH Consulting Engineer's Engineering Planning Report 222102-PUNCH-XX-XX-RP-C-0002 revision C06. Following discussion with DCC Drainage Planning department, an amended detention basin and associated drainage layout has been proposed to ensure a clear delineation for taking in charge purposes. Please refer to drawing 222102-PUNCH-XX-XX-DR-C-0470 for the detention basin proposals. The Engineering Planning Report contains information on how the detention basin will operate in a flood scenario, and how often the detention basin should be maintained. Following discussion with DCC Drainage Planning it was confirmed that SuDS for the carriageway junction works could not be provided due to spatial constraints.

Ref No.	DCC Comment	PUNCH Response
9.	<p>Basement Impact Assessment (BIA)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A preliminary check suggests revisions are required, e.g. text missing/incorrect, no assessment has been carried out under the Land Stability and Ground Movement section – contains the construction plan from a later section. 	<p>A workshop was held with DCC Drainage Planning on 8th July 2024 to discuss the proposals. DCC subsequently actioned an audit of the BIA submitted at LRD Stage 2, with the resulting Auditor's Report (dated 19/07/2024) prepared by Cundall supplied by DCC on 07/08/2024.</p> <p>PUNCH has updated to the BIA to address the identified inadequacies outlined in this Auditor's Report. Please refer to updated PUNCH Consulting Engineer's Basement Impact Assessment 222102-PUNCH-XX-XX-RP-C-0011 revision C02.</p> <p>Please note that Appendix H of the BIA contains the Auditor's Report. The relevant items identified as 'Inadequate' have been addressed in this updated BIA. The updates principally relate to providing clarification on the 'Zone of Influence' extents as the justification for adjacent structures not requiring analysis or modelling.</p>
9.	<p>Consultation with Drainage Planning is highly recommended to ensure all surface water management matters are addressed prior to lodgement of any planning application</p>	<p>A workshop was held with DCC Drainage Planning, Policy and Development Control Division (DPPDCD) on 8th July 2024 to discuss the proposals. Following this workshop, updated proposals were issued to DCC DPPDCD on 7th August 2024 and any subsequent queries and comments received through further engagement with DCC DPPDCD were incorporated in the final design.</p>

Appendix A NTA Correspondence

From: Paul Casey | PUNCH
Sent: Wednesday 4 September 2024 22:01
To: Kevin Cox
Cc: David Clements; gareth.hyland@dublincity.ie
Subject: RE: LRD6058/24: Fortfield Road LRD - Request for NTA Consultation/Engagement NTA:00000156000000594

Hi Kevin,

Many thanks for the responses to the queries below.

We will elaborate on the reasoning for the relocated Bus Stop in the LRD planning submission. In short, we believe relocating the Bus Stop 2397 south along Fortfield Road is the optimum solution in order to:

1. Clear the new 4-arm signalised junction to ensure that the junction can operate safely and effectively.
2. We cannot move the Bus Stop north of the 4-arm signalised junction as this would coincide with the residential dwelling or be located too close to the junction with Greenlea Road.
3. Positioning the Bus Stop along our proposed development frontage negates the risk of objections from existing Residents.
4. Similarly, we are very reluctant to propose extinguishing the Bus Stop 2398 as a proposal for our development given the relationship with the school and the controversy/objections (real or imagined) that may result.

I note your recommendation to maintain the existing footpaths through the adjacent green space at College Drive given they are a desire line. You are completely correct that they represent desire lines. My only reluctance to maintaining these short sections of 'diagonal' footpaths is that their omission would greatly assist in formalising the upgraded 4-arm junction and the associated pedestrian crossing facilities. We believe that this improves legibility and removes a possible source of confusion for Vulnerable Road Users, specifically the visually impaired as they will be able to negotiate the route more clearly via the proposed tactile paving proposals.

Similar to the Bus Stop item, we will outline our reasoning in the LRD planning submission, and we would be happy to progress on the basis of the Planning Authority's preference, which can be approved/conditioned as appropriate.

