

**Uimhir Thagarta Uathúil:** FIN-C532-59

**Údar:** Jimmy Guerin

**Stádas:** Submitted

**Aighneacht:** Opposition to Zoning

**Comhairliúchán:**

Proposed Material Alterations to the Draft Fingal Development

Plan 2023-2029

---

## MAP SHEET 12: Blanchardstown North

**Caibidil:** PART 3: Proposed Amendments to the Draft Developm...» MAP SHEET 12: Blanchardstown North

**Select, where provided, the reference for the amendment on which you wish to comment , or for flood maps, the drawing ref number:**

PA SH

12.4

Submission Re: PA SH 12.4

I am opposed to this Zoning on the basis of the expert advice afforded to members at the earlier stages of the plan and also as I believe that this site was introduced by the executive in an attempt to provide an alternative site for one they were strongly opposed to and not because of its suitability.

There were two sections of land proposed for rezoning in this area and the first was supported by a large majority of elected members in both previous rounds of the development plan.

On both occasions the management opposed the Zoning of the land supported by the members and in both previous stages gave many reasons why additional land Zoned GE in this area was bad for Fingal.

The land subject to this proposed alteration was, in my considered view, introduced as an alternative site in the hope that members would be persuaded to reverse their earlier decision in relation to the other site. Members were totally baffled to see one site being so strongly opposed while this site close by was the subject of a CE recommendation.

In the managements contribution at the first and second stage of the plan they made a number of comments that in fact are applicable to both sites

These included:

The first site that was passed by 76% of the members was too close to the Airport and this was a cause for concern, the site that is the subject of this alteration is in fact closer to the Airport so it would be wrong in managements and in my view to Zone this land GE

The first site that was passed by 76% of the members, if zoned, according to management would greatly eat into the Green Belt and could lead to overdevelopment in the area. Management could not emphasise enough how bad this was. This being the case and that site having been adopted by the members on two occasions we must respect the advice and allow this land, brought forward by the CE in the last round remain GB

The management on many occasions advised members that they must take account of the Core Strategy when considering proposals for rezoning. We have completed a study that indicated that enough land was zoned and while I understand members wanting additional employment lands in Fingal I am confused as to how Management can bring forward this proposal.

The proposed special objective states:

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

*While I accept that this could be beneficial to Fingal if this is deemed necessary then a CPO could be considered on the portion of the lands required without having to rezone such a large area.*

*Jimmy Guerin*

---

**Documents Attached:** Níl