Many thanks again for the review and response. It is greatly appreciated.

Kind regards,
Paul Casey
BEng CEng MIEI
Director



Carnegie House, Library Road, Dun Laoghaire, Co Dublin, A96 C7W7, Ireland
t: +353 1 271 2200 m: +353 85 825 1255 w: www.punchconsulting.com
Dublin | Limerick | Cork | Galway | Glasgow



From: Kevin Cox <Kevin.Cox@nationaltransport.ie>
Sent: Wednesday, September 4, 2024 2:30 PM
To: Paul Casey | PUNCH <pcasey@punchconsulting.com>
Cc: David Clements <David.Clements@nationaltransport.ie>; gareth.hyland@dublincity.ie
Subject: RE: LRD6058/24: Fortfield Road LRD - Request for NTA Consultation/Engagement NTA:00000156000000594

Hi Paul,

We have reviewed the documents you have sent across for the Fortfield Road LRD and just have the two below comments.

- The main comment we would have at this point relates to the proposed relocation of the southbound bus stop. There would be some concern with the significantly reduced distance between stops as a result of the relocation as this would not be considered best practice from a service planning perspective. We acknowledge however there may be challenges with other locations in the vicinity and so would just request that you ensure potential alternative options have been fully explored as part of your design process. In terms of the design of the stop, it is considered that the detailed design elements can be addressed prior to construction but generally the plans as presented at this stage are considered acceptable.
- With regard to the proposed junction, we would recommend that the existing footpaths through the adjacent green space at College Drive are maintained as they accommodate desire lines to the northbound bus stop and other locations.

Kind regards,

Kevin



Kevin Cox (he/him/his)

Land Use & Transport Planner

National Transport Authority | Udarás Náisiúnta Iompair

A: Dún Scéine, Iveagh Court, Harcourt Lane, Dublin 2, D02 WT20

E: kevin.cox@nationaltransport.ie

W: www.nationaltransport.ie

In accordance with NTA's Right to Disconnect policy, if you are receiving this email outside of normal working hours, I do not expect a response or action outside of your own working hours.

From: Paul Casey | PUNCH <pcasey@punchconsulting.com>

Sent: 15 August 2024 13:11

To: Kevin Cox <Kevin.Cox@nationaltransport.ie>

Cc: David Clements <David.Clements@nationaltransport.ie>

Subject: RE: LRD6058/24: Fortfield Road LRD - Request for NTA Consultation/Engagement

NTA:00000156000000594

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Kevin,

Many thanks for your prompt response to my email yesterday.

Please find attached PUNCH drawings:

- 222102-PUNCH-XX-XX-DR-C-0460_PROPOSED LINEMARKINGS - NORTHERN ACCESS
- 222102-PUNCH-XX-XX-DR-C-0461_PROPOSED LINEMARKINGS – BUS STOP

As outlined in my email, it is proposed to replace Bus Stops 2397 (existing location compromised by new 4 arm signalised junction of Fortfield Road and College Drive) with a new locally relocated bus stop facility. The proposed replacement bus stop is located 60m south of Bus Stop 2397. This bus stop facility will consist of a covered bus shelter with seating in accordance with the requirements of Dublin Bus. The introduction of this bus stop would represent an improvement on the current bus stops which consist of unsheltered stop signage only. It is proposed to retain Bus Stop 2398 (nearest the school) in its current location/arrangement. This is illustrated in the figure below.



To date, we have not illustrated much in the way of detail to the proposed bus stop per PUNCH Drawing 0461. This has been a function of recent changes to the Bus Stop guidance arising from the Bus Connects updates, kessel kerb detail being amended, the standard JCDecaux bus shelter designs and where exactly the NTA requirements now stand.

If there are standard details or guidance booklets that we should reference, we can add details/annotation to satisfy the NTA.

Also happy for this to be captured as a planning condition along the lines of *"Details of the bus stop to be agreed with NTA in advance of works commencing..."*

Regards and thanks,

Paul Casey
BEng CEng MIEI
Director



Carnegie House, Library Road, Dun Laoghaire, Co Dublin, A96 C7W7, Ireland

t: +353 1 271 2200 m: +353 85 825 1255 w: www.punchconsulting.com

Dublin | Limerick | Cork | Galway | Glasgow



From: Kevin Cox <Kevin.Cox@nationaltransport.ie>

Sent: Wednesday, August 14, 2024 4:58 PM

To: Paul Casey | PUNCH <pcasey@punchconsulting.com>

Cc: David Clements <David.Clements@nationaltransport.ie>

Subject: FW: LRD6058/24: Fortfield Road LRD - Request for NTA Consultation/Engagement
NTA:00000156000000594

You don't often get email from kevin.cox@nationaltransport.ie. [Learn why this is important](#)

Hi Paul,

Thank you for email. I can prepare a response to these items following liaison with my colleagues in active travel and bus service planning and revert as soon as possible.

In the first instance, I was just wondering if you had additional drawings that showed the proposed relocated bus stops in more detail, including the proposed design specifications?

Kind regards,

Kevin



Kevin Cox (he/him/his)

Land Use & Transport Planner

National Transport Authority | Údarás Náisiúnta Iompair

A: Dún Scéine, Iveagh Court, Harcourt Lane, Dublin 2, D02 WT20

E: kevin.cox@nationaltransport.ie

W: www.nationaltransport.ie

In accordance with NTA's Right to Disconnect policy, if you are receiving this email outside of normal working hours, I do not expect a response or action outside of your own working hours.

----- Original Message -----

From: Paul Casey | PUNCH;

Received: Wed Aug 14 2024 11:47:27 GMT+0100 (Irish Standard Time)

To: info@nationaltransport.ie ;

Subject: LRD6058/24: Fortfield Road LRD - Request for NTA Consultation/Engagement

You don't often get email from pcasey@punchconsulting.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Sir/Madam,

We are currently progressing a Large-Scale Residential Development (LRD) planning submission with Dublin City Council (DCC) in relation to a proposed development located on Fortfield Road, Terenure, Dublin 6W.

As part of this process, DCC has issued their LRD Opinion document 'Notice of LRD Opinion' (see attached Planning Authority Ref No. LRD6058/24) in which they request the following:

Opinion Item 8(a)

"The applicant is required to consult with the NTA and Dublin Bus regarding the capacity of the urban bus services serving the application site. Relevant information regarding service capacity, including existing and planned bus priority measures along the relevant bus routes within the network, should be included in the planning application to inform the applicant's justification for the scale and density of development."

Opinion Item 8(b)

"The applicant is required to consult with Dublin City Council's Environment and Transportation Department and the NTA regarding the design of the 4-arm signalised junction, the proposed relocation and design of the bus stop on Fortfield Road and the increased footpath provision along the eastern side of Fortfield Road, a continuous minimum width of at least 2 m should be achieved."

Opinion Item 8(a):

As part of the proposed planning submission, we have prepared documents that reflect the urban bus services:

1. **Residential Travel Plan** – this document outlines available transport infrastructure serving the development location including public transport, cycle infrastructure, proposed car and cycle parking quantum, Census 2022 travel patterns, the Templeogue / Rathfarnham to City Centre Core Bus Corridor proposals.
2. **Public Transport Capacity Study** – This consists of a public transport capacity study in relation to a Large-Scale Residential Development (LRD) at Fortfield Road. The study has been informed by a comprehensive bus occupancy survey undertaken in February 2024. Based on the findings of the public transport occupancy survey, mode share targets set out within the Residential Travel Plan, and analysis contained within this Note, it was found that residents of the proposed development would utilise ca. 2.0% and 1.7% of the total capacity of existing AM and PM peak hour bus services respectively. During the AM and PM peak hours, bus service excess capacities were found to be 42% and 43% respectively in the direction of maximum demand. As such, it is apparent that current public transport capacity within the application site's vicinity is sufficient to accommodate additional demand generated by the proposed development.

(Note: These reports can be supplied to the NTA for your information upon request)

In relation to Opinion Item 8(a), can the NTA provide any further relevant information regarding service capacity, including existing and planned bus priority measures along the relevant bus routes within the network, to inform the development proposals?

Opinion Item 8(b):

As part of the proposed planning submission, we have also prepared drawings that reflect the design of the 4-arm signalised junction, the proposed relocation and design of the bus stop on Fortfield Road and the increased footpath provision along the eastern side of Fortfield Road.

The development will be accessed by vehicles via a single proposed junction off Fortfield Road. This junction will consist of an upgrade of the existing Fortfield Road/College Drive non-signalised T-Junction to a 4-arm signalised junction with pedestrian controlled crossing facilities. Please refer to attached PUNCH Drawing 222102-PUNCH-XX-XX-DR-C-0460 for illustration.

As part of the proposed development works, it is proposed to replace Bus Stops 2397 (existing location compromised by new 4 arm signalised junction of Fortfield Road and College Drive) with a new locally relocated bus stop facility. The proposed replacement bus stop is located 60m south of Bus Stop 2397. This bus stop facility will consist of a covered bus shelter with seating in accordance with the requirements of Dublin Bus. The introduction of this bus stop would represent an improvement on the current bus stops which consist of unsheltered stop signage only. It is proposed to retain Bus Stop 2398 (nearest the school) in its current location/arrangement.

I can also confirm that the development proposals include for the increased footpath provision along the eastern side of Fortfield Road, with a continuous minimum width of at least 2m being achieved.

These proposals are outlined in a series of drawings that can be supplied to the NTA for your information upon request.

In relation to Opinion Item 8(b), can the NTA please review the proposals and provide feedback regarding the design of the 4-arm signalised junction, the proposed relocation and design of the bus stop on Fortfield Road and the increased footpath provision along the eastern side of Fortfield Road?

We would greatly appreciate your engagement on the above to close out these DCC Opinion items.

If a specific NTA contact could please be identified, this would help expedite the matter and allow close-out through direct engagement.

Regards and thanks,
Paul Casey
BEng CEng MIEI
Director

Carnegie House, Library Road, Dun Laoghaire, Co Dublin, A96 C7W7, Ireland
t: +353 1 271 2200 m: +353 85 825 1255 w: www.punchconsulting.com
Dublin | Limerick | Cork | Galway | Glasgow

This e-mail and any files transmitted are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed and should not be released to a third party without the consent of PUNCH Consulting Engineers. Any views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender unless stated otherwise. Although we take great care to protect our computer network against viruses, we accept no responsibility for mail-borne viruses and recommend that you scan the email and attachments. Reg: Michael Punch and Partners Ltd Reg Office: 97 Henry Street Limerick, Ireland Reg no: 111183

From: Paul Casey | PUNCH
Sent: Wednesday 14 August 2024 11:45
To: info@nationaltransport.ie
Subject: LRD6058/24: Fortfield Road LRD - Request for NTA Consultation/Engagement
Attachments: 222102-PUNCH-XX-XX-DR-C-0460_PROPOSED LINEMARKINGS - NORTHERN ACCESS.pdf; Notice of LRD Opinion.pdf

Dear Sir/Madam,

We are currently progressing a Large-Scale Residential Development (LRD) planning submission with Dublin City Council (DCC) in relation to a proposed development located on Fortfield Road, Terenure, Dublin 6W.



As part of this process, DCC has issued their LRD Opinion document 'Notice of LRD Opinion' (see attached Planning Authority Ref No. LRD6058/24) in which they request the following:

Opinion Item 8(a)

"The applicant is required to consult with the NTA and Dublin Bus regarding the capacity of the urban bus services serving the application site. Relevant information regarding service capacity, including existing and planned bus priority measures along the relevant bus routes within the network, should be included in the planning application to inform the applicant's justification for the scale and density of development."

Opinion Item 8(b)

"The applicant is required to consult with Dublin City Council's Environment and Transportation Department and the NTA regarding the design of the 4-arm signalised junction, the proposed relocation and design of the bus stop on Fortfield Road and the increased footpath provision along the eastern side of Fortfield Road, a continuous minimum width of at least 2 m should be achieved."

Opinion Item 8(a):

As part of the proposed planning submission, we have prepared documents that reflect the urban bus services:

1. **Residential Travel Plan** – this document outlines available transport infrastructure serving the development location including public transport, cycle infrastructure, proposed car and cycle parking quantum, Census 2022 travel patterns, the Templeogue / Rathfarnham to City Centre Core Bus Corridor proposals.
2. **Public Transport Capacity Study** – This consists of a public transport capacity study in relation to a Large-Scale Residential Development (LRD) at Fortfield Road. The study has been informed by a comprehensive bus occupancy survey undertaken in February 2024. Based on the findings of the public transport occupancy survey, mode share targets set out within the Residential Travel Plan, and analysis contained within this Note, it was found that residents of the proposed development would utilise ca. 2.0% and 1.7% of the total capacity of existing AM and PM peak hour bus services respectively. During the AM and PM peak hours, bus service excess capacities were found to be 42% and 43% respectively in the direction of maximum demand. As such, it is apparent that current public transport capacity within the application site's vicinity is sufficient to accommodate additional demand generated by the proposed development.

(Note: These reports can be supplied to the NTA for your information upon request)

In relation to Opinion Item 8(a), can the NTA provide any further relevant information regarding service capacity, including existing and planned bus priority measures along the relevant bus routes within the network, to inform the development proposals?

Opinion Item 8(b):

As part of the proposed planning submission, we have also prepared drawings that reflect the design of the 4-arm signalised junction, the proposed relocation and design of the bus stop on Fortfield Road and the increased footpath provision along the eastern side of Fortfield Road.

The development will be accessed by vehicles via a single proposed junction off Fortfield Road. This junction will consist of an upgrade of the existing Fortfield Road/College Drive non-signalised T-Junction to a 4-arm signalised junction with pedestrian controlled crossing facilities. Please refer to attached PUNCH Drawing 222102-PUNCH-XX-XX-DR-C-0460 for illustration.

As part of the proposed development works, it is proposed to replace Bus Stops 2397 (existing location compromised by new 4 arm signalised junction of Fortfield Road and College Drive) with a new locally relocated bus stop facility. The proposed replacement bus stop is located 60m south of Bus Stop 2397. This bus stop facility will consist of a covered bus shelter with seating in accordance with the requirements of Dublin Bus. The introduction of this bus stop would represent an improvement on the current bus stops which consist of unsheltered stop signage only. It is proposed to retain Bus Stop 2398 (nearest the school) in its current location/arrangement.



I can also confirm that the development proposals include for the increased footpath provision along the eastern side of Fortfield Road, with a continuous minimum width of at least 2m being achieved.

These proposals are outlined in a series of drawings that can be supplied to the NTA for your information upon request.

In relation to Opinion Item 8(b), can the NTA please review the proposals and provide feedback regarding the design of the 4-arm signalised junction, the proposed relocation and design of the bus stop on Fortfield Road and the increased footpath provision along the eastern side of Fortfield Road?

We would greatly appreciate your engagement on the above to close out these DCC Opinion items.

If a specific NTA contact could please be identified, this would help expedite the matter and allow close-out through direct engagement.

Regards and thanks,
Paul Casey
BEng CEng MIEI
Director



Carnegie House, Library Road, Dun Laoghaire, Co Dublin, A96 C7W7, Ireland
t: +353 1 271 2200 m: +353 85 825 1255 w: www.punchconsulting.com
Dublin | Limerick | Cork | Galway | Glasgow



Appendix B Dublin Bus Correspondence

From: Paul Casey | PUNCH
Sent: Monday 21 October 2024 13:44
To: info@dodublin.ie
Subject: RE: LRD6058/24: Fortfield Road LRD - Request for Dublin Bus Consultation/Engagement
Attachments: Notice of LRD Opinion.pdf
Importance: High

Sir/Madam,

I am following up on previous correspondence of 14th August.

We have not received a response to date from Dublin Bus to assist in addressing the Dublin City Council's LRD Opinion in relation to a proposed residential development on Fortfield Road, Terenure. Specifically they have requested the following:

Opinion Item 8(a)

"The applicant is required to consult with the NTA and Dublin Bus regarding the capacity of the urban bus services serving the application site. Relevant information regarding service capacity, including existing and planned bus priority measures along the relevant bus routes within the network, should be included in the planning application to inform the applicant's justification for the scale and density of development."

We would greatly appreciate your engagement. **If a specific Dublin Bus contact could please be identified, this would help expedite the matter and allow close-out through direct engagement.**

Note: The NTA have reverted with their comments but are supportive of the proposals.

Kind regards,

Paul Casey
BEng CEng MIEI
Director



Carnegie House, Library Road, Dun Laoghaire, Co Dublin, A96 C7W7, Ireland

t: +353 1 271 2200 m: +353 85 825 1255 w: www.punchconsulting.com

Dublin | Limerick | Cork | Galway | Glasgow



From: Paul Casey | PUNCH
Sent: Wednesday 14 August 2024 11:49
To: info@dodublin.ie
Subject: LRD6058/24: Fortfield Road LRD - Request for Dublin Bus Consultation/Engagement

Dear Sir/Madam,

We are currently progressing a Large-Scale Residential Development (LRD) planning submission with Dublin City Council (DCC) in relation to a proposed development located on Fortfield Road, Terenure, Dublin 6W.



As part of this process, DCC has issued their LRD Opinion document 'Notice of LRD Opinion' (see attached Planning Authority Ref No. LRD6058/24) in which they request the following:

Opinion Item 8(a)

"The applicant is required to consult with the NTA and Dublin Bus regarding the capacity of the urban bus services serving the application site. Relevant information regarding service capacity, including existing and planned bus priority measures along the relevant bus routes within the network, should be included in the planning application to inform the applicant's justification for the scale and density of development."

Opinion Item 8(a):

As part of the proposed planning submission, we have prepared documents that reflect the urban bus services:

1. **Residential Travel Plan** – this document outlines available transport infrastructure serving the development location including public transport, cycle infrastructure, proposed car and cycle parking quantum, Census 2022 travel patterns, the Templeogue / Rathfarnham to City Centre Core Bus Corridor proposals.
2. **Public Transport Capacity Study** – This consists of a public transport capacity study in relation to a Large-Scale Residential Development (LRD) at Fortfield Road. The study has been informed by a comprehensive bus occupancy survey undertaken in February 2024. Based on the findings of the public transport occupancy survey, mode share targets set out within the Residential Travel Plan, and analysis contained within this Note, it was found that residents of the proposed development would utilise ca. 2.0% and 1.7% of the total capacity of existing AM and PM peak hour bus services respectively. During the AM and PM peak hours, bus service excess capacities were found to be 42% and 43% respectively in the direction of maximum demand. As such, it is apparent that current public transport capacity within the application site's vicinity is sufficient to accommodate additional demand generated by the proposed development.

(Note: These reports can be supplied to the NTA for your information upon request)

In relation to Opinion Item 8(a), can Dublin Bus provide any further relevant information regarding service capacity, including existing and planned bus priority measures along the relevant bus routes within the network, to inform the development proposals?

We would greatly appreciate your engagement on the above to close out the DCC Opinion item.

If a specific Dublin Bus contact could please be identified, this would help expedite the matter and allow close-out through direct engagement.

Regards and thanks,

Paul Casey
BEng CEng MIEI
Director



Carnegie House, Library Road, Dun Laoghaire, Co Dublin, A96 C7W7, Ireland

t: +353 1 271 2200 **m:** +353 85 825 1255 **w:** www.punchconsulting.com

Dublin | Limerick | Cork | Galway | Glasgow